



Armin Pöhlmann

# The Debate

between Rammohan Roy  
and Joshua Marshman  
1820 to 1825

A Fight About the Interpretation of the  
Bible as an Interreligious Encounter

Edition

λoγoς



# The Debate between Rammohan Roy and Joshua Marshman 1820 to 1825

A Fight About the Interpretation of the Bible  
as an Interreligious Encounter

Armin Pöhlmann

Logos Verlag Berlin



Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.



The corresponding text is available under DOI 10.30819/5387.

Cover image: Joshua Marshman, image, courtesy, Center for Study of the Life and Work of William Carey, D.D. (1761-1834), William Carey University, Hattiesburg, Mississippi, USA.

Cover image: Rammohan Roy, Frontispiece by *The Brahma Samaj and Other Modern Eclectic Systems of Religion in India. Religious Reform, Part IV*, Madras 1893.

© Copyright Logos Verlag Berlin GmbH 2022

All rights reserved.

DOI 10.30819/5387E

Logos Verlag Berlin GmbH  
Georg-Knorr-Str. 4, Geb. 10,  
12681 Berlin

Tel.: +49 (0)30 / 42 85 10 90

Fax: +49 (0)30 / 42 85 10 92

<http://www.logos-verlag.de>



# Introduction

This edition is a supplement for my doctoral thesis published in 2022 under the title *Die Debatte zwischen Rammohan Roy und Joshua Marshman von 1820–1825. Ein Streit um die Auslegung der Bibel zwischen interreligiöser Begegnung und Unversöhnlichkeit*. In 1820, the Hindu philosopher Rammohan Roy published a book *The Precepts of Jesus* which caused a debate of five years between him and the Baptist missionary Joshua Marshman from Serampore.

One aim of my thesis was to analyse the contributions of Rammohan Roy and Joshua Marshman on equal terms. Mostly Rammohan has been in the focus of scholarship, while Marshman was disregarded. Although this is not without reason, it is important to read all the texts and to follow their connections.

In my work I found it useful to type the source texts into my computer, and I introduced numbered paragraphs for quotation. Step by step I realized that the result could be useful for further scholarship, and I made this edition which, for the first time in history, combines the texts of Rammohan and Marshman in chronological order.

One feature of the debate is that we have several discourses about biblical passages and dogmatic topics stretching through ten texts. Both opponents react to each other by objecting the other's position, changing their own position, or strengthening it with additional arguments. They quote each other through these discourses and the mass of text is growing contribution by contribution. The result is a long discourse with internal quotations and links, much like a modern hypertext.

There are three types of quotations. First, there are quotations from within the discourse, quotations from the opponent or self quotations, sometimes also quotations containing other quotations. These quotations have been [marked by colour](#) and they have been referenced with respective footnotes showing the paragraph where they came from. There is an index in the appendix of all these references (*Paragraphs Referred to in Later Contributions*). If someone wants to know whether an argument is contested or taken up again in the debate, this index will show it.

Second, there are quotations from the Bible and other holy scriptures. They are referenced in the margin of the page and by a full index in the appendix (*Index of Scriptural References*). The *Precepts of Jesus*, which is a compilation of biblical text, is not taken up in this reference system, although there is another Index listing the passages in the *Precepts* by their common designation.

Third, there are quotations from the works of other authors used by Rammohan and Marshman. As far as they could be identified they are referenced with footnotes and also with an index (*Index of Quoted Authors*).

Considering which source texts should be appropriate for this edition I chose the

original publication in the *Friend of India* for the contributions of Marshman (and Schmid), and for Rammohan's contributions I chose the first edition published by the Unitarian Society. It is closer to the very first edition published by Rammohan himself in Calcutta than the later editions e. g. the *English Works* by Nag/Burman or Ghose, but still it is much better available than the Calcutta editions.<sup>1</sup> The Unitarian editors corrected some mistakes and marked these changes with [brackets]. From these source texts the original page numbering is visible by /numbers in the text.

Each contribution is introduced with some editorial remarks and a summary of the history and the content. The conclusions presented there are results of my doctoral thesis, which should be consulted for further explanation.

I am indebted to Dr. Şuayip Seven, *University of Münster, Zentrum für Islamische Theologie*, who took the time to explain to me the origin and meaning of the Arabic quotations in §138, and to Ms. Meriam Adami, who helped me with the spelling and typesetting of Arabic. In the same way I am indebted to Dr. Monika Freier, *Institut für Asien- und Afrikawissenschaften at Humboldt University Berlin*, who did the typesetting of the Sanscrit and Bengali words and phrases in this edition for me.

---

<sup>1</sup> In some cases differences between the several editions have been annotated.

## Acronyms

**FI MS** The Friend of India, Monthly Series.

**FI QS** The Friend of India, Quarterly Series.

**Ghose** Jogendra Chunder Ghose (ed.), *The English Works of Raja Rammohun Roy*, Vol. III, New Delhi 1906.

**KJV** Holy Bible. King James Version, 1611.

**London 1823** The first edition of the *Precepts* and the three Appeals published by Thomas Rees.

**London 1824** The second edition from 1824.

**Luther 2017** The German Lutherbibel, revised 2017.

**Nag/Burman** Kalidas Nag, Debajyoti Burman (eds.), *The English Works of Raja Rammohun Roy*, 1945, Reprint Calcutta 1995.

**NTIV** Thomas Belsham et al., *The New Testament, in an Improved Version*.

## Critical Signs and Annotations

* † ‡ etc.	Original notes in the source text.
1, 2, 3	Editorial notes in this edition.
[]	Within the text: changes made by the editors of the London edition 1823.
⊔	Omission in the <i>Precepts of Jesus</i> of biblical text compared to the King James Version.
/45	Pagination of the source text.
abc	Quotation from another contribution to the debate.
[abc]	Titles of chapters or sections added in this edition for the reader's orientation.



# Contents

<b>1 Rammohan: The Precepts of Jesus (Jan. 1820)</b>	9
Editorial Introduction . . . . .	9
Introduction . . . . .	11
Matthew. . . . .	14
Mark. . . . .	36
Luke. . . . .	44
John. . . . .	65
<b>2 Schmid/Marshman: Some Remarks on the <i>Precepts</i> (Feb. 1820)</b>	69
Editorial Introduction . . . . .	69
Deocar Schmid: Some remarks on the Precepts . . . . .	71
Joshua Marshman (Editor): Some additional remarks . . . . .	75
<b>3 Rammohan: Appeal to the Christian Public (April 1820)</b>	77
Editorial Introduction . . . . .	77
The identity and the believes of the compiler of the Precepts, his possible reactions onto the insult being called a “heathen”. . . . .	79
The Greatest Commandment as criterion for the selection of passages from the gospels. . . . .	81
The two important points pointed out by the reviewer answered by God’s forgiveness and his gift of strength to humankind. . . . .	83
Love and charity in their importance for salvation in opposite to dogmatic confession. . . . .	85
About the failure of the missionaries’s strategies in India. . . . .	87
The question of dogmatic passages. . . . .	89
Charges of inconsistency. . . . .	91
The belief in God generally prevailing? Hindu-polytheism, freethinkers and Advaita Vedāntists. . . . .	92
<b>4 Marshman: Answer to the <i>Appeal</i> (May 1820)</b>	95
Editorial Introduction . . . . .	95

<b>5</b>	<b>Marshman: Review of <i>Precepts and Appeal</i> (Sept. 1820)</b>	103
	Editorial Introduction . . . . .	103
	The Deity of Christ. . . . .	107
	The Atonement through Jesus, the Messiah . . . . .	112
	Human depravity and necessity of Divine influence . . . . .	117
	Questions of doctrines and miracles . . . . .	121
	Conclusion . . . . .	125
<b>6</b>	<b>Rammohan: Second Appeal to the Christian Public (Spring 1821)</b>	127
	Editorial Introduction . . . . .	127
	Advertisement . . . . .	130
	I. General Defence of the Precepts . . . . .	131
	II. Natural inferiority of the Son . . . . .	137
	III. The “seven positions” . . . . .	147
	IV. The Doctrine of Atonement . . . . .	161
	V. Doctrines and miraculous narrations . . . . .	168
	VI. Impersonality of the Holy Spirit &c. . . . .	175
	App. I. Quotations from the Old Testament in the New . . . . .	194
	App. II. Deity of Jesus in the Old Testament . . . . .	200
	P. S. Prideaux’ Interpretation of Is 9:6f. . . . .	226
<b>7</b>	<b>Marshman: Review of the Second Appeal (Dec. 1821)</b>	231
	Editorial Introduction . . . . .	231
	Introduction . . . . .	233
	Chapter I. On the Atonement . . . . .	236
	Chapter II. On the Deity of Christ . . . . .	269
	Rammohun Roy’s Second Chapter, “Natural Inferiority of the Son to the Father,” examined . . . . .	292
	Rammohun Roy’s Objection to the Seven Positions, considered. . . . .	303
	Concluding Observations . . . . .	317
<b>8</b>	<b>Rammohan: The Final Appeal to the Christian Public (Jan. 1823)</b>	321
	Editorial Introduction . . . . .	321
	Notice . . . . .	323
	Preface . . . . .	324
	I. Introductory Remarks . . . . .	327
	II. On the Doctrine of Atonement . . . . .	337
	III. On the Doctrine of the Trinity . . . . .	365
	IV. Natural inferiority of the Son . . . . .	429

V. The “seven positions” . . . . .	460
I. On the Holy Spirit and other Subjects . . . . .	480
<b>9 Marshman: First Review of the Final Appeal – Atonement (Dec. 1823)</b>	<b>493</b>
Editorial Introduction . . . . .	493
Introductory Observations . . . . .	495
Section I. Remarks on his Preliminary Observations . . . . .	496
Section II. Rammohun Roy’s objections to the evidence for the Atonement adduced from the Pentateuch, considered . . . . .	511
Section III. Rammohun Roy’s observations on the Evidence for the Atonement adduced from the Book of Psalms, considered. . . . .	527
Section IV. Rammohun Roy’s observations on the Evidence for the Atonement adduced from the Prophets, considered. . . . .	534
Section V. Rammohun Roy’s observations on the Evidence for the Atonement adduced from the Evangelists, considered. . . . .	544
Section VI. Rammohun Roy’s observations on the Evidence for the Atonement adduced from the Epistles, considered. . . . .	547
<b>10 Marshman: Second Review of the Final Appeal – Deity (Jan. 1825)</b>	<b>559</b>
Editorial Introduction . . . . .	559
Introduction . . . . .	560
The Angel of the LORD . . . . .	560
The Psalms as christological evidence . . . . .	576
The Prophets as christological evidence . . . . .	601
Against the Natural Inferiority of the Son (Final Appeal Chapter IV) . . . .	639
The “Seven Positions” again reviewed. . . . .	666
Other Subjects and Conclusion . . . . .	679
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>685</b>
<b>Index of Scriptural References</b>	<b>693</b>
<b>Index of Quoted Authors</b>	<b>715</b>
<b>Paragraphs Referred to in Later Contributions</b>	<b>717</b>
<b>Passages in the <i>Precepts</i> by Name</b>	<b>725</b>
<b>Index of Topics</b>	<b>729</b>





# 1 Rammohan Roy: The Precepts of Jesus

## Editorial Introduction

*The Precepts of Jesus* was a failed interfaith Bible translation project. The first incomplete version of the book was published anonymously in January 1820. The editor and compiler of the text was Rammohan Roy, and the publisher was the *Baptist Mission Press* in Calcutta, which belonged to a group of Baptist missionaries calling themselves *Union of Baptist Brethren*. Their probably most influential person, the theologian and linguist William Yates (1792-1845), had made contact to Rammohan Roy in 1815 and a friendship had developed. In 1821 the Baptist Mission Press also announced to republish the other works of Rammohan Roy.

The published version is incomplete insofar it contained only the English text according to the King James Version. The Bengali and Sanskrit translation was supposed to be worked out by Rammohan Roy, William Yates and another Baptist missionary, William Adam, who formed a weekly meeting translators' group. In translating the whole New Testament into Bengali, they aimed at a Bengali version of the *Precepts* and an own translation for the Calcutta Baptists for their own use in their mission work. The Driving force for this was the dissatisfaction with the existing translations made by the Serampore missionaries.

During the work, the *Precepts* was attacked by Deocar Schmid (CMS) and Joshua Marshman (Serampore), and the three translators faced growing disagreements concerning dogmatic expressions in the Greek text and their correct translation. The translators' group broke up during the first half of 1821 because of this internal and external pressure. As Rammohan seemed to have lost his interest in finishing the *Precepts* according to their original plan in the following years, the work remained incomplete.

The *Precepts* begin with an "Introduction" by Rammohan Roy, stating the idea and criteria of the compilation, and biblical text from the four gospels.

The criteria of Rammohan's compilation can be concluded from the title, the introduction and the later defence he wrote in the Appeal to the Christian Public. He identified the Greatest Commandment (Mk 12:28–34) as the core of Jesus' teachings

and selected passages from Jesus' preaching and conversation, precepts, parables and controversies. *The Precepts of Jesus* is not an attempt to reconstruct the "life of Jesus" or to select historically plausible texts against dubious passages. Rammohan's statements in his introduction are not to be understood in a way that he himself did not believe in the reliability of the text he omitted. The *Precepts* contain 1197 verses selected out of the four gospels as follows:

Mt	Mk	Lk	Joh	Σ
498	153	493	53	1197

In the original editions, the biblical text runs through without any verse numbers or headlines. In most cases we find a footnote indicating the new beginning after some portion of the gospel is omitted, but this is not reliable.

The planned full edition with Bengali and Sanskrit translations was probably supposed to contain additional introductory explanations in these languages, as Rammohan used to do with his other multilingual editions of the Upaniṣads.

The text basis for this edition is the London Reprint 1823, pp. xxi-xxviii; 1-98, published by the Unitarian Society. The original text of the *Precepts* does not contain any headlines of the gospels or of bible passages and no verse numbering. I added verse numbering for the orientation and access to the text and <small titles> for the pericopes. These small titles follow the titles in the *North American Standard Bible* and similar modern editions. They don't suggest or pretend to reflect Rammohan's understanding of the text.

Omissions of passages of the biblical text are marked with T and explained in footnotes. The aim of this additions is to make the text and it's compilation process more transparent for readers and for research. The size and structure of the paragraphs Rammohan divided the text into is maintained.

The London edition contains a table of contents of the whole volume before the introduction on p. xxiii which I omitted, and on page xxiv an Erratum referring to the *Second Appeal* §151, which I moved to that place.

/[xxi]

THE  
PRECEPTS OF JESUS  
THE GUIDE TO PEACE AND HAPPINESS,  
EXTRACTED FROM THE  
BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT  
ASCRIBED TO THE FOUR EVANGELISTS.  
WITH  
TRANSLATIONS INTO SUNGSCRIT AND BENGALEE.  
CALCUTTA:  
PRINTED AT THE BAPTIST MISSION PRESS, CIRCULAR ROAD.  
1820.  
LONDON, REPRINTED:  
1823.

/(xxv)

INTRODUCTION.

A CONVICTION in the mind of its total ignorance of the nature and of the specific attributes of the Godhead, and a sense of doubt respecting the real essence of the soul, give rise to feelings of great dissatisfaction with our limited powers, as well as with all human acquirements which fail to inform us on these interesting points.— On the other hand, a notion of the existence of a supreme superintending power, the author and preserver of this harmonious system, who has organized and who regulates such an infinity of celestial and terrestrial objects; and a due estimation of that law which teaches that man should do unto others as he would wish to be done by, reconcile us to human nature, and tend to render our existence agreeable to ourselves and profitable to the rest of mankind. The former of these sources of satisfaction, viz. a belief in God, prevails generally; being derived either from tradition and instruction, or from an attentive survey of the wonderful skill and contrivance displayed in the works of nature. The latter, although it is partially taught also in every system of religion with which I am acquainted, is principally inculcated by Christianity. This essential characteristic of the Christian religion I was for a long time unable to distinguish as such, amidst /xxvi the various doctrines I found insisted upon in the writings of Christian authors, and in the conversation of those teachers of Christianity with whom I have had the honor of holding communication. Amongst those opinions, the most prevalent seems to be, that no one is justly

§1

entitled to the appellation of Christian who does not believe in the divinity of Christ and of the Holy Ghost, as well as in the divine nature of God, the Father of all created beings. Many allow a much greater latitude to the term Christian, and consider it as comprehending all who acknowledge the Bible to contain the revealed will of God, however they may differ from others in their interpretations of particular passages of the Scripture; whilst some require from him who claims the title of Christian only an adherence to the doctrines of Christ, as taught by himself, without insisting on implicit confidence in those of the Apostles, as being, except when speaking from inspiration, like other men, liable to mistake and error. That they were so is obvious from the several instances of differences of opinion amongst the Apostles recorded in the Acts and Epistles.\*

§2 Voluminous works, written by learned men of particular sects for the purpose of establishing the truth, consistency, rationality, and priority of their own peculiar doctrines, contain such variety of /xxvii arguments, that I cannot hope to be able to adduce here any new reasonings of sufficient novelty and force to attract the notice of my readers. Besides, in matters of religion particularly, men in general, through prejudice and partiality to the opinions which they once form, pay little or no attention to opposite sentiments (however reasonable they may be,) and often turn a deaf ear to what is most consistent with the laws of nature, and conformable to the dictates of human reason and divine revelation. At the same time, to those who are not biased by prejudice, and who are, by the grace of God, open to conviction, a simple enumeration and statement of the respective tenets of different sects may be sufficient guide to direct their inquiries in ascertaining which of them is most consistent with the sacred traditions, and most acceptable to common sense.—For these reasons, I decline entering into any discussion on those points, and confine my attention at present to the task of laying before my fellow-creatures the words of Christ, with a translation from the English into Sungscrit and the language of Bengal. I feel persuaded that by separating from the other matters contained in the New Testament the moral precepts found in that book, these will be more likely to produce the desirable effect of improving the hearts and minds of men of different persuasions and degrees of understanding. For, historical and some other passages are liable to the doubts and disputes of free-thinkers and antichris-/xxviiiitians, especially miraculous relations, which are much less wonderful than the fabricated tales handed down to the natives of Asia,† and consequently would be apt at best to carry

\* Vide Acts, ch. xi. 2, 3, ch. xv. 2, 7; I Corinthians, ch. i. 12; Galatians, ch. ii. 11–13.

† Ugisti<sup>1</sup> is famed for having swallowed the ocean, when it had given him offence, and having restored

<sup>1</sup> London1823 and the Unitarian editions read “Ugisti”. Ghose reads “Ugusti”, Nag/Burman: “Agasti”. Schmid and Marshman quote “Ugusti” (§6, §21, §60).

little weight with them. On the contrary, moral doctrines, tending evidently to the maintenance of the peace and harmony of mankind at large, are beyond the reach of metaphysical perversion, and intelligible alike to the learned and to the unlearned. This simple code of religion and morality is so admirably calculated to elevate men's ideas to high and liberal notions of one GOD<sup>1</sup>, who has equally subjected all living creatures, without distinction of cast, rank, or wealth, to change, disappointment, pain and death, and has equally admitted all to be partakers of the bountiful mercies which he has lavished over nature, and is also so well fitted to regulate the conduct of the human race in the discharge of their various duties to GOD, to themselves, and to society, that I cannot but hope the best effects from its promulgation in the present form.

---

it by urinary evacuation: at his command, also, the Vindhyu range of mountains prostrated itself, and so remains. (*Wilson's Dictionary*)<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ghose: "of God". Schmid quotes "of one God", §11. See also *Appeal*, §22 and §36.

<sup>2</sup> Rammohan quotes closely from Wilson's Sanskrit Dictionary. The referred paragraph is: "अगस्ति [...]"

<sup>1</sup>The name of a Saint, celebrated in Hindu mythology, the son of both MITRA and VARUNA, by URVÁSI: he is represented of short stature, and is said by some to have been born in a water jar; he is famed for having swallowed the ocean, when it had given him offence, and having restored it by urinary evacuation: at his command also, the VINDYA range of mountains prostrated itself, and so remains; hence his present appellation. He is also considered as the regent of the star Canopus. *Hém. 2. 36.*" (*Wilson, Dictionary*, 5.)

/[1]

THE  
PRECEPTS OF JESUS,  
THE  
GUIDE TO PEACE AND HAPPINESS.

†<sup>1</sup>

<The Beatitudes Mt 5:1-12>

<sup>\*1</sup>AND seeing the multitudes, he went up into a mountain: and when he was set, his disciples came unto him: <sup>2</sup>and he opened his mouth, and taught them, saying, <sup>3</sup>Blessed *are* the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. <sup>4</sup>Blessed *are* they that mourn: for they shall be comforted. <sup>5</sup>Blessed *are* the meek: for they shall inherit the earth. <sup>6</sup>Blessed *are* they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled. <sup>7</sup>Blessed *are* the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy. <sup>8</sup>Blessed *are* the pure in heart: for they shall see God. <sup>9</sup>Blessed *are* the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God. <sup>10</sup>Blessed *are* they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. <sup>11</sup>Blessed are ye, when *men* shall revile you, and persecute *you*, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. <sup>12</sup>Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great *is* your reward in /2 heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you.

<Salt and Light Mt 5:13-16>

<sup>13</sup>Ye are the salt of the earth: but if the salt have lost his savour, wherewith shall it be salted? It is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men. <sup>14</sup>Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on an hill cannot be hid. <sup>15</sup>Neither do men light a candle, and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick; and it giveth light unto all that are in the house. <sup>16</sup>Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven.

---

\* Matthew, Chap. v.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Mt 1-4 (Genealogy, birth, temptation, first disciples of Jesus, John the Baptist).

<The Law and the Prophets Mt 5:17-20>

<sup>17</sup>Think not that I am come to destroy the Law, or the Prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. <sup>18</sup>For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. <sup>19</sup>Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach *them*, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. <sup>20</sup>For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed *the righteousness* of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.

<Concerning Anger Mt 5:21-26>

<sup>21</sup>Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment: <sup>22</sup>but I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment: and /3 whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire. <sup>23</sup>Therefore if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee; <sup>24</sup>leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift. <sup>25</sup>Agree with thine adversary quickly, whilst thou art in the way with him; lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. <sup>26</sup>Verily I say unto thee, Thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing.

<Concerning Adultery and Divorce Mt 5:27-32>

<sup>27</sup>Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery: <sup>28</sup>but I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart. <sup>29</sup>And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast *it* from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not *that* thy whole body should be cast into hell. <sup>30</sup>And if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off, and cast *it* from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not *that* thy whole body should be cast into hell. <sup>31</sup>It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement: <sup>32</sup>but I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: /4 and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery. †<sup>1</sup>

<Love for Enemies Mt 5:43-48>

<sup>43</sup>Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy: <sup>44</sup>But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Mt 5:33-37 (Concerning oaths) and Mt 5:38-42 (Concerning retaliation), but see Lk 6:29-30.

to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; <sup>45</sup>that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. <sup>46</sup>For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same? <sup>47</sup>And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more *than others*? do not even the publicans so? <sup>48</sup>Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.

<Concerning Almsgiving Mt 6:1-4>

<sup>1</sup>\*Take heed that ye do not your alms before men, to be seen of them: otherwise ye have no reward of your Father, which is in heaven. <sup>2</sup>Therefore when thou doest *thine* alms, do not sound a trumpet before thee, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the streets, that they may have glory of men. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward. <sup>3</sup>But when thou doest alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth: <sup>4</sup>that thine alms may be in secret: and thy Father which seeth in secret, himself shall reward thee openly.

<Concerning Prayer Mt 6:5-15>

<sup>5</sup>And when thou prayest, thou shalt not be as the /5 hypocrites *are*: for they love to pray standing in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward. <sup>6</sup>But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly. <sup>7</sup>But when ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathen *do*: for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking. <sup>8</sup>Be not ye therefore like unto them: for your Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask him. <sup>9</sup>After this manner therefore pray ye: Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name. <sup>10</sup>Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as *it is* in heaven. <sup>11</sup>Give us this day our daily bread. <sup>12</sup>And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. <sup>13</sup>And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: for thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen. <sup>14</sup>For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you: <sup>15</sup>but if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses.

<Concerning Fasting Mt 6:16-18>

<sup>16</sup>Moreover when ye fast, be not, as the hypocrites, of a sad countenance: for they disfigure their faces, that they may appear unto men to fast. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward. <sup>17</sup>But thou, when thou fastest, anoint thine head, and wash thy face; <sup>18</sup>that thou appear not unto men to fast, but unto thy /6 Father which is in secret: and thy Father, which seeth in secret, shall reward thee openly.

---

\* Matthew, Chap. vi.



<Concerning Treasures; The Sound Eye Mt 6:19-23>

<sup>19</sup>Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal: <sup>20</sup>but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal: <sup>21</sup>for where your treasure is, there will your heart be also. <sup>22</sup>The light of the body is the eye: if therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light. <sup>23</sup>But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness. If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great *is* that darkness!

<Serving Two Masters; Do Not Worry Mt 6:24-34>

<sup>24</sup>No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and Mammon. <sup>25</sup>Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment? <sup>26</sup>Behold the fowls of the air: for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they? <sup>27</sup>Which of you by taking thought can add one cubit unto his stature? <sup>28</sup>And why take ye thought for raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin: <sup>29</sup>and yet I say unto /7 you, that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. <sup>30</sup>Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, *shall he* not much more *clothe* you, O ye of little faith? <sup>31</sup>Therefore take no thought, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed? <sup>32</sup>(for after all these things do the Gentiles seek:) for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things. <sup>33</sup>But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you. <sup>34</sup>Take therefore no thought for the morrow: for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself. Sufficient unto the day *is* the evil thereof.

<Judging others; Profaning the Holy; Ask, Search, Knock; The Golden Rule Mt 7:1-12>

<sup>1</sup>\*Judge not, that ye be not judged. <sup>2</sup>For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again. <sup>3</sup>And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye? <sup>4</sup>Or how wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me pull out the mote out of thine eye; and, behold, a beam *is* in thine own eye? <sup>5</sup>Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye. <sup>6</sup>Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under /8 their feet,

---

\* Matthew, Chap. vii.

and turn again and rend you. <sup>7</sup>Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you: <sup>8</sup>for every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened. <sup>9</sup>Or what man is there of you, whom if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone? <sup>10</sup>Or if he ask a fish, will he give him a serpent? <sup>11</sup>If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him? <sup>12</sup>Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the Prophets.

<The Narrow Gate; A Tree and Its Fruit; Concerning Self-Deception Mt 7:13-23>

<sup>13</sup>Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide *is* the gate, and broad *is* the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat: <sup>14</sup>because strait *is* the gate, and narrow *is* the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it. <sup>15</sup>Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. <sup>16</sup>Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? <sup>17</sup>Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. <sup>18</sup>A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither *can* a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. <sup>19</sup>Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire. <sup>20</sup>Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them. <sup>21</sup>Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the king-/9dom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. <sup>22</sup>Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? <sup>23</sup>And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity.

<Hearers and Doers Mt 7:24-29>

<sup>24</sup>Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock: <sup>25</sup>and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock. <sup>26</sup>And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand: <sup>27</sup>and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell: and great was the fall of it. <sup>28</sup>And it came to pass, when Jesus had ended these sayings, the people were astonished at his doctrine: <sup>29</sup>for he taught them as *one* having authority, and not as the Scribes. †<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Mt 8:1-9:9 (Healing a leper, a centurion's servant, the Gadarene demoniacs and a paralytic; would-be followers of Jesus, but see Lk 9:57-62; stilling the Storm; call of Matthew).

<Questions About Purity and Fasting Mt 9:10-17>

\*<sup>10</sup>And it came to pass, as Jesus sat at meat in the house, behold, many Publicans and sinners came and sat down with him and his disciples. <sup>11</sup>And when the Pharisees saw it, they said unto his disciples, Why eateth your Master with Publicans and sinners? <sup>12</sup>But when Jesus heard that, he said unto them, They /10 that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick. <sup>13</sup>But go ye and learn what that meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice: for I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance. <sup>14</sup>Then came to him the disciples of John, saying, Why do we and the Pharisees fast oft, but thy disciples fast not? <sup>15</sup>And Jesus said unto them, Can the children of the bride-chamber mourn, as long as the bridegroom is with them? But the days will come, when the bridegroom shall be taken from them, and then shall they fast. <sup>16</sup>No man putteth a piece of new cloth unto an old garment, for that which is put in to fill it up taketh from the garment, and the rent is made worse. <sup>17</sup>Neither do men put new wine into old bottles: else the bottles break, and the wine runneth out, and the bottles perish; but they put new wine into new bottles, and both are preserved. †<sup>1</sup>

<Coming persecutions; Whom to Fear; Not Peace, but a Sword; Rewards Mt 10:16-42>

†<sup>16</sup>Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves: be ye therefore wise as serpents, and harmless as doves. <sup>17</sup>But beware of men: for they will deliver you up to the councils, and they will scourge you in their synagogues: <sup>18</sup>and ye shall be brought before governors and kings for my sake, for a testimony against them and the Gentiles. <sup>19</sup>But when they deliver you up, take no thought how or what ye shall speak: for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak. <sup>20</sup>For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh /11 in you. <sup>21</sup>And the brother shall deliver up the brother to death, and the father the child: and the children shall rise up against *their* parents, and cause them to be put to death. <sup>22</sup>And ye shall be hated of all *men* for my name's sake: but he that endureth to the end shall be saved. <sup>23</sup>But when they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another: for verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come. <sup>24</sup>The disciple is not above *his* master, nor the servant above his lord. <sup>25</sup>It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his lord. If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more *shall they call* them of his household? <sup>26</sup>Fear them not therefore; for there is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed; and hid, that shall not be known. <sup>27</sup>What I tell you in darkness, *that* speak ye in light: and what ye hear in the ear, *that* preach ye upon the housetops.

\* Matthew, Chap. ix. 10. † Matthew, Chap. x. 16.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Mt 9:18-10:15 (A girl restored to life and a woman healed; healing of blinds and a mute; the great harvest; the twelve apostles and their mission).

<sup>28</sup>And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell. <sup>29</sup>Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and one of them shall not fall on the ground without your Father. <sup>30</sup>But the very hairs of your head are all numbered. <sup>31</sup>Fear ye not therefore, ye are of more value than many sparrows. <sup>32</sup>Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven. <sup>33</sup>But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven. <sup>34</sup>Think not that /12 I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword. <sup>35</sup>For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law. <sup>36</sup>And a man's foes *shall be* they of his own household. <sup>37</sup>He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than me, is not worthy of me. <sup>38</sup>And he that taketh not his cross, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me. <sup>39</sup>He that findeth his life shall lose it: and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it. <sup>40</sup>He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me. <sup>41</sup>He that receiveth a prophet in the name of a prophet, shall receive a prophet's reward; and he that receiveth a righteous man in the name of a righteous man, shall receive a righteous man's reward. <sup>42</sup>And whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold *water* only in the name of a disciple, verily I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward. †<sup>1</sup>

<Jesus thanks his Father; The easy Yoke Mt 11:25-30>

\*<sup>25</sup>At that time Jesus answered and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. <sup>26</sup>Even so, Father: for so it seemed good in thy sight. <sup>27</sup>All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither /13 knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and *he* to whomsoever the Son will reveal *him*. <sup>28</sup>Come unto me, all *ye* that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. <sup>29</sup>Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls. <sup>30</sup>For my yoke *is* easy, and my burden is light.

<Plucking Grain on the Sabbath Mt 12:1-8>

†<sup>1</sup>At that time Jesus went on the Sabbath-day through the corn; and his disciples were an hungered, and began to pluck the ears of corn, and to eat. <sup>2</sup>But when the Pharisees saw *it*, they said unto him, Behold, thy disciples do that which is not lawful to do upon the Sabbath-day. <sup>3</sup>But he said unto them, Have ye not read what David

\* Matthew, Chap. xi. 25. † Matthew, Chap xii.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Mt 11:1-24 (About John the Baptist; woes to unrepentant cities).

did, when he was an hungered, and they that were with him; <sup>4</sup>how he entered into the house of God, and did eat the shewbread, which was not lawful for him to eat, neither for them which were with him, but only for the priests? <sup>5</sup>Or have ye not read in the law, how that on the Sabbath-days the priests in the temple profane the Sabbath, and are blameless? <sup>6</sup>But Isay unto you, That in this place is *one* greater than the temple. <sup>7</sup>But if ye had known what *this* meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless. <sup>8</sup>For the Son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath-day.

<The Man with a Withered Hand Mt 12,9-13>

<sup>9</sup>And when he was departed thence, he went into their synagoge: <sup>10</sup>And, behold, there was a man /14 which had *his* hand withered. And they asked him, saying, Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath-days? that they might accuse him. <sup>11</sup>And he said unto them, What man shall there be among you, that shall have one sheep, and if it fall into a pit on the Sabbath-day, will he not lay hold on it, and lift *it* out? <sup>12</sup>How much then is a man better than a sheep? Wherefore it is lawful to do well on the Sabbath-days. <sup>13</sup>Then saith he to the man, Stretch forth thine hand. And he stretched *it* forth; and it was restored whole, like as the other. †<sup>1</sup>

<Friends and Enemies; A Tree and Its Fruit Mt 12:30-37>

<sup>\*30</sup>He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad. <sup>31</sup>Wherefore I say unto you, All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy *against* the *Holy* Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men.<sup>2</sup> <sup>32</sup>And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the *world* to come. <sup>33</sup>Either make the tree good, and his fruit good; or else make the tree corrupt, and his fruit corrupt: for the tree is known by *his* fruit. <sup>34</sup>O generation of vipers, how can ye, being evil, speak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh. <sup>35</sup>A good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things: and an evil man out of the evil treasure bringeth forth /15 evil things. <sup>36</sup>But I say unto you, That every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment. <sup>37</sup>For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt

---

<sup>\*</sup> Matthew, Chap. xii. 30.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Mt 12:14-29 (Conspiracy of the Pharisees to destroy Jesus; God's chosen servant; Jesus and Beelzebul).

<sup>2</sup> Ghose: "Wherefore I say unto you, All manner of sin and blasphemy *against* the *Holy* Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men." This is probably an error. In the *Second Appeal*, §160, Rammohan quotes the verse in the correct form like given above and London1823.

be condemned. †<sup>1</sup>

<The True Kindred of Jesus Mt 12:46-50>

<sup>46</sup>While he yet talked to the people, behold, *his* mother and his brethren stood without, desiring to speak with him. <sup>47</sup>Then one said unto him, Behold, thy mother and brethren stand without, desiring to speak with thee. <sup>48</sup>But he answered and said unto him that told him, Who is my mother? and who are my brethren? <sup>49</sup>And he stretched forth his hand toward his disciples, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren! <sup>50</sup>For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother.

<Parables of the Kingdom of Heaven Mt 13:1-43>

<sup>\*1</sup>The same day went Jesus out of the house, and sat by the sea-side. <sup>2</sup>And great multitudes were gathered together unto him, so that he went into a ship, and sat; and the whole multitude stood on the shore. <sup>3</sup>And he spake many things unto them in parables, saying, Behold, a sower went forth to sow; <sup>4</sup>and when he sowed, some *seeds* fell by the way side, and the fowls came and devoured them up: <sup>5</sup>some fell upon stony places, where they had not much earth: and forthwith they sprung up, because they had no deepness of earth: <sup>6</sup>and when the sun was up, they were scorched; and because they had no root, they /16 withered away. <sup>7</sup>And some fell among thorns; and the thorns sprung up, and choked them: <sup>8</sup>but other fell into good ground, and brought forth fruit, some an hundredfold, some sixtyfold, some thirtyfold. <sup>9</sup>Who hath ears to hear, let him hear. <sup>10</sup>And the disciples came, and said unto him, Why speakest thou unto them in parables? <sup>11</sup>He answered and said unto them, Because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given. <sup>12</sup>For whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance: but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath. <sup>13</sup>Therefore speak I to them in parables: because they seeing, see not; and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand. <sup>14</sup>And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias, which saith, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive: <sup>15</sup>for this people's heart is waxed gross, and *their* ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with *their* eyes, and hear with *their* ears, and should understand with *their* heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them. <sup>16</sup>But blessed *are* your eyes, [for they see: and your ears,] for they hear. <sup>17</sup>For verily I say unto you, That many prophets and righteous *men* have desired to see *those things* which ye see, and have not seen *them*; and to hear *those things* which ye hear, and have not

---

\* Matthew, Chap. xiii.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Mt 12:38-45 (The sign of Jonah; return of the unclean spirit).

heard *them*. <sup>18</sup>Hear ye therefore the parable of the sower. <sup>19</sup>When any one heareth the word of /17 the kingdom, and understandeth *it* not, then cometh the wicked *one*, and catcheth away that which was sown in his heart. This is he which received seed by the way side. <sup>20</sup>But he that received the seed into stony places, the same is he that heareth the word, and anon with joy receiveth it: <sup>21</sup>yet hath he not root in himself, but dureth for a while; for when tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the word, by and by he is offended. <sup>22</sup>He also that received seed among the thorns is he that heareth the word; and the care of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches, choke the word, and he becometh unfruitful. <sup>23</sup>But he that received seed into the good ground, is he that heareth the word, and understandeth *it*; which also beareth fruit, and bringeth forth, some an hundredfold, some sixty, some thirty. <sup>24</sup>Another parable put he forth unto them, saying, The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man who sowed good seed in his field: <sup>25</sup>but while men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way. <sup>26</sup>But when the blade was sprung up, and brought forth fruit, then appeared the tares also. <sup>27</sup>So the servants of the householder came and said unto him, Sir, didst not thou sow good seed in thy field? From whence then hath it tares? <sup>28</sup>He said unto them, An enemy hath done this. The servants said unto him, Wilt thou then that we go and gather them up? <sup>29</sup>But he said, Nay; lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them. <sup>30</sup>Let both grow together until the harvest: and in the time of /18 harvest I will say to the reapers, Gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them: but gather the wheat into my barn. <sup>31</sup>Another parable put he forth unto them, saying, The kingdom of heaven is like to a grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and sowed in his field: <sup>32</sup>which indeed is the least of all seeds; but when it is grown, it is the greatest among herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof. <sup>33</sup>Another parable spake he unto them; The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven, which a woman took, and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened. <sup>34</sup>All these things spake Jesus unto the multitude in parables; and without a parable spake he not unto them: <sup>35</sup>that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, I will open my mouth in parables; I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world. <sup>36</sup>Then Jesus sent the multitude away, and went into the house: and his disciples came unto him, saying, Declare unto us the parable of the tares of the field. <sup>37</sup>He answered and said unto them, He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man: <sup>38</sup>the field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked *one*: <sup>39</sup>the enemy that sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels. <sup>40</sup>As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of this world. <sup>41</sup>The /19 Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend,

and them which do iniquity; <sup>42</sup>and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. <sup>43</sup>Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. Who hath ears to hear, let him hear. †<sup>1</sup>

<The Tradition of the Elders; Things that Defile Mt 15:1-20>

\*<sup>1</sup>Then came to Jesus Scribes and Pharisees, which were of Jerusalem, saying, <sup>2</sup>Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders? for they wash not their hands when they eat bread. <sup>3</sup>But he answered and said unto them, Why do you also transgress the commandment of God by your tradition? <sup>4</sup>For God commanded, saying, Honour thy Father and mother: and, He that curseth father or mother, let him die the death. <sup>5</sup>But ye say, Whosoever shall say to *his* father or *his* mother, *It is a gift*, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me; <sup>6</sup>and honour not his father or his mother, *he shall be free*. Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition. <sup>7</sup>Ye hypocrites, well did Esaias prophesy of you, saying, <sup>8</sup>This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoureth me with *their* lips; but their heart is far from me. <sup>9</sup>But in vain they do worship me, teaching *for* doctrines the commandments of men. <sup>10</sup>And he called the multitude, and said unto them, Hear and understand: <sup>11</sup>Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man; /20 but that which cometh out of the mouth, this defileth a man. <sup>12</sup>Then came his disciples, and said unto him, Knowest thou that the Pharisees were offended, after they heard this saying? <sup>13</sup>But he answered and said, Every plant, which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up. <sup>14</sup>Let them alone: they be blind leaders of the blind. And if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch. <sup>15</sup>Then answered Peter and said unto him, Declare unto us this parable. <sup>16</sup>And Jesus said, Are ye also yet without understanding? <sup>17</sup>Do not ye yet understand, that whatsoever entereth in at the mouth goeth into the belly, and is cast out into the draught? <sup>18</sup>But those things which proceed out of the mouth come forth from the heart; and they defile the man. <sup>19</sup>For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies: <sup>20</sup>These are *the things* which defile a man: but to eat with unwashen hands defileth not a man.<sup>2</sup> †<sup>3</sup>

---

\* Matthew, Chap. xv.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Mt 13:44-58 (Parables of the treasure in the field, the fine pearl, the fishing net; treasures new and old; rejection of Jesus at Nazareth) and Mt 14 (Death of John the Baptist; feeding the five thousand; Jesus walks on the water; healing of the sick in Gennesaret).

<sup>2</sup> Compare Rammohan's Introduction to his translation of the *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* (1819): "Contrary to the code of idolatry, this system [the Vedānta] defines sins as evil thoughts proceeding from the heart, quite unconnected with observances as to diet and other matters of form", Rammohan, *Uth*, 46.

<sup>3</sup> Omitting Mt 15:21-16:4 (The Canaanite women; Jesus cures many people; feeding the four thousand; demand for a sign).



<The Yeast of the Pharisees and Sadducees Mt 16:5-8, 11-12>

<sup>5</sup>And when his disciples were come to the other side, they had forgotten to take bread. <sup>6</sup>Then Jesus said unto them, Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees. <sup>7</sup>And they reasoned among themselves, saying, *It is because we have taken no bread.* <sup>8</sup>*Which* when Jesus perceived, he said unto them, O ye of little faith, why reason ye among yourselves, because ye have brought no bread? <sup>9</sup>How is it that ye do not understand that I spake *it* /21 not to you concerning bread, that ye should beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees? <sup>10</sup>Then understood they how that he bade *them* not beware of the leaven of bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.

<Peter's Declaration about Jesus; Jesus Foretells His Death and Resurrection;  
Cross and Self-Denial Mt 16:13-23>

<sup>13</sup>When Jesus came into the coasts of Cæsarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying, Whom do men say that I the Son of man am? <sup>14</sup>And they said, Some *say that thou art* John the Baptist: some, Elias; and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets. <sup>15</sup>He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am? <sup>16</sup>And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. <sup>17</sup>And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed *it* unto thee, but my Father who is in heaven. <sup>18</sup>And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. <sup>19</sup>And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. <sup>20</sup>Then charged he his disciples that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ. <sup>21</sup>From that time forth began Jesus to shew unto his disciples, how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and Scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day. <sup>22</sup>Then Peter took him, and began to rebuke him, saying, Be it far from thee, Lord: this shall /22 not be unto thee. <sup>23</sup>But he turned, and said unto Peter, Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art an offence unto me: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men. <sup>24</sup>Then said Jesus unto his disciples, If any *man* will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. <sup>25</sup>For whosoever will save his life shall lose it: and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it. <sup>26</sup>For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul? <sup>27</sup>For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels;

---

\* Matthew, Chap. xvi. 5.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting verses 9 and 10. Rammohan removes the reference to the feeding of four and five thousand.

and then he shall reward every man according to his works. <sup>28</sup>Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom. †<sup>1</sup>

<True Greatness Mt 18:1-6>

<sup>\*1</sup>At the same time came the disciples unto Jesus, saying, Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven? <sup>2</sup>And Jesus called a little child unto him, and set him in the midst of them, <sup>3</sup>and said, Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. <sup>4</sup>Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven. <sup>5</sup>And whoso shall receive one such little child in my name, receiveth me. <sup>6</sup>But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in /23 me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and *that* he were drowned in the depth of the sea.

<Temptations to Sin; The Parable of the Lost Sheep;

Reproving Another Who Sins Mt 18:7-20>

<sup>7</sup>Woe unto the world because of offences! For it must needs be that offences come; but woe to that man by whom the offence cometh! <sup>8</sup>Wherefore if thy hand or thy foot offend thee, cut them off, and cast *them* from thee: it is better for thee to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire. <sup>9</sup>And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast *it* from thee: it is better for thee to enter into life with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into hell-fire. <sup>10</sup>Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, That in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father, which is in heaven. <sup>11</sup>For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost. <sup>12</sup>How think ye? If a man have an hundred sheep, and one of them be gone astray, doth he not leave the ninety and nine, and goeth into the mountains, and seeketh that which is gone astray? <sup>13</sup>And if so be that he find it, verily I say unto you, he rejoiceth more of that *sheep*, than of the ninety and nine which went not astray. <sup>14</sup>Even so, it is not the will of your Father which is in heaven, that one of these little ones should perish. <sup>15</sup>Moreover, if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. <sup>16</sup>But if he will not hear *thee*, *then* take with thee one or two more, that /24 in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. <sup>17</sup>And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell *it* unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be

---

\* Matthew, Chap. xviii.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Mt 17 (The Transfiguration; Jesus cures a boy with a demon; Jesus again foretells his death and resurrection).

unto thee as an heathen man and a publican. <sup>18</sup>Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. <sup>19</sup>Again I say unto you, That if two of you shall agree on earth as touching any thing that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven. <sup>20</sup>For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.

<Forgiveness Mt 18:21-35>

<sup>21</sup>Then came Peter to him, and said, Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? Till seven times? <sup>22</sup>Jesus saith unto him, I say not unto thee, Until seven times: but, Until seventy times seven. <sup>23</sup>Therefore is the kingdom of heaven likened unto a certain king, which would take account of his servants. <sup>24</sup>And when he had begun to reckon, one was brought unto him, which owed him ten thousand talents. <sup>25</sup>But forasmuch as he had not to pay, his lord commanded him to be sold, and his wife, and children, and all that he had, and payment to be made. <sup>26</sup>The servant therefore fell down, and worshipped him, saying, Lord, have patience with me, and I will pay thee all. <sup>27</sup>Then the lord of that servant was moved with compassion, and loosed him, and forgave him the debt. <sup>28</sup>But the same servant went out, and found one of his fellow-servants which /25 owed him an hundred pence: and he laid hands on him, and took *him* by the throat, saying, Pay me that thou owest. <sup>29</sup>And his fellow-servant fell down at his feet, and besought him, saying, Have patience with me, and I will pay thee all. <sup>30</sup>And he would not: but went and cast him into prison, till he should pay the debt. <sup>31</sup>So when his fellow-servants saw what was done, they were very sorry, and came and told unto their lord all that was done. <sup>32</sup>Then his lord, after that he had called him, said unto him, O thou wicked servant, I forgave thee all that debt, because thou desiredst me: <sup>33</sup>shouldest not thou also have had compassion on thy fellowservant, even as I had pity on thee? <sup>34</sup>And his lord was wroth, and delivered him to the tormentors, till he should pay all that was due unto him. <sup>35</sup>So likewise shall my heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses. †<sup>1</sup>

<Teaching about Divorce Mt 19:3-12>

<sup>\*3</sup>The Pharisees also came unto him, tempting him, and saying unto him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? <sup>4</sup>And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made *them* at the beginning, made them male and female, <sup>5</sup>and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh? <sup>6</sup>Wherefore they are no

\* Matthew, Chap. xix. 3.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Mt 19:1-2 (Jesus leaving Galilee and coming to Judea, healing crowds of people).

more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God /26 hath joined together, let not man put asunder. <sup>7</sup>They say unto him, Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away? <sup>8</sup>He saith unto them, Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so. <sup>9</sup>And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except *it be* for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery. <sup>10</sup>His disciples say unto him, If the case of the man be so with *his* wife, it is not good to marry. <sup>11</sup>But he said unto them, All *men* cannot receive this saying, save *they* to whom it is given. <sup>12</sup>For there are some eunuchs, which were so born from *their* mother's womb: and there are some eunuchs, which were made eunuchs of men: and there be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive *it*, let him receive *it*.

<Jesus Blesses Little Children; The Rich Young Man Mt 19:13-30>

<sup>13</sup>Then were there brought unto him little children, that he should put *his* hands on them, and pray: and the disciples rebuked them. <sup>14</sup>But Jesus said, Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me: for of such is the kingdom of heaven. <sup>15</sup>And he laid *his* hands on them, and departed thence. <sup>16</sup>And, behold, one came and said unto him, Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life? <sup>17</sup>And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? *there* is none good but one, *that is*, God: but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments. /27 <sup>18</sup>He saith unto him, Which? Jesus said, Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, <sup>19</sup>Honour thy father and *thy* mother: and, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. <sup>20</sup>The young man saith unto him, All these things have I kept from my youth up: what lack I yet? <sup>21</sup>Jesus said unto him, If thou wilt be perfect, go *and* sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come *and* follow me. <sup>22</sup>But when the young man heard that saying, he went away sorrowful: for he had great possessions. <sup>23</sup>Then said Jesus unto his disciples, Verily I say unto you, That a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven. <sup>24</sup>And again I say unto you, It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God. <sup>25</sup>When his disciples heard *it*, they were exceedingly amazed, saying, Who then can be saved? <sup>26</sup>But Jesus beheld *them*, and said unto them, With men this is impossible; but with God all things are possible. <sup>27</sup>Then answered Peter and said unto him, Behold, we have forsaken all, and followed thee; what shall we have therefore? <sup>28</sup>And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, in the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve

tribes of Israel. <sup>29</sup>And every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or /28 lands, for my name's sake, shall receive an hundredfold, and shall inherit everlasting life. <sup>30</sup>But many *that are* first shall be last; and the last *shall be* first.

<The Labourers in the Vineyard Mt 20:1-16>

\*<sup>1</sup>For the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man *that is* an householder, which went out early in the morning to hire labourers into his vineyard. <sup>2</sup>And when he had agreed with the labourers for a penny a-day, he sent them into his vineyard. <sup>3</sup>And he went out about the third hour, and saw others standing idle in the market-place, <sup>4</sup>and said unto them; Go ye also into the vineyard, and whatsoever is right I will give you. And they went their way. <sup>5</sup>Again he went out about the sixth and ninth hour, and did likewise. <sup>6</sup>And about the eleventh hour he went out, and found others standing idle, and saith unto them, Why stand ye here all the day idle? <sup>7</sup>They say unto him, Because no man hath hired us. He saith unto them, Go ye also into the vineyard; and whatsoever is right, *that shall ye receive.* <sup>8</sup>So when even was come, the lord of the vineyard saith unto his steward, Call the labourers, and give them *their hire*, beginning from the last unto the first. <sup>9</sup>And when they came that *were hired* about the eleventh hour, they received every man a penny. <sup>10</sup>But when the first came, they supposed that they should have received more; and they likewise received every man a penny. <sup>11</sup>And when they had received *it*, they murmured /29 against the goodman of the house, <sup>12</sup>saying, These last have wrought *but* one hour, and thou hast made them equal unto us, which have borne the burden and heat of the day. <sup>13</sup>But he answered one of them, and said, Friend, I do thee no wrong: didst not thou agree with me for a penny? <sup>14</sup>Take *that thine is*, and go thy way: I will give unto this last, even as unto thee. <sup>15</sup>Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own? Is thine eye evil, because I am good? <sup>16</sup>So the last shall be first, and the first last: for many be called, but few chosen. †<sup>1</sup>

<The Request of the Mother of James and John Mt 20:20-28>

<sup>20</sup>Then came to him the mother of Zebedee's children with her sons, worshipping *him*, and desiring a certain thing of him. <sup>21</sup>And he said unto her, What wilt thou? She saith unto him, Grant that these my two sons may sit, the one on thy right hand, and the other on the left, in thy kingdom. <sup>22</sup>But Jesus answered and said, Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with? They say unto him, We are able.

\* Matthew, Chap. xx.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Mt 20:17-19 (A third time Jesus foretells His Death and Resurrection). New beginning in verse 20 is not marked.

<sup>23</sup>And he saith unto them, Ye shall drink indeed of my cup, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with: but to sit on my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give, but *it shall be given to them* for whom it is prepared of my Father. <sup>24</sup>And when the ten heard *it*, they were moved with indignation against the two brethren. <sup>25</sup>But Jesus called them *unto him*, and said, Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that /30 are great exercise authority upon them. <sup>26</sup>But it shall not be so among you: but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; <sup>27</sup>and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant: <sup>28</sup>even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many. †<sup>1</sup>

<The Authority of Jesus; The Parable of the Two Sons; The Parable of the Wicked Tenants Mt 21:23-44>

\*<sup>23</sup>And when he was come into the temple, the chief priests and the elders of the people came unto him as he was teaching, and said, By what authority doest thou these things? and who gave thee this authority? <sup>24</sup>And Jesus answered and said unto them, I also will ask you one thing, which if ye tell me, I in like wise will tell you by what authority I do these things. <sup>25</sup>The baptism of John, whence was it? from heaven, or of men? And they reasoned with themselves, saying, If we shall say, From heaven; he will say unto us, Why did ye not then believe him? <sup>26</sup>But if we shall say, Of men; we fear the people; for all hold John as a prophet. <sup>27</sup>And they answered Jesus, and said, We cannot tell. And he said unto them, Neither tell I you by what authority I do these things. <sup>28</sup>But what think ye? A *certain* man had two sons; and he came to the first, and said, Son, go work to-day in my vineyard. <sup>29</sup>He answered and said, I will not: but afterward he repented, and went. <sup>30</sup>And he came to the second, and said likewise. And he answered and said, I go, sir: and went not. /31 <sup>31</sup>Whether of them twain did the will of *his* father? They say unto him, The first. Jesus saith unto them, Verily I say unto you, That the publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you. <sup>32</sup>For John came unto you in the way of righteousness, and ye believed him not: but the publicans and the harlots believed him: and ye, when ye had seen *it*, repented not afterward, that ye might believe him. <sup>33</sup>Hear another parable: There was a certain householder, which planted a vineyard, and hedged it round about, and digged a winepress in it, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into a far country: <sup>34</sup>and when the time of the fruit drew near, he sent his servants to the husbandmen, that they might receive the fruits of it. <sup>35</sup>And the husbandmen took his servants, and beat one, and killed another, and stoned another. <sup>36</sup>Again, he sent other servants more than the first: and

---

\* Matthew, Chap. xxi. 23.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Mt 20:29-21:22 (Jesus heals two blind men; triumphal entry into Jerusalem; Jesus cleanses the temple; Jesus curses the fig tree).

they did unto them likewise. <sup>37</sup>But last of all he sent unto them his son, saying, They will reverence my son. <sup>38</sup>But when the husbandmen saw the son, they said among themselves, This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and let us seize on his inheritance. <sup>39</sup>And they caught him, and cast *him* out of the vineyard, and slew *him*. <sup>40</sup>When the lord therefore of the vineyard cometh, what will he do unto those husbandmen? <sup>41</sup>They say unto him, He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will let out *his* vineyard unto other husbandmen, which shall render him the fruits in their seasons. <sup>42</sup>Jesus saith unto them, Did ye never read /32 in the Scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner: this is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes? <sup>43</sup>Therefore say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. <sup>44</sup>And whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken: but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder.

<The Parable of the Wedding Banquet Mt 22:2-14>

†<sup>1</sup> <sup>2</sup>The kingdom of heaven is like unto a certain king, which made a marriage for his son, <sup>3</sup>and sent forth his servants to call them that were bidden to the wedding: and they would not come. <sup>4</sup>Again, he sent forth other servants, saying, Tell them which are bidden, Behold, I have prepared my dinner: my oxen and *my* fatlings *are* killed, and all things *are* ready: come unto the marriage. <sup>5</sup>But they made light of *it*, and went their ways, one to his farm, another to his merchandise: <sup>6</sup>and the remnant took his servants, and entreated *them* spitefully, and slew *them*. <sup>7</sup>But when the king heard *thereof*, he was wroth: and he sent forth his armies, and destroyed those murderers, and burned up their city. <sup>8</sup>Then saith he to his servants, The wedding is ready, but they which were bidden were not worthy. <sup>9</sup>Go ye therefore into the highways, and as many as ye shall find, bid to the marriage. <sup>10</sup>So those servants went out into the highways, and gathered together all as /33 many as they found, both bad and good: and the wedding was furnished with guests. <sup>11</sup>And when the king came in to see the guests, he saw there a man which had not on a wedding garment: <sup>12</sup>and he saith unto him, Friend, how camest thou in hither, not having a wedding garment? And he was speechless. <sup>13</sup>Then said the king to the servants, Bind him hand and foot, and take him away, and cast *him* into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. <sup>14</sup>For many are called, but few *are* chosen.

<The Question about Paying Taxes Mt 22:15-22;>

<sup>15</sup>Then went the Pharisees, and took counsel how they might entangle him in *his* talk. <sup>16</sup>And they sent out unto him their disciples with the Herodians, saying, Master,

---

\* Matthew, Chap. xxii. 2.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting the introductory verse 1.

we know that thou art true, and teachest the way of God in truth, neither carest thou for any *man*: for thou regardest not the person of men. <sup>17</sup>Tell us therefore, what thinkest thou; Is it lawful to give tribute unto Cæsar, or not? <sup>18</sup>But Jesus perceived their wickedness, and said, Why tempt ye me, ye hypocrites? <sup>19</sup>Shew me the tribute money. And they brought unto him a penny. <sup>20</sup>And he saith unto them, Whose is this image and superscription? <sup>21</sup>They say unto him, Cæsar's. Then he saith unto them, Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's. <sup>22</sup>When they had heard *these words*, they marvelled, and left him, and went their way.

<The Question about Resurrection Mt 22:23-33>

<sup>23</sup>The same day came to him the Sadducees, which say that there is no resurrection, and asked him, /34 <sup>24</sup>saying, Master, Moses said, If a man die, having no children, his brother shall marry his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother. <sup>25</sup>Now there were with us seven brethren: and the first, when he had married a wife, deceased, and, having no issue, left his wife unto his brother: <sup>26</sup>likewise the second also, and the third, unto the seventh. <sup>27</sup>And last of all the woman died also. <sup>28</sup>Therefore, in the resurrection, whose wife shall she be of the seven? for they all had her. <sup>29</sup>Jesus answered and said unto them, Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God. <sup>30</sup>For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven. <sup>31</sup>But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, <sup>32</sup>I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. <sup>33</sup>And when the multitude heard *this*, they were astonished at his doctrine.

<The Greatest Commandment Mt 22:34-40>

<sup>34</sup>But when the Pharisees had heard that he had put the Sadducees to silence, they were gathered together. <sup>35</sup>Then one of them, *which was* a Lawyer, asked *him a question*, tempting him, and saying, <sup>36</sup>Master, which is the great commandment in the law? <sup>37</sup>Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. <sup>38</sup>This is the first and great commandment. <sup>39</sup>And the second is like unto /35 it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. <sup>40</sup>On these two commandments hang all the Law and the Prophets.

<The Question about David's Son Mt 22:41-46>

<sup>41</sup>While the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them, <sup>42</sup>saying, What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? They say unto him, *The son* of David. <sup>43</sup>He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying, <sup>44</sup>The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool. <sup>45</sup>If David then call him Lord, how is he his son? <sup>46</sup>And no man was able to answer



him a word, neither durst any *man* from that day forth ask him any more *questions*.

<Jesus Denouncing Scribes and Pharisees Mt 23>

\*<sup>1</sup>Then spake Jesus to the multitude, and to his disciples, <sup>2</sup>saying, The Scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: <sup>3</sup>all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, *that* observe and do; but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not. <sup>4</sup>For they bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay *them* on men's shoulders; but they *themselves* will not move them with one of their fingers. <sup>5</sup>But all their works they do for to be seen of men: they make broad their phylacteries, and enlarge the borders of their garments, <sup>6</sup>and love the uppermost rooms at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues, <sup>7</sup>and greetings in the markets, and to be called of men, Rabbi, Rabbi. <sup>8</sup>But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your Master, *even* Christ; and all ye are /36 brethren. <sup>9</sup>And call no *man* your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, who is in heaven. <sup>10</sup>Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, *even* Christ. <sup>11</sup>But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant. <sup>12</sup>And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased; and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted. <sup>13</sup>But woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in *yourselves*, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in. <sup>14</sup>Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation. <sup>15</sup>Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him two-fold more the child of hell than yourselves. <sup>16</sup>Woe unto you, *ye* blind guides, which say, Whosoever shall swear by the temple, it is nothing; but whosoever shall swear by the gold of the temple, he is a debtor! <sup>17</sup>*Ye* fools and blind: for whether is greater, the gold, or the temple that sanctifieth the gold? <sup>18</sup>And, Whosoever shall swear by the altar, it is nothing; but whosoever sweareth by the gift that is upon it, he is guilty. <sup>19</sup>*Ye* fools and blind: for whether *is* greater, the gift, or the altar that sanctifieth the gift? <sup>20</sup>Whoso therefore shall swear by the altar, sweareth by it, and by all things thereon. <sup>21</sup>And whoso shall swear by the temple, sweareth by it, and by him that dwelleth therein. <sup>22</sup>And he that shall /37 swear by heaven, sweareth by the throne of God, and by him that sitteth thereon. <sup>23</sup>Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier *matters* of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone. <sup>24</sup>*Ye* blind guides, which strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel. <sup>25</sup>Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye make clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within they are full of extortion and excess. <sup>26</sup>*Thou* blind Pharisee, cleanse first that *which* is within the cup and platter,

---

\* Matthew, Chap. xxiii.

that the outside of them may be clean also. <sup>27</sup>Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead *men's* bones, and of all uncleanness. <sup>28</sup>Even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity. <sup>29</sup>Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchres of the righteous, <sup>30</sup>and say, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. <sup>31</sup>Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets. <sup>32</sup>Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers. <sup>33</sup>Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell? <sup>34</sup>Wherefore, behold, I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes: and /38 *some* of them ye shall kill and crucify; and *some* of them shall ye scourge in your synagogues, and persecute *them* from city to city: <sup>35</sup>that upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar. <sup>36</sup>Verily I say unto you, All these things shall come upon this generation. <sup>37</sup>O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, *thou* that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under *her* wings, and ye would not! <sup>38</sup>Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. <sup>39</sup>For I say unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed *is* he that cometh in the name of the Lord. †<sup>1</sup>

<The Watchfulness of the Faithful Servant and the Evil Servant Mt 24:42-51>

\*<sup>42</sup>Watch therefore; for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come. <sup>43</sup>But know this, that if the good man of the house had known in what watch the thief would come, he would have watched, and would not have suffered his house to be broken up. <sup>44</sup>Therefore be ye also ready: for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of man cometh. <sup>45</sup>Who then is a faithful and wise servant, whom his lord hath made ruler over his household, to give them meat in due season? <sup>46</sup>Blessed *is* that servant, whom his lord when he cometh shall find so doing. <sup>47</sup>Verily I say unto you, That he shall make him ruler over all his /39 goods. <sup>48</sup>But and if that evil servant shall say in his heart, My lord delayeth his coming; <sup>49</sup>and shall begin to smite *his* fellow-servants, and to eat and drink with the drunken; <sup>50</sup>the lord of that servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for *him*, and in an hour that he is not aware of, <sup>51</sup>and shall cut him asunder, and appoint *him* his portion with the hypocrites: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

---

\* Matthew, Chap. xxiv. 42.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Mt 24:1-41 (The destruction of the temple foretold; signs of the end of the age; persecutions; the desolating sacrilege; the coming of the Son of Man; the lesson of the fig tree; the days of Noah).

<The Coming of the Son of Man (The Ten Bridesmaids; The Talents; The Judgement of the Nations)  
Mt 25>

<sup>1</sup>Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins, which took their lamps, and went forth to meet the bridegroom. <sup>2</sup>And five of them were wise, and five *were* foolish. <sup>3</sup>They that *were* foolish took their lamps, and took no oil with them: <sup>4</sup>but the wise took oil in their vessels with their lamps. <sup>5</sup>While the bridegroom tarried, they all slumbered and slept. <sup>6</sup>And at midnight there was a cry made, Behold, the bridegroom cometh; go ye out to meet him. <sup>7</sup>Then all those virgins arose, and trimmed their lamps. <sup>8</sup>And the foolish said unto the wise, Give us of your oil; for our lamps are gone out. <sup>9</sup>But the wise answered, saying, *Not so*; lest there be not enough for us and you: but go ye rather to them that sell, and buy for yourselves. <sup>10</sup>And while they went to buy, the bridegroom came; and they that were ready went in with him to the marriage: and the door was shut. <sup>11</sup>Afterward came also the other virgins, saying, Lord, Lord, open to us. <sup>12</sup>But he answered and said, Verily I say unto you, I know /40 you not. <sup>13</sup>Watch therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh. <sup>14</sup>For *the kingdom of heaven* is as a man travelling into a far country, *who* called his own servants, and delivered unto them his goods. <sup>15</sup>And unto one he gave five talents, to another two, and to another one; to every man according to his several ability; and straightway took his journey. <sup>16</sup>Then he that had received the five talents went and traded with the same, and made *them* other five talents. <sup>17</sup>And likewise he that *had received* two, he also gained other two. <sup>18</sup>But he that had received one went and digged in the earth, and hid his lord's money. <sup>19</sup>After a long time the lord of those servants cometh, and reckoneth with them. <sup>20</sup>And so he that had received five talents came and brought other five talents, saying, Lord, thou deliveredst unto me five talents: behold, I have gained beside them five talents more. <sup>21</sup>His lord said unto him, Well done, *thou* good and faithful servant: thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy lord. <sup>22</sup>He also that had received two talents came and said, Lord, thou deliveredst unto me two talents: behold, I have gained two other talents beside them. <sup>23</sup>His lord said unto him, Well done, good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy lord. <sup>24</sup>Then he which had received the one talent came and said, Lord, I knew thee that thou art an hard man, reaping /41 where thou hast not sown, and gathering where thou hast not strawed: <sup>25</sup>and I was afraid, and went and hid thy talent in the earth: lo, *there* thou hast *that is* thine. <sup>26</sup>His lord answered and said unto him, *Thou* wicked and slothful servant, thou knewest that I reap where I sowed not, and gather where I have not strawed: <sup>27</sup>thou oughtest

<sup>1</sup> Matthew, Chap. xxv.

therefore to have put my money to the exchangers, and *then* at my coming I should have received mine own with usury. <sup>28</sup>Take therefore the talent from him, and give *it* unto him which hath ten talents. <sup>29</sup>For unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but from him that hath not, shall be taken away even that which he hath. <sup>30</sup>And cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. <sup>31</sup>When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: <sup>32</sup>and before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth *his* sheep from the goats: <sup>33</sup>and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. <sup>34</sup>Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: <sup>35</sup>for I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in: <sup>36</sup>naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me. <sup>37</sup>Then shall the /42 righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungred, and fed *thee*? or thirsty, and gave *thee* drink? <sup>38</sup>When saw we thee a stranger, and took *thee* in? or naked, and clothed *thee*? <sup>39</sup>Or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee? <sup>40</sup>And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done *it* unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done *it* unto me. <sup>41</sup>Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels: <sup>42</sup>for I was an hungred, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink: <sup>43</sup>I was a stranger, and ye took me not in: naked, and ye clothed me not: sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not. <sup>44</sup>Then shall they also answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungred, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee? <sup>45</sup>Then shall he answer them, saying, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did *it* not to one of the least of these, ye did *it* not to me. <sup>46</sup>And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal. †<sup>1</sup>

<Jesus Eats with Publicans and Sinners; The Question about Fasting Mk 2:15-22>

\*<sup>15</sup>And it came to pass, that, as Jesus sat at meat in his<sup>2</sup> house, many publicans and sinners sat also together with Jesus and his disciples: for there were many, and they

---

\* Mark, Chap, ii. 15.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Mt 26-28 (The night of the Passover meal, crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus). Omitting Mk 1:1-2:14 (Introduction, baptism of Jesus, temptation, first disciples, healings of a man with unclean spirit, a leper, a paralytic and many others, summary preachings, calling of Levi.

<sup>2</sup> Rammohan skipped verse 14, where Jesus called Levi. Jesus now sits in Levi's house, but with the remaining text, it reads as if it were Jesus' house.

followed him. <sup>16</sup>And when the Scribes and Pharisees saw him eat with publicans /43 and sinners, they said unto his disciples, How is it that he eateth and drinketh with publicans and sinners? <sup>17</sup>When Jesus heard *it*, he saith unto them, They that are whole have no need of the physician, but they that are sick: I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance. <sup>18</sup>And the disciples of John and of the Pharisees used to fast: and they come and say unto him, Why do the disciples of John and of the Pharisees fast, but thy disciples fast not? <sup>19</sup>And Jesus said unto them, Can the children of the bride-chamber fast, while the bridegroom is with them? As long as they have the bridegroom with them, they cannot fast. <sup>20</sup>But the days will come, when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then shall they fast in those days. <sup>21</sup>No man also seweth a piece of new cloth on an old garment: else the new piece that filled it up taketh away from the old, and the rent is made worse. <sup>22</sup>And no man putteth new wine into old bottles: else the new wine doth burst the bottles, and the wine is spilled, and the bottles will be marred: but new wine must be put into new bottles.

<Plucking Grain on the Sabbath Mk 2:23-28>

<sup>23</sup>And it came to pass, that he went through the corn fields on the Sabbath-day; and his disciples began, as they went, to pluck the ears of corn. <sup>24</sup>And the Pharisees said unto him, Behold, why do they on the Sabbath-day that which is not lawful? <sup>25</sup>And he said unto them, Have ye never read what David did, when he had need, and was an hungred, he, and they that were with him? <sup>26</sup>How he went into the house of /44 God in the days of Abiathar the High Priest, and did eat the shew-bread, which is not lawful to eat but for the Priests, and gave also to them which were with him? <sup>27</sup>And he said unto them, The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath: <sup>28</sup>therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath. †<sup>1</sup>

<The True Kindred of Jesus (Mk 3:31-35)>

<sup>\*31</sup>There came then his brethren and his mother, and, standing without, sent unto him, calling him. <sup>32</sup>And the multitude sat about him, and they said unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren without seek for thee. <sup>33</sup>And he answered them, saying, Who is my mother, or my brethren? <sup>34</sup>And he looked round about on them,<sup>2</sup> and said, Behold my mother and my brethren! <sup>35</sup>For whosoever shall do the will of God,

---

\* Mark, Chap. iii. 31.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Mk 3:1-30 (The man with the withered hand (but see Mt 12:9-13 and Lk 6:6-9); a multitude at the seaside; appointment of the twelve; Jesus and Beelzebul).

<sup>2</sup> The correct text of KJV is: "And he looked round about on them, which sat about him, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren!" Ghose reads like KJV, the London editions omit these few words, probably an error.

the same is my brother, and my sister, and mother. †<sup>1</sup>

<Parables (The Sower; The Purpose of Parables; A Lamp under a Bushel Basket; The Growing Seed; The Mustard Seed) Mk 4:2-32>

<sup>\*2</sup>And he taught them many things by parables, and said unto them in his doctrine, <sup>3</sup>Hearken; Behold, there went out a sower to sow: <sup>4</sup>and it came to pass, as he sowed, some fell by the way side, and the fowls of the air came and devoured it up. <sup>5</sup>And some fell on stony ground, where it had not much earth: and immediately it sprang up, because it had no depth of earth: <sup>6</sup>but when the sun was up, it was scorched; and because it had no root, it withered away. <sup>7</sup>And some fell among thorns, and the thorns grew up, and choked it, and it yielded no fruit. <sup>8</sup>And other fell on good ground, and did yield fruit that sprang up and increased: and brought forth, some thirty, and /45 some sixty, and some an hundred. <sup>9</sup>And he said unto them, He that hath ears to hear, let him hear. <sup>10</sup>And when he was alone, they that were about him with the twelve asked of him the parable. <sup>11</sup>And he said unto them, Unto you it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of God: but unto them that are without, all *these* things are done in parables: <sup>12</sup>That seeing they may see, and not perceive; and hearing they may hear, and not understand; lest at any time they should be converted, and *their* sins should be forgiven them. <sup>13</sup>And he said unto them, Know ye not this parable? and how then will ye know all parables? <sup>14</sup>The sower soweth the word. <sup>15</sup>And these are they by the way side, where the word is sown; but when they have heard, Satan cometh immediately, and taketh away the word that was sown in their hearts. <sup>16</sup>And these are they likewise which are sown on stony ground; who, when they have heard the word, immediately receive it with gladness: <sup>17</sup>and have no root in themselves, and so endure but for a time: afterward, when affliction or persecution ariseth for the word's sake, immediately they are offended. <sup>18</sup>And these are they which are sown among thorns; such as hear the word, <sup>19</sup>and the cares of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches, and the lusts of other things entering in, choke the word, and it becometh unfruitful. <sup>20</sup>And these are they which are sown on good ground; such as hear the word, and receive *it*, and bring forth fruit, some thirtyfold, some sixty, and some an hundred. <sup>21</sup>And /46 he said unto them, Is a candle brought to be put under a bushel, or under a bed, and not to be set on a candlestick? <sup>22</sup>For there is nothing hid, which shall not be manifested; neither was any thing kept secret, but that it should come abroad. <sup>23</sup>If any man have ears to hear, let him hear. <sup>24</sup>And he saith unto them, Take heed what ye hear: with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you: and unto you that hear shall more be given. <sup>25</sup>For he

---

\* Mark, Chap. iv. 2.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Mk 4:1 (A crowd gathers, and Jesus speaks to them from a boat).

that hath, to him shall be given: and he that hath not, from him shall be taken even that which he hath. <sup>26</sup>And he said, So is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed into the ground; <sup>27</sup>and should sleep, and rise night and day, and the seed should spring and grow up, he knoweth not how. <sup>28</sup>For the earth bringeth forth fruit of herself; first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear. <sup>29</sup>But when the fruit is brought forth, immediately he putteth in the sickle, because the harvest is come. <sup>30</sup>And he said, Whereunto shall we liken the kingdom of God? or with what comparison shall we compare it? <sup>31</sup>*It is like a grain of mustard seed, which, when it is sown in the earth, is less than all the seeds that be in the earth: <sup>32</sup>but when it is sown, it groweth up, and becometh greater than all herbs, and shooteth out great branches; so that the fowls of the air may lodge under the shadow of it.* †<sup>1</sup>

<The Tradition of the Elders; Things that Defile (Mk 7:5-23)>

<sup>\*5</sup>Then the Pharisees and Scribes asked him, /47 Why walk not thy disciples according to the tradition of the elders, but eat bread with unwashen hands? <sup>6</sup>He answered and said unto them, Well hath Esaias prophesied of you hypocrites, as it is written, This people honoureth me with *their* lips, but their heart is far from me. <sup>7</sup>Howbeit, in vain do they worship me, teaching *for* doctrines the commandments of men. <sup>8</sup>For, laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men, *as* the washing of pots and cups: and many other such like things ye do. <sup>9</sup>And he said unto them, Full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition. <sup>10</sup>For Moses said, Honour thy father and thy mother; and, Whoso curseth father or mother, let him die the death: <sup>11</sup>but ye say, If a man shall say to his father or mother, *It is Corban*, that is to say, a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me; *he shall be free.* <sup>12</sup>And ye suffer him no more to do aught for his father or his mother; <sup>13</sup>making the word of God of none effect through your tradition, which ye have delivered: and many such like things do ye. <sup>14</sup>And when he had called all the people *unto him*, he said unto them, Hearken unto me every one *of you*, and understand: <sup>15</sup>there is nothing from without a man, that entering into him can defile him: but the things which come out of him, those are they that defile the man. <sup>16</sup>If any man have ears to hear, let him hear. <sup>17</sup>And when he was entered into the house from the people, his disciples asked him concerning the parable. <sup>18</sup>And he saith unto /48 them, Are ye so without understanding also? Do ye not perceive, that whatsoever thing from without entereth into the man, it cannot defile him; <sup>19</sup>because it entereth

\* Mark, Chap. vii. [5.] 6.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Mk 4:33-7:4 (End of the parables; Jesus stills a storm; healing of the Gerasene demoniac; restoring a girl to life and healing a woman; rejection of Jesus at Nazareth; mission of the twelve; death of John the Baptist; feeding the five thousand; walking on the water; healing the sick in Gennesaret; Pharisees observing the habits of the disciples).

not into his heart, but into the belly, and goeth out into the draught, purging all meats? <sup>20</sup>And he said, That which cometh out of the man, that defileth the man. <sup>21</sup>For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, <sup>22</sup>Thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness: <sup>23</sup>All these evil things come from within, and defile the man. †<sup>1</sup>

<Cross and Self-Denial Mk 8:34-38>

<sup>\*34</sup>And when he had called the people *unto him* with his disciples also, he said unto them, Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. <sup>35</sup>For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the Gospel's, the same shall save it. <sup>36</sup>For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? <sup>37</sup>Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul? <sup>38</sup>Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation; of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels. †<sup>2</sup>

<True Greatness Mk 9:33-37>

†<sup>33</sup>And he came to Capernaum: and being in the house he asked them, What was it that ye disputed /49 among yourselves by the way? <sup>34</sup>But they held their peace: for by the way they had disputed among themselves, who *should be* the greatest. <sup>35</sup>And he sat down, and called the twelve, and saith unto them, If any man desire to be first, *the same* shall be last of all, and servant of all. <sup>36</sup>And he took a child, and set him in the midst of them: and when he had taken him into his arms, he said unto them, <sup>37</sup>Whosoever shall receive one of such children in my name, receiveth me: and whosoever shall receive me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me.

<Another Exorcist; Temptations to Sin Mk 9:38-50>

<sup>38</sup>And John answered him, saying, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and he followeth not us: and we forbad him, because he followeth not us. <sup>39</sup>But Jesus said, Forbid him not: for there is no man which shall do a miracle in my name, that can lightly speak evil of me. <sup>40</sup>For he that is not against us is on our part. <sup>41</sup>For whosoever shall give you a cup of water to drink in my name, because ye belong to Christ, verily I say unto you, he shall not lose his reward. <sup>42</sup>And whosoever shall

---

\* Mark, Chap. viii. 34. † Mark, Chap. ix. 33.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Mk 7:24-8:33 (The Syro-phoenecian woman; curing a deaf man; feeding the four thousand; the demand for a sign; the yeast of the Pharisees and of Herod; curing a blind man at Bethsaida; Peter's declaration about Jesus; Jesus foretelling his death and resurrection); but see Mt 16:5-12.

<sup>2</sup> Omitting Mk 9:1-32 (The Transfiguration; The Coming of Elijah; Healing a Boy with a Spirit; Jesus Again Foretells His Death and Resurrection).



offend one of *these* little ones that believe in me, it is better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were cast into the sea. <sup>43</sup>And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched: <sup>44</sup>where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. <sup>45</sup>And if thy foot offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter halt into life, than having two feet to be cast /50 into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched: <sup>46</sup>where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. <sup>47</sup>And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out: it is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire: <sup>48</sup>where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. <sup>49</sup>For every one shall be salted with fire, and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt. <sup>50</sup>Salt is good: but if the salt have lost his saltness, wherewith will ye season it? Have salt in yourselves, and have peace one with another. †<sup>1</sup>

<Jesus Blesses Little Children Mk 10:13-16>

<sup>\*13</sup>And they brought young children to him, that he should touch them: and *his* disciples rebuked those that brought *them*. <sup>14</sup>But when Jesus saw *it*, he was much displeased, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God. <sup>15</sup>Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein. <sup>16</sup>And he took them up in his arms, put *his* hands upon them, and blessed them.

<The Rich Young Man Mk 10:17-31>

<sup>17</sup>And when he was gone forth into the way, there came one running, and kneeled to him, and asked him, Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life? <sup>18</sup>And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? *there is none good but one, that is, God.* <sup>19</sup>Thou knowest the commandments, Do not commit adultery, Do not kill, Do not steal, Do not /51 bear false witness, Defraud not, Honour thy father and mother. <sup>20</sup>And he answered and said unto him, Master, all these have I observed from my youth. <sup>21</sup>Then Jesus beholding him loved him, and said unto him, One thing thou lackest: go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, take up the cross, and follow me. <sup>22</sup>And he was sad at that saying, and went away grieved: for he had great possessions. <sup>23</sup>And Jesus looked round about, and saith unto his disciples, How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God! <sup>24</sup>And the disciples were astonished at his words. But Jesus answereth again, and saith unto them, Children, how hard is it for them that trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of God! <sup>25</sup>It is easier for a camel

---

\* Mark, Chap. x. 13.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Mk 10:1-12 (Teaching about Divorce), but see Mt 19:3-12.

to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God. <sup>26</sup>And they were astonished out of measure, saying among themselves, Who then can be saved? <sup>27</sup>And Jesus looking upon them saith, With men *it is impossible*, but not with God: for with God all things are possible. <sup>28</sup>Then Peter began to say unto him, Lo, we have left all, and have followed thee. <sup>29</sup>And Jesus answered and said, Verily I say unto you, There is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my sake, and the gospel's, <sup>30</sup>but he shall receive an hundredfold now in this time, houses, and brethren, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands, /52 with persecutions; and in the world to come eternal life. <sup>31</sup>But many *that are first shall be last; and the last first.* †<sup>1</sup>

<The Request of James and John Mk 10,35-45>

<sup>35</sup>And James and John, the sons of Zebedee, come unto him, saying, Master, we would that thou shouldst do for us whatsoever we shall desire. <sup>36</sup>And he said unto them, What would ye that I should do for you? <sup>37</sup>They said unto him, Grant unto us that we may sit, one on thy right hand, and the other on thy left hand, in thy glory. <sup>38</sup>But Jesus said unto them, Ye know not what ye ask: can ye drink of the cup that I drink of? and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with? <sup>39</sup>And they said unto him, We can. And Jesus said unto them, Ye shall indeed drink of the cup that I drink of; and with the baptism that I am baptized with shall ye be baptized: <sup>40</sup>but to sit on my right hand and on my left hand is not mine to give; but *it shall be given to them* for whom it is prepared. <sup>41</sup>And when the ten heard *it*, they began to be much displeased with James and John. <sup>42</sup>But Jesus called them *to him*, and saith unto them, Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and their great ones exercise authority upon them. <sup>43</sup>But so shall it not be among you: but whosoever will be great among you, shall be your minister: <sup>44</sup>and whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all. <sup>45</sup>For even the Son of man /53 came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many. †<sup>2</sup>

---

\* Mark, Chap. x. 35.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Mk 10:32-34 (Jesus foretells his death and resurrection a third time).

<sup>2</sup> Omitting Mk 10:46-11:23 (Healing of the blind Bartimaeus; triumphal entry into Jerusalem; Jesus curses the fig tree; cleansing of the temple; a believer can throw a mountain into the sea).

<The Prayer for Forgiveness Mk 11:24-26>

\*<sup>24</sup>Therefore I say unto you, What things soever ye desire, when ye pray, believe that ye receive *them*, and ye shall have *them*. <sup>25</sup>And when ye stand praying, forgive, if ye have ought against any: that your Father also which is in heaven may forgive you your trespasses. <sup>26</sup>But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in heaven forgive your trespasses. †<sup>1</sup>

<The Question about Paying Taxes; The Question about the Resurrection;

The Greatest Commandment Mk 12:13-34.>

†<sup>13</sup>And they send unto him certain of the Pharisees and of the Herodians, to catch him in *his* words. <sup>14</sup>And when they were come, they say unto him, Master, we know that thou art true, and carest for no man: for thou regardest not the person of men, but teachest the way of God in truth: Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæsar, or not? <sup>15</sup>Shall we give, or shall we not give? But he, knowing their hypocrisy, said unto them, Why tempt ye me? Bring me a penny, that I may see *it*. <sup>16</sup>And they brought *it*. And he saith unto them, Whose *is* this image and superscription? And they said unto him, Cæsar's. <sup>17</sup>And Jesus answering said unto them, Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's. And they marvelled at him. <sup>18</sup>Then come unto him the Sadducees, which say there is no resurrection; and they asked him, saying, <sup>19</sup>Master, Moses wrote unto us, If a man's brother die, and /54 leave *his* wife *behind* *him*, and leave no children, that his brother should take his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother. <sup>20</sup>Now there were seven brethren: and the first took a wife, and dying left no seed. <sup>21</sup>And the second took her, and died, neither left he any seed: and the third likewise. <sup>22</sup>And the seven had her, and left no seed: last of all the woman died also. <sup>23</sup>In the resurrection, therefore, when they shall rise, whose wife shall she be of them? for the seven had her to wife. <sup>24</sup>And Jesus answering said unto them, Do ye not therefore err, because ye know not the Scriptures, neither the power of God? <sup>25</sup>For when they shall rise from the dead, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage; but are as the angels which are in heaven. <sup>26</sup>And as touching the dead, that they rise: have ye not read in the book of Moses, how in the bush God spake unto him, saying, I *am* the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? <sup>27</sup>He is not the God of the dead, but the God of the living: ye therefore do greatly err. <sup>28</sup>And one of the Scribes came, and having heard them reasoning together, and perceiving that he had answered them well, asked him, Which is the first commandment of all? <sup>29</sup>And Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments *is*, Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God is one Lord:

\* Mark, Chap. xi. 24. † Mark, Chap. xii. 13.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Mk 11:27-12:12 (The Authority of Jesus and the parable of the wicked tenants), but see Mt 21:23-27.

<sup>30</sup>and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment. <sup>31</sup>And the second is like, *namely* this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as /55 thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these. <sup>32</sup>And the Scribe said unto him, Well, Master, thou hast said the truth: for there is one God; and there is none other but he: <sup>33</sup>and to love him with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the soul, and with all the strength, and to love *his* neighbour as himself, is more than all whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices. <sup>34</sup>And when Jesus saw that he answered discreetly, he said unto him, Thou art not far from the kingdom of God. And no man after that durst ask him *any question*. †<sup>1</sup>

<The Widow's Offering Mk 12:41-44>

<sup>\*41</sup>And Jesus sat over against the treasury, and beheld how the people cast money into the treasury: and many that were rich cast in much. <sup>42</sup>And there came a certain poor widow, and she threw in two mites, which make a farthing. <sup>43</sup>And he called *unto him* his disciples, and saith unto them, Verily I say unto you, That this poor widow hath cast more in, than all they which have cast into the treasury: <sup>44</sup>for all *they* did cast in of their abundance; but she of her want did cast in all that she had, *even* all her living. †<sup>2</sup>

<The Sermon of Jesus at Nazareth, preaching the gospel to the poor Lk 4:16-27>

†<sup>16</sup>And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up: and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the sabbath-day, and stood up for to read. <sup>17</sup>And there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Esaias. And when he had opened the book, he found the place where it was written, /56 <sup>18</sup>The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, <sup>19</sup>to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. <sup>20</sup>And he closed the book, and he gave *it* again to the minister, and sat down. And the eyes of all them that were in the synagogue were fastened on him. <sup>21</sup>And he began to say unto them, This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears. <sup>22</sup>And all bare him witness, and wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth. And they said, Is not this Joseph's son? <sup>23</sup>And he said unto them, Ye will surely say unto me this proverb, Physician, heal thyself: whatsoever we have

\* Mark, Chap. xi. [xii.] 41. † Luke, Chap. iv. 16.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Mk 12:35-40 (The question about David's son and denouncing the Scribes), but see Mt 22:41-46 and Mt 23.

<sup>2</sup> Omitting Mk 13-16 (Sermons about the end; The night of the Passover meal, crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus). Omitting Lk 1:1-4:15 (Dedication; birth of John the Baptist; birth and childhood of Jesus; baptism and temptation of Jesus).

heard done in Capernaum, do also here in thy country. <sup>24</sup>And he said, Verily I say unto you, No prophet is accepted in his own country. <sup>25</sup>But I tell you of a truth, many widows were in Israel in the days of Elias, when the heaven was shut up three years and six months, when great famine was throughout all the land: <sup>26</sup>but unto none of them was Elias sent, save unto Sarepta, a city of Sidon, unto a woman that was a widow. <sup>27</sup>And many lepers were in Israel in the time of Eliseus the prophet; and none of them was cleansed, saving Naaman the Syrian. †<sup>1</sup>

<Purity and Fasting Lk 5:30-32, 36-39>

\*<sup>30</sup>But their Scribes and Pharisees murmured /57 against his disciples, saying, Why do ye eat and drink with publicans and sinners? <sup>31</sup>And Jesus answering said unto them, They that are whole need not a physician; but they that are sick. <sup>32</sup>I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance. †<sup>2</sup> <sup>36</sup>And he spake also a parable unto them; No man putteth a piece of a new garment upon an old; if otherwise, then both the new maketh a rent, and the piece that was taken out of the new agreeth not with the old. <sup>37</sup>And no man putteth new wine into old bottles; else the new wine will burst the bottles, and be spilled, and the bottles shall perish. <sup>38</sup>But new wine must be put into new bottles; and both are preserved. <sup>39</sup>No man also having drunk old wine straightway desireth new: for he saith, The old is better.

<Plucking Grain on the Sabbath Lk 6:1-5>

†<sup>1</sup>And it came to pass on the second sabbath after the first, that he went through the corn fields; and his disciples plucked the ears of corn, and did eat, rubbing them in their hands. <sup>2</sup>And certain of the Pharisees said unto them, Why do ye that which is not lawful to do on the sabbath-days? <sup>3</sup>And Jesus answering them said, Have ye not read so much as this, what David did, when himself was an hungered, and they which were with him; <sup>4</sup>how he went into the house of God, and did take and eat the shew-bread, and gave also to them that were with him; which it is not lawful to eat but for the Priests alone? /58 <sup>5</sup>And he said unto them, That the Son of man is Lord also of the sabbath.

<The Man with the Withered Hand Lk 6:6-9>

<sup>6</sup>And it came to pass also on another sabbath, that he entered into the synagogue and taught: and there was a man whose right hand was withered. <sup>7</sup>And the Scribes and Pharisees watched him, whether he would heal on the sabbath-day; that they

\* Luke, Chap. vi. [v.] 30. † Luke, Chap. vi. 1.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Lk 4:28-5:29 (Attempt to kill Jesus after his Sermon in Nazareth; healing a man with an unclean spirit; healings at Peter's house; summary preachings; first disciples; healing of a leper and a paralytic; calling Levi).

<sup>2</sup> Omitting v. 33-35 (The disciples of John and the children of the bridechamber). Only omitted in the Lk-version.

might find an accusation against him. <sup>8</sup>But he knew their thoughts, and said to the man which had the withered hand, Rise up, and stand forth in the midst. And he arose and stood forth. <sup>9</sup>Then said Jesus unto them, I will ask you one thing; Is it lawful on the sabbath-day to do good, or to do evil? to save life, or to destroy *it*? †<sup>1</sup>

<The Beatitudes and Woes; Love for Enemies; Judging Others; A Tree and Its Fruit; Hearers and Doers Lk 6:20-49>

<sup>\*20</sup>And he lifted up his eyes on his disciples, and said, Blessed *be ye* poor: for yours is the kingdom of God. <sup>21</sup>Blessed *are ye* that hunger now: for ye shall be filled. Blessed *are ye* that weep now: for ye shall laugh. <sup>22</sup>Blessed are ye, when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you *from their company*, and shall reproach *you*, and cast out your name as evil, for the Son of man's sake. <sup>23</sup>Rejoice ye in that day, and leap for joy: for, behold, your reward *is* great in heaven: for in the like manner did their fathers unto the prophets. <sup>24</sup>But woe unto you that are rich! for ye have received your consolation. <sup>25</sup>Woe unto you that are full! for ye /59 shall hunger. Woe unto you that laugh now! for ye shall mourn and weep. <sup>26</sup>Woe unto you, when all men shall speak well of you! for so did their fathers to the false prophets. <sup>27</sup>But I say unto you which hear, Love your enemies, do good to them which hate you, <sup>28</sup>bless them that curse you, and pray for them which despitefully use you. <sup>29</sup>And unto him that smiteth thee on the *one* cheek offer also the other; and him that taketh away thy cloke forbid not *to take thy* coat also. <sup>30</sup>Give to every man that asketh of thee; and of him that taketh away thy goods ask *them* not again. <sup>31</sup>And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise. <sup>32</sup>For if ye love them which love you, what thank have ye? for sinners also love those that love them. <sup>33</sup>And if ye do good to them which do good to you, what thank have ye? for sinners also do even the same. <sup>34</sup>And if ye lend *to them* of whom ye hope to receive, what thank have ye? for sinners also lend to sinners, to receive as much again. <sup>35</sup>But love ye your enemies, and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing again; and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be the children of the Highest: for he is kind unto the unthankful and *to* the evil. <sup>36</sup>Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful. <sup>37</sup>Judge not, and ye shall not be judged: condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned: forgive, and ye shall be forgiven: <sup>38</sup>give, and it shall be given unto you; good measure, pressed down, and shaken together, and running over, shall men give into your bosom. For /60 with the same measure that ye mete withal, it shall be measured to you again. <sup>39</sup>And he spake a parable unto them, Can the blind lead the blind? shall they not both fall into the ditch? <sup>40</sup>The disciple is not above his master: but every one that

---

\* Luke, Chap. vi. 20.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Lk 6:10-19 (Actual healing of the man with the withered hand – but not omitted in the Mt-version; the twelve apostles; summary teaching and healing).

is perfect shall be as his master. <sup>41</sup>And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but perceivest not the beam that is in thine own eye? <sup>42</sup>Either how canst thou say to thy brother, Brother, let me pull out the mote that is in thine eye, when thou thyself beholdest not the beam that is in thine own eye? Thou hypocrite! cast out first the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to pull out the mote that is in thy brother's eye. <sup>43</sup>For a good tree bringeth not forth corrupt fruit; neither doth a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. <sup>44</sup>For every tree is known by its own fruit. For of thorns men do not gather figs, nor of a bramble bush gather they grapes. <sup>45</sup>A good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is good; and an evil man out of the evil treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is evil: for of the abundance of the heart his mouth speaketh. <sup>46</sup>And why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say? <sup>47</sup>Whosoever cometh to me, and heareth my sayings, and doeth them, I will shew you to whom he is like: <sup>48</sup>he is like a man which built an house, and digged deep, and laid the foundation on a rock: and when the flood arose, the stream beat vehemently upon that house, and could not shake it; for it was founded upon a rock. <sup>49</sup>But /61 he that heareth, and doeth not, is like a man that without a foundation built an house upon the earth; against which the stream did beat vehemently, and immediately it fell; and the ruin of that house was great. †<sup>1</sup>

<A Sinful Woman Anoints Jesus Lk 7:36-50>

<sup>2</sup> <sup>36</sup>And one of the Pharisees desired him that he would eat with him. And he went into the Pharisee's house, and sat down to meat. <sup>37</sup>And, behold, a woman in the city, which was a sinner, when she knew that *Jesus* sat at meat in the Pharisee's house, brought an alabaster box of ointment, <sup>38</sup>and stood at his feet behind *him* weeping, and began to wash his feet with tears, and did wipe them with the hairs of her head, and kissed his feet, and anointed *them* with the ointment. <sup>39</sup>Now when the Pharisee which had bidden him saw *it*, he spake within himself, saying, This man, if he were a prophet, would have known who and what manner of woman *this is* that toucheth him: for she is a sinner. <sup>40</sup>And Jesus answering said unto him, Simon, I have somewhat to say unto thee. And he saith, Master, say on. <sup>41</sup>There was a certain creditor which had two debtors: the one owed five hundred pence, and the other fifty. <sup>42</sup>And when they had nothing to pay, he frankly forgave them both. Tell me therefore, which of them will love him most? <sup>43</sup>Simon answered and said, I suppose

\* Luke, Chap. vii. 36.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Lk 7:1-35 (Healing of the centurion's servant; raising the widow's son at Nain; messengers from John the Baptist.

<sup>2</sup> This passage, despite some differences, seems to be a parallel of Mt 26:6-13, Mk 14:3-9 and Jn 12:1-8, which are all omitted, Bovon, *Lukas Bd.* 1, 387-389.

that *he*, to whom he forgave most. And he said unto him, Thou hast rightly judged. <sup>44</sup>And he turned to the woman, and /62 said unto Simon, Seest thou this woman? I entered into thine house, thou gavest me no water for my feet: but she hath washed my feet with tears, and wiped *them* with the hairs of her head. <sup>45</sup>Thou gavest me no kiss: but this woman since the time I came in hath not ceased to kiss my feet. <sup>46</sup>My head with oil thou didst not anoint: but this woman hath anointed my feet with ointment. <sup>47</sup>Wherefore I say unto thee, Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much: but to whom little is forgiven, *the same* loveth little. <sup>48</sup>And he said unto her, Thy sins are forgiven. <sup>49</sup>And they that sat at meat with him began to say within themselves, Who is this that forgiveth sins also? <sup>50</sup>And he said to the woman, Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace. †<sup>1</sup>

<The Parable of the Sower Lk 8:4-18>

<sup>\*4</sup>And when much people were gathered together, and were come to him out of every city, he spake by a parable: <sup>5</sup>A sower went out to sow his seed: and as he sowed, some fell by the way side; and it was trodden down, and the fowls of the air devoured it. <sup>6</sup>And some fell upon a rock; and as soon as it was sprung up, it withered away, because it lacked moisture. <sup>7</sup>And some fell among thorns; and the thorns sprang up with it, and choked it. <sup>8</sup>And other fell on good ground, and sprang up, and bare fruit an hundredfold. And when he [had] said these things, he cried, He that hath ears to hear, let him hear. <sup>9</sup>And his disciples asked him, saying, What might this /63 parable be? <sup>10</sup>And he said, Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God: but to others in parables; that seeing they might not see, and hearing they might not understand. <sup>11</sup>Now the parable is this: The seed is the word of God. <sup>12</sup>Those by the way side are they that hear; then cometh the devil, and taketh away the word out of their hearts, lest they should believe and be saved. <sup>13</sup>They on the rock *are they*, which, when they hear, receive the word with joy; and these have no root, which for a while believe, and in time of temptation fall away. <sup>14</sup>And that which fell among thorns are they, which, when they have heard, go forth, and are choked with cares and riches and pleasures of *this* life, and bring no fruit to perfection. <sup>15</sup>But that on the good ground are they, which in an honest and good heart, having heard the word, keep *it*, and bring forth fruit with patience. <sup>16</sup>No man, when he hath lighted a candle, covereth it with a vessel, or putteth *it* under a bed; but setteth *it* on a candlestick, that they which enter in may see the light. <sup>17</sup>For nothing is secret, that shall not be made manifest; neither *any thing* hid, that shall not be known and come abroad. <sup>18</sup>Take heed therefore how ye hear: for whosoever

---

\* Luke, Chap. viii. 4.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Lk 8:1-3 (Women accompany Jesus).



hath, to him shall be given; and whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken even that which he seemeth to have.

<The True Kindred of Jesus Lk 8:19-21>

<sup>19</sup>Then came to him *his* mother and his brethren, and could not come at him for the press. <sup>20</sup>And it was told him *by certain* which said, Thy mother and /64 thy brethren stand without, desiring to see thee. <sup>21</sup>And he answered and said unto them, My mother and my brethren are these which hear the word of God, and do it. †<sup>1</sup>

<True Greatness; Another Exorcist Lk 9:46-50>

<sup>46</sup>Then there arose a reasoning among them, which of them should be greatest. <sup>47</sup>And Jesus, perceiving the thought of their heart, took a child, and set him by him, <sup>48</sup>And said unto them, Whosoever shall receive this child in my name receiveth me: and whosoever shall receive me receiveth him that sent me: for he that is least among you all, the same shall be great. <sup>49</sup>And John answered and said, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name; and we forbad him, because he followeth not with us. <sup>50</sup>And Jesus said unto him, Forbid *him* not: for he that is not against us is for us.

<Jesus Beginning his Journey to Jerusalem;

A Samaritan Village Refuses to Receive Jesus Lk 9:51-56>

<sup>51</sup>And it came to pass, when the time was come that he should be received up, he stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem, <sup>52</sup>and sent messengers before his face: and they went, and entered into a village of the Samaritans, to make ready for him. <sup>53</sup>And they did not receive him, because his face was as though he would go to Jerusalem, <sup>54</sup>And when his disciples James and John saw *this*, they said, Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them, even as Elias did? <sup>55</sup>But he turned, and rebuked them, and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. <sup>56</sup>For the Son of man is /65 not come to destroy men's lives, but to save *them*. And they went to another village.

<Would-Be Followers of Jesus Lk 9:57-62>

<sup>57</sup>And it came to pass, that, as they went in the way, a certain *man* said unto him, Lord, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest. <sup>58</sup>And Jesus said unto him, Foxes have holes, and birds of the air *have* nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay *his* head. <sup>59</sup>And he said unto another, Follow me. But he said, Lord, suffer me first to go and bury my father. <sup>60</sup>Jesus said unto him, Let the dead bury their dead: but

---

\* Luke, Chap. ix. 46.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Lk 8:22-9:45 (Jesus calms a storm; heals the Gerasene demoniac; restores a girl to life and heals a woman; the mission of the twelve; Herod's perplexity; feeding the five thousand; Peter's declaration about Jesus; Jesus foretells his death and resurrection; the transfiguration; healing of a boy with a demon; again foretelling his death), but see Mt 16:13-23.

go thou and preach the kingdom of God. <sup>61</sup>And another also said, Lord, I will follow thee; but let me first go bid them farewell, which are at home at my house. <sup>62</sup>And Jesus said unto him, No man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God.

<The Mission of the Seventy; Woes to Unrepentant Cities Lk 10:1-16>

<sup>\*1</sup>After these things, the Lord appointed other seventy also, and sent them two and two before his face into every city and place, whither he himself would come. <sup>2</sup>Therefore said he unto them, The harvest truly *is* great, but the labourers *are* few: pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he would send forth labourers into his harvest. <sup>3</sup>Go your ways: behold, I send you forth as lambs among wolves. <sup>4</sup>Carry neither purse, nor scrip, nor shoes: and salute no man by the way. <sup>5</sup>And into whatsoever house ye enter, first say, Peace *be* to this house. <sup>6</sup>And if the son of peace be there, your peace shall /66 rest upon it: if not, it shall turn to you again. <sup>7</sup>And in the same house remain, eating and drinking such things as they give: for the labourer is worthy of his hire. Go not from house to house. <sup>8</sup>And into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you, eat such things as are set before you: <sup>9</sup>and heal the sick that are therein, and say unto them, The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you. <sup>10</sup>But into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you not, go your ways out into the streets of the same, and say, <sup>11</sup>Even the very dust of your city, which cleaveth on us, we do wipe off against you: notwithstanding be ye sure of this, that the kingdom of God is come nigh unto you. <sup>12</sup>But I say unto you, that it shall be more tolerable in that day for Sodom, than for that city. <sup>13</sup>Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works had been done in Tyre and Sidon, which have been done in you, they had a great while ago repented, sitting in sackcloth and ashes. <sup>14</sup>But it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the judgment, than for you. <sup>15</sup>And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted to heaven, shalt be thrust down to hell. <sup>16</sup>He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you despiseth me; and he that despiseth me despiseth him that sent me. †<sup>1</sup>

<The Greatest Commandment and the Good Samaritan Lk 10:25-37>

†<sup>25</sup>And, behold, a certain lawyer stood up, and tempted him, saying, Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? <sup>26</sup>He said unto him, What is /67 written in the law? how readest thou? <sup>27</sup>And he answering said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself. <sup>28</sup>And he said unto him, Thou hast answered right: this do, and thou shalt live. <sup>29</sup>But he, willing to justify himself, said unto Jesus, And

\* Luke, Chap. x. 1. † Luke, Chap. x. 25.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Lk 10:17-24 (Return of the seventy; Jesus thanks his Father, but see Mt 11:25-27.)

who is my neighbour? <sup>30</sup>And Jesus answering said, A certain *man* went down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and fell among thieves, which stripped him of his raiment, and wounded *him*, and departed, leaving *him* half dead. <sup>31</sup>And by chance there came down a certain Priest that way: and when he saw him, he passed by on the other side. <sup>32</sup>And likewise a Levite, when he was at the place, came and looked *on him*, and passed by on the other side. <sup>33</sup>But a certain Samaritan, as he journeyed, came where he was: and when he saw him, he had compassion *on him*, <sup>34</sup>and went to him, and bound up his wounds, pouring in oil and wine, and set him on his own beast, and brought him to an inn, and took care of him. <sup>35</sup>And on the morrow when he departed, he took out two pence, and gave *them* to the host, and said unto him, Take care of him; and whatsoever thou spendest more, when I come again, I will repay thee. <sup>36</sup>Which now of these three, thinkest thou, was neighbour unto him that fell among the thieves? <sup>37</sup>And he said, He that shewed mercy on him. Then said Jesus unto him, Go, and do thou likewise. /68

<Jesus Visits Martha and Mary Lk 10:38-42>

<sup>\*38</sup>Now it came to pass, as they went, that he entered into a certain village: and a certain woman named Martha received him into her house. <sup>39</sup>And she had a sister called Mary, which also sat at Jesus' feet, and heard his word. <sup>40</sup>But Martha was cumbered about much serving, and came to him, and said, Lord, dost thou not care that my sister hath left me to serve alone? Bid her therefore that she help me. <sup>41</sup>And Jesus answered and said unto her, Martha, Martha, thou art careful and troubled about many things: <sup>42</sup>but one thing is needful: and Mary hath chosen that good part, which shall not be taken away from her.

<The Lord's Prayer; The Good Friend; Ask, Search, Knock Lk 11:1-13>

<sup>†1</sup>And it came to pass, that, as he was praying in a certain place, when he ceased, one of his disciples said unto him, Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples. <sup>2</sup>And he said unto them, When ye pray, say, Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth. <sup>3</sup>Give us day by day our daily bread. <sup>4</sup>And forgive us our sins; for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us. And lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil. <sup>5</sup>And he said unto them, Which of you shall have a friend, and shall go unto him at midnight, and say unto him, Friend, lend me three loaves; <sup>6</sup>for a friend of mine in his journey is come to me, and /69 I have nothing to set before him? <sup>7</sup>And he from within shall answer and say, Trouble me not: the door is now shut, and my children are with me in bed; I cannot rise and give thee. <sup>8</sup>I say unto you, Though he will not rise and give him, because he is his friend, yet because of his importunity he will rise and give him as many as he needeth. <sup>9</sup>And I say unto you,

\* Luke, Chap. x. 38. † Luke, Chap. xi. 1.

Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you. <sup>10</sup>For every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened. <sup>11</sup>If a son shall ask bread of any of you that is a father, will he give him a stone? Or if *he ask* a fish, will he for a fish give him a serpent? <sup>12</sup>Or if he shall ask an egg, will he offer him a scorpion? <sup>13</sup>If ye, then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children: how much more shall *your* heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him? †<sup>1</sup>

<A Woman Praising Jesus' Mother Lk 11:27-28>

\*<sup>27</sup>And it came to pass, as he spake these things, a certain woman of the company lifted up her voice, and said unto him, Blessed *is* the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked. <sup>28</sup>But he said, Yea, rather blessed *are* they that hear the word of God, and keep it. †<sup>2</sup>

<The Sound Eye Lk 11:33-36>

†<sup>33</sup>No man, when he hath lighted a candle, putteth *it* in a secret place, neither under a bushel, but on a candlestick, that they which come in may see /70 the light. <sup>34</sup>The light of the body is the eye: therefore when thine eye is single, thy whole body also is full of light; but when *thine eye* is evil, thy body also *is* full of darkness. <sup>35</sup>Take heed therefore that the light which is in thee be not darkness. <sup>36</sup>If thy whole body therefore *be* full of light, having no part dark, the whole shall be full of light, as when the bright shining of a candle doth give thee light.

<Jesus Denounces Pharisees and Lawyers Lk 11:37-52>

<sup>37</sup>And as he spake, a certain Pharisee besought him to dine with him: and he went in, and sat down to meat. <sup>38</sup>And when the Pharisee saw *it*, he marvelled that he had not first washed before dinner. <sup>39</sup>And the Lord said unto him, Now do ye Pharisees make clean the outside of the cup and the platter; but your inward part is full of ravening and wickedness. <sup>40</sup>*Ye* fools, did not he that made that which is without make that which is within also? <sup>41</sup>But rather give alms of such things as ye have; and, behold, all things are clean unto you. <sup>42</sup>But woe unto you, Pharisees! for ye tithe mint and rue and all manner of herbs, and pass over judgment and the love of God: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone. <sup>43</sup>Woe unto you, Pharisees! for ye love the uppermost seats in the synagogues, and greetings in the markets. <sup>44</sup>Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are as graves which appear not, and the men that walk over *them* are not aware *of them*. <sup>45</sup>Then answered one of the Lawyers, and said unto him, Master, thus saying thou reproachest us also. <sup>46</sup>And he

---

\* Luke, Chap. xi. 27. † Luke, Chap. xi. 33.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Lk 11:14-26 (Jesus and Beelzebul; return of the unclean spirits).

<sup>2</sup> Omitting Lk 11:29-32 (The sign of Jonah).

said, Woe unto /71 you also, ye Lawyers! for ye lade men with burdens grievous to be borne, and ye yourselves touch not the burdens with one of your fingers. <sup>47</sup>Woe unto you! for ye build the sepulchres of the prophets, and your fathers killed them. <sup>48</sup>Truly ye bear witness that ye allow the deeds of your fathers: for they indeed killed them, and ye build their sepulchres. <sup>49</sup>Therefore also said the wisdom of God, I will send them prophets and apostles, and *some* of them they shall slay and persecute: <sup>50</sup>that the blood of all the prophets, which was shed from the foundation of the world, may be required of this generation; <sup>51</sup>from the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, which perished between the altar and the temple: verily I say unto you, It shall be required of this generation. <sup>52</sup>Woe unto you, Lawyers! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge: ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered. †<sup>1</sup>

<The Yeast of the Pharisees; Coming Persecutions; The Parable of the Rich Fool; Do Not Worry; Watchful Slaves; The Faithful and the Evil Slave; Jesus the Cause of Division; Interpreting the Time; Settling with Your Opponent Lk 12>

\*In the mean time, when there were gathered together an innumerable multitude of people, insomuch that they trode one upon another, he began to say unto his disciples first of all, Beware ye of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy. <sup>2</sup>For there is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed; neither hid, that shall not be known. <sup>3</sup>Therefore whatsoever ye have spoken in darkness shall be heard in the light; and that which ye have spoken in the ear in closets shall be proclaimed upon the house-/72tops. <sup>4</sup>And I say unto you my friends, Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. <sup>5</sup>But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear: Fear him, which after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, Fear him. <sup>6</sup>Are not five sparrows sold for two farthings? and not one of them is forgotten before God: <sup>7</sup>but even the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear not therefore: ye are of more value than many sparrows. <sup>8</sup>Also I say unto you, Whosoever shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of man also confess before the angels of God: <sup>9</sup>but he that denieth me before men shall be denied before the angels of God. <sup>10</sup>And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but unto him that blasphemeth against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven. <sup>11</sup>And when they bring you unto the synagogues, and *unto* magistrates, and powers, take ye no thought how or what thing ye shall answer, or what ye shall say: <sup>12</sup>for the Holy Ghost shall teach you in the same hour what ye ought to say. <sup>13</sup>And one of the company said unto him, Master, speak to

\* Luke, Chap. xii. 1.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Lk 11:53-54 (Hostility of the Pharisees and Scribes).

my brother, that he divide the inheritance with me. <sup>14</sup>And he said unto him, Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you? <sup>15</sup>And he said unto them, Take heed, and beware of covetousness: for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth. <sup>16</sup>And he spake a parable unto them, saying, The ground of a certain rich man brought forth plentifully: <sup>17</sup>and he thought within himself, saying, What shall I do, because I have no room where to bestow my fruits? <sup>18</sup>And he said, This will I do: I will pull down my barns, and build greater; and there will I bestow all my fruits and my goods. <sup>19</sup> And I will say to my soul, Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink, *and* be merry. <sup>20</sup>But God said unto him, *Thou* fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee: then whose shall those things be, which thou hast provided? <sup>21</sup>So *is* he that layeth up treasure for himself, and is not rich towards God. <sup>22</sup>And he said unto his disciples, Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat; neither for the body, what ye shall put on. <sup>23</sup>The life is more than meat, and the body *is more* than raiment. <sup>24</sup>Consider the ravens: for they neither sow nor reap; which neither have storehouse nor barn; and God feedeth them: how much more are ye better than the fowls! <sup>25</sup>And which of you with taking thought can add to his stature one cubit? <sup>26</sup>If ye then be not able to do that thing which is least, why take ye thought for the rest? <sup>27</sup>Consider the lilies how they grow: they toil not, they spin not; and yet I say unto you, that Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. <sup>28</sup>If then God so clothe the grass, which is to-day in the field, and to-morrow is cast into the oven; how much more *will he clothe* you, O ye of little faith! <sup>29</sup>And seek not ye what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink, neither be ye of doubtful mind. <sup>30</sup>For all these things do the nations of the world seek after: and your Father knoweth that [ye] have need of these things. <sup>31</sup>But rather seek ye the kingdom of God; and all these things shall be added unto you. <sup>32</sup>Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom. <sup>33</sup>Sell that ye have, and give alms; provide yourselves bags which wax not old, a treasure in the heavens that faileth not, where no thief approacheth, neither moth corrupteth. <sup>34</sup>For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also. <sup>35</sup>Let your loins be girded about, and *your* lights burning; <sup>36</sup>and ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their lord, when he will return from the wedding; that when he cometh and knocketh, they may open unto him immediately. <sup>37</sup>Blessed *are* those servants, whom the lord, when he cometh, shall find watching: verily I say unto you, that he shall gird himself, and make them to sit down to meat, and will come forth and serve them. <sup>38</sup>And if he shall come in the second watch, or come in the third watch, and find *them* so, blessed are those servants. <sup>39</sup>And this know, that if the good man of the house had known what hour the thief would come, he would have watched, and not have suffered his house to be broken through. <sup>40</sup>Be ye therefore ready also: for the Son of man cometh at an hour when ye think not.

<sup>41</sup>Then Peter said unto him, Lord, speakest thou this parable unto us, or even to all?  
<sup>42</sup>And the Lord said, Who then is that faithful and wise steward, /75 whom *his* lord shall make ruler over his household, to give *them their* portion of meat in due season? <sup>43</sup>Blessed is that servant, whom his lord, when he cometh, shall find so doing.  
<sup>44</sup>Of a truth I say unto you, that he will make him ruler over all that he hath. <sup>45</sup>But and if that servant say in his heart, My lord delayeth his coming; and shall begin to beat the men-servants and maidens, and to eat and drink, and to be drunken; <sup>46</sup>The lord of that servant will come in a day when he looketh not for *him*, and at an hour when he is not aware, and will cut him in sunder, and will appoint him his portion with the unbelievers. <sup>47</sup>And that servant, which knew his lord's will, and prepared not *himself*, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many *stripes*. <sup>48</sup>But he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few *stripes*. For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required: and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more. <sup>49</sup>I am come to send fire on the earth; and what will I, if it be already kindled? <sup>50</sup>but I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished! <sup>51</sup>Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on earth? I tell you, Nay; but rather division: <sup>52</sup>for from henceforth there shall be five in one house divided, three against two, and two against three. <sup>53</sup>The father shall be divided against the son, and the son against the father; the mother against the daughter, and the daughter against the mother; the mother-in-law /76 against her daughter-in-law, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law. <sup>54</sup>And he said also to the people, When ye see a cloud rise out of the west, straightway ye say, There cometh a shower; and so it is. <sup>55</sup>And when ye see the south wind blow, ye say, There will be heat; and it cometh to pass. <sup>56</sup>Ye hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky and of the earth; but how is it that ye do not discern this time? <sup>57</sup>Yea, and why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?  
<sup>58</sup>When thou goest with thine adversary to the magistrate, *as thou art* in the way, give diligence that thou mayest be delivered from him; lest he hale thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and the officer cast thee into prison. <sup>59</sup>I tell thee, thou shalt not depart thence, till thou hast paid the very last mite.

<Repent or Perish; The Parable of the Barren Fig Tree Lk 13:1-9>

<sup>\*1</sup>There were present at that season some that told him of the Galileans, whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices. <sup>2</sup>And Jesus answering said unto them, Suppose ye that these Galileans were sinners above all the Galileans, because they suffered such things? <sup>3</sup>I tell you, Nay: but, except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish. <sup>4</sup>Or those eighteen, upon whom the tower in Siloam fell, and slew them, think ye that they were sinners above all men that dwelt in Jerusalem? <sup>5</sup>I tell you,

\* Luke, Chap. xiii. 1.

Nay: but, except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish. <sup>6</sup>He spake also this parable; A certain *man* had a fig-/77tree planted in his vineyard: and he came and sought fruit thereon, and found none. <sup>7</sup>Then said he unto the dresser of his vineyard, Behold, these three years I come seeking fruit on this fig-tree, and find none: cut it down; why cumbereth it the ground? <sup>8</sup>And he answering said unto him, Lord, let it alone this year also, till I shall dig about it, and dung it: <sup>9</sup>And if it bear fruit, *well*: and if not, *then* after that thou shalt cut it down. †<sup>1</sup>

<Jesus Defends Himself After Healing a Woman on the Sabbath Day Lk 13:14-17>

<sup>\*14</sup>And the ruler of the synagogue answered with indignation, because that Jesus had healed on the sabbath-day, and said unto the people, There are six days in which men ought to work: in them therefore come and be healed, and not on the sabbath-day. <sup>15</sup>The Lord then answered him, and said, *Thou* hypocrite! doth not each one of you on the sabbath loose his ox or *his* ass from the stall, and lead *him* away to watering? <sup>16</sup>And ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound, lo, these eighteen years, be loosed from this bond on the sabbath-day? <sup>17</sup>And when he had said these things, all his adversaries were ashamed: and all the people rejoiced for all the glorious things that were done by him.

<The Parable of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven Lk 13:18-21>

<sup>18</sup>Then said he, Unto what is the kingdom of God like? and whereunto shall I resemble it? <sup>19</sup>It is like a grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and cast into his garden; and it grew, and waxed a great /78 tree; and the fowls of the air lodged in the branches of it. <sup>20</sup>And again he said, Whereunto shall I liken the kingdom of God? <sup>21</sup>It is like leaven, which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened. †<sup>2</sup>

<The Closed Door Lk 13:23-30>

<sup>23</sup>Then said one unto him, Lord, are there few that be saved? And he said unto them, <sup>24</sup>Strive to enter in at the strait gate: for many, I say unto you, will seek to enter in, and shall not be able. <sup>25</sup>When once the master of the house is risen up, and hath shut to the door, and ye begin to stand without, and to knock at the door, saying, Lord, Lord, open unto us; and he shall answer and say unto you, I know you not whence ye are: <sup>26</sup>then shall ye begin to say, We have eaten and drunk in thy presence, and thou hast taught in our streets. <sup>27</sup>But he shall say, I tell you, I know you not whence ye are; depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity. <sup>28</sup>There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob,

---

\* Luke, Chap. xiii, [14,] 17.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Lk 13:10-13 (Jesus heals a crippled woman).

<sup>2</sup> Omitting Lk 13:22 (Jesus moving on towards Jerusalem).



and all the prophets, in the kingdom of God, and you *yourselves* thrust out. <sup>29</sup>And they shall come from the east, and *from* the west, and from the north, and *from* the south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God. <sup>30</sup>And, behold, there are last which shall be first, and there are first which shall be last.

<Warning of Herod; Lament over Jerusalem Lk 13:31-35>

<sup>31</sup>The same day there came certain of the Pharisees, saying unto him, Get thee out, and depart hence: for Herod will kill thee. <sup>32</sup>And he said unto them, Go ye, and tell that fox, Behold, I cast out devils, /79 and I do cures to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I shall be perfected. <sup>33</sup>Nevertheless I must walk to-day, and to-morrow, and the *day* following: for it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem. <sup>34</sup>O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen *doth gather* her brood under *her* wings, and ye would not! <sup>35</sup>Behold, your house is left unto you desolate: and verily I say unto you, Ye shall not see me, until *the time* come when ye shall say, Blessed *is* he that cometh in the name of the Lord.

<Jesus Heals the Man with Dropsy on the Sabbath Day; Humility and Hospitality; The Parable of the Great Dinner Lk 14:1-24>

\*<sup>1</sup>And it came to pass, as he went into the house of one of the chief Pharisees to eat bread on the sabbath-day, that they watched him. <sup>2</sup>And, behold, there was a certain man before him which had the dropsy. <sup>3</sup>And Jesus answering spake unto the Lawyers and Pharisees, saying, Is it lawful to heal on the sabbath-day? <sup>4</sup>And they held their peace. And he took *him*, and healed him, and let him go; <sup>5</sup>and answered them, saying, Which of you shall have an ass or an ox fallen into a pit, and will not straightway pull him out on the sabbath-day? <sup>6</sup>And they could not answer him again to these things. <sup>7</sup>And he put forth a parable to those which were bidden, when he marked how they chose out the chief rooms; saying unto them, <sup>8</sup>When thou art bidden of any *man* to a wedding, sit not down in the highest /80 room; lest a more honourable man than thou be bidden of him; <sup>9</sup>and he that bade thee and him come and say to thee, Give this man place; and thou begin with shame to take the lowest room. <sup>10</sup>But when thou art bidden, go and sit down in the lowest room; that when he that bade thee cometh, he may say unto thee, Friend, go up higher: then shalt thou have worship in the presence of them that sit at meat with thee. <sup>11</sup>For whosoever exalteth himself shall be abased; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted. <sup>12</sup>Then said he also to him that bade him, When thou makest a dinner or a supper, call not thy friends, nor thy brethren, neither thy kinsmen, nor *thy* rich neighbours; lest they also bid thee again, and a recompence be made thee. <sup>13</sup>But when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind: <sup>14</sup>and thou

\* Luke, Chap. xiv. 1.

shalt be blessed; for they cannot recompense thee: for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just. <sup>15</sup>And when one of them that sat at meat with him heard these things, he said unto him, Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God. <sup>16</sup>Then said he unto him, A certain man made a great supper, and bade many: <sup>17</sup>and sent his servant at supper time to say to them that were bidden, Come; for all things are now ready. <sup>18</sup>And they all with one *consent* began to make excuse. The first said unto him, I have bought a piece of ground, and I must needs go and see it: I pray thee have me excused. <sup>19</sup>And another said, I have bought five yoke of oxen, and I go to prove /81 them: I pray thee have me excused. <sup>20</sup>And another said, I have married a wife, and therefore I cannot come. <sup>21</sup>So that servant came, and shewed his lord these things. Then the master of the house being angry, said to his servant, Go out quickly into the streets and lanes of the city, and bring in hither the poor, and the maimed, and the halt, and the blind. <sup>22</sup>And the servant said, Lord, it is done as thou hast commanded, and yet there is room. <sup>23</sup>And the lord said unto the servant, Go out into the highways and hedges, and compel *them* to come in, that my house may be filled. <sup>24</sup>For I say unto you, That none of those men which were bidden shall taste of my supper.

<The Cost of Discipleship Lk 14:25-35>

<sup>25</sup>And there went great multitudes with him: and he turned, and said unto them, <sup>26</sup>If any *man* come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple. <sup>27</sup>And whosoever doth not bear his cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple. <sup>28</sup>For which of you, intending to build a tower, sitteth not down first, and counteth the cost, whether he have *sufficient* to finish *it*? <sup>29</sup>Lest haply, after he hath laid the foundation, and is not able to finish *it*, all that behold *it* begin to mock him, <sup>30</sup>saying, This man began to build, and was not able to finish. <sup>31</sup>Or what king, going to make war against another king, sitteth not down first, and consulteth whether he be able with ten thousand to meet him that cometh against him with twenty thousand? <sup>32</sup>Or /82 else, while the other is yet a great way off, he sendeth an ambassage, and desireth conditions of peace. <sup>33</sup>So likewise, whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple. <sup>34</sup>Salt is good: but if the salt have lost his savour, wherewith shall it be seasoned? <sup>35</sup>It is neither fit for the land, nor yet for the dunghill; *but* men cast it out. He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.

<The Parable of the Lost Sheep; The Parable of the Lost Coin; The Parable of the Prodigal and His Brother Lk 15>

<sup>\*1</sup>Then drew near unto him all the publicans and sinners for to hear him. <sup>2</sup>And the Pharisees and Scribes murmured, saying, This man receiveth sinners, and eateth

---

\* Luke, Chap. xv. 1.

with them. <sup>3</sup>And he spake this parable unto them, saying, <sup>4</sup>What man of you, having an hundred sheep, if he lose one of them, doth not leave the ninety and nine in the wilderness, and go after that which is lost, until he find it? <sup>5</sup>And when he hath found *it*, he layeth *it* on his shoulders, rejoicing. <sup>6</sup>And when he cometh home, he calleth together *his* friends and neighbours, saying unto them, Rejoice with me; for I have found my sheep which was lost. <sup>7</sup>I say unto you, that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons which need no repentance. <sup>8</sup>Either what woman having ten pieces of silver, if she lose one piece, doth not light a candle, and sweep the house, and seek diligently till she find *it*? <sup>9</sup>And when she hath found *it*, she calleth *her* friends and her neighbours together, /83 saying, Rejoice with me; for I have found the piece which I had lost. <sup>10</sup>Likewise, I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth. <sup>11</sup>And he said, A certain man had two sons: <sup>12</sup>and the younger of them said to *his* father, Father, give me the portion of goods that falleth to *me*. And he divided unto them *his* living. <sup>13</sup>And not many days after the younger son gathered all together, and took his journey into a far country, and there wasted his substance with riotous living. <sup>14</sup>And when he had spent all, there arose a mighty famine in that land; and he began to be in want. <sup>15</sup>And he went and joined himself to a citizen of that country; and he sent him into his fields to feed swine. <sup>16</sup>And he would fain have filled his belly with the husks that the swine did eat: and no man gave unto him. <sup>17</sup>And when he came to himself, he said, How many hired servants of my father's have bread enough and to spare, and I perish with hunger! <sup>18</sup>I will arise and go to my father, and will say unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and before thee, <sup>19</sup>and am no more worthy to be called thy son: make me as one of thy hired servants. <sup>20</sup>And he arose, and came to his father. But when he was yet a great way off, his father saw him, and had compassion, and ran, and fell on his neck, and kissed him. <sup>21</sup>And the son said unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son. <sup>22</sup>But the father said to his servants, Bring forth the best robe, and put *it* on him; /84 and put a ring on his hand, and shoes on *his* feet: <sup>23</sup>and bring hither the fatted calf, and kill *it*; and let us eat, and be merry: <sup>24</sup>for this my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found. And they began to be merry. <sup>25</sup>Now his elder son was in the field: and as he came and drew nigh to the house, he heard music and dancing. <sup>26</sup>And he called one of the servants, and asked what these things meant. <sup>27</sup>And he said unto him, Thy brother is come; and thy father hath killed the fatted calf, because he hath received him safe and sound. <sup>28</sup>And he was angry, and would not go in: therefore came his father out, and intreated him. <sup>29</sup>And he answering said to *his* father, Lo, these many years do I serve thee, neither transgressed I at any time thy commandment: and yet thou never gavest me a kid, that I might make merry with my friends: <sup>30</sup>but as soon

as this thy son was come, which hath devoured thy living with harlots, thou hast killed for him the fatted calf. <sup>31</sup>And he said unto him, Son, thou art ever with me, and all that I have is thine. <sup>32</sup>It was meet that we should make merry, and be glad: for this thy brother was dead, and is alive again; and was lost, and is found.

<The Parable of the Dishonest Steward; The Law and the Kingdom of God; The Rich Man and Lazarus Lk 16:1-31>

<sup>\*1</sup>And he said also unto his disciples, There was a certain rich man, which had a steward; and the same was accused unto him that he had wasted his goods. <sup>2</sup>And he called him, and said unto him, How is it that I hear this of thee? give an account of thy /85 stewardship; for thou mayest be no longer steward. <sup>3</sup>Then the steward said within himself, What shall I do? for my lord taketh away from me the stewardship? I cannot dig; to beg I am ashamed. <sup>4</sup>I am resolved what to do, that, when I am put out of the stewardship, they may receive me into their houses. <sup>5</sup>So he called every one of his lord's debtors *unto him*, and said unto the first, How much owest thou unto my lord? <sup>6</sup>And he said, An hundred measures of oil. And he said unto him, Take thy bill, and sit down quickly, and write fifty. <sup>7</sup>Then said he to another, And how much owest thou? And he said, An hundred measures of wheat. And he said unto him, Take thy bill, and write fourscore. <sup>8</sup>And the lord commended the unjust steward, because he had done wisely: for the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light. <sup>9</sup>And I say unto you, Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness; that, when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations. <sup>10</sup>He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much: and he that is unjust in the least is unjust also in much. <sup>11</sup>If therefore ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon, who will commit to your trust the true *riches*? <sup>12</sup>And if ye have not been faithful in that which is another man's, who shall give you that which is your own? <sup>13</sup>No servant can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mam-/86mon. <sup>14</sup>And the Pharisees also, who were covetous, heard all these things: and they derided him. <sup>15</sup>And he said unto them, Ye are they which justify yourselves before men; but God knoweth your hearts: for that which is highly esteemed amongst men is abomination in the sight of God. <sup>16</sup>The Law and the Prophets *were* until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it. <sup>17</sup>And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail. <sup>18</sup>Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marieth another, committeth adultery: and whosoever marieth her that is put away from *her* husband, committeth adultery. <sup>19</sup>There was a certain rich man, which was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day: <sup>20</sup>and there

---

\* Luke, Chap. xiii. [xvi.] 1.

was a certain beggar named Lazarus, which was laid at his gate, full of sores, <sup>21</sup>and desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table: moreover the dogs came and licked his sores. <sup>22</sup>And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom: the rich man also died, and was buried; <sup>23</sup>and in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. <sup>24</sup>And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame. <sup>25</sup>But Abraham said, Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things: but /87 now he is comforted, and thou art tormented. <sup>26</sup>And beside all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed: so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us, that *would come* from thence. <sup>27</sup>Then he said, I pray thee therefore, father, that thou wouldest send him to my father's house: <sup>28</sup>for I have five brethren; that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment. <sup>29</sup>Abraham saith unto him, They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them. <sup>30</sup>And he said, Nay, father Abraham: but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent. <sup>31</sup>And he said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead.

<Various Sayings of Jesus Lk 17:1-10>

<sup>\*1</sup>Then said he unto the disciples, It is impossible but that offences will come: but woe *unto him*, through whom they come! <sup>2</sup>It were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he cast into the sea, than that he should offend one of these little ones. <sup>3</sup>Take heed to yourselves: If thy brother trespass against thee, rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him. <sup>4</sup>And if he trespass against thee seven times in a day, and seven times in a day turn again to thee, saying, I repent; thou shalt forgive him. <sup>5</sup>And the Apostles said unto the Lord, Increase our faith. <sup>6</sup>And the Lord said, If ye had faith as a grain of mustard-seed, ye might say unto this syc- /88 mine-tree, Be thou plucked up by the root, and be thou planted in the sea; and it should obey you. <sup>7</sup>But which of you, having a servant plowing or feeding cattle, will say unto him by and by, when he is come from the field, Go and sit down to meat? <sup>8</sup>and will not rather say unto him, Make ready wherewith I may sup, and gird thyself, and serve me, till I have eaten and drunken; and afterward thou shalt eat and drink? <sup>9</sup>Doth he thank that servant because he did the things that were commanded him? I trow not. <sup>10</sup>So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which

---

\* Luke, Chap. xvii. 1

was our duty to do. †<sup>1</sup>

<The Parable of the Widow and the Unjust Judge Lk 18:1-8>

\*<sup>1</sup>And he spake a parable unto them *to this end*, that men ought always *to pray*, and not to faint; <sup>2</sup>saying, There was in a city a judge, which feared not God, neither regarded man: <sup>3</sup>and there was a widow in that city; and she came unto him, saying, Avenge me of mine adversary. <sup>4</sup>And he would not for a while: but afterward he said within himself, Though I fear not God, nor regard man; <sup>5</sup>yet because this widow troubleth me, I will avenge her, lest by her continual coming she weary me. <sup>6</sup>And the Lord said, Hear what the unjust judge saith. <sup>7</sup>And shall not God avenge his own elect, which cry day and night unto him, though he bear long with them? <sup>8</sup>I tell you that he will avenge them speedily. /<sup>89</sup> Nevertheless when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?

<The Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican Lk 17:9-14>

<sup>9</sup>And he spake this parable unto certain which trusted in themselves that they were righteous, and despised others: <sup>10</sup>Two men went up into the temple to pray; the one a Pharisee, and the other a Publican. <sup>11</sup>The Pharisee stood and prayed thus with himself, God, I thank thee, that I am not as other men *are*, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this Publican. <sup>12</sup>I fast twice in the week, I give tithes of all that I possess. <sup>13</sup>And the Publican, standing afar off, would not lift up so much as *his eyes* unto heaven, but smote upon his breast, saying, God be merciful to me a sinner. <sup>14</sup>I tell you, this man went down to his house justified *rather* than the other: for every one that exalteth himself shall be abased; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted.

<Jesus Blesses Little Children Lk 18:15-17>

<sup>15</sup>And they brought unto him also infants, that he would touch them: but when *his* disciples saw *it*, they rebuked them. <sup>16</sup>But Jesus called them *unto him*, and said, Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God. <sup>17</sup>Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child shall in no wise enter therein.

<The Rich Ruler Lk 18:18-30>

<sup>18</sup>And a certain ruler asked him, saying, Good Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? <sup>19</sup>And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? none *is* good, save one, *that is*, God. <sup>20</sup>Thou knowest the commandments, Do not commit adultery, Do /<sup>90</sup> not kill, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Honour thy father and thy mother. <sup>21</sup>And he said, All these have I kept from my youth up. <sup>22</sup>Now when Jesus

---

\* Luke, Chap. xviii. 1.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Lk 17:11-37 (Jesus cleanses ten Lepers; the coming of the kingdom).

heard these things, he said unto him, Yet lackest thou one thing: sell all that thou hast, and distribute unto the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, follow me. <sup>23</sup>And when he heard this, he was very sorrowful: for he was very rich. <sup>24</sup>And when Jesus saw that he was very sorrowful, he said, How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God! <sup>25</sup>For it is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God. <sup>26</sup>And they that heard *it* said, Who then can be saved? <sup>27</sup>And he said, The things which are impossible with men are possible with God. <sup>28</sup>Then Peter said, Lo, we have left all, and followed thee. <sup>29</sup>And he said unto them, Verily I say unto you, There is no man that hath left house, or parents, or brethren, or wife, or children, for the kingdom of God's sake, <sup>30</sup>who shall not receive manifold more in this present time, and in the world to come life everlasting. †<sup>1</sup>

<The Parable of the Ten Pounds Lk 19:12-27>

<sup>\*12</sup>He said therefore, A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return. <sup>13</sup>And he called his ten servants, and delivered them ten pounds, and said unto them, Occupy till I come. <sup>14</sup>But his citizens hated him, and sent a message after him, saying, We will not /91 have this *man* to reign over us. <sup>15</sup>And it came to pass, that when he was returned, having received the kingdom, then he commanded these servants to be called unto him, to whom he had given the money, that he might know how much every man had gained by trading. <sup>16</sup>Then came the first, saying, Lord, thy pound hath gained ten pounds. <sup>17</sup>And he said unto him, Well, thou good servant: because thou hast been faithful in a very little, have thou authority over ten cities. <sup>18</sup>And the second came, saying, Lord, thy pound hath gained five pounds. <sup>19</sup>And he said likewise to him, Be thou also over five cities. <sup>20</sup>And another came, saying, Lord, behold, *here is* thy pound, which I have kept laid up in a napkin: <sup>21</sup>for I feared thee, because thou art an austere man: thou takest up that thou layedst not down, and reapest that thou didst not sow. <sup>22</sup>And he saith unto him, Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee, *thou* wicked servant. Thou knewest that I was an austere man, taking up that I laid not down, and reaping that I did not sow: <sup>23</sup>wherefore then gavest not thou my money into the bank, that at my coming I might have required mine own with usury? <sup>24</sup>And he said unto them that stood by, Take from him the pound, and give *it* to him that hath ten pounds. <sup>25</sup>(And they said unto him, Lord, he hath ten pounds.) <sup>26</sup>For I say unto you, That unto every one which hath shall be given; and from him that hath not, even that he hath shall be taken away from him. <sup>27</sup>But those mine /92 enemies, which would not that I should

† Luke, Chap. xix. 12.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Lk 18:31-19:9 (Jesus Foretells His Death and Resurrection a Third Time; Healing of a Blind Beggar; Jesus and Zacchaeus).

reign over them, bring hither, and slay *them* before me. †<sup>1</sup>

<The Questions about Paying Taxes and about the Resurrection Lk 20:19-39>

\*<sup>19</sup> And the Chief Priests and the Scribes the same hour sought to lay hands on him; and they feared the people: for they perceived that he had spoken this parable against them.<sup>2</sup> <sup>20</sup> And they watched *him*, and sent forth spies, which should feign themselves just men, that they might take hold of his words, that so they might deliver him unto the power and authority of the governor. <sup>21</sup> And they asked him, saying, Master, we know that thou sayest and teachest rightly, neither acceptest thou the person of *any*, but teachest the way of God truly: <sup>22</sup> Is it lawful for us to give tribute unto Cæsar, or no? <sup>23</sup> But he perceived their craftiness, and said unto them, Why tempt ye me? <sup>24</sup> Shew me a penny. Whose image and superscription hath it? They answered and said, Cæsar's. <sup>25</sup> And he said unto them, Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which be Cæsar's, and unto God the things which be God's. <sup>26</sup> And they could not take hold of his words before the people: and they marvelled at his answer, and held their peace. <sup>27</sup> Then came to *him* certain of the Sadducees, which deny that there is any resurrection; and they asked him, <sup>28</sup> Saying, Master, Moses wrote unto us, If any man's brother die, having a wife, and he die without children, that his brother should take his wife, and /93 raise up seed unto his brother. <sup>29</sup> There were therefore seven brethren: and the first took a wife, and died without children. <sup>30</sup> And the second took her to wife, and he died childless. <sup>31</sup> And the third took her; and in like manner the seven also: and they left no children, and died. <sup>32</sup> Last of all the woman died also. <sup>33</sup> Therefore in the resurrection whose wife of them is she? for seven had her to wife. <sup>34</sup> And Jesus answering said unto them, The children of this world marry, and are given in marriage: <sup>35</sup> but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage: <sup>36</sup> neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection. <sup>37</sup> Now that the dead are raised, even Moses shewed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. <sup>38</sup> For he is not a God of the dead, but of the living: for all live unto him. <sup>39</sup> Then certain of the Scribes answering said, Master, thou hast well said.

<The Widow's Offering Lk 21:1-4>

†<sup>1</sup> And he looked up, and saw the rich men casting their gifts into the treasury. <sup>2</sup> And

\* Luke, Chap. xx. [19.] 20. † Luke, Chap. xxi. 1.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Lk 19:28-20:18 (Triumphal entry into Jerusalem; Jesus weeps over Jerusalem; cleanses the temple; Jesus' authority; the wicked tenants, but see Mt 21:33-44).

<sup>2</sup> In the context of Luke's gospel this verse refers to the parable of the wicked tenants, which was omitted. Now it seems as if it referred to the parable of the ten pounds.



he saw also a certain poor widow casting in thither two mites. <sup>3</sup>And he said, Of a truth I say unto you, that this poor widow hath cast in more than they all: <sup>4</sup>for all these have of their abundance cast in unto the offerings of /94 God: but she of her penury hath cast in all the living that she had. †<sup>1</sup>

<Nicodemus Visits Jesus Jn 3:1-21>

†<sup>2</sup> \*<sup>1</sup>There was a man of the Pharisees, named Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews: <sup>2</sup>The same came to Jesus by night, and said unto him, Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God: for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him. <sup>3</sup>Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. <sup>4</sup>Nicodemus saith unto him, How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be born? <sup>5</sup>Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. <sup>6</sup>That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. <sup>7</sup>Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again. <sup>8</sup>The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit. <sup>9</sup>Nicodemus answered and said unto him, How can these things be? <sup>10</sup>Jesus answered and said unto him, Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things? <sup>11</sup>Verily, verily, I say unto thee, We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen; and ye receive not our witness. <sup>12</sup>If I have told you earthly things, and ye /95 believe not, how shall ye believe, if I tell you of heavenly things? <sup>13</sup>And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, *even* the Son of man which is in heaven. <sup>14</sup>And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: <sup>15</sup>that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life. <sup>16</sup>For God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. <sup>17</sup>For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. <sup>18</sup>He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God. <sup>19</sup>And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. <sup>20</sup>For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved. <sup>21</sup>But he that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his

---

\* John, Chap. iii. 1.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Lk 21:5-24:53 (Sermons about the end; The night of the Passover meal, crucifixion, resurrection and ascension of Jesus).

<sup>2</sup> Omitting Jn 1-2 (Introduction; John the Baptist; disciples; wedding at Cana).

deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God.

<The Worship in Spirit and Truth Jn 4:23-24>

†<sup>1</sup> \*<sup>23</sup> But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him. <sup>24</sup> God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship *him* in spirit and in truth.<sup>2</sup> /96

<The Meat Which Endureth Jn 6:27>

†<sup>3</sup> †<sup>27</sup> Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give unto you: for him hath God the Father sealed.

<The Woman Caught in Adultery Jn 8:3-11>

†<sup>4</sup> †<sup>3</sup> And the Scribes and Pharisees brought unto him a woman taken in adultery; and when they had set her in the midst, <sup>4</sup> they say unto him, Master, this woman was taken in adultery, in the very act. <sup>5</sup> Now Moses in the law commanded us, that such should be stoned: but what sayest thou? <sup>6</sup> This they said, tempting him, that they might have to accuse him. But Jesus stooped down, and with *his* finger wrote on the ground, *as though he heard them not*. <sup>7</sup> So when they continued asking him, he lifted up himself, and said unto them, He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her. <sup>8</sup> And again he stooped down, and wrote on the ground. <sup>9</sup> And they which heard *it*, being convicted by *their own* conscience, went out one by one, beginning at the eldest, *even* unto the last: and Jesus was left alone, and the woman standing in the midst. <sup>10</sup> When Jesus had lifted up himself, and saw none but the woman, he said unto her, Woman, where are those thine accusers? Hath no man condemned thee? <sup>11</sup> She said, No man, Lord. And Jesus said unto her, Neither do I condemn thee: go, and sin no more.

<Spiritual Blindness Joh 9,39-41>

†<sup>5</sup> §<sup>39</sup> And Jesus said, For judgment I am come into /97 this world, that they which

\* John, Chap. iv. 23. † John, Chap. vi. 27.

‡ John, Chap. viii. 3.

§ John, Chap. ix. 39.

<sup>1</sup> After omitting the rest of Jn 3, from the conversation between Jesus and the Samaritan woman Rammohan only quotes Jesus's words about the true worship.

<sup>2</sup> Compare Rammohan's Introduction to his translation of the *Mundaka Upaniṣad* (1919): "An attentive perusal of this as well as of the remaining books of the Vedānta will, I trust, convince every unprejudiced mind, that they, with great consistency, inculcate the unity of God; instructing men, at the same time, in the pure mode of adoring him in spirit", Rammohan, *Moonduk*, 21.

<sup>3</sup> After omitting the rest of Jn 4 and Jn 5, Rammohan includes from the sermon about the bread from heaven the verse about the comparison between the perishing and the lasting bread.

<sup>4</sup> After omitting the rest of Jn 6 and Jn 7, Rammohan brings Jn 8:3-11.

<sup>5</sup> Omitting Jn 8:12-9:38.

see not might see; and that they which see might be made blind. <sup>40</sup>And *some* of the Pharisees which were with him heard these words, and said unto him, Are we blind also? <sup>41</sup>Jesus said unto them, If ye were blind, ye should have no sin: but now ye say, We see; therefore your sin remaineth.

<Jesus the True Vine Jn 15:1-17>

†<sup>1</sup> \*<sup>1</sup>I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman. <sup>2</sup>Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away: and every *branch* that beareth fruit, he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit. <sup>3</sup>Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you. <sup>4</sup>Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me. <sup>5</sup>I am the vine, ye *are* the branches: He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without me ye can do nothing. <sup>6</sup>If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast *them* into the fire, and they are burned. <sup>7</sup>If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you. <sup>8</sup>Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit; so shall ye be my disciples. <sup>9</sup>As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you: continue ye in my love. <sup>10</sup>If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's /98 commandments, and abide in his love. <sup>11</sup>These things have I spoken unto you, that my joy might remain in you, and *that* your joy might be full. <sup>12</sup>This is my commandment, That ye love one another, as I have loved you. <sup>13</sup>Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends. <sup>14</sup>Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you. <sup>15</sup>Henceforth I call you not servants; for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth: but I have called you friends; for all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you. <sup>16</sup>Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and *that* your fruit should remain: that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my name, he may give it you. <sup>17</sup>These things I command you, that ye love one another. †<sup>2</sup>

---

\* John, Chap. xv. 1.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting Jn 10-14. <sup>2</sup> Omitting the rest of the gospel.



## 2 Deocar Schmid/Joshua Marshman: Some Remarks on the *Precepts of Jesus*

### Editorial Introduction

Deocar Schmid and Joshua Marshman reacted very quickly after the publication of the *Precepts*. Deocar Schmid was a German Lutheran missionary associated with the Anglican *Christian Missionary Society* who came to Calcutta in 1818. He had been fascinated by Rammohan and his publications about Hinduism and wanted to see him as a religious reformer of India turning the country to Christianity. His personal acquaintance with Rammohan made it clear to him that this was an illusion. He seemed to have followed Rammohan's steps closely, because his short review already appeared in February in the *Friend of India*, and he had approached the Editor Joshua Marshman even before a copy of the *Precepts* had reached Serampore (§19). Probably he received a fresh copy right from the *Baptist Missionary Press*. Schmid judged the *Precepts* from a Lutheran confessional and evangelical revivalist point of view. Although he attacked Rammohan's compilation harshly, he still thought he could influence Rammohan to change the text and the compilation (§16).

Schmid uses the pseudonym "A Christian Missionary". He had used the same words already in his treatise *Do the Christian Scriptures or the Védas contain a Divine Revelation?*, signing with "by Deocar Schmid, a Christian Missionary", and the identity of the author was officially confirmed in 1822 when Marshman's texts were reprinted in England.<sup>1</sup>

Through Schmid, Joshua Marshman, the editor of the *Friend of India*, became aware of the *Precepts*. His comment is short and reflects rather some first impressions. He sees Rammohan's publication on the background of dogmatic discussions with Unitarians, liberal theologians and enlightenment philosophers in Britain. Marshman's comment became famous for his designating Rammohan as "intelligent heathen" (§20). This is not so much an insult but rather a reference to

---

<sup>1</sup> See Marshman, *Defence*, iv.

British theological discussions and the subsisting idea that a Non-Christian could provide an unbiased interpretation of the scriptures.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless the general expression “heathen” for all non-Christians gives an insight into the self-understanding of the European mind of that time.

Marshman’s words deal with the *Precepts* as such, but they are also a warning to the young Baptist missionaries in Calcutta who enabled this publication. They, however, were unimpressed by Schmid’s and Marshman’s review and announced the further distribution of the *Precepts* with other works of Rammohan Roy in April 1820.<sup>2</sup>

This text follows the original print in the *Friend of India. Monthly Series*, Vol. III., No. XX., February 1820, pp. 23-31. The paragraphs in this text are very long, but there are big spaces after certain contextual passages – the editor wanted to save printing space. These long spaces were maintained and used to mark new paragraphs (§).

A reprint of Marshman’s text was published in 1822 by British Baptists in London in the volume *A Defence of the Deity and Atonement of Jesus Christ, in Reply to Ram-Mohun Roy of Calcutta. By Dr. Marshman of Serampore*, pp. 1-4.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Zastoupil, *Victorian Britain*, 34. <sup>2</sup> See Majumdar, *Progressive Movements*, 29.

[Deocar Schmid: Some remarks on the Precepts]

/23 [...]

*Some remarks on a Publication entitled: "The Precepts of Jesus the Guide to Peace and Happiness; extracted from the Books of the New Testament, ascribed to the four Evangelists. With Translations into Sungskrita and Bengalee." Calcutta, 1820.* §3

"All those who feel a concern for the enlargement of the empire of truth and virtue, will rejoice to see a collection of a part of the sayings of Christ published by a respectable Hindoo, who, though he has not thought fit publicly to profess himself the Author, will yet easily be recognized as such by all who have not been /24 inattentive spectators of the face of the sky on the religious horizon of Bengal. The more generally the gracious words which proceeded out of the mouth of him who spake as "never man spake" are divulged, the more men will be excited to enquire into the character of that great prophet and the nature of that religion of which he is both the author and the chief object. Although it was by no means the only, nor even the most important design of Christ's Mission to instruct mankind—for he himself has declared that the design of his coming was "to give his life a ransom for many" (wherefore he has directed us to his Apostles for fuller instruction in the way of salvation)—yet there is no fundamental truth of the Gospel which is not either explicitly taught by him, or which may not at least be easily deduced from his words. It is therefore impossible to raise any valid objection against the separate publication of the sayings of Jesus for the benefit of those who are not unwilling to receive the doctrines of Christ himself as undubitable truths, whilst at the same time they are hesitating with regard to the degree of confidence which the apostles and prophets are entitled to. Accordingly, if the respected Author of the Compilation which has given rise to these remarks had confined himself to publishing the words of Christ without depreciating the value of other parts of the inspired Writings, he would have been free from all blame, and my pleasure on seeing the publication in question would have been unalloyed by any sensations of an opposite nature. But I was sorry to find that this is far from being the case. The very title page, the introduction and the work itself, are evidently written under the supposition that only the moral precepts contained in the New Testament are of real importance; nay the Author ventures to intimate in the introduction, that the dogmatical and historical matter, though of this by far the greater part of the whole consists, so far from being necessary for the instruction, guidance, and comfort of mankind, is rather calculated to do injury. (In order to shew that I do not wrong the Author I put here the very words he has in page 3, to which I allude: "I feel persuaded, that by separat-

Jn 7:45

Mt 20:28; Mk 10:45

§4

§5

§6

ing from the other matters contained in the New Testament the moral precepts found in that book, these will be more likely to produce the desirable effect of improving the hearts and minds of men of different persuasions and

degrees of understanding.—For historical and some other passages are liable to the doubts and disputes of free thinkers and anti-christians, especially miraculous relations, which are much less wonderful than the fabricated tales handed down to the Natives of Asia,\* and consequently would be apt *at best* (!!!) to carry little weight with them.”<sup>1</sup>

- §7 “In order to prove that the doctrinal part of the New Testament is of comparatively little importance, the author states that a belief in the existence of God and a due regard to the rule of doing unto others as we wish to be done by, are necessary for our peace and happiness, but as the former was generally prevailing, the latter, which was principally inculcated by Christianity, claimed the greatest share of our attention. In answer to this I must deny that a belief in the existence of God, (in the genuine sense of the word) is generally prevailing; for not to speak of the millions who believe in a plurality of Gods, I am firmly persuaded that the majority of those professedly more enlightened persons who reject the Jewish and Christian revelations, are, strictly speaking, Atheists. The very system of the Vedanta, which is followed by a considerable number of the best informed Hindoos, is, I am convinced, nothing better than a specious system of refined and disguised Atheism; for a God without moral attributes, /26 such as the Vedanta philosophers teach, is but a nominal, not a real God.—But granting even that a belief in the existence of God were generally prevailing, which it is not, this is by no means sufficient to make us truly happy. For the correctest notions of the Divine attributes do not furnish us with an answer to these two most important questions, without a satisfactory solution of which no true peace of mind can exist: 1. How may I obtain the forgiveness of my sins and the favour of God; and, 2. How may I obtain strength to overcome my sinful passions and lusts and to keep the commandments of him whom I am bound to obey? Now as the historical and dogmatical part of the Christian Scriptures gives the only satisfactory information on these two points which is in existence, it is clear that this, so far from being comparatively useless, or even calculated by its association with the moral precepts to diminish the effect of the latter, is just that which
- §8
- §9

---

\* “The Author instances here the fable of Ugusti’s having swallowed the ocean when it had given him offence, and having restored it by urinary evacuation; and that of the Vindhya range of mountains having prostrated itself at his command and so remaining. I am utterly at loss to conceive, how a reasonable man can imagine that the silly nursery stories which form the substance of the Hindoo religion and literature, can in any wise diminish the weight which the well authenticated narratives of the benign and highly significant miracles of the holy Jesus carry with them. Such a juxta position of the miraculous relations in the New Testament and of the impure fictions of Hindoo mythology, would be more worthy of a bisotted Hindoo idolater, than of a thinking man who has renounced the superstitions of his benighted countrymen.”

<sup>1</sup> §2



makes them practicable and truly useful. For the law cannot possibly impart peace to the troubled conscience; it worketh on the contrary wrath, as it shews us our sinfulness—it is the Gospel alone which can make us truly happy and holy, because it makes us acquainted with the way to obtain the pardon of our past transgressions, and with the means by which we may be enabled to walk conformably to the law of God in future. The most distinguishing feature of Christianity therefore, is not, that it contains the most complete and perfect exposition of the moral law, but—that it shews us how “God may be just and yet the justifier of the ungodly;”<sup>1</sup> and it is no small recommendation of the teachers of Christianity with whom the author professes to have had intercourse, that keeping in view the peculiar glory of that religion whose ministers they are, they did not lead him to conclude that it was little more than a good system of morality. §10

Rm 3:26; Rm 4:5

“But in raising the moral value of the moral precepts which are found in the New Testament to an undue height at the expense of the historical and doctrinal matter which it contains, the author of the Compilation in question is inconsistent with himself. For even if it were true that a belief in the existence of God is generally prevailing, and that this, united with a due regard to the moral law, is sufficient to make us truly happy, it would nevertheless be necessary to propagate the knowledge of God, (as otherwise it would cease to prevail generally,) not confining ourselves to an inculcation of the precepts of Christianity, as the Compiler has *ex professo* done in the publication before us. He seems indeed to have an indistinct feeling of this, which probably led him to write the following passage: “This simple Code of Religion and morality” (he means the moral sayings of Christ, which, however, can form a code of morality only, not of religion also) “is so admirably calculated to elevate men’s ideas to high and liberal notions of one God, &c.”<sup>2</sup> But it is utterly impossible that even the most perfect system of morality can produce any such effect. §11

For as the law supposes the existence of a sovereign law-giver, and includes as an essential part the duties which we owe to him, it can neither produce correct notions of God, where they do not exist, nor enlarge and elevate them, where they do. It is clearly illogical to say that A is calculated to elevate men’s ideas to high and liberal notions of B, if A cannot even exist, where just notions of B are wanting. §12

§13

“For these reasons I cannot but greatly disapprove the plan upon which the author has acted, because it is founded upon the radically false supposition, that the moral sayings of Jesus, even if separated from the dogmas propounded by him, are able §14

<sup>1</sup> This phrase blends two verses of Romans and was used by Puritan and other Christian writers, for example by Ryland, *The Law*, 21.

<sup>2</sup> §2

- §15 to “guide us to peace and happiness.” It is undoubtedly the *ne plus ultra* of arrogance to presume that we poor, weak, sinful mortals are better qualified to judge what sort of instruction is necessary or advantageous for the happiness of mankind than the Son of God himself, who never gave the least hint that he attributed less importance to those of his sayings which are of a dogmatical, than to those which are of an ethical nature. Nay such a sentiment debars, according to the author’s own principles, those who entertain it from every just claim to the name of a Christian even in the most latitudinarian sense of the word, in which, as the author says, Introduction page 2, it designates one who “adheres to the doctrines of Christ, as taught by himself.”<sup>1</sup> It is true, the author has introduced several passages of a dogmatical nature also into his compilation, it is, however, evident, that he has done so, not from principle, but from a happy inconsistency; and the extracts from the Gospel of Christ’s beloved disciple, who has recorded his Master’s sublimest dogmatic sayings, which has been passed over by the other Evangelists, fill scarcely four pages, whereas those from the Gospel of St. Matthew fill thirty-five, and those from the Gospel of St. Luke thirty-two pages.
- §16 “Hoping, as I do, that these remarks upon his publication will be seen by its respected author, I would humbly, yet earnestly recommend to him to adopt in a second edition a somewhat enlarged plan, and to admit all the sayings of Christ without
- §17 exception, whether ethical, or dogmatical. The bulk of the little work would not be increased thereby, if instead of printing twice or thrice the same words of Christ, because recorded by more than one Evangelist, only one and that the most complete account were inserted. Moreover the author would greatly improve the work, if he would take the trouble of arranging all the sayings of Jesus under proper heads in systematic order; at least it would be absolutely necessary to print them in the chronological order in which they were spoken, according to the Evangelical Harmony of Macknight<sup>2</sup> or of some other good Commentator, and thus to avoid the numerous repetitions of the same subjects which are to be found in the present edition. I feel confident that the author would considerably increase the good effects which he anticipates from the circulation of his work by adopting in a second edition those modifications of his plan which I have taken the liberty herewith to

---

\* “Although the words of the title: “The Precepts of Jesus the Guide to Peace and Happiness” are ambiguous, inasmuch as it is not clear whether “The Guide, &c.” is the predicate of “the Precepts” or of “Jesus,” (which latter construction would convey a beautiful idea,) yet it is evident from the Introduction that the author intended the words to be construed in the former way, as he considers the precepts of Jesus without his dogmas as a sufficient guide to peace and happiness.”

<sup>1</sup> §1

<sup>2</sup> Schmid is referring to James Macknight (1721-1800), *Harmony of the Gospels, The New Translation of the Apostolical Epistles, with a Commentary and Notes* (1795).

recommend to him. /29

“It will afford pleasure to all the friends of the Bible to hear that the author of this compilation has engaged to publish a translation of it into Sungskrita and Bengalee, as will doubtless be found useful for improving the existing translations of the Gospels in those languages.” §18

“A CHRISTIAN MISSIONARY.”

“*Calcutta, February, 1820.*”

[Joshua Marshman (Editor): Some additional remarks]

Since receiving the above Remarks, we have obtained a copy of the work to which they allude, which contains 82 octavo pages, exclusive of the introduction. §19

This work while it furnishes an overwhelming proof of the truth and excellence of the Sacred Scriptures, since an intelligent heathen whose mind is as yet completely §20

opposed to the *grand design* of the Saviour’s becoming incarnate, feels constrained to acknowledge that the precepts of Jesus the Saviour, are so fully consonant with truth and righteousness, so exactly suited to the circumstances of mankind—those of his own countrymen, as well as those of the western world, tend so evidently “to maintain the peace and harmony of mankind at large, and are so admirably calculated to elevate men’s ideas to high and liberal notions of one God, while they are intelligible alike to the learned and the unlearned,”<sup>1</sup> that he feels constrained to recommend them to his countrymen as, “the Guide to Peace and Happiness.” While this recommendation of merely a part of the Sacred Scriptures, which “cannot be broken,” forming as they do a harmonious whole, decides the question for ever among the Hindoos respecting their paramount excellence, and of course their Divine Origin, the manner in which this is done, as is justly observed by our highly esteemed correspondent, may greatly injure the cause of truth. Jn 10:35

It is well known that in Britain and on the Continent there are many who, while §21

they do not openly deny Him, earnestly wish to degrade the Redeemer of the world to a level with Confucius or Mahomet, and to contemplate him as the Teacher and Founder of a Sect, instead of adoring him as the Lord of all, the Redeemer /30 of men, the Sovereign Judge of quick and dead. These, viewing the Compiler of this work as a man new to the subject and not yet biassed, (as they term it,) in favor of any system of doctrine, will insist on his being far more likely to discover the genuine meaning of the Scriptures, than those who, educated in a Christian country, have been conversant from their youth with the generally received interpretation of the Scripture; and giving him full credit for having examined the whole of the Sacred

---

<sup>1</sup> §2

Writings in the closest manner, will be pleased beyond measure to find that, by the testimony of an intelligent and unprejudiced Heathen, they have in Jesus Christ a Teacher who *cannot* search the heart—a Saviour (if the name still be used) who does not reduce them to the mortifying necessity of giving up all their boasted rectitude of intention and submitting unconditionally to his mere grace for salvation,—who while he, in their opinion, duly appreciates their native goodness of heart by submitting to them the noblest and most equitable precepts, never intends, as the Judge of all, to examine whether they cordially obey them, nor indeed lays claim to that Divine Nature which alone could render Him capable of judging the secrets of the heart, the hidden springs of action, at the great and final day. Meanwhile, the Deist and the Infidel will be no less delighted to find the miracles of Jesus Christ classed by a well informed Hindoo, with the Hindoo sage Ugusti’s drinking up the ocean in a fit of passion and his causing the Vindhya mountains to prostrate themselves before him, described to his countrymen as being such, as, if narrated “[would be apt at best to carry little weight with them,](#)”<sup>1</sup> and hence represented as being better suppressed though his Precepts are excellent. Whether this decision, in which the enemies of Revelation will so much triumph, be the effect of a most careful and thorough examination of the Sacred Writing—or of the *absence* of such examination, it is certainly important to enquire, on account of the many opposers of Divine Revelation still to be found in Europe; but as it is impossible to do justice to the enquiry in our present Number, we intend to take up the subject more fully in the First /31 Number of the Quarterly Series, which we hope will appear in about two months.

---

<sup>1</sup> §2

# 3 Rammohan Roy: Appeal to the Christian Public

## Editorial Introduction

*An Appeal to the Christian Public, in Defence of the “Precepts of Jesus”* was published in April 1820, also at the *Baptist Mission Press* in Calcutta. The writer used the pseudonym “A Friend to Truth”, although from the text it is easy to deduct that it is Rammohan Roy writing. Rammohan Roy is also unveiled as the compiler of the *Precepts of Jesus* (§24).

The *Appeal* is a defence against Schmid’s and Marshman’s critique in the *Friend of India*. It covers reflections about the religious identity of the compiler of the *Precepts* not being a “heathen”, explains criteria for the selection of biblical passages, an answer to Schmid’s accusation, the *Precepts* was missing the two main questions of human existence, reflections about dogmatic texts in their relation to “moral” passages, an attack against the Serampore missionaries’ strategies and a defence of the Vedāntic system, comparing it to the biblical image of God. Rammohan still tries to avoid direct attacks against the Trinitarian dogma, although he presents a quite different idea of God, contextualising the biblical God with the Upaniṣads (§38), and he criticises the Christian dogma as mysterious and hard to understand (§32, §35).

Rammohan points out that in his view the Greatest Commandment is the core of Jesus’ teachings and that the obedience to these words is a sufficient path to peace and happiness. According to this criterion he selected passages from the New Testament for the *Precepts* (§26). This is his main line of defence. The Markian version of the dialogue about the Greatest Commandment (Mk 12:28–34) shows that two people from different religious schools (Jesus and the scribe) can agree on the unity of God, the love towards God and the love towards their neighbour. This relates strongly to Rammohan’s view about “religion and morality”.

The story of the converts presenting a petition to the Bishop of Calcutta, Thomas F. Middleton (§31), is explained by Marshman in his review in May 1820 (§55), and also in a later number of the *Friend of India, Quarterly Series* (No. VII., p. 349), and William Adam pointed out contradictions between these two versions.<sup>1</sup>

The text basis for this edition is the London Reprint 1823, pp. 99-130, published by the Unitarian Society. The London edition scarcely has verse numbers in biblical quotations. It reads rather “Ch. xviii.” instead of “Ch. xviii. ver. 11”, and contains several mistakes. This is closer to the original Calcutta text, and it has been kept like this in this edition without any notes, except pointing out the mistakes. In the later editions by Ghose and Nag/Burman, the biblical references have been reviewed by these editors and verse numbers have been added.

The original text contains an introduction and eight sections, marked with numbers. Appropriate [headlines] have been given to these sections for the reader’s orientation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ware/Adam/Rammohan, *Correspondence*, 44.

/[99]

AN APPEAL  
TO  
THE CHRISTIAN PUBLIC,  
IN DEFENCE OF THE  
“PRECEPTS OF JESUS.”

BY  
A FRIEND TO TRUTH.

PRINTED AT CALCUTTA:  
1820.

LONDON, REPRINTED: 1823.

/[101]

AN APPEAL, &c. &c.

[The identity and the believes of the compiler of the Precepts, his possible reactions onto the insult being called a “heathen”.]

In perusing the twentieth number of “The Friend of India,” I felt as much surprised §22 as disappointed at some remarks made in that magazine by a gentleman under the signature of “A Christian Missionary,” on a late publication, intitled, “The Precepts of Jesus;” and also at some observations of a similar nature on the same subject by the Editor of that publication. Before, however, I attempt to enquire into the ground upon which their objections to the work in question are founded, I humbly beg to appeal to the public against the unchristianlike, as well as uncivil manner in which the Editor has adduced his objections to the compilation, by introducing personality, and applying the term of *heathen* to the Compiler.<sup>1</sup> I say unchristianlike manner, because the Editor, by making use of the term heathen, has, I presume, violated truth, charity, and liberality, which are essential to Christianity in every sense of the word. For there are only two methods by which the character of the Compiler as a heathen, or as a believer in one true and living God, can be satisfactorily inferred. The most reasonable of the two modes is to confine such /102 enquiries to the evidence contained in the subject of review, no mention of the name of the Compiler being made in the publication itself. Another mode, which is obviously inapplicable in such discussions, is to guess at the real author, and to infer his opinions from a

---

<sup>1</sup> §20, §21.

knowledge of his education or other circumstances. With respect to the first source of evidence, the following expressions of the Compiler's sentiments are found in the Introduction. "A notion of the existence of a Supreme Superintending Power, the author and preserver of the harmonious system, who has organized and who regulates such an infinity of celestial and terrestrial objects, and a due estimation of that law which teaches that man should do to others as he would wish to be done by, reconcile us to human nature, &c."<sup>1</sup> "This simple code of religion and morality, (meaning the Precepts of Jesus,) is so admirably calculated to elevate men's ideas to high and liberal notions of one God<sup>2</sup>, &c." "so well fitted to regulate the conduct of the human race in the discharge of their various duties to God, to themselves and to society," and "so conformable to the dictates of human reason and divine revelation, &c."<sup>3</sup> These expressions are calculated, in my humble opinion, to convince every mind not biassed by prejudice, that the Compiler believed not only in one God, whose nature and essence is beyond human comprehension, but in the truths revealed in the Christian system. I should hope neither the Reviewer nor the Editor can be justified in inferring /103 the heathenism of the Compiler, from the facts of his extracting and publishing the moral doctrines of the New Testament, under the title of "A Guide to Peace and Happiness"—his styling the Precepts of Jesus, a code of religion and morality—his believing God to be the author and preserver of the universe—or his considering those sayings as adapted to regulate the conduct of the whole human race in the discharge of all the duties required of them.

§23 Neither, I trust, can his separating the moral sayings of Christ from the mysterious dogmas and historical parts of the New Testament, under the impression, that these are liable to the doubts and disputes of freethinkers and antichristians, with which this part of the world is unfortunately filled; nor his opinion that this simple code of morality would be more likely to attract the notice and respect of such men, and to guide their mind into the paths of peace and happiness, than if presented to them in conjunction with other matter against which their education has taught them to revolt; justly subject him, in the opinion of the most orthodox Christians, to the epithet applied to him by the Editor. If they do, I cannot see how the same condemnation can be spared to numerous publications of extracts from the Old and the New Testaments, made and sent forth by several Christian authors, under various designations and for different purposes.

§24 With respect to the latter mode of seeking evidence, however unjustified the Editor may be in /104 coming to such a conclusion, he is safe in ascribing the collection of these Precepts to Rammohun Roy; who, although he was born a Brahmun, not only renounced idolatry at a very early period of his life, but published at that

---

<sup>1</sup> §1. <sup>2</sup> Ghose: "of God". <sup>3</sup> §2.



time a treatise in Arabic and Persian against that system;<sup>1</sup> and no sooner acquired a tolerable knowledge of English, than he made his desertion of idol worship known to the Christian world by his English publication<sup>2</sup>—a renunciation that, I am sorry to say, brought severe difficulties upon him, by exciting the displeasure of his parents, and subjecting him to the dislike of his near, as well as distant relations, and to the hatred of nearly all his countrymen for several years. I therefore presume that among his declared enemies, who are aware of those facts, no one who has the least pretension of truth, would venture to apply the designation of heathen to him; but I am sure, that the respect he entertains for the very name of Christianity, which the Editor of the Friend of India seems to profess, will restrain him from retorting on that Editor, although there may be differences of opinion between them, that might be thought sufficient to justify the use towards the Editor of a term no less offensive. The Editor perhaps may consider himself justified by numerous precedents amongst the several partizans of different Christian sects, in applying the name of heathen to one who takes the Precepts of Jesus as his principal guide in matters of religious and civil duties; as Roman Catholics bestow the appellation /105 of heretics or infidels on all classes of Protestants, and Protestants do not spare the title of idolators to Roman Catholics; Trinitarians deny the name of Christian to Unitarians, while the latter retort by stigmatising the worshippers of the Son of man as Pagans, who adore a created and dependent Being. Very different conduct is inculcated in the precept of Jesus to John, when complaining of one who performed cures in the name of Jesus, yet refused to follow the apostles:—he gave a rebuke, saying, “He that is not against us is on our part.” *Mark*, ch. ix. ver. 40. The Compiler, having obviously in view at least one object in common with the Reviewer and Editor, that of procuring respect for the precepts of Christ, might have reasonably expected more charity from professed teachers of his doctrines.

Mk 9:40

The Compiler of the Precepts of Jesus, will, however, I doubt not, give preference to the guidance of those Precepts, which justify no retaliation even upon enemies, to the hasty suggestion of human passion, and the example of the Editor of the Friend of India.

§25

[The Greatest Commandment as criterion for the selection of passages from the gospels.]

2. The Editor of the Friend of India and the respected Reviewer, both not only disapprove absolutely the plan adopted by the Compiler in separating the moral doctrines of the books of the New Testament ascribed to the four Evangelists from the mysteries and historical matters therein contained, but even blame him as an injurer of the cause of truth; and for such disapprobation they assign several reasons: first,

§26

<sup>1</sup> Reference to *Tuhfat-ul-Muwahhidin* (1803/04).

<sup>2</sup> Reference to *Translation of the Abridgment of the Vedant* (1816).

The Reviewer says, the supposition of the moral /106 sayings being sufficient for salvation, independent of the dogmas, is, (as he notes in page 27<sup>1</sup>,) radically false; and that it is presumption of him (the Compiler) to think himself qualified to judge, independently of the Divine Teacher, what sort of instruction is advantageous for the happiness of mankind. If indeed the Reviewer understands by the word *moral*, what relates to conduct only with reference to man, it cannot apply to those precepts of Jesus, that teach the duty of man to God; which, however, the Reviewer will find included in the collection of the Precepts of Jesus by the Compiler: but a slight attention to the scope of the Introduction might have convinced the Reviewer, that the sense in which the word *moral* is there used, whether rightly or otherwise, is quite general, and applies equally to our conduct in religious as in civil matters. Without attaching this meaning to the term moral doctrines, the whole of the concluding sentence must appear absurd, where it is said, “**This simple code is well fitted to regulate the conduct of the human race in the discharge of their various duties to God, to themselves, and to society.**”<sup>2</sup> This assertion is corroborated and supported by a great number of passages in the treatise in question, which point out the appropriate mode of performing our duty to the Almighty Power. It is, however, too true to be denied, that the Compiler of those moral precepts separated them from some of the dogmas and other matters, chiefly under the supposition, that they alone were a suffi-/107ent guide to secure peace and happiness to mankind at large—a position that is entirely founded on an supported by the express authorities of Jesus of Nazareth—a denial of which would imply a total disavowal of Christianity. Some of those authorities, as found amongst these precepts, here follow: *Matthew*, ch. xxii. beginning with ver. 37: “Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. 38. This is the first and great commandment. 39. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. 40. ON THESE TWO COMMANDMENTS HANG ALL THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS.” *Mark*, ch. xii. beginning with ver. 29: “And Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel, The Lord our God is one Lord. 30. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength. This is the first commandment. 31. And the second is LIKE, namely this: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself: there is none other commandment greater than these. 32. And he said unto him, Well, Master, thou hast said the truth; for there is one God, and there is none other but he. 33. And to love him with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the soul, and with all the strength, and to love his neighbour as himself, is more than all whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices. 34. And when Jesus saw that he an-

Mt 22:37–40

Mk 12:29–34

<sup>1</sup> §11. <sup>2</sup> §2.

swered discreetly, he said unto him, Thou /108 art not far from the kingdom of God." *Matthew*, ch. vii. ver. 12: "Therefore all things whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; FOR THIS IS THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS. Ch. v. "Think not that I am come to destroy the Law or the Prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." *Luke*, ch. x. beginning with ver. 25: "And behold, a certain lawyer stood up, and tempted him, saying, Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? 26. He said unto him, What is written in the Law? How readest thou? 27. He answering said, Thou shalt [love the] Lord thy God with all thy heart,<sup>1</sup> and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind, and thy neighbour as thyself. 28. And he said unto him, Thou hast answered right. THIS DO, and THOU SHALT LIVE." The Saviour meant of course by the words *Law* and *Prophets*, all the commandments ordained by divine authority, and the religion revealed to the prophets and observed by them; as is evident from Jesus's declaring those commandments to afford perfect means of acquiring eternal life, and directing men to follow them accordingly. Had any other doctrine been requisite to teach men the road to peace and happiness, Jesus could not have pronounced to the lawyer, "This do and THOU SHALT LIVE." It was the characteristic of the office of Christ to teach men, that forms and ceremonies were useless tokens of respect for God, compared with the essential proof of obedience and love towards him evinced by the practice of beneficence towards their fellow-creatures. /109The Compiler, finding these commandments given as including all the revealed law and the whole system of religion adopted by the prophets, and re-established and fulfilled by Jesus himself, as the means to acquire peace and happiness, was desirous of giving more full publicity in this country to them, and to the subsidiary moral doctrines that are introduced by the Saviour in detail. Placing also implicit confidence in the truth of his sacred commandments, to the observance of which we are directed by the same Teacher, (*John*, ch. xiv. ver. 16<sup>2</sup>, "If ye love me, keep my commandments;" ver. 24, "He that loveth me not, keepeth not my sayings,") the Compiler never hesitated in declaring (page 1) "a belief in God, and a due regard to that law, 'Do unto others as you would wish to be done by,' render our existence agreeable to ourselves, and profitable to the rest of mankind."<sup>3</sup> It may now be left to the public to judge, whether or not the charge of arrogance and presumption which the Reviewer has imputed to the Compiler, under the idea that he preferred his own judgment to that of the Saviour, be justly applicable to him.

Mt 7:12

Mt 5:17f.

Lk 10:25-28

Jn 14:15

Jn 14:24

[The two important points pointed out by the reviewer answered by God's forgiveness and his gift of strength to humankind.]

3. The respected Reviewer argues in *page 26*<sup>4</sup>, that there are two important points, a knowledge of which is not to be acquired by following the moral precepts of Christ,

§27

<sup>1</sup> Omitting "and with all thy soul". <sup>2</sup> Read: "15". <sup>3</sup> §1. <sup>4</sup> §9

but which are essential to the attainment of true peace of mind; they being entirely founded (as he alleges) upon the dogmas and histories, viz. how to obtain, 1st, the forgiveness of sins /110 and the favour of God; and 2dly, strength to overcome human passions, and to keep the commandments of God. These precepts separated from the mysterious dogmas and historical records, appear, on the contrary, to the Compiler to contain not only the essence of all that is necessary to instruct mankind in their civil duties, but also the best and only means of obtaining the forgiveness of our sins, the favour of God, and strength to overcome our passions, and to keep his commandments. I therefore extract from the same compilation a few passages of that greatest of all prophets, who was sent to call sinners to repentance; a due attention to which will, I hope, satisfy the respected Reviewer on those two points. *Luke*, ch. xiii. ver. 3: "Except you repent, you shall all likewise perish." Ch. xv. ver. 7: "I say unto you, that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons who need no repentance. I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth." *Matthew*, ch. ix.: "I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." Ch. xviii.: "For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost." *Luke*, ch. vi.<sup>1</sup>: "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." Which sayings are confirmatory of what is taught in *Ezekiel*, ch. xviii. ver. 30: "Repent and turn yourselves from all your transgressions, so iniquity shall not be your ruin." See also the parable of the prodigal son, where the mercy of God is illus-/111trated by the example of a father pardoning the transgressions of his repenting son. Numerous passages of the Old and the New Testaments to the same effect, which might fill a volume, distinctly promise us that the forgiveness of God and the favour of his Divine Majesty may be obtained by sincere repentance, as required of sinners by the Redeemer.

§28 As to the second point, that is, How to be enabled to overcome our passions, and keep the commandments of God:—we are not left unprovided for in that respect, as our gracious Saviour has promised every strength and power as necessary consequences of earnest prayer and hearty desire. *Matthew*, ch. vii., and *Luke*, ch. vi.<sup>2</sup> "Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you." "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him." *Luke*, ch. xi. ver. 9: "I say unto you, Ask, and it shall be given you." After a due attention to these and to numerous passages of the same effect, no one who believes in the divine message of Jesus of Nazareth, or even in the truth of his doctrine only, can be at all at a loss to find adequate means of attaining those two ends, justly considered to be most essential by the Reviewer.

<sup>1</sup> Read: "v". <sup>2</sup> Read: "xi."

[Love and charity in their importance for salvation in opposite to dogmatic confession.]

4. The Reviewer imputes to the Compiler, error in exalting the value of the moral doctrines above that of the historical facts and dogmas contained in /112 the New Testament. This imputation, I humbly maintain, can be of no weight or force against the authority of Jesus himself, as quoted in the above texts; which clearly shew, that there is no other means of attaining eternal life except the performance of our duties towards God in obeying his commandments. That the aim and object of all the commandments of God is to teach us our duty towards our fellow-creatures, may be gathered from a hundred passages of Scripture, of which perhaps the following may suffice. *Matthew*, ch. xxv. ver. 31: “When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory. And before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats. And he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. For I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in: naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me. Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungred, and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink? When saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee? Or when saw we thee sick, or in /113 prison, and came unto thee? And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me. Then shall he say unto them also on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. For I was an hungred, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me not in: naked, and ye clothed me not: sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not. Then shall they also answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungred, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee? Then shall he answer them, saying, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal.” In this description of the day of judgment it is clearly announced, that the merciful Father of the universe accepts as [a] manifestation of love towards himself, every act of charity and beneficence performed towards his creatures. (See text already quoted, *Matthew*, ch. vii. ver. 12.) And apparently to counteract by anticipation the erroneous idea that such conduct might be dispensed with, and reliance placed on a mere dogmatical knowledge of God or of the Saviour, the following declaration seems to have been uttered. *Matthew*, ch. vii. ver. 21: “Not every one that saith

§29

Mt 25:31–46

Mt 7:21–26

unto me, /114 Lord! Lord! shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord! Lord! have we not prophesied in thy name; in thy name have cast out devils; and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work iniquity. Therefore whosoever heareth *these sayings* of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, who built his house upon a rock.<sup>1</sup> And every one that heareth *these sayings* of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, who built his house upon the sand.” *Matthew* ch. xii. “Whosoever shall do the will of my Father who is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother.” *Luke*, ch. ix.<sup>2</sup> “My mother and my brethren are these which hear the word of God and do it.” Ch. xi. “Blessed is the womb (said a certain woman to Jesus) that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked: but he said, Yea, rather blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it.” *John*, ch. xv. “If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father’s commandments, and abide in his love.” What, then, are THOSE SAYINGS, the obedience to which is so absolutely commanded as indispensable and all-sufficient to those who desire to inherit eternal life? They are no other than the blessed and benign moral doctrines taught in the sermon on the mount, (contained in the 5th, 6th, /115 and 7th chapters of *Matthew*,) which include therefore every duty of man, and all that is necessary to salvation; and they expressly exclude mere profession or belief, from those circumstances which God graciously admits as giving a title to eternal happiness. Neither in this, nor in any other part of the New Testament, can we find a commandment similarly enjoining a knowledge of any of the mysteries or historical relations contained in those books. It is besides plainly stated, that but a very small portion of the works of Jesus have been handed down to us by the Evangelists. *John* says at the conclusion of his gospel, ch. xxi. ver. 25, “There are also many other things which Jesus did, the which if they should be written every one, I suppose the world itself could not contain the books that should be written.” On the other hand we cannot doubt that the whole spirit of his doctrines has been faithfully and fully recorded. The reason of this appears obvious:—miracles must have had a powerful effect on the minds of those who witnessed them, and who, without some such evidence, were disposed to question the authority of the teacher of those doctrines. *John*, ch. xv. ver. 23:<sup>3</sup> “The works that I do in my Father’s name, they bear witness of me.” Ver. 37, 38: “If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works.” Had his doctrines of themselves made not their due impression, the aid of miracles would not have been requisite, nor had recourse to. In this /116 country, the bare report of such miracles

<sup>1</sup> Omitting v. 25. <sup>2</sup> Read: “viii.” <sup>3</sup> Read: “x. ver. 25”.

could have given no support to the weight of the doctrines; for, as the Compiler has stated in his Introduction, miracles infinitely more wonderful are related of their gods and saints, on authorities that the Hindoos must deem superior to those of the Apostles.

We are taught by revelation, as well as education, to ascribe to the Deity the perfection of those attributes which are esteemed excellent amongst mankind. And according to those ideas it must surely appear more consistent with the justice of the Sovereign Ruler, that he should admit to mercy those of his subjects who, acknowledging his authority, have endeavoured to obey his laws; or shewn contrition, when they have fallen short of their duty and love; than that he should select for favour those whose claims rest on having acquired particular ideas of his nature and of the origin of his Son, and of what afflictions that Son may have suffered in behalf of his people. If the Reviewer and Editor will continue to resist both authority and common sense, I must be content to take leave of them with the following words, (*Luke*, ch. xviii.<sup>1</sup>): “And he said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead.”

§30

Lk 16:31

[About the failure of the missionaries’s strategies in India.]

5. The Reviewer observes, (in page 24,<sup>2</sup>) with every mark of disapprobation, that the Compiler has intimated in the Introduction, that the dogmatical and historical matters are rather calculated to do in-/117jury. The Compiler could not certainly overlook the daily occurrences and obvious facts which led him to remark, [in the Introduction,] that “[historical and some other passages are liable to the doubts and disputes of Freethinkers and Anti-christians, especially miraculous relations, which are much less wonderful than the fabricated tales handed down to the natives of Asia.](#)”<sup>3</sup> and to prove what the Compiler stated, I humbly entreat any one to refer to the numerous volumes written by persons unattached to any of the established churches against the miracles, the history, and some of the dogmas of Christianity. It has been the different interpretations of the dogmas that have been given rise to such keen disputes amongst the followers of Jesus. They have not only destroyed harmony and union between one sect of Christians and another, and continue to do so; but in past times have even caused continual wars and frequent bloodshed to rage amongst them, more dreadfully than between Christians and infidels. A slight reference to the histories of Christian countries, will, I trust, afford to my readers entire conviction upon this head. Besides, the Compiler, residing in the same spot where European missionary gentlemen and others for a period of upwards of twenty years have been, with a view to promote Christianity, distributing in vain amongst the natives numberless copies of the complete Bible, written in different languages,

§31

<sup>1</sup> Read: “ch. xvi.” <sup>2</sup> §6 <sup>3</sup> §2.

could not be altogether ignorant of the causes of their disappointment. He, however, never /118 doubted their zeal for the promulgation of Christianity, nor the accuracy of their statement with regard to immense sums of money being annually expended in preparing vast numbers of copies of the Scriptures; but he has seen with regret, that they have completely counteracted their own benevolent efforts, by introducing all the dogmas and mysteries taught in Christian churches to people by no means prepared to receive them; and that they have been so incautious and inconsiderate in their attempts to enlighten the natives of India, as to address their instructions to them in the same way as if they were reasoning with persons brought up in a Christian country, with those dogmatical notions imbibed from their infancy. The consequence has been, that the natives in general, instead of benefiting by the perusal of the Bible, copies of which they always receive gratuitously, exchange them very often for blank paper; and generally use several of the dogmatical terms in their native language as a mark of slight in an irrelevant manner; the mention of which is repugnant to my feelings. Sabat, an eminently learned but grossly unprincipled Arab, whom our divines supposed that they had converted to Christianity, and whom they of course instructed in all the dogmas and doctrines, wrote a few years ago a treatise in Arabic against those very dogmas, and printed himself and published several hundred copies of this work. And another Moosulman, of the name of Ena'et Ahmud, a man of respectable family, who is /119 still alive, speedily returned to Mohumudanism from Christianity, pleading that he had not been able to reconcile to his understanding certain dogmas which were imparted to him. It has been owing to their beginning with the introduction of mysterious dogmas, and of relations that at first sight appear incredible, that notwithstanding every exertion on the part of our divines, I am not aware that we can find a single respectable Moosulman or Hindoo, who was not in want of the common comforts of life, once glorified with the truth of Christianity, constantly adhering to it. Of the few hundred natives who have been nominally converted to Christianity, and who have been generally of the most ignorant class, there is ground to suspect that the greater number have been allured to change their faith by other attractions than by a conviction of the truth and reasonableness of those dogmas; as we find nearly all of them are employed or fed by their spiritual teachers, and in case of neglect are apt to manifest a rebellious spirit;—a circumstance which is well known to the Compiler from several local facts, as well as from the following occurrence. About three years ago, the Compiler, on his visit to an English gentleman, who is still residing in the vicinity of Calcutta, saw a great number of Christian converts with a petition, which they intended to present to the



highest ecclesiastical authority,<sup>1</sup> stating, that their teachers, through false promises of advancement, had induced them to give up their /120 ancient religion. The Compiler felt indignant at their presumption, and suggested to the gentleman, as a friend, the propriety of not countenancing a set of men who, from their own declaration, seemed so unprincipled. The Missionaries themselves are as well aware as the Compiler, that those very dogmas are the points which the people always select as the most proper for attack, both in their oral and written controversies with Christian teachers; all of which, if required, the Compiler is prepared to prove by the most unquestionable testimony.

Under these circumstances the Compiler published such sayings of Christ, as he §32  
thought intelligible to all, conveying conviction with them, and best calculated to lead mankind to universal love and harmony; not dwelling upon those matters, an observance of which is not absolutely ordained, and the interpretations of which, instead of introducing peace and happiness, have generally given rise to disputes and controversies. The Compiler has had no local influence nor power to promote any one's interest, nor has he situations to give away, nor yet has he friends and colleagues to recommend others to their patronage. Humble as he is, he has therefore adopted those measures which he thought most judicious to spread the truth in an acceptable manner; but I am sorry to observe, that he has unfortunately and unexpectedly met with opposition from those whom he considered the last persons likely to oppose him on this subject. From what has already been /121 advanced, the Reviewer may perceive the reason why the passages extracted by the Compiler from the Gospel of St. John should be comparatively few. It is from this source that the most difficult to be comprehended of the dogmas of the Christian religion have been principally drawn; and on the foundation of passages of that writer, the interpretation of which is still a matter of keen discussion amongst the most learned and most pious scholars in Christendom, is erected the mysterious doctrine of three Gods in one Godhead, the origin of Mohummudanism, and the stumbling-block to the conversion of the more enlightenend amongst the Hindoos.

To impress more strongly on the minds of those for whom this compilation was §33  
intended, the doctrines taught by Jesus, the Compiler thought the varied repetition of them by different but concurring reporters highly advantageous, as showing clearly that those doctrines were neither misrepresented nor misconceived by any of those Evangelists.

[The question of dogmatic passages.]

6. Nor is the conduct of the Compiler in selecting certain passages of the Scrip- §34  
tures for certain purposes singular; for we see very often extracts from the Bible,

<sup>1</sup> This would be Thomas F. Middleton (1769-1822), Anglican bishop of Calcutta 1814-1822.

published by the learned men of every sect of Christians, with a view to maintenance of particular doctrines. Christian churches have selected passages from the Bible, which they conceive particularly excellent, and well adapted for the constant perusal and study of the people of their respective churches; and besides, it is the continual practice /122 of every Christian teacher to choose from the whole Scriptures such texts as he deems most important, for the purposes of illustrating them, and impressing them on the minds of his hearers. Nor will those teachers, if questioned as to their object in such selections, hesitate to assign as their motive the very reason adopted by the Compiler as his—the superior importance of the parts so selected. Whether or not he has erred in his judgment on that point, must be determined by those who will candidly peruse and consider the arguments already advanced on the subject, always bearing in mind the lesson practically taught by the Saviour himself, of adapting his instructions to the susceptibility and capacity of his hearers. *John*, ch. xvi: “I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now.”

Jn 16:12

§35

Hindustan is a country, of which nearly 3-5ths of the inhabitants are Hindoos, and 2-5ths Moosulmans. Although the professors of neither of these religions are possessed of such accomplishments as are enjoyed by Europeans in general, yet the latter portion are well known to be firmly devoted to a belief in one God, which has been instilled into their minds from their infancy. The former (I mean the Hindoos) are, with a few exceptions, immersed in gross idolatry, and in belief of the most extravagant description respecting futurity, antiquity, and the miracles of their deities and saints, as handed down to them and recorded in their ancient books. Weighing these circumstances, and anxious, from his long /123 experience of religious controversy with natives, to avoid further disputation with them, the Compiler selected those precepts of Jesus, the obedience to which he believed most peculiarly required of a Christian, and such as could by no means tend, in doctrine, to excite the religious horror of Mohummedans, or the scoffs of Hindoos. What benefit or peace of mind can we bestow upon a Moosulman, who is an entire stranger to the Christian world, by communicating to him without preparatory instruction all the peculiar dogmas of Christianity; such as those contained in *ver. 1st, chap. 1st, of St. John*, “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God”? Would they not find themselves at a loss to reconcile this dogma to their unprepared understandings, viz. A is B, and A is also with B? Although the interpretations given us of such texts by truly learned and candid divines be ever so satisfactory, yet to those that are strangers to these explanations, they cannot be intelligible; nor can it be expected from the order of things that each can happily find at hand an able interpreter, to whom he can have recourse for an explanation, whenever he may be involved in difficulties or doubts. But as a great number of Missionary gentlemen

Jn 1:1

may perhaps view the matter in a different light, and join the Editor of the Friend of India, in accusing the Compiler as an injurer of the cause of truth, I doubt not that with a view to avoid every possibility of such imputation, and to prevent /124 others from attributing their ill success to his interference with their duties, he would gladly abstain from publishing again on the same subject, if he could see in past experience any thing to justify hopes of their success. From what I have already stated, I hope no one will infer that I feel ill-disposed towards the Missionary establishments in this country. This is far from being the case. I pray for their augmentation, and that their members may retain in the happy enjoyment of life in a climate so generally inimical to European constitutions; for in proportion to the increase of their number, sobriety, moderation, temperance, and good behaviour, have been diffused among their neighbours as the necessary consequences of their company, conversation, and good example.

[Charges of inconsistency.]

[7.] The Reviewer charges the Compiler with inconsistency, (p. 27<sup>1</sup>.) because §36 he has termed the precepts collected by him, a code of religion and morality, while, as the Reviewer supposes, they form only a code of morality and not of religion. It is already explained in paragraph 2d, that the Compiler has introduced those precepts of Jesus under the denomination of the moral sayings of the New Testament, taking the word moral in its wide sense, as including our conduct to God, to each other, and to ourselves;<sup>2</sup> and to avoid the least possibility of misunderstanding the term, he has carefully particularized the sense in which he accepted that word by the latter sentence, “[This simple code of Religion and Mora-125lity](#), (meaning the former, those precepts which treat of our duty to God, and by the latter, such as relate to our duties to mankind and to ourselves,) [is so admirably calculated to elevate men’s ideas to high and liberal notions of one God, &c.](#)” “[and is also so well fitted to regulate the conduct of the human race in the discharge of their various duties to God, to themselves, and to society, &c.](#)” In conformity to the design thus expressed, he has collected all the sayings that have a tendency to those ends. The Compiler, however, observes with regret, that neither this language nor this fact, has afforded to the Reviewer satisfactory evidence of his intention, nor sufficed to save him from the unexpected imputation of inconsistency.

The Reviewer again (page 29<sup>3</sup>) charges the Compiler with inconsistency, in having §37

<sup>1</sup> §11

<sup>2</sup> Compare Rammohan, *Second Defence*, 106: “The Sanskrit word which signifies *works*, is not to be understood in the same sense as that which implies in Christian theology, when works are opposed to faith. Christians understand by works actions of *moral merit*, whereas Hindus use the term in their theology only to denote religious rites and ceremonies prescribed by Hindu lawgivers”.

<sup>3</sup> §15

introduced some doctrinal passages into his compilation. In reply to which, I again entreat the attention of the respected Reviewer to that passage in the Introduction, in which the Compiler states the motives that have led him to exclude certain parts of the gospels from his publication. He there states, that it is on account of these passages being such as were the ordinary foundation of the arguments of the opponents of Christianity, or the sources of the interminable controversies that have let to heart-burnings and even bloodshed amongst Christians, that they were not included in his selection; and they were omitted the more readily, as he considered them not essential to /126 religion. But such dogmas or doctrinal and other passages as are not exposed to those objections, and are not unfamiliar to the minds of those for whose benefit the compilation was intended, are generally included, in conformity with the avowed plan of the work—particularly such as seem calculated to direct our love and obedience to the beneficent Author of the universe, and to him whom he graciously sent to deliver those Precepts of Religion and Morality, whose tendency is to promote universal peace and harmony.

[The belief in God generally prevailing? Hindu-polytheism, freethinkers and Advaita Vedāntists.]

§38

8. In objecting to the assertion made by the Compiler in the Introduction as to a belief in the existence of God prevailing generally, the respected Reviewer advances three arguments:—1st, That millions of people believe in a plurality of Gods. 2dly, That the majority of those enlightened persons who deny the truth of the Jewish and Christian Revelation are Atheists. 3rdly, That the very system of the Vedant, which denies to God his moral attributes, is a refined and disguised Atheism.<sup>1</sup> I certainly admit that a great number of men, and even men of profound learning and extensive abilities, are, owing to their early education, literally sunk in Polytheism, an absurd and irrational system of religion. But the admission of a plurality of Gods does not amount the denial of Godhead. A man, for instance, cannot be accused of having no notion of mankind, because he is proved to believe in the existence of a plurality of individuals. The Reviewer ought, there-/127fore, to have confined himself to the remark, the truth of which will be readily admitted, that there are millions of people ignorant of the Unity of God, the only doctrine consistent with reason and revelation. The astonishing eagerness of the learned amongst those whose practice and language are polytheistical, to prefer their claim to be considered as Monotheists, is a strong evidence of the consistency of the system of Monotheism with reason. Debased and despicable as is the belief of the Hindoos in three hundred and thirty millions of gods, they pretend to reconcile this persuasion with the doctrine of the Unity of God; alleging that the three hundred and thirty millions of gods, whom they enumerate, are subordinate agents, assuming various offices in preserving the harmony of the

---

<sup>1</sup> §§7-8.

universe under one Godhead, as innumerable rays issue from one sun. I am at a loss to trace the origin of his second argument, imputing Atheism to the majority of those who deny the divinity of the Jewish and Christian Revelation. For, notwithstanding my acquaintance with several Europeans and Asiatics who doubt the possibility of Revelation, I have never met with one, to the best of my recollection, maintaining Atheism, however widely they might differ from the Reviewer and the Compiler in a great many points of belief relating to the Deity. The Reviewer perhaps may have met with some unhappy Freethinkers, who have professed doubts respecting the existence of a supreme superintending power—a circumstance which has proba-  
/128bly induced him to form this opinion; but such rare instances can have no force to set aside the credit of what the Compiler affirms, that a belief in God *prevails generally*. Neither can I conscientiously coincide with the respected Reviewer in his imputing Atheism on the Vedant system, under the supposition of its denying moral attributes to God; nor can I help lamenting that religious prejudice should influence the Reviewer so much, as to make him apply the term of Atheist towards a sect or to individuals who look up to the God of nature through his wonderful works alone; for the Vedant, in common with the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, from the impossibility of forming more exalted conceptions, constantly ascribes to God the perfection of those moral attributes which are considered among the human species excellent and sublime. To prove this I quote one passage from each of the four Oopunishuds of the Vedant, which have already been translated into English. Moonduk, ch. 1, sect. 1: “By him who knows all things collectively and distinctly, whose knowledge and will are the only means of his actions, Bruhma, name, and form, and all that vegetates, are produced.”<sup>1</sup> Kuthu, ch. 5: “God is eternal, among all the perishable universe; and is the source of sensation among all animate existences; and he alone assigns to so many objects their respective purposes.”<sup>2</sup> Kenopunishud: “In a battle between the celestial gods and the demons, God enabled the former to defeat the latter.”<sup>3</sup> And Ishopunishud: “He over-  
/129spreads all creatures, is merely spirit without the form either of a minute body or of an extended one, which is liable to impression or organization. He is pure, perfect, omniscient, the Ruler of the intellect, omnipresent, and the self-existent. He has from eternity been assigning to all creatures their respective purposes.”<sup>4</sup> For further evidence, if required, I beg to refer the Reviewer to the rest of the original Vedant works that may be found in the College Library and in the Missionary stores of books.<sup>5</sup> It is, however, very true, that

Moonduk 1:1.9

Kuthu 2:2.13

Kena 3:1

Isho 8

<sup>1</sup> Rammohan, *Moonduk*, 24. <sup>2</sup> Rammohan, *Uth*, 58. <sup>3</sup> Rammohan, *Cena*, 41.

<sup>4</sup> Rammohan, *Ishopanishad*, 76.

<sup>5</sup> Rammohan is referring to the Library of Fort Williams College and its Sanskrit collections, and to the stores of the *Baptist Missionary Press* which were distributing his own translations. (See Majumdar, *Progressive Movements*, 29.)

the Vedant declares very often its total ignorance of the real nature and attributes of God. Kenopunishud, ver. 3: "Hence no vision can approach him, no language can describe him, no intellectual power can compass or determine him; we know nothing how the Supreme Being should be explained,"<sup>1</sup> &c. It also represents God sometimes in a manner familiar to the understanding of the vulgar. Moonduk ch. 7. sect. 1: "Heaven is his head, and the sun and the moon are his eyes; space is his ears,"<sup>2</sup> &c. But such declarations are not peculiar to the Vedant doctrines, as these are found frequently in the sacred Scriptures. *Job xxxvi. 26*: "Behold God is great, and we know him not;" "touching the Almighty we cannot find him out; his greatness is unsearchable." The Scriptures also represent God in the same familiar and figurative manner as is found in the Vedant. God is affirmed to have made man in his own image, after his own likeness. The angels always behold God's face in /130 heaven. In the Old Testament, as well as in the New, God is represented as repenting of his works, as being moved with anger, vexation, grief, joy, love, and hate: as moving from place to place; having arms, with hands and fingers; a head, with face, mouth, tongue, eyes, nose, ears, a heart, bowels, back, thighs, legs; as seeing, being seen, speaking and hearing, slumbering, waking, &c. No one capable of sound reasoning can for a moment imagine that these or any other descriptions of God are intended to convey literal notions of the unsearchable, incomprehensible Being.

§39 May God render religion destructive of differences and dislike between man and man, and conducive to the peace and union of mankind. Amen.

---

<sup>1</sup> Rammohan, *Cena*, 39. <sup>2</sup> Rammohan, *Moonduk*, 26.

## 4 Joshua Marshman: An Answer to the *Appeal*

### Editorial Introduction

In the February edition of *The Friend of India* Marshman had announced a thorough review of the *Precepts* in the first number of the quarterly edition “in about two months” (§21). However, this first number was delayed and appeared in September only. In the meantime, Rammohan published his *Appeal*, and Marshman probably wanted to react quickly. In May he published first “remarks” on the *Appeal*, and in these remarks he dealt with more personal topics: Rammohan had rejected his designation as “heathen”, and he had attacked the Serampore Mission and their converts quite openly. In this short text, Marshman takes care of both of these matters.

It is remarkable that Marshman, as a weaver’s son, defends the Indian converts in Serampore on the basis that they prefer honest labour as Christians to living an idle life as high cast Hindus in Calcutta. This is not only about Protestant work ethics, but also carries a biographical background.

Marshman is quoting Rammohan and using inverted commas to mark those quotations, but they are not exact and differing in many cases from Rammohan’s original words, although they maintain the original meaning, summarising and rephrasing it.

This text follows the original print in the *Friend of India. Monthly Series*, Vol. III., No. XXIII., May 1820, pp. 133-139. As in the last text from the *Friend of India*, the long spaces were maintained and used to mark new paragraphs (§).

A reprint of Marshman’s text was published in 1822 by British Baptists in London in the volume *A Defence of the Deity and Atonement of Jesus Christ, in Reply to Ram-Mohun Roy of Calcutta. By Dr. Marshman of Serampore*, pp. 5-16.

§40 /133 *Remarks on certain Observations in "An Appeal to the Christian public in defence of the Precepts of Jesus, by a Friend to truth."*

§41 Since publishing our last Number we have been favored with the perusal of a Pamphlet of thirty-two pages, which has just appeared under the title of "An Appeal to the Christian public in defence of 'the Precepts of Jesus,' by a Friend to truth;" in which he begs "to appeal to the public against the unchristianlike as well as uncivil manner in which the Editor (of the Friend of India,) has adduced his objections to the compilation by introducing personality, and applying the term of *heathen* to the compiler." He adds "I say unchristianlike manner, because the Editor by making use of the term *heathen*, has I presume violated truth, charity, and liberality, which are essential to Christianity in every sense of the word."<sup>1</sup> While we fully agree with this writer, that truth, charity, and liberality are essential to christianity in every sense of the word, we must intreat permission to plead not guilty to this charge, not even in thought.

§42 Of the three generic terms applicable to natives of India, Christian, Heathen, or Musulman, the last was evidently inapplicable, if we were at all correct, (as it now appears we were) in our conjecture relative to the Compiler of the work in question; and of his wish to be denominated a Christian, the obscure hint conveyed by the "Friend of truth" in the present appeal, is the first we have received. But the candid Author of the "Guide to Happiness and Peace," will readily perceive, that as we belong to that class who think that no one can be a real Christian without believing the Divinity and the Atonement of Jesus Christ, and the Divine Authority of the whole of the Holy Scriptures, while we most cordially wish that he were altogether such, we could not term him a Christian without a violation of our own principles.

§43 We apprehend however, that the term "Heathen" unless accompanied with adjuncts which mark it as reproachful, to which class we were not aware that "intelligent" or "unprejudiced" belongs, /134 cannot be candidly construed into a term of reproach, when it hat been so often applied by the most eminent English divines to the best men who have ever appeared in the heathen world, and even to those who have been most averse to the popular idolatry of their countrymen. We cannot but think therefore, that this "appeal to the public against the unchristian-like, as well as uncivil conduct of the Editor of the Friend of India," might have been spared; and that it required no very high exercise of the Christian virtues to avoid in this instance "retaliation upon enemies, and the example of the Editors of the Friend of India."<sup>2</sup>

§44 The attempts of Ram-mohun Roy to burst the bonds of superstition in which his countrymen have been held for so many ages, although they have gone no farther,

---

<sup>1</sup> §22. <sup>2</sup> §25.



and particularly his humane efforts in favor of that large portion of our unoffending Indian fellow subjects who are liable every day to be immolated on the funeral pile of their husbands, have given him a high place in our esteem: With our noticing the preface of the work in question, we feel assured its Author is too candid to be offended. The ground he has himself so properly taken when investigating the works of his countrymen, forbids us to think he can be offended with a calm and faithful investigation of any thing published by himself; and the circumstances of his own countrymen, render the manner in which the Holy Scriptures may be introduced to them of the utmost importance. It will be at once granted that they alone are able to make the most ignorant wise unto salvation. But this depends wholly on the manner in which they are received. If a part of them alone be received because it contains certain valuable precepts, while the rest is esteemed scarcely worthy of notice, the Holy Scriptures are not received as the word of God; they are stripped of their peculiar majesty and authority, and degraded to a level with the writings of men. But when stripped of those doctrines (or dogmas) which enlighten the mind, awaken the conscience, and convert the soul, to those who thus receive them they are no longer the power of God unto salvation; they rather become a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence. If the Holy Scriptures be there-<sup>135</sup>fore the only remedy for the misery of mankind, it is scarcely possible to injure men more than by presenting them in such a way as shall destroy their efficiency, since this is robbing the diseased of their only chance of recovery.

In the present circumstances of India therefore, none who have its welfare at heart ought to be indifferent to a point so important. Whether the preface to Rammohun Roy's work has this tendency or not it certainly becomes him earnestly to consider, were it only for the sake of that respectable body of his countrymen who are likely to regard the Sacred Scriptures precisely as he represents them. When to this he adds the effect which his representation of them is likely to have on those in Europe, who, while they call themselves by the name of Christ, would gladly degrade him to a level with Confucius or Mahomet, and rather regard him as the Founder of a sect, than adore him as God over all, blessed for evermore,<sup>1</sup> we are ready to hope that his philanthropy will lead him to regret that he had not more deeply studied the whole of the Sacred Writings before he had thus delivered his opinion of them. The examination of the reasonableness of this opinion, we shall reserve as already mentioned, for the first Number of the Quarterly Series of the Friend of India, which is now in the press;<sup>2</sup> in doing which while a regard to the best interests of mankind will not permit us to

<sup>1</sup> This is a mixture of Rm 9:5 and 2 Co 11:31.

<sup>2</sup> The first Number appeared in September only. Either there were some problems in printing, or Marshman is expressing rather hope than facts.

trifle, we trust that we shall not lose sight of that impartial candor which ought to pervade all discussions relative to the Sacred Writings.

§46 We feel constrained however, though with much regret, to add a remark or two on the observations of the “Friend of Truth” in this appeal, relative to the Circulation of the Scriptures, and to those Natives who have been baptized on a profession of faith in the Redeemer of Men. In this instance we regret that the “Friend of Truth” had not previously sought the best information on the subject, which would have been cheerfully imparted had it been desired. He would then have learned that “European Missionary gentlemen residing on nearly the same spot upwards of twenty years;” (nothing of course personal in all this!) “had *not* distributed among the natives” numberless copies of the complete /136 Bible written in different languages; for a few figures would express the number: and that these have *not been* “distributed in vain;”<sup>1</sup> for a degree of light has already gone abroad into various circles in India of which he can have little knowledge, which there is reason to hope will never be extinguished.

§47 With the “dogmas taught by these missionaries which have completely counteracted their benevolent efforts;”<sup>2</sup> the Friend of Truth is accurately acquainted, or he is not; if he be not, he should not have ventured this assertion; but if he be, he knows that while they are the leading doctrines of the New Testament, they may be summed up in the two following positions, that God views all sin so abominable that the death of Jesus Christ alone can expiate its guilt; and that the human heart is so corrupt that it must be renewed by the Divine Spirit before a man can enter heaven. These two doctrines, with those connected with them, are the leading dogmas they have attempted to teach the heathen. But we may ask him, Without these two dogmas what is the gospel? To persuade men to accept the gospel or receive the Scriptures without believing these, would be like persuading a man in a deadly disease, to commit himself to a physician possessed of a specific remedy by assuring him that he shall never be troubled with his medicine. If teaching Christianity to the natives of India *with* these dogmas, has effected little, still that little is all clear gain to the cause of righteousness; to have taught it *without* them would have effected nothing; it must have left the Hindoos nearly as they were: a God who does not abhor and justly punish all sin, is an idol still; a mere fiction of the imagination. Besides, this admirable way of circulating the Holy Scriptures by observing a profound

§48 silence relative to the dogmas they contain, must have ended in shame. Intelligent natives could scarcely have opened them without something of the dogmas already mentioned meeting them at every page. To have circulated the Scriptures therefore, while their distinguishing doctrines were kept wholly out of sight would

---

<sup>1</sup> §31. <sup>2</sup> §31.

only have led to a contempt of those engaged therein for their disingenuous conduct.  
/137

The "Friend of Truth" is not aware however "that we can find a single respectable Musulman or Hindoo who were not in want of the necessaries of life, once glorified with the truth of Christianity, constantly adhering to it."<sup>1</sup> But does this prove that there have been none? may there not have been some without his being aware of it? Is he quite certain that he has carefully examined every case? We think he has not; and regret his venturing this assertion without such examination. Is it a fact then that "nearly all who have changed their faith have been allured by other attractions than by a conviction of the truth and reasonableness of these dogmas"?<sup>2</sup> By what means has this "Friend of Truth" ascertained this? Has he examined the hearts and scrutinized the motives of hundreds of persons whom he can scarcely have seen? A friend of truth however should have done this before he published to the world his suspicion of their hypocrisy, otherwise he may have fixed a stigma upon upright characters which they may never have an opportunity of removing. But "they are nearly all employed or fed by their spiritual teachers."<sup>3</sup> This is a singular assertion. To be fed gratis then, and to live honestly by labor, are both marks of consummate hypocrisy! The coupling of these together was necessary however, for had the "Friend of Truth" said, they are nearly all *fed* in idleness by their spiritual teachers, he must have forfeited all right to this appellation; for of no one native convert, not incapacitated for labour by disease or old age, can it be said that he is fed in perfect idleness for embracing Christianity. But is constant labor so much the delight of the natives of India, that Brahmuns and men of the highest families in the Writer cast, of respectable moral character, are to be easily found, who will renounce all the honors of cast for themselves and their posterity, for the sake of gaining eight or ten Rupees monthly by steady and constant labor? How many Brahmuns and Kaystas have turned Musulmans with this view in the last twenty years? Yet we have seen men of this rank in Hindoo society forsake the houses of their rich relatives in Calcutta where they lived in ease and idleness, come to Seram-/138pore, and professing to believe the dogmas in question, submit year after year to a regular course of labor, proving themselves the most upright among all our native servants, and steadily resisting all solicitations from their wealthy relatives to return to a life of idleness and ease. The Missionaries of Serampore have now in their employ *thirteen* of the Brahmun and Writer casts, men correct in their morals and upright in their conduct. Let the "Friend of Truth," if he be able, prevail on an equal number of precisely the same rank, (their morals we will wave,) to renounce for ever all the honors of cast for the sake of receiving in a state of per-

---

<sup>1</sup> §31. <sup>2</sup> §31. <sup>3</sup> §31.

fect idleness, the monthly sum these gain by labor. But till he can do this, ought he not as a friend to truth, to forbear publishing suspicions of base hypocrisy respecting those with whom he must be so imperfectly acquainted, merely because they have professedly for Christ's sake, preferred a life of honest and constant labor, though attended with the loss of cast, to a life of ease and worldly honor in a course which they deemed contrary to the will of Him who created and redeemed them?

§55 But it is not a fact that nearly all these *are* either fed or employed by their spiritual teachers. "Employed" we trust they are in some honest calling or other, for we  
1 Th 2:10 inculcate it as a fundamental law of Christianity, that he who will not work should not eat. By their spiritual teachers however we are certain they cannot all be employed. We think that all their spiritual teachers in India besides, can scarcely employ an equal number with the Missionaries of Serampore, and for the information of this Friend to Truth we will give him the exact number employed at Serampore. They amount to *thirty-five*\* including both men and women, for Christianity by no means forbids the employment in honest labor of the latter as well as the former; and thirty-three servants equally faithful and correct in their moral conduct, they /139 do not possess among several hundreds. Precisely the same labor is required of them however, as of Musulman and Hindoo servants, which accounts for the story of the "rebellious" ones given in this appeal.<sup>1</sup> Certain natives had been excluded from Christian communion for vice, for which however they were indebted to Hindooism, not to Christianity, and having as little relish for labor as for virtue, they left their employments which had been continued to them notwithstanding their exclusion; and prevailing on two or three weak men of better morals to join with them, they presented a Petition to the Bishop of Calcutta with the hope of living without labor. Upon this petition his Lordship wisely frowned, which made the profligate abscond, and the weak quietly return to their employ acknowledging their folly. From this brief statement the "Friend of Truth" will see, that if there be indeed "a few hundreds of these native converts,"<sup>2</sup> they cannot be all or nearly all employed by their spiritual teachers; and that the conduct of those employed by them in preferring Christianity with a life of constant labor and the loss of worldly honor, to idolatry with a life of idleness, and all the honors of the cast, united with their correct moral conduct, ought rather to be esteemed a proof of their sincerity in their profession, than adduced as a proof of their hypocrisy.

§56 As the "Friend of Truth" chose to affirm these things relative to the Native converts under our own eye, we have felt it a duty due equally to Christianity and

---

\* In addition to these there are perhaps from ten to fifteen Native Christian Itinerants employed by the Serampore Missionaries in different parts of the country.

<sup>1</sup> §31. <sup>2</sup> §31.

to India, to be thus particular in our reply, although we have done it with much reluctance.—And if previously to asserting any thing again on this subject, he will consult the Missionaries of Serampore, who must be fully acquainted therewith, and to the accuracy of whose statements in pecuniary affairs he himself bears witness, the most exact information will be given him; which for him thus to seek previously to charging a large body of his own countrymen with gross hypocrisy, will we apprehend be no dishonor to his character as a “Friend of Truth.”



## 5 Joshua Marshman: Review of the *Precepts and the Appeal*

### Editorial Introduction

In September 1820 the new *Quarterly Series of The Friend of India* appeared for the first time. It was meant for articles and literary reviews too large for the monthly appearing series. Article No. IV is Marshman's first big review of a publication of Rammohan. Although it was titled *Observations on certain ideas contained in the Introduction to "the Precepts of Jesus the Guide to Happiness and Peace"*, it also deals with the *Appeal*.

In his review, Marshman keeps the general line that selecting certain passages from the Bible for separate distribution is not to be criticised, but he rejects Rammohan's assertion that his selection of "moral precepts" was a "guide to peace and happiness". From his strict Calvinist view and his Particular Baptist theological background he had to deny any human contribution to salvation because of the doctrine of total human depravity. In general, the Calvinist concepts of "law", "gospel", "doctrines" and other theological terms are applied to the discussion and Rammohan's *Precepts* without further explanation or reflection.

Marshman's tone is rather constructive. As he justly believes that Rammohan trusts in the words of Jesus and the written tradition about him, he makes an attempt to prove that the central christological and soteriological dogmas are consistent with Jesus' teachings and his claims about himself. As foundation for his argument he only uses Jesus' words and texts from the Gospel writers. The result is an image of Jesus as God and suffering Messiah who does everything which is needed for human salvation and surpasses all other religious founders and wisdom teachers.

The text is structured into an introduction, three sections (Deity of Christ; Atonement; Human depravity) with subsections, and some additional remarks about the role of doctrines and miracles. In this edition these sections are marked by [headlines]. From Marshman's subsections, Rammohan will deduct the "seven positions of the Editor", which he discusses in the *Second Appeal*. They will appear again and

again in the debate.

For an unknown reason, Marshman prefers to write “Happiness and Peace” instead of “Peace and Happiness” (which would be the correct title of the *Precepts*).

This text follows the second edition of the *Friend of India. Quarterly Series*, Vol. I., No. I., September 1820, pp. 96-130. On page 155 it says that the page numbers differ from the first edition because the second edition had been printed “in a new type from England”. There is no indication for an altered text. The *Serampore Mission Press* produced this second edition in 1822. The first edition of Vol. I. is from 1821.

A reprint of Marshman’s text was published in 1822 by British Baptists in London in the volume *A Defence of the Deity and Atonement of Jesus Christ, in Reply to Ram-Mohun Roy of Calcutta. By Dr. Marshman of Serampore*, pp. 17-63.



196 Art. IV.—*Observations on certain ideas contained in the Introduction to “the Precepts of Jesus the Guide to Happiness and Peace.”* Calcutta, 1820. §57

A FEW months ago when it was announced that a compilation from the four Gospels by a native of India, (it was supposed Ram-mohun Roy,) was in the press, designed for the use of his countrymen, much interest was excited in all who had witnessed his laudable endeavours to expose the folly of that system of idolatry universally prevalent among his countrymen. The idea of a well informed Hindoo’s bearing witness to the authenticity and excellence of the Divine Writings, and recommending them to the perusal of his countrymen as being able to make them wise unto salvation through faith in Jesus Christ, delighted all who felt an interest in the happiness of their Indian fellow-subjects, and regarded their reception of the Sacred Oracles in all their divine authority, as the grand means by which this could be secured. §58

In proportion however as the friends of religion were delighted with the idea of a Selection from the Sacred Scriptures by a Hindoo, which should impart to the minds of his countrymen his own ideas of their excellence, was their disappointment and regret, when they found that this Compilation entitled “the Precepts of Jesus the Guide to Happiness and Peace,” instead of exhibiting these precepts as a sample of the whole Scriptures, and representing them as affording indubitable proof of the authenticity of its narratives and the reasonableness and importance of its doctrines, were in reality separated from that gospel of which they form so important a part, and held up as forming of them-<sup>97</sup>selves the way of life; an idea which perverts the grand design of the gospel, and frustrates the grace of God in the salvation of men, the apostolic axiom applying with as great force now as ever, “If righteousness come by the law, Christ is dead in vain.” §59

But great as was this disappointment, it was heightened by their perceiving that the Introduction to this Compendium, instead of treating with reverence the other parts of the Sacred Oracles, unhappily tended rather to impugn them, the reader being told that “[historical and some other passages are liable to the doubts and disputes of free-thinkers and anti-christians, especially miraculous relations, which are much less wonderful than the fabricated tales handed down to the natives of Asia, and consequently would be apt at best to carry little weight with them.](#)”<sup>1</sup> These hints respecting the rest of the Sacred Writings, particularly when taken in connexion with the note added at the foot of the page as a specimen of these fabricated tales more wonderful than the miracles of Christ, “[that Ugusti is famed for having swallowed the ocean when it had given him offence, and for having restored it by urinary evacuation, and that at his command also the Vindya range of mountains prostrated](#)” §60

<sup>1</sup> §2.

itself, and so remains;”<sup>1</sup> appeared likely to convey ideas of them so contrary to that deep and just reverence with which both the doctrines and the miracles they contain must be regarded if they become the means of salvation, that those who duly venerate the Sacred Oracles, could not but feel grieved that they should be thus held out to those, who, despising idolatry for its grossness and folly, might probably be enquiring for something on which they might build their hopes of future happiness.

§61 It may be proper to observe, that we do not in the /98 least censure any one’s forming a Compilation from the Sacred Scriptures, whether it be of its preceptive, prophetic, or doctrinal parts. We not only think that Ram-mohun Roy had as fair a right to fix on the preceptive part, as any one else has to select its doctrines, but that such a compilation might have been highly useful. But it is of importance that every compilation be given as a *sample* of the Sacred Writings in all their excellence and importance, and not as a substitute for the whole; in such a way as to create a deep reverence for every part of the Scriptures, and not so as to depreciate the rest of the word of God. For a Compilation therefore to be represented as containing what is peculiarly excellent in the Divine Writings, and other parts to be described as comparatively of little value, we think highly injurious to them and to the best interests of men. It is on this ground that we regret the manner in which this Compilation is introduced to the natives of India: for what the Introductory Preface strongly intimates the “Defence” of the work since published actually affirms, that “it is too true to be denied, that the Compiler of those moral precepts separated them from some of the dogmas and other matters, chiefly under the supposition that they *alone* were a sufficient guide to secure peace and happiness to mankind at large.”<sup>2</sup> These moral Precepts were then presented to the Natives of India as being themselves sufficient to secure happiness and peace to mankind, while the great Doctrines of salvation were omitted as comparatively unimportant,—and even the Miracles of Christ to which he himself refers the Jews as calculated to constrain belief, should they even refuse his teaching, were omitted as apt at best to carry little weight with them, being much less wonderful /99 than the fabricated tales handed down to the natives of Asia. How different his idea of these miraculous works must be from that of Jesus himself, will appear in the sequel.

Jn 10:37f.

§62 We cannot but consider it as a duty we owe to the cause of truth—to our Hindoo fellow-subjects,—and even to the Compiler himself, to enquire whether his thus treating the doctrines of Christianity arose from want of proof in the Sacred Writings respecting them,—or from his want of diligence in weighing and examining those proofs of their Divine origin which must have fallen in his way while making this Compilation, and which are decidedly implied in many of the precepts inserted

---

<sup>1</sup> §2. <sup>2</sup> §26.

therein. In doing this, were we to have recourse the authority of Christ's Apostles whom he commissioned to promulgate his doctrines after his ascension, we might demonstrate their truth and importance by an overwhelming cloud of witness. But uncertain as we are whether the Compiler reposes equal confidence in the doctrines of the Apostles as in those taught by Christ himself, we shall confine ourselves to those furnished by the Authors of the Gospels alone.

In making this enquiry we are assisted by two data furnished by the very title of this Compilation. The precepts of Jesus are termed "the way to happiness and peace." To deserve this name however, not only must they have been delivered by one whose veracity is indubitable, but by one most thoroughly acquainted with the connection subsisting between the creature and the Creator, and with the nature and state of mankind. Without the former they could be of no value; without the latter they would be totally inapplicable to the state of men, and could no more ensure happiness to mankind, than the laws of Draco secured happiness and peace /100 in Athens. Whatever Jesus has said therefore, deserves full acceptance for its truth, and the knowledge it displays both of God and of man. Further, to render the Precepts of Jesus a sure guide to happiness and peace, we require the most perfect veracity and accuracy in the Narrators of these sayings and precepts. As Jesus wrote nothing himself, our having a single saying of his delivered as really spoken, depends on the veracity of the relators, and the accuracy of their information. The truth, benevolence, and wisdom of Jesus, and the faithfulness and accuracy of the Four Evangelists then being so fully conceded in the very title given to this Compendium, we confess ourselves quite at a loss to account for the Compiler's not being convinced even by their testimony alone, of the truth and importance of those *doctrines* which must have met him so often while forming this compilation. §63

[The Deity of Christ.]

I. To begin with the most abstruse and yet the most important of these, *the Deity of Jesus Christ*, is there no evidence afforded by Jesus himself respecting the truth of this doctrine? Can any evidence be desired more conclusive than the witness he has even obliquely given of himself? We have already supposed his veracity to be indubitable, his knowledge of God and of created beings, to be perfectly accurate, and his love of virtue and goodness to be such as to render it impossible for him to assume those honors to which he had not the least right: this indeed will be done by no good man. Will a good man speak of himself as God? describe himself as doing that which none can do but the Deity? suffer men to worship him as God? refuse to undeceive men when they understand him as making himself equal with God? and direct himself to be regarded equally with God to the end of time? Yet has /101 all this been done by Jesus of Nazareth, as will appear from the following instances. §64

§65 No being possesses *ubiquity* but God himself; to no Creature is it given to be in two places at the same moment. Yet Jesus tells Nicodemus,\* “No man hath ascended up to heaven but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man who is *in* heaven?” But he was at that moment on the earth conversing with Nicodemus. What can this sentence mean then? If it be not a solemn affirmation that he, the Son of man, was at that moment in heaven as well as on earth, has it any meaning? If he did not hereby affirm that he possessed the *omnipresence* of God, we have an affirmation without meaning, intermixed with the most important instruction, by one whose precepts are the guide to happiness and peace. This however is not a solitary instance; in Mark<sup>1</sup> we have another. Exhorting his followers to social prayer, Mt 18:20 Jesus adds; “where two or three are gathered together in my name there *am I* in the midst of them.” Here Jesus evidently claims *omnipresence*. If this promise did not extend to futurity, he had even then more than *two or three* followers, and to be with them all he must be omnipresent. But the directions given evidently point to future ages. If Jesus did not possess omnipresence therefore, we have a sentence without the least meaning delivered by Him who declares, that for every idle word shall men give account in the judgment.

§66 Again Jesus ascribes to himself a *knowledge* and an *incomprehensibility of nature* equal with that of God, and peculiar to God alone, even in an address to God himself. Mt 11:27 “No man *knoweth the Son* but the Father; neither *knoweth* any man the Father save the *Son*, and /102 he to whomsoever the *Son* will reveal him.” Here he declares, that the nature of the *Son*, (the term by which he constantly designates himself,) is as incomprehensible as the nature of the Father, the Lord of heaven and earth, that his own *knowledge* of the incomprehensible nature of the Father, is equal to that of the Father, and that this knowledge is *peculiar* to himself, and communicated to no man but *by* himself and at his own *will*. If this be not assuming the attributes of Deity, we have language perfectly unintelligible made the ground of a solemn and earnest invitation to men, to come to *Jesus* for happiness. But if in these terms he justly describes his own Divine nature, nothing can be more suitable to the succeeding invitation “Come to *me* all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and *I* will give you rest.” Who can give rest to the troubled mind, but God alone? Whose *knowledge* beside can discern its griefs in all their multiplied causes? or whose *power* is equal to the mighty task of speaking peace to the heart?

§67 The act of *forgiving sins* is so peculiarly the prerogative of God, that for any to attempt it except in his name, has ever been justly accounted impious. We find Jesus however claiming this prerogative, and in the midst of the Jews, then better

\* See “Precepts of Jesus,” page 79.

<sup>1</sup> Matthew is correct.

acquainted with theology than any people on earth. On seeing a man with his hand withered, he at once addresses him, "Man, thy sins are forgiven thee." This instantly strikes the Jews, the best theologians of the age; and they justly exclaim, Who can forgive sins but God only? What course does Jesus take to free himself from this charge of blasphemy now lying upon him? Does he explain away his words? Does he declare that he forgives sins only in the name of God as his prophet or messenger, as did Isaiah to Judah, Nathan to David, and Moses /103 to Israel? Nothing of the kind: he replies by displaying another attribute of Deity, *almighty power*, in at once healing the man with the withered hand, and asking them, which was easiest? to pronounce sins forgiven, or thus to heal? The spontaneous and almost involuntary approbation of all around, many of whom were sufficiently disposed to criminate Jesus, plainly discovers their ideas on the subject;—and their conviction may well suffice for ours.<sup>1</sup>

Lk 5:18–26

*Almighty power* is also claimed by Jesus in the most unequivocal manner on a different occasion, even when charged by the Jews with making himself equal with God. In such a case a wise and good man who meant nothing of the kind, would have repelled the charge with just indignation, or would have shown them calmly that they had mistaken his meaning. Yet Jesus does neither; but, on the contrary, further ascribes to himself the power of *quickenings and raising the dead* like the Father himself, adding, that the Father had committed all judgment unto him, "that all men might honor the Son, *even as they honor the Father*";—and that the Father himself is not honored by those who refuse to honor the Son. Can this language be reconciled to piety sobriety, or truth, if Jesus did not intend to claim Divine honors as his proper right? But if his *precepts* be a guide to happiness and peace, he must have possessed these qualities in a superior degree.

§68

Jn 5:19–23

The fact of his heavenly Father's having committed to him the *final judgment* of all who have lived since the creation, may of itself serve instead of all other proof. Let it be recollected that on the accuracy and justice of this final decision, are suspended—not only the eternal destiny of countless millions, who are to be judged according to the secrets of their hearts, (for all other judgment /104 would be incomplete;) but the honor of God's character and the happiness of the whole universe to all eternity. Were this judgment to be unjust or inaccurate in a single instance, it would be impossible that this fact should be concealed from the injured individual, or from the whole creation; and instead of the Divine character's appearing righteous and glorious in the eyes even of the wicked, it would for ever appear the reverse. No work therefore can be imagined so important as this to mankind, to

§69

<sup>1</sup> Marshman confuses the healing of the man with the withered hand on the sabbath (Lk 6:6-12) with the healing of the paralytic (Lk 5:18-26).

the interests of righteousness, to the character of the Supreme, and the happiness of every righteous being throughout eternity, which would be at once destroyed if the most distant suspicion of unrighteousness could exist against the character of Him whose Supreme Excellence constitutes all their felicity. Yet consider the qualifications requisite for this work:—To secure a perfectly accurate judgment of one individual, not only must all his *public* actions be known, but all the secret springs of those actions—all that was intended by them—all the conduct of others which rendered these actions with the feelings dictating them, either proper or blameable. It is further necessary that every *private* act be carefully scanned, every word duly weighed, and every secret thought fully discerned. But what being not *omniscient* can thus judge of the life of one individual through the term of seventy years? What being not *omnipresent* can thus be acquainted with the actions, words, and thoughts of all the individuals who compose only one age of mankind? What finite mind could search into past ages, accurately discerning every deed, and word, and thought since the creation? or *recollect* the mighty mass of information furnished by the secret and public actions of the millions who have lived in the remotest countries in every /105 age of the world, where it communicated to him? What mind short of infinite, could even *arrange* all these actions, discriminate their nicest shades of criminality, and pronounce a sentence in which even men’s self-love shall not be able to discern any thing unjust throughout eternity? One failure here, one circumstance overlooked, one feeling overrated, one action mistaken as to its motive, would at once tarnish the glory of the Divine Character and Government—quench the joys of heaven—and fill the universe with mourning throughout eternity. As all this must have been present to the Infinite Mind of the Father, his committing to the Son this mighty work, on the due execution of which the glory of his character and the justification of all his ways to men and angels, are suspended for ever, forms a testimony to *His* knowledge of the real character and attributes of Jesus, which leaves nothing to be added by men: and that he has thus done is declared by one who, if his precepts are “the guide to happiness and peace,” cannot be suspected of falsehood or mistake.

§70

To these instances, which so evidently shew that Jesus claimed the attributes of Deity, ascribed to himself the works God alone can perform, and when charged with this by most inveterate enemies, neither endeavoured to undeceive them, nor repelled the charge, might be added many others. That *worship* is due to no *man*, but to God alone, is universally allowed; but to one of the Evangelists was this fact confirmed in a most forcible manner respecting *angels*. Astonished at the things revealed to him, John was about to worship the heavenly messenger from whom he had received them. The angel promptly forbids him, saying, “See thou do it not.—Worship God.” Yet this evangelist declares that the blind man whose eyes Jesus had opened, /106 worshipped *him*; without giving the last hint that Jesus felt unwilling

Rv 19:10; 22:6–16

Jn 9:35–38

to permit this act, although he with such exactness relates the angel's refusing it. Did he think his beloved master, less humble than the angel, or did he know him to be more worthy by nature? This he will himself decide if we permit him to speak. He describes his Lord as speaking thus after his ascension. "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, saith the Lord, who is, and who was, and who is to come, the Almighty." And we see no reason why Jesus should not be as fully believed after his ascension to heaven, as while giving those precepts on earth which form our guide to happiness and peace; or why John the Divine should not be as worthy of credit, as John the Evangelist. John however is not alone in the testimony that his Master permitted himself to be worshipped. Matthew declares that he was worshipped by a leper whom he had healed;—by the mariners when he had calmed the winds and the waves by saying "Peace; be still;"<sup>1</sup>—and by his disciples themselves after his resurrection. This last fact is also confirmed by the testimony of Luke.

Mt 8:2-4;  
14:32-33;  
28:9-10;  
28:16-20

If we unite with this, Jesus's own idea of worship, we shall see at once in what light he regarded himself. That he thought worship due to no created being, he himself has fully satisfied us. When thus tempted by Satan, "All these things will I give thee if thou wilt fall down and worship me;" he replied, "It is written Thou shalt worship he Lord thy God, and him *only* shalt thou serve;" and that he applied the adverb "*only*" to worship as well as to service is evident from his subtle enemy's being silenced thereby. This renders it indubitable that Jesus himself regarded worship as due to God alone. Yet he constantly permitted *himself* to be worshipped! If this was not his native right, can /107 this conduct be reconciled to the character of one whose precepts are a guide to happiness?

§71

Mt 4:10

Were we indeed to quote every instance in the Gospels, in which Jesus claimed the honors of Deity, we should exceed all reasonable bounds; we will only refer the reader to such as occurred after his resurrection, and which have for their object *the perpetuating of His claim to Deity through every age of the world*. Among these we may mention his solemn declaration, "all power in heaven and in earth is delivered unto me." Consider for a moment the import of this declaration. Of what value would this power be to one who could not be *every where present*, to ascertain in what instances it ought to be exerted? who was not *omniscient* to discern in what degree it must be exercised to preserve the good and punish the evil? and *all-wise* to discern amidst the inextricable mazes of human action, who are innocent or guilty, and in what degree? Of what value could it have been to Mahomet, had this power been committed to him? Could he or any other mortal have managed the affairs of the world for a single day? Had he an arm like God? Could he thunder with a voice like his? Could he cast abroad his anger, beholding and abasing every one that is

§72

Mt 28:16-20

<sup>1</sup> This is from Mk 4:39.

proud, and treading down the wicked in their place? Yet this power the government of the world requires, no less than boundless knowledge, and infinite wisdom. Had Jesus not known himself possessed of these, could he have engaged men to trust in him by such a declaration? consistently with seeking their happiness and peace?

§73 But the next instance is, if possible, still more strong; it is no less than his associating *his own name with that of God the Father*, in a sacred rite intended to remain in force to the end of the world: we mean that of Bap-/108tism. Could the author of precepts which form the only guide to happiness, have said, “Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, baptizing them in the name of the Father, *and of the Son*, and of the Holy Ghost,” if he had not been equal in nature with the Father? Had Jesus been merely man, could any thing have been imagined more subversive of truth and righteousness, than for men to the end of time to associate him with God the Father in that solemn act by which they profess to renounce the worship of every false god? Does he not hereby annihilate all worship to God the Father, unless as equally shared by himself? Yet if he did not give this command, we cannot depend on one of these precepts now published as the guide to happiness and peace? How could this escape the penetration of the ingenious Compiler of this Compendium?—It is needless to add that this testimony of Jesus, is equally decisive respecting the Deity of the Holy Spirit?

Mt 28:16–20

§74 As though these were not sufficient, however, Jesus reiterates his claim to Deity by adding “And lo *I am with you always even to the end of the world.*” Granting that this was not intended to imply guidance, protection, and success, still how could any one be present in every country, in every age, without being *omnipresent*? Did Moses, or Abraham, or any one of God’s messengers, ever make such a declaration? Did Mahomet himself, arrogant as he was? If this declaration were not intended to secure protection, guidance, and success, however, it is difficult to say what it could import. But if these were included in such a work as spreading the gospel among the heathen, to the hopelessness of which the “Friend of Truth” in his “Defence of the precepts of Jesus,” bears such ample testimony, nothing short of /109 the possession of Infinite Power, and Infinite Wisdom could have warranted any teacher honestly to make such a declaration to his followers. And if in this triple declaration respecting his Deity, Jesus cannot be relied on, how can we rely on his precepts as the guide to happiness and peace?

[The Atonement through Jesus, the Messiah]

§75 II. The series of “dogmas” or doctrines which relate to *Jesus’s expiating sin by his death*, his giving life to those who believe on him, his interceding with God for sinners, and his forming the *only medium* through which men can approach God, are also fully witnessed by himself,—and than himself none could be better acquainted



with his design in becoming incarnate. The Deity of Jesus Christ being once established, indeed, his *atoning for sin by his death*, unavoidably follows. That He came as the Saviour of men is in words granted by all. But is he called the Saviour of men, because he gave them moral precepts by obeying which they might obtain the Divine favor with the enjoyment of heaven as their just desert? or because *he died in their stead*, to atone for their sins, and procure for them every blessing, yea even his Spirit to enable them to trust in his death and merits for salvation, and from a principle of love cordially obey his precepts to the end of life? If he be termed a Saviour merely because he instructed men, he has this honor in common with Moses, and Elijah, and John the Baptist; neither of whom however assumed the title of Saviour. Indeed if he be esteemed merely a Teacher, the greater degree of honor must be given to Moses, for it was in reality *his law* that he explained and established. As he taught nothing which is not virtually included in these two great commandments, “thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and thy neighbour as thyself,” on which he himself declared the <sup>1</sup>110 law and the prophets to hinge, it is evident that as to moral precepts he really added nothing to the original law given by Moses, although he explained and illustrated it in the most luminous manner. Moses himself however, “esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt.” For Him indeed to have come down on earth merely to illustrate a law given by his own servant, when he could have raised up thousands to do this work, seems in itself so unworthy of God, that even reason revolts against the idea. A heathen poet could lay it down as an axiom, that a deity should never intervene but on occasions worthy of his dignity. But if we view Jesus Christ as atoning for the sins of men, we have every thing perfectly in character: he became incarnate to accomplish that which could have been effected by neither men nor angels.

Mt 22:37-40

Heb 11:26

That he *professed* to come for this purpose and not as a mere teacher, will appear from circumstances, the very minuteness of which, serves to enhance their value as testimonies. On his entrance on his public work one of this kind occurred: John the Baptist was a man so revered as a just man even by the Jews who crucified Jesus, that they accounted the defeat sustained by Herod’s army sent against Aretas King of Arabia soon after John’s death, a judgment from heaven on him for this murder.<sup>1</sup> John after he had baptized Jesus, seeing him one day coming to him, said “Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world.” The next day he repeated this testimony as he saw Jesus walking. This testimony, if it was not founded in truth, betrayed in John consummate folly as well as falsehood. His two disciples who heard him thus speak, immediately left him to follow Jesus. Now of the circumstances which occasioned their following him, Je-<sup>1</sup>111sus must have been aware. He was also

§76

Jn 1:29-37

<sup>1</sup> Josephus, *Antiquitates* XVIII 5,2.

thoroughly acquainted with the Mosaic economy and the writings of the prophets, and knew well that a lamb, particularly the Paschal lamb, was constantly offered in sacrifice as an expiation to prefigure the Messiah who should come “to be cut off, not for himself;—but to make an end of sin,—to make reconciliation for iniquity,—and to bring in everlasting righteousness.” If *he* was not sent to take away the sin of the world, therefore, he ought not to have encouraged their following him from this expectation; an upright and humble man would not.

Dn 9:24–26

§77

Much less would he have permitted Simon Peter to bring Andrew his brother to him under the express idea of his being the Messiah. Yet he did encourage this; and after this speech of Peter’s, upon which he ought to have frowned had it been a falsehood, he confers on him a new name, that of Cephas, a stone or a rock. But can we compare the conduct of Jesus in this instance, a young teacher who had as yet scarcely made a single disciple of his own, with that of John, revered by all Judah and Jerusalem as a prophet sent from God, without being struck with the contrast? When the question was put to John, whether or not he was the expected Messiah, he promptly replied, “I am not.” But Jesus on the contrary though scarcely known, receives this honor as his own without the least hesitation, and tacitly acknowledges himself the Son of God about to die for the expiation of sin, as was prefigured by the expiatory lamb appointed by Moses: and if his assuming this character *was* a deception, he labors to keep it up in the minds of his new followers, by referring to circumstances which constrain one of them to exclaim, “Thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel.” But had he *not been* the expected Messiah, of whom he /112 knew that the Prophets had united in predicting that he should die to expiate the sins of men, what excuse can be made for his thus acting? Must not the vanity and arrogance displayed in this case, contrasted with the humility of John their former master, have struck these disciples themselves? When the ingenious compiler of this Selection carefully weighs these facts, he must we think be convinced, that if Jesus was not the Messiah about to *expiate the sins of men*, he was not one whose precepts ought to be esteemed a guide to happiness and peace.

Mt 16:13–23

Jn 1:49

§78

In addition to his suffering himself to receive declarations, which belonged only to the expected Messiah, with the predictions respecting whom by Isaiah and Daniel, he was well acquainted, we find him soon after declaring himself the Messiah in the plainest terms, and in circumstances wherein to have taken advantage of the simplicity of his hearers, would have been an eternal dishonor to any teacher. We allude to his conversation with the woman of Samaria, to whom after explaining the nature of God’s worship, and insisting that he must be worshipped “in spirit and in *truth*,” he at once declares himself to be “the Messiah called Christ, who when he came should teach men all things.” After such a conversation with this woman, how tremendously awful was this declaration, if it was not the truth! The testimony of

Jn 4

the Samaritans also, after he had remained conversing with them two days, renders it impossible for us to doubt under what character he represented himself to them: “Now we believe, not because of thy saying, for we have heard him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world.”

We have also an instance wherein he himself enquired of his disciples, evidently for their sakes, whom they thought him to be, and on Peter’s replying, “Thou art the Christ, (the Messiah) the Son of the living God,” he confirms the declaration by declaring that the knowledge of this fact was derived from his heavenly Father, whom he hereby makes a witness to its truth. From that time too he began to shew them that, as predicted of Messiah, he was about to suffer even unto death,—and to rise again the third day.

§79

Mt 16:13–23

As Jesus drew nearer to the end of his mission, it was to be expected that he would speak more clearly on this momentous subject. This we find him doing on various occasions. Conversing with those who followed him because he had fed them by a miracle, he, following up the figure in his accustomed manner, exhorts them to labour, not for the meat that perisheth, but for that which endureth to everlasting life which the Son of man was ready to give them: and at length adds: “I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever.” But what can this be which secures eternal life to those who trust in him? He drops the figure, and tells them plainly, that it is “his giving his flesh for the life of the world.” What can this mean but his being about to offer himself an expiatory sacrifice for the world? On a subsequent occasion, after claiming precisely such a knowledge of God the Father, as the Father possesses of him, he expressly declares “And I lay down my life for my sheep,” adding, “Therefore doth my Father love me.” Stronger expressions than these he could scarcely select in order to shew that he was about to die for the sins of men? With this declaration however accords that mentioned by Luke, “The Son of man is come to give his life a ransom for many,” with a multitude of others, which we are constrained to pass over lest we should tire our readers.

§80

Jn 6:22–58

Jn 10:14–18

Mk 10:45

When on the very eve of suffering, Jesus takes occasion to remind his disciples that his sufferings *were already predicted*. Betrayed by the avarice and perfidy of Judas, he says “Truly the Son of man goeth *as it is written of him;*” and when in the hands of his enraged enemies, he forbears to deliver himself for this reason alone. “Thinkest thou,” says he to Peter, “that I cannot pray to my father and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels? But how then *shall the Scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be?*” Nor is he silent respecting their *object and design*. When apprehended, he reminds his disciples that this scripture must be fulfilled, “and he was numbered with the transgressors.”<sup>1</sup> But why numbered with

§81

Lk 22:22

Mt 26:52–56

Is 52:13–53:12

transgressors? Had he ever transgressed his heavenly Father's will? So far from it that he declares, "I do always the things that please him." To justify the guilty and condemn the innocent however, are both an abomination to God. Yet we have the testimony of Him who came into the world that he might bear witness to the truth, that in his case the innocent "was made answerable." The fact therefore we cannot doubt, and the inference is inevitable, that according to this prophecy, which Jesus by thus applying testifies to belong to himself, "the Lord laid on him the iniquities of us all."

§82 Let us however examine his idea of his sufferings when he was about to ascend to heaven. Surely he now had a clear view both of his sufferings and their glorious design. Thus then does he unfold it to his astonished disciples, "Thus it is written, and thus it *behoved Christ to suffer*, and to rise again the third day." But wherefore, when perfectly sinless in the sight of /115 his heavenly Father and of every righteous being? The answer is, "that repentance and remission of sins should be preached among *all nations*, beginning at Jerusalem," whose inhabitants had imbued their hands in his blood. This confirms all that has been hitherto advanced. It was now evident to all that he *was* the Messiah,—that it *behoved* him to suffer,—that these sufferings were finished,—and that nothing remained but for remission of sins through him to be proclaimed throughout the earth to all who repent of sin and trust in him. And that tremendous declaration, "If ye believe not that I am *he*, ye shall die in your sins," extends to every individual now, as really as to the Jews to whom it was spoken.

Lk 24:36-49

Jn 8:24

§83 To the same series of doctrines we must refer *his desiring his disciples to ask blessings in his name*. A little reflection will convince any one that this belongs to no Teacher. Never did John the Baptist—never did any of the prophets direct men to ask blessings of God in their names, not even Moses. There was never any real prophet indeed, who would not have trembled at the thought of directing any one to approach in his name "a God glorious in holiness, fearful in praises." The work of a Teacher, however great or worthy, is simply to deliver precepts which direct men to God independently of himself. If he to this add the promise of interfering with God in their behalf, he assumes a totally new character, constitutes himself a Mediator between the Deity and his followers, and on the very face of things needs that *omnipresence* which may enable him to receive the prayers of his followers that he may present them to God, and that *omniscience* through which he may discriminate between the sincere and the feigned, otherwise he may have the prayers he

Ex 15:11

---

<sup>1</sup> In Gethsemane Jesus reminded his disciples that the "the scriptures [must] be fulfilled" (Mt 26:54), not mentioning which word of the scriptures he was talking about. Marshman is probably referring to Lk 22:37 where Jesus quotes Is 53:12 at the Last Supper.

pre-/116sumes to recommend to the Deity thrown back upon him with shame, as the prayer of hypocrisy. But if he possess not *infinite merit* also, on what principle can he in his own name request of the Deity, forgiveness and blessings for others?

That Jesus however thus encourages his disciples to petition in his name, is indisputable. He commands them to “ask and receive, that their joy may be full;” and declares that whatsoever they shall ask in his name, the Father will give them. But such a promise as this must have been soon put to the test; and if it were not fulfilled, what must follow but disappointment and shame, of which an upright and ingenuous mind would have been fully aware? Yea on what principle could the Father, infinitely righteous, give blessings to his sinful creatures for the sake of another, implying the forgiveness of sins, but on account of his merit and worthiness in dying for them? But that he does this, is so strongly enforced by Jesus, that he declares, “no one cometh to the Father but by me;” in other words that there is no acceptable prayer made to God throughout the whole earth, which is not offered in dependence on his merit for its acceptance. Can this declaration be made by him who in the same breath declares to be the *truth*, without demonstrating either that he had fully opened the way of access to God,—or that he was leading men to delusion and ruin, instead of happiness and peace. If we conclude these examples with the testimony of the aged John, who, fifty or sixty years before, had leaned on the breast of his beloved master and imbibed his spirit, we admit only the testimony of one of the Evangelists, “My little children, these things I write unto you that ye sin not. And if any man sin we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ /117 the righteous, And he is *the propitiation for our sins*: and not for ours only, but also *for the sins of the whole world*.” Thus then we find the doctrine of Jesus’s atonement for the sins of men, and of his forming the only way of access to God, so fully interwoven into the instruction he gave to men, that if it be taken away, nothing remains to which we can attach either truth or consistency.

§84

Jn 16:23–26

Jn 14:6

1 Jn 2:1–2

[Human depravity and necessity of Divine influence]

III. If we also advert to the series of dogmas or doctrines which relate to *human depravity* and the necessity of *Divine influence* to change the heart and fit it for heaven, we shall find Jesus bearing ample testimony even to these. As he possessed infinite penetration, (if it be lawful thus to describe his knowledge of man,) and needed to learn nothing either from the testimony of others or his own observation, what he says on this subject has peculiar force. It is neither the happy guess of a sagacious teacher, nor the result of a long train of reasoning inferring the feelings of one mind from what had been observed of another: it is the declaring of One, “to whom all

§85

Heb 4:12–13

<sup>1</sup> Heb 4:13 speaks of the Word of God (λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ), probably having in mind a christological context (Heb 1:1-4).

Mt 7:15–19;  
12:33; 15:16–20

things are naked and opened.”<sup>1</sup> Jesus, however, relative to man, lays it down as an axiom that the fruit and the tree are of the same nature; that “a good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, nor an evil tree, good fruit.” Either make the tree good and its fruit good,” says he; “or the tree corrupt and its fruit; for the tree is known by its fruit.”<sup>2</sup>—The idea of that heart being good therefore, from which evil deeds, and words and thoughts, are constantly springing, he at once discards. Would we however learn his opinion of the human mind, we have it fully given in the following passage, “For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies.” Could he who invariably deemed the /118 fruit and the tree one in nature, suppose all these to spring from an uncorrupt and sinless mind? Yet it is of *men in general* that he speaks, of the human heart as found in every age and in every nation; and if he made an erroneous estimate of human nature, how can we rely on *his* precepts as the guide to happiness and peace. The wisdom and benevolence which shine through them, however, forbid our supposing for a moment, that he could be ignorant of human nature, or disposed to speak of it in terms of aggravation.

§86  
Jn 3:1–21

With this fully accords his solemn declaration to Nicodemus: “Except a man be born again, he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven.” To this declaration the circumstances of Nicodemus impart a peculiar force. While he was evidently a man of education, we have no reason to suppose him a man of immoral character. Among those who paid so much attention to decency of conduct as did the Jews, and especially the Pharisees, of which sect he was, this would have been scarcely compatible with his being a ruler, “a Master in Israel.” Nor does any thing appear in him of that malignity of disposition manifested by some of that sect: on the contrary his coming to Jesus for instruction though by night, circumstanced as he was, argued a mind highly candid and ingenuous. Yet to this man does Jesus enforce this doctrine in a manner that filled him with amazement, which wisdom would certainly have forbidden, had it not been indispensable. Could an exception have been made in favor of any, learned and ingenuous as was Nicodemus, he was the man in whose favor it should have been made. But Jesus admits of none; he illustrates the subject in such a manner as to exclude all exception. “That which is born of the flesh is flesh,” is a sentence which necessarily in-/119cludes all mankind; and to leave no doubt on the mind of Nicodemus, Jesus solemnly assures him that his inculcating this doctrine was the result of the most thorough knowledge, “Verily I say unto thee, we speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen.”

§87

Jesus further confirms this doctrine by declaring that no man can come to him for salvation *unless drawn by God himself*. When surrounded by those who murmured

<sup>2</sup> Marshman brings a mixed quotation from Mt 7 and 12. All these passages can be found in the *Precepts*.

at his teaching, he is thus decided in his language, “No man *can* come to me except the Father who hath sent me draw him.” Surely to assist a man in doing what he can accomplish himself, is unworthy of the Divine character. Such a declaration therefore, if not the truth, would involve an insult on human nature, and imply a desire to share in the glory of human virtue totally unworthy of God. Yet Jesus enforces this doctrine as being of ancient date; “It is written in the prophets,” says he, “Every man therefore who hath heard and learned of the Father, cometh unto me.” Such then were indisputably the ideas of Jesus: ideas which he concealed not; but brought forward in the most prominent manner, at the risk of displeasing those who professed the strongest desire to become his disciples. Jn 6:41–46

But we must not overlook the source to which Jesus ascribes this inability. He never treats it as a natural inability, involuntary and excusable. He attaches to it the highest turpitude, he does not hesitate to impute it to the worst of motives. In his estimation it is a preference of darkness—such a hatred of the light as occasions its being avoided from the most unworthy principle, a fear lest evil deeds should be reproved. He in a word, considers it as furnishing just ground of condemnation in the sight of God himself. It is evident /120 therefore, that Jesus regarded this inability as wilful, criminal, and totally inexcusable, as the inability of an unprincipled man to act honestly, because he loves the gain of unrighteousness,—of one who cannot cease from impurity, because he so thoroughly delights therein. Conformably to this, he charges men’s not coming to him, decidedly on their want of *will*. He tells the Jews, “you *will not* come to me that you may have life;” and follows up the charge by pointing out the cause, “How can you believe *who receive honor one of another* and seek not the honor that cometh from God only?”<sup>1</sup> §88  
Jn 5:36–44

The same idea pervades his charge against Jerusalem, while lamenting over it, “O Jerusalem! Jerusalem!—how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen gathered her chickens under her wings, and *ye would not!*” But was this criminality of the will trivial? Trivial as it might seem, it led to their *killing the prophets of God*, and their stoning those sent unto them;—and by the sentence of Him who cannot err, to their city’s being visited with desolation which overwhelms it even to this day. We indeed every day decide in the same manner: it is not the absence of ability, but the evident absence of the *will* to assist us, which adds pungency to a breach of friendship. It is the *will*, the *intention*, which constitutes the essence of the crime in robbery, in murder, and even in treason itself. §89  
Mt 23:37–39

If Jesus however, describes the depravity of the human mind as total, wilful, and §90

---

<sup>1</sup> The distinction between natural and moral inability is an essential part in the theology of Andrew Fuller (1754–91), co-founder of the *Baptist Mission Society*, in his book *The Gospel Worthy of All Acceptation* (1785).

Lk 11:9-13 inexcusable, he no less clearly describes God's merciful readiness to impart to every one who desires it, his Holy Spirit which fully ensures salvation. His language is "Ask and you shall receive; seek and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened to you;" and he solemnly assures us, that God /121 will no more refuse his Holy Spirit to those who seek him, than a tender father would refuse bread to a supplicating child, or give him a serpent instead of a fish.<sup>1</sup>—That Jesus deems the teaching of the Holy Spirit fully sufficient to secure salvation, and the utmost purity and holiness of life, may be inferred from his saying, "Every one that hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me." But he further declares, "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: and I give to them eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand." To adduce further examples would be easy; but it would only tire the reader. These may suffice to shew that had the ingenious Compiler of this Selection examined the subject with sufficient diligence, he might have found the most obnoxious of all the dogmas of Christianity, even those which relate to the Divine Sovereignty and the final perseverance of those who trust in Christ, contained, not merely in the Four Evangelists, but in *the teaching of Jesus himself*; and these doctrines not delivered in a number of insulated propositions separated from his general discourses, but inculcated in the plainest language and on the most familiar occasions, and so interwoven with the whole of his conversation and teaching, that if nullified, they leave behind neither *truth* sufficient to form a teacher, nor that *consistency* requisite for the success of imposture.

Jn 10:27-28 §91 When these doctrines then so thoroughly pervade the teaching of Jesus, why were they omitted and his "moral precepts" *alone* given as the way to happiness and peace? How could these doctrines be deemed unimportant of which Jesus himself testifies that "they are spirit and they are life?"<sup>2</sup> To lay before men mere moral precepts as the way to happiness and peace,—/122and at the same time to remove from their view those doctrines which are the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, what is it but to consign them over to eternal death? That the most excellent precepts, the most perfect law, can never lead to happiness and peace, unless by causing men to take refuge in the doctrine of the cross, it requires little reflection to discover. A law, to deserve the name, requires *perfect* obedience on pain of its penalty being inflicted. How mistaken the idea that a law observed *occasionally*, or *partially*, can ever speak peace! What is *partial* obedience to the statutes forbidding robbery, murder, or treason? Can obedience for numerous years to these be regarded, if a man violate them but once! Is his murdering *daily*, necessary to con-

<sup>1</sup> Marshman uses the same verses as Rammohan, §28, explaining the source of power "to overcome our passions, and keep the commandments of God".

<sup>2</sup> Jn 6:63: "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life."



stitute him a transgressor? Must a man have plotted treason against his sovereign every day of his life, to render him a traitor? Should he have obeyed the law fully for thirty, forty, or fifty years, will not the first breach of it render him guilty? If he obtain mercy and escape punishment, it must be because the law in his case is set aside: the law knows nothing of mercy. But what man has ever perfectly obeyed for a year, or a month, or a single day, the law commanding supreme love to God and disinterested love to his neighbour? To set the most excellent precepts, as the way to happiness and peace, before men who have *already violated* them, what is it better than mocking malefactors condemned to death, by telling them, that they need fear nothing if they have never violated the law? Separated from his doctrines, the precepts of Jesus can no more give peace than the law as given by Moses. To those who have already violated the Divine precepts even in thought, (and this includes every man on earth) must not every glimpse of happiness and peace arise /123 from the *doctrines* Jesus taught together with his precepts? Yet the Compiler of this Selection unhappily omits them, because they have been a source of dispute to unbelievers and anti-christians.

[Questions of doctrines and miracles]

It is however scarcely just to charge on the “dogmas,” or doctrines of Christianity those wars and that bloodshed which have occurred between nations merely termed Christian. War and bloodshed existed before the promulgation of Christianity in the world. Neither Christianity therefore, nor its “dogmas,” created the *causes* of war and bloodshed. They existed in the human mind long before its doctrines were published; and it requires but a very slight acquaintance with history to convince any one that the quarrels and feuds between the Arians and the Orthodox in the fourth and fifth centuries, were little more than that struggle *for power and wealth* which the cupidity and ambition of the human mind have exhibited in every age of the world, and that the “dogmas” which were made the pretext, merely furnished the *occasion*. Between the Papists and Protestants there was never any dispute respecting the Deity of Christ or of the Holy Spirit; and the oceans of blood which were spilt by the former, had far less to do with the truth of any doctrine, than with the preservation of that secular power and wealth possessed by one party, and denounced by the other as contrary both to scripture and reason. The same may be justly said respecting the fiercest disputes between Protestants themselves. Among them indeed there has been little bloodshed on account of “dogmas” or doctrines of any kind; in general the disputes among them have ostensibly related to church government and rites and ceremonies; but the real object has been, the preservation of that power and wealth connected with ceremo- /124 nies or forms of church government already established. All the war and bloodshed therefore, and the greater part of the dis-

§92

putes for which the “dogmas” of christianity have been made answerable, ought to be placed to the credit of that ambition and cupidity, which Christianity *found* in the human heart, but never *created* there. Let the “dogmas” of Christianity be separated wholly from wealth and power either as the reward of supporting or of opposing them, and in future we shall witness little of bloodshed respecting them,—and possibly little of fierce dispute. Even then however, if the doctrines of Christianity are of God, they will certainly be opposed by all who think that their opinion of themselves and of human nature is far nearer the truth, than that which God has expressed by these doctrines; and to expect that men should not cavil against them, is to expect that the carnal mind, while enmity against God, should manifest the most cordial submission to the doctrines taught in his Sacred Word.

§93 Is it, however any dishonor to these doctrines that they have been the subject of dispute? Is it any wonder that men, in God’s estimation transgressors, but in their own, righteous, should dispute against the truths which convict them? What prisoner ever yet welcomed the witnesses which proved him guilty? or hailed with joy that statute which condemned him to death? But is a doctrine to be suppressed because it has been made the subject of dispute? It can scarcely be unknown to the Compiler of this Selection, that *the very being of a God*, has been for numerous ages the subject of dispute among the most learned of his own country. But does he account this a sufficient reason for suppressing this doctrine? He knows that he does not. Why then /125 should he omit the *doctrines* of Christ and his Apostles, because men have made them the subject of dispute? That Jesus himself esteemed this no *dishonor* to them, is evident from his expressly forewarning his disciples that this would be the case. He even declares with reference to them that he came “not to send peace on the earth,—but a sword”—that he came, “to send fire on the earth,” and almost longed to see it kindled. Yet did he view this as dishonorable to the doctrines from which he expected these effects to spring? Why then did he not withdraw them? They were as yet scarcely published by himself, and not at all by his Apostles. But if He, whose precepts are the guide to happiness and peace, did not refuse to teach them; surely we need not. If he, who so loved men as to lay down his life to render them blessed, thought it important to their happiness that these doctrines should be published throughout the world, we need not profess a greater regard for the peace of mankind, than he really felt.

Mt 10:34–39;

Lk 12:49

§94 While the testimony of Jesus himself to his Doctrines is so decisive, we cannot but wonder that his Miracles should not have found greater favor in the eyes of the Compiler of this Selection, when the amazing weight *which Jesus himself attaches to them*, could scarcely have escaped his notice. What *His* testimony is concerning them, the following passages sufficiently shew. We find him in one instance preferring them in point of weight to the testimony even of John. This however arose

from no want of esteem for John: in that very passage he describes him as “bearing witness to the truth,” and terms him “a burning and shining light;” yet says he “I have *greater witness* than that of John: the works that the Father hath given me to do, they bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me.” What /126 testimony could be more weighty than that of the best man on earth? It was the witness of God,—to substantiate which *to us*, nothing is necessary beyond a credible testimony that these works were really done. Jn 5:32–38

When John, probably with the view of fixing their faith immovably on Jesus as the Messiah, sent two of his disciples to him to ask him, “Art thou he that should come? or do we look for another?” Jesus merely calls their attention to his miraculous works, “Go and shew John again,” says he, “those things which ye do hear and see; the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached unto them.” Beyond these works he deemed nothing necessary to carry the fullest conviction to the mind.—On another occasion Jesus describes these miraculous works as in some sense possessing a weightier degree of evidence than even his own teaching. When the Jews had charged him with blasphemy because “he being a man made himself God,” his reply was, “If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not; but if I do, *though ye believe not me, believe the works*, that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in him.”<sup>1</sup> Here it is evident, that, excellent as he knew his precepts to be, he esteemed his miracles to carry a superior weight with them even among his bitterest enemies. §95 Mt 11:2–6 Jn 10:33–38

In his last conversation with his disciples, he confirms this idea even to them. Philip had said, “Lord, shew us the Father and it sufficeth us;” to which Jesus replies, “Believe me that I am in the Father and the Father in me, or else *believe me for the very works’ sake*.” In this instance it is evident that Jesus deemed his miraculous works suited to carry with them such weight, as not only to evidence themselves by their own intrin-/127sic force, but to prove that He was equal with the Father.—But his declaration that his miracles increased to the highest the guilt of his enemies in rejecting him as the Son of God, adds a weight to these works which nothing can augment, particularly when we consider, that he himself is the righteous Judge of quick and dead. After he had said to his disciples, “If I had not come and *spoken* unto them, they had not had sin, but now they have no cloak for their sin,” he adds, “If I had not done among them *the works* which none other man did, they had not had sin,” thus declaring *his works* to carry a weight with them which rendered his rejection as the Messiah, the Redeemer of men, perfectly inexcusable. §96 Jn 14:8–11 Jn 15:21–24

<sup>1</sup> Rammohan used this verse to show the miraculous works of Jesus as merely supporting witness to the doctrines, §29.

§97 But perhaps the Compiler imagined them apt to carry little weight with them among the Hindoos because *not done in their sight*, as they were in that of the Jews.<sup>1</sup> Candor indeed requires this to be supposed; for if it be not, how can we account for the awful difference of opinion between him and their great Author respecting them? A little reflection however will evince the futility of this idea. If the weight of miracles consists in their being *seen*, rather than *testified* by credible witnesses, reflect for a moment within what narrow limits their weight must be confined. The miracles of Jesus could carry no weight with them in the very next age. Of course none of these had *seen* his miracles, why should they allow them any weight?—Even in the same age, they could carry little weight with them in any other country. They could of course carry no weight with them at Rome,—in Greece—or indeed any where, except in Judea, for who in these countries had *seen* them done?—Further, as each work could only be done in *one place*, their weight would be confined to a very small number even /128 among the Jews themselves! How few even of them had actually *seen* a miracle performed by Jesus. We know that Herod had not,—and probably many others of his enemies, who were still inexcusable in rejecting him.

§98 *If credible testimony* however were not esteemed equivalent to *actual sight*, both as ground of belief and of action, the whole of the business of life would soon cease. We must give up at once all our knowledge of History: that Cyrus or Alexander, Scipio or Pompey, Mahomet, or Aurungzeb, and a thousand others, ever existed, we know not, for we never *saw* them; we have only the testimony of others to the fact, and this perhaps not very credible.—We must also relinquish our knowledge of other nations. How many of us in India have ever *seen* London, or Paris, or Madrid, or Constantinople, or Pekin! We merely believe these cities exist, on the testimony of others.—The public business even of the country in which we dwell, must also be suspended: how little can any one in authority *actually see* of what may now be passing in India or even in Bengal? And all mercantile transactions must cease at once, for who in Calcutta *has seen* the present state of the market in Europe, in China, and elsewhere? As they have no other proof than the testimony of others, and possibly this uncertain, how can men be expected to risk their fortunes when they *have seen* nothing with their own eyes?—The Courts of Justice too must be at once closed, for what Judge has ever *seen* the robberies and murders committed which are brought before him? or even what Jury? These when they sentence a man to death, have nothing to rely on but the testimony of other whose honesty my not always be above suspicion. Yet on this evidence does a judge pronounce a sentence /129 which involves the death of a fellow-creature, and feels that to forbear, though *he has seen*

---

<sup>1</sup> §29: “In this country, the bare report of such miracles could have given no support to the weight of the doctrines”.

*nothing* of the matter himself, would be to betray his trust, and violate his duty to his sovereign and his country. Could he do more had he seen the whole transaction with his own eyes?

It is evident therefore that *credible testimony* has the same force in urging us to duties of the most important nature, as our having witnessed things ourselves. But if the testimony of the Evangelists be not *credible*, how can “the *Precepts of Jesus*” be “the guide to happiness and peace?” And if their testimony respecting the *sayings* of Jesus be so worthy of credit, how came their testimony respecting his *acts*, to be apt at best to carry so little weight with it? As they both rest on precisely the same authority, our ingenious friend must either admit the full weight of the *miraculous deeds* of Jesus, or no longer present his countrymen with his *sayings* or precepts, as the guide to happiness and peace. §99

[Conclusion]

If we combine all these facts, it will be evident that Jesus *must be* regarded as God equal with the Father, expiating the sins of men, and saving them by his mighty power—or the whole of the Gospels, no less than the rest of the Sacred Scriptures, must *be* rejected as a cunningly devised fable, involving a tissue of arrogance and deception unparalleled in the history of mankind. That one who had invited men to learn of him from his “being meek and lowly in heart” that they might “find rest to their souls”—taught them “that he who exalteth himself shall be abased,” and that there is nothing hid which “shall not be known and come abroad”—solemnly affirmed that he sought not his own glory, and yet that he was “the truth” itself, and that heaven and earth should pass away, but not his word, should after this declare himself to be equal with the Father, to have /130 come down from heaven to expiate the sins of men and save them from the love of sin, to govern the world, and to be about to judge all mankind after previously raising them from their graves—and *yet there be no truth in this declaration respecting himself*, would form, (with deep reverence be it spoken,) a combination of arrogance, falsehood, and folly, unequalled in the annals of human imposture. And that all this should be found in One whose precepts are allowed by the most unbiassed to be worthy of being set before mankind as a sure guide to happiness and peace, involves a fact far more wonderful than any miraculous relation given in Scripture. We intreat the Author of this Selection to weigh these things with the utmost care, not only for the sake of his countrymen, but from a regard to his own immortal interests, so deeply affected by that declaration of Jesus “no man cometh to the Father *but by me*,” and that solemn warning, “If ye believe not that I am *He*, ye shall die in your sins.” In examining this subject we have carefully avoided every expression that could give him a moment’s pain; and we beg to assure him, that while our grand object has been to place the truth clearly §100

Mt 11:28–30  
Lk 14:11  
Lk 8:17  
Jn 14:6  
Jn 14:6; 8:24

before him, if there be found a single word of that nature, we are unconscious of any such with, and intreat him to pardon the unintentional offence.

# 6 Rammohan Roy: Second Appeal to the Christian Public

## Editorial Introduction

The *Second Appeal to the Christian Public* appeared in spring or in early summer 1821 at the *Baptist Mission Press* in Calcutta, and it was the last writing by Rammohan published by the Calcutta Baptists. It is also the first writing about Christianity with his own name on the titlepage. Around this time, the interfaith Bible translation project broke apart because of dogmatic disagreements of the participants.<sup>1</sup> William Yates split off and stayed within the Baptist mission as a convinced Trinitarian, but William Adam and Rammohan found the Arian understanding of the New Testament to be a more plausible Christological system. The *Second Appeal* is a clear witness of this Arian hypothesis. It is not sure, which Arian literature Rammohan had access to, but his Christological system bears resemblance to the writings of William Whiston (1667-1752) and Samuel Clarke (1675-1729), two well-known proponents of British Arian and subordinatorial Christology. For Rammohan, Christ is not God in an Trinitarian Godhead, but God's created first-born of creation, "superior even to the angels in heaven, living from the beginning of the world to eternity, and [...] the Father created all things by him and for him" (§125). The Holy Spirit is one expression for the power of God prevailing among humankind and creation.

The *Second Appeal to the Christian Public* is not only a reply to Marshman or a further defence of the *Precepts*, but it is an extensive writing about the understanding of Christianity, the Bible and the development of the Christological doctrines from Rammohan's perspective. Main characteristics are the proposition of an Arian Christology, the rejection of vicarious atonement and Trinity as irrational, and the attack against the Christological reading of the Old Testament. If the short time of its composition is considered,<sup>2</sup> the *Second Appeal* also shows that Rammohan's opinions about Christianity were already formed and only needed to be fixed in writing.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Collet, *Life and Letters*, 122-123.

<sup>2</sup> Marshman's last reply was in September 1820, so Rammohan could have written only seven or eight months.

Several European sources are quoted or mentioned explicitly by Rammohan, others can be identified by comparison:

- *King-James-Version* of the Bible.
- *Biblia sacra polyglotta* (1656).
- John Brown (1722-1787), *The Self-Interpreting Bible* (1778).
- Alexander Cruden (1699-1770), *Complete Concordance to the Old and New Testament* (1737).
- William Jones of Nayland (1726-1800), *The Catholic Doctrine of a Trinity* (1767).
- John Locke (1632-1704) *Second Vindication of the Reasonableness of Christianity* (1697).
- Thomas Middleton, *The Doctrine of the Greek Article* (1808).
- Johannes Lorenz Mosheim (1693-1755), *Ecclesiastical History* (1726, English 1764).
- William Newcome (1729-1800), *An Attempt Towards an Improved Version, a Metrical Arrangement and an Explanation of the Twelve Minor Prophets* (1785, reissued 1809).
- Isaac Newton (1642-1726) *Observations upon the Prophecies of Holy Writ; particularly the Prophecies of Daniel and the Apocalypse of St. John* (1733).
- Humphrey Prideaux (1648-1724), *The Old and New Testament Connected* (1715-1717).
- Thomas Randolph (1701-1783), *The Prophecies, and Other Texts, Cited in the New Testament* (1782).
- Ambrose Serle (1742-1812), *Horæ Solitariae, or, Essays upon some Remarkable Names and Titles of Christ* (1799?).

In this alphabetical list, the year of first publication is given. Rammohan used or could have used later editions. Sometimes the text in the editions I found differs from Rammohan's quotation, and it is not sure whether Rammohan used a different text or altered the text on his own. Although Rammohan quoted only two writings of Locke and Newton, he had more extensive knowledge of their works. Rammohan also had access to German biblical scholarship and knows some interpretations from Griesbach and Michaelis.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The bibliography shows the editions which were used here. A list of all references made by Rammohan is given in the *Index of quoted authors*.



Rammohan also used Muslim sources, quoting the Quran and several Hadiths (§138, §166), and through the contact to the Baghdadi Jews of Calcutta, he also got knowledge of Jewish interpretations and explanations of the Hebrew Bible, and he also knew about Hellenistic Judaism and the Sephirot (§264).

Especially the appendices about the Christological interpretation of the Old Testament created a large base for further confrontation with Marshman. So far, the discussion was only about the interpretation of Jesus' words in the New Testament. Christological interpretations of the Old Testament become now a further proof for the irrationality of Trinitarian belief. For this, Rammohan worked through William Jones' book nearly page by page, as the annotations in this edition show. Many Old Testament passages are explained and interpreted by Rammohan, and his interpretations are sometimes from Jewish or other background, and sometimes very individual and creative. Especially interesting in this regards are his explanations of the Emmanuel (Is 9), the "pierced one" (Zc 12) or Isaiah's vision (Isa 6). In these he goes deeply into the original Hebrew sources, which gave him a reputation of being a qualified interpreter of the Bible among many readers.

The text basis for this edition is the London Reprint 1823, pp. 131-318, published by the Unitarian Society. The table of contents has been omitted.

/[131]

SECOND APPEAL  
TO  
THE CHRISTIAN PUBLIC,  
IN DEFENCE OF THE  
“*PRECEPTS OF JESUS.*”

BY  
RAMMOHUN ROY.

CALCUTTA:  
PRINTED AT THE BAPTIST MISSION PRESS, CIRCULAR ROAD.  
1821.

LONDON, REPRINTED:  
1823.

/[133]

ADVERTISEMENT.

- §101 THE contents of the following Treatise are included under these two propositions:—1st, That the Precepts of Jesus, which teach that love to God is manifested in beneficence towards our fellow-creatures, are a sufficient Guide to Peace and Happiness; and 2ndly, That that omnipresent God, who is the only proper object of religious veneration, is one and undivided in person.
- §102 Though these doctrines, as I conceive them to be alike founded on reason and revelation, appear to me to be almost as obvious truths as any abstract axiom, yet they are opposed in fact by a very large body of writers and teachers. I must therefore leave them to be decided upon by those, who will be pleased to bestow their candid and liberal attention on the arguments I have used in the succeeding pages;—and on their impartial judgment I confidently rely.

A SECOND APPEAL.

CHAPTER I. GENERAL DEFENCE OF THE PRECEPTS IN QUESTION.

THE observations contained in No. I. of the Quarterly Series of “The Friend of India,” on the Introduction to “The Precepts of Jesus,” as well as on their defence, termed “An Appeal to the Christian Public,” are happily expressed in so mild and Christian-like a style, that they have not only afforded me ample consolation for the disappointment and vexation I felt from the personality conveyed in the preceding Magazines, (Nos. 20 and 23,) but have also encouraged me to pursue my researches after the fundamental principles of Christianity in a manner agreeable to my feelings, and with such respect as I should always wish to manifest for the situation and character of so worthy a person as the Editor of the Friend of India. §103

The Reverend Editor labours in his Review to establish two points—the truth and excellency of the miraculous relations and of the dogmas found in the Scriptural writings—and 2ndly, the insufficiency of /146 the compiled Precepts of Jesus alone to lead to salvation, unless accompanied with the important doctrines of the Godhead of Jesus and his atonement. §104

As the Compiler neither in his Introduction to the Precepts of Jesus, nor in his defence of those Precepts, has expressed the least doubt as to the truth of any part of the Gospels, the arguments adduced by the learned Editor to demonstrate the truth and excellence of the authority on which they rest, are, I am inclined to think, quite superfluous, and foreign to the matter in question. §105

The only reasons assigned by the Compiler, ([in the] Introduction,) for separating the Precepts from the abstruse doctrines and miraculous relations of the New Testament are, that the former “are liable to the doubts and disputes of Freethinkers and Anti-christians, and the latter are capable at best of carrying little weight with the natives of this part of the globe, the fabricated tales handed down to them being of more wonderful nature.”<sup>1</sup> §106

These sentiments respecting the doctrines and miracles, founded as they are upon undeniable facts, do not, I presume, convey any disavowal or doubt of their truth. Besides, in applying the term “fabricated” to the tales received by the credulous Hindoos, the Compiler clearly evinced the contemptible light in which he viewed those legends; and in stating that the miracles of the Scriptures were subject to the doubts of “Freethinkers and Anti-christians,” it /147 can never fairly be supposed that he meant himself, or any other person labouring in the promulgation of Christianity,<sup>2</sup> to be included in that class. §107

<sup>1</sup> §2. <sup>2</sup> This may defend the *Baptist Mission Press* for publishing the *Precepts* and the *Appeals*.

§108

As to the second point urged by the Reverend Editor, namely, that the compiled Precepts were not sufficient to lead to salvation, I deeply regret that the Editor should appear to have overlooked the authority of the gracious author of this religion in the several passages cited by the Compiler in his Appeal, to prove beyond doubt the sufficiency of the Precepts in question to procure eternal life; as it is almost impossible that so numerous quotations, spreading over a great part of the Appeal, could have escaped his notice. The Reverend Editor, while endeavouring to prove, that the compiled Precepts would fall short of guiding to peace and happiness, only illustrates by sacred authority the truth excellency of the miracles and the doctrines of Christianity. But such illustration can have no tendency to demonstrate the position he endeavours to maintain; I am therefore under the necessity of repeating a few passages already quoted, with some others,<sup>1</sup> shewing that the compiled Precepts are sufficient to conduct the human race to happiness; and I humbly entreat to know, if I be persuaded to believe in the divine origin of those passages, and in the entire veracity of their author, how I am to reconcile their authority with the position maintained by the learned Editor, as to the insufficiency of the Precepts of Jesus to guide to peace and happiness.—/148

Mt 22:37–40 *Matthew*, ch. xxii., beginning with ver. 37: “Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind; this is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the Law and the Prophets.”

Mk 12:29–34 *Mark*, ch. xii. beginning with ver. 29: “And Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment. And the second is like, namely this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these.”

Mt 7:12 *Matthew*, ch. vi. ver. 12: “Therefore all things whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the Law and the Prophets.”

Lk 10:25–28 *Luke*, ch. x. from ver. 25: “And behold, a certain lawyer stood up and tempted him, saying, Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? He said unto him, What is written in the Law? How readest thou? He answering said: Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself. And he said unto him, Thou hast answered right. *This do, and thou shalt live*.”

Mt 7:21–26 *Matthew*, ch. vii. ver. 21: “Not every one that saith unto me, Lord! Lord! shall enter into the /149 kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my

<sup>1</sup> All the following verses except the Passages from John are repetitions from the *Precepts* and the *Appeal*, except the three passages from John. The verses from Jn 15 are part of the *Precepts*, and the verses from Jn 15 have not been quoted before.

Father who is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord! Lord! have we not prophesied in thy name; and in thy name have cast out devils; and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work iniquity. Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, who built his house upon a rock.<sup>1</sup> And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, who built his house upon the sand.” *Luke*, ch. xi. ver. 27: “Blessed is the womb (said a certain woman to Jesus), that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked: but he said, Yea rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it.” *John*, ch. xv. ver. 12: “This is my commandment, that ye love one another, as I have loved you.” Ver. 17: “These things I command you, that ye love one another.” Ch. xiii. ver. 34: “A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another;” 35, “By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another.” Observing those two commandments, (*Matt.* ch. xxii. ver. 37, 38, and 39,) selected by the Saviour as a substitute for all the Law and the Prophets, and sufficient means to produce peace and happiness to mankind, the Compiler never scrupled to follow the example /150 set forth by Jesus himself in compiling such precepts as include those two commandments, and their subsidiary moral doctrines, as a true substitute of the Gospel, without intending to depreciate the rest of the word of God. I regret that the Reverend Editor should have disapproved of this compilation on the ground that “it is of importance that every compilation be given as a sample of the Sacred Writings in all their excellence and importance, and not as a substitute for the whole.”<sup>2</sup>

Lk 11:27f.

Jn 15:12

Jn 15:17

Jn 13:33-35

The authority of St. Paul, the most exalted among primitive Christians, quoted by the Reverend Editor, (page 89,) “If righteousness come by the law, Christ is dead in vain,”<sup>3</sup> is not, I presume, adequate to set aside, nor even applicable to the express authority of the Author of Christianity, already quoted; as the latter includes not only the Mosaic law, to which St. Paul alludes,<sup>4</sup> but both law and religion, and is evident from the following passages: “Therefore all things whatever you would that men should do to you, do you even so to them; for this is the Law and the Prophets.” “On these two commandments (to love God and to love our neighbours), hang all the Law and the Prophets.” Every one must admit, that the gracious Saviour meant by the words “the Law and the Prophets,” all the divine commandments found in the Scriptures, obedience to which is strictly required of us by the founder of that religion. *Luke*, ch. xi. ver. 28: “Blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it.”

§109

Ga 2:21

Mt 7:12

Mt 22:40

Lk 11:27f.

<sup>1</sup> Omitting v. 25.   <sup>2</sup> §61   <sup>3</sup> §59

<sup>4</sup> Maybe Rammohan draws from Locke’s comment on Ga 2:21, Locke, *Works III, A Paraphrase and Notes on his Epistle to the Galatians*, 126: “This and the former Verse seems to be spoken in Opposition of St. Peter’s owning a Subjection to the Law of Moses, by his Walking, mentioned, v. 14.”

Jn 14:15 *John*, /151 ch. xiv. ver. 15: "If you love me, keep my commandments." Had the manifestation of love towards God with all our strength, and towards our neighbours as ourselves, been practically impossible, as maintained by the Editor, (page 112,)<sup>1</sup> or had any other doctrines been necessary to lead to eternal life, Jesus of Nazareth, (in whose veracity, candour, and perfection, we have happily been persuaded to place implicit confidence,) could not, consistently with his office as the Christ of God, have enjoined the lawyer to the obedience of those two commandments, and would not have promised him eternal life as the reward of such obedience; (*vide Luke*, ch. x. ver. 28, "*This do, and thou shalt live;*") for a man possessed of common sense and common humanity would not incite another to labour in vain by attempting what was practically impossible, nor delude him with promises of a reward upon conditions beyond his power to fulfil; much less could a Being, in whom dwelt all truth, and who was sent with a divine law to guide mankind by his preaching and example, inculcate precepts that it was impracticable to follow. Any commandment enjoining man to love God with all his heart and all his strength, requires of us of course to direct our love towards him as the sole Father of the Universe; but does not amount to a prohibition of the pursuits necessary for life, or to an abstinence from love towards any other object; for such love also is enjoined by the subsequent commandment. The following passages, *John*, /152 ch. xiv. ver. 21, "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father; and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him:" Jn 14:21 Ch. xv. ver. 10: "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love:" ver. 14, "Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you, &c.," and many other passages of a similar import, exhibit clearly, that love of and adherence to Jesus can be evinced solely by obedience to the divine commandments. But if the observance of those commandments be treated as practically impossible, the love of Jesus and adherence to him must likewise be so considered, and Christianity altogether regarded as existing only in theory.

§110 I appeal to the Reverend Editor himself, whether we are to set at defiance the express commandments of Jesus, under the supposition that manifestation of the love enjoined by him is practically impossible? Yet this we must do, if we are to adopt the position of the Editor, found in his Review, page 111, "[That the most excellent precepts, the most perfect law, can never lead to happiness and peace, unless by causing men to take refuge in the doctrine of the cross;](#)"<sup>2</sup> meaning, I presume, the doctrine of the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus on the cross, as an atonement for the sins

<sup>1</sup> "But what man has ever perfectly obeyed for a year, or a month, or a single day, the law commanding supreme love to God and disinterested love to his neighbour?," §91.

<sup>2</sup> §91

of mankind.

As the Reverend Editor has most fairly and justly confined himself to arguments, §111  
 founded in the authority of the divine Teacher himself, I should hope /153 to be  
 allowed to beg him to point out, in order to establish his position, even a single  
 passage pronounced by Jesus, enjoining a refuge in such a doctrine of the cross,  
 as all-sufficient or indispensable for salvation; so that his position, thus supported,  
 may be placed in competition with that founded on those passages which I have  
 quoted in the forgoing paragraph, shewing both the indispensableness and the all-  
 sufficiency of the excellent Precepts in question to procure salvation; and may impel  
 us to endeavour to reconcile contradictions, which would in that case be shewn  
 to subsist between the passages, declaring the all-sufficiency of the moral precepts  
 preached by Christ for eternal life, and those that might be found to announce the  
 indispensableness of the doctrine of the cross for everlasting happiness.

It is however evident, that the human race are naturally so weak, and so prone §112  
 to be led astray by temptations of temporary gratifications, that the best and wisest  
 of them fall short of manifesting a strict obedience to the divine commandments,  
 and are constantly neglecting the duty they owe to the Creator and to their fellow-  
 creatures; nevertheless, in reliance on numerous promises found in the sacred writ-  
 ings, we ought to entertain hope of enjoying the blessings of pardon from the mer-  
 ciful Father through repentance, which is declared the only means of procuring for-  
 giveness of our failures. I have already quoted some of these comforting passages in  
 my Appeal, page 110; but as the Reverend Editor seems to have entirely overlooked  
 them, /154 and omitted to notice them in any of his publications, I deem it neces-  
 sary to repeat them here with a few additions. *Ezekiel*, chap. xviii. ver. 30: “Repent  
 and turn yourselves from all your transgressions, so iniquity shall not be your ruin.” *Ezk 18:30*  
*Luke*, ch. xiii. ver. 3: “Except ye repent, you shall all likewise perish.” *Lk 13:3*  
 Ch. xv. ver. 7: “I say unto you, that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that  
 repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons who need no repentance.” *Lk 15:7*  
*Matthew*, ch. ix. ver. 13: “I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repen-  
 tance.” *Mt 9:13*  
 Ch. iii. ver. 2: John the Baptist preached, saying, “Repent for the kingdom of  
 heaven is at hand;” and Jesus, after his resurrection, lastly, directs his disciples, *Luke*,  
*Mt 3:2*  
 ch. xxiv. ver. 47, “That repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his  
 name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem,” wherein he declares the remission  
 of sins as an immediate and necessary consequence of repentance. *Lk 24:47*

The foregoing authorities and remarks will, I trust, suffice with every candid §113  
 reader, as my apology for persisting in the conviction, that the Precepts compiled  
 and published as a guide to peace and happiness, though deficient in respect to spec-  
 ulative doctrines and creeds, as well as narrative, yet contain all that is essential in  
 practical Christianity; since they teach us the performance of our duty to God and

to our fellow-creatures, and the most acceptable atonement on our part to the All-merciful, when we have fallen short of that duty. /155



## CHAPTER II. NATURAL INFERIORITY OF THE SON TO THE FATHER.

IN endeavouring to prove what he represents as “the most abstruse, and yet the most important of doctrines, the Deity of Jesus Christ,”<sup>1</sup> the Reverend Editor advances seven positions: 1st, that Jesus was possessed of ubiquity, an attribute peculiar to God alone. 2ndly, That he declared a knowledge of his nature was equally incomprehensible with that of the nature of God. 3rdly, That he exercised the power of forgiving sins, the peculiar prerogative of God. 4thly, That he claimed almighty power, “in the most unequivocal manner.”<sup>2</sup> 5thly, That his heavenly Father had committed to him the final judgment of all who have lived since the creation. 6thly, That he received worship due to God alone. 7thly, That he associated his own name with that of God the Father in the sacred rite of baptism.—The facts on which the Editor labours to establish these positions, however, seem to me, upon an impartial examination, not only unfavourable to his inference, but even confirmatory of the opposite opinion. For admitting for a moment that the positions of the Editor are well founded, and that the Saviour was in possession of attributes and powers /156 ascribed to God; have we not his own express and often-repeated avowal, that all the powers he manifested were committed to him as the Son, by the Father of the Universe? And does not reason force us to infer, that a Being who owes to another all his power and authority, however extensive and high, should be in reality considered inferior to that other? Surely, therefore, those who believe God to be Supreme, possessing the perfection of all attributes, independently of all other things, must necessarily deny the identity of Christ with God: as the sun, although he is the most powerful and most splendid of all known created things, the greatest immediate source of life and enjoyment in this world, has yet no claim to be considered identical in nature with God, who has given to the sun all the light and animating warmth which he sheds on our globe.<sup>3</sup> To effect a material change without the aid of physical means, is a power peculiar to God; yet we find this power exercised by several of the prophets on whom the gifts of miracles was bestowed. Besides, it is evident, from the first chapter of Genesis, that in the beginning of the creation God bestowed on man his own likeness, and sovereignty over all living creatures. Was not his own likeness and that dominion peculiar to God, before mankind were partakers of them? Did God then deify man by such mark of distinction?

The following passages, I presume, suffice to illustrate the entire dependence of §115

<sup>1</sup> §64    <sup>2</sup> §68

<sup>3</sup> Rammohan, *Abridgment*, 8: “Light, of whatever description, is not inferred to be the Lord of the Universe, from the following assertion of the Veda: ‘The pure Light of all lights is the Lord of all creatures;’ for the Veda again declares, that ‘The sun and all others imitate God, and borrow their light from him;’ and the same declaration is found in the Vedanta.”

the Son on God, and /157 his inferiority and subjection to, and his living by, him.

Jn 10:17f. *St. John*, ch. x. vers. 17 and 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.

Jn 12:49 *This commandment have I received of my Father.*” Chap. xii. ver. 49: “For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father *who sent me, he gave me commandment* what I should say, and what I should speak.” Chap. xiv. ver. 31: “But that the world may know that I love the Father, and *as the Father gave me commandment, even so I do.*”

Jn 14:31 Chap. xvii. vers. 1 and 2, Jesus in his prayer—“Glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee; *as thou hast given him power* over all flesh, that he should give eternal life *to as many as thou hast given him.*” *John*, ch. iii. ver. 35: “The Father loveth the Son, and *hath given all things* into his hand.” Chap. v. ver. 19: “*The Son can do nothing of himself*, but what he seeth the Father do,” &c.: 22, “For the Father judgeth no man, but *hath committed* all judgment unto the Son.” 30: “*I can of mine own self do nothing*: as I hear I judge; and my judgment is just; because *I seek not my own will, but the will of my Father who hath sent me.*” Chap. vi. ver. 37: “All that the Father giveth me shall come to me,” &c. 38: “For I came down from heaven, *not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.*” Chap. viii. ver. 28, “*That I do nothing of myself; /158 but as my Father hath taught me*, I speak these things.” Ver. 50: “I seek not my own glory; there is one that seeketh and judgeth.” Chap. xiv. ver. 24: “The word which ye hear is not mine, *but the Father’s which sent me.*” Ver. 31: “*As the Father gave me commandment, even so I do.*” And after his resurrection Jesus saith, chap. xx. ver. 21, “*As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you.*” Ver. 17: “I ascend unto *my Father* and *your Father, to my God* and *your God.*” *Matthew*, ch. xii. ver. 18, from Isaiah: “Behold *my servant, whom I have chosen*; my beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased; *I will put my spirit upon him*, and he shall shew judgment to the Gentiles.” Chap. xxviii, ver. 18, “And Jesus came and spoke unto them, saying, *All power is given unto me* in heaven and in earth.” *Luke*, ch. i. ver. 32, “He shall be great, and shall be called *the Son of the Highest*: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David.” For testimony that he lived by the Father, see *John*, ch. vi. 57: “As the living Father *hath sent me, and I live by the Father*” &c. Ch. v. ver. 26: “For as the Father hath life in himself, *so hath he given to the Son* to have life in himself.”

§116

As the Reverend Editor in two instances quoted, perhaps inadvertently, the authority of the Apostles, I think myself justified in introducing some of the sentiments entertained by them on this subject, though I should be contented to deduce my argu- /159ments, as proposed by the Editor, exclusively from the direct authority of Jesus himself. I shall confine myself to the quotation of one or two texts from the Epistles of St. Paul. 1st *Corinthians*, ch. xv. vers. 24—28: “Then cometh the end, when he

1 Co 15:24—28

shall have *delivered up the kingdom to God*, even the Father. 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 manifest 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.” *Colossians*, ch. i. ver. 15: “Who is the image of the invisible God, *the first-born of every creature*.”

Col 1:15

§117

From a due attention to the support of the above quoted texts, and to the term *Son*, distinctly mentioned in them, the reader will, I trust, be convinced, that those powers were conferred on Jesus, and declared by himself to have been received by him from the Father, as the Messiah, Christ, or anointed Son of God, and not solely in his human capacity; and that such interpretation as declares these and other passages of a similar effect to be applicable to Jesus as a man, is an unscriptural invention. Jesus spoke of himself throughout all the Scriptures only as the promised Messiah, vested with high glory from the beginning of the world. *John*, /160 ch. xvii. ver. 5: “And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.” In this passage, with the same breath with which he prays for glory, he identifies *the nature* in which he does so with that under which he lived with God before the creation of the world, and of course before his assuming the office of the Messiah. Ver. 24: “Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me *be with me, where I am*; that they may behold *my glory, which thou hast given me*: for thou *lovedst me before the foundation of the world*.” Here again Jesus prays, that his Apostles may witness such honour as the Father had bestowed on him, even before the foundation of the world. Ch. ix. vers. 35–37: “Dost thou” (says Jesus to a man who had been blind) “believe in the *Son of God*? He answered and said, Who is he, Lord, that I might believe on him? And Jesus said unto him: Thou hast both *seen him, and it is he* (the Son of God) *that talketh with thee*.” Ch. xvii. vers. 1, 2. “Father, glorify *thy Son*; as *thou hast given him* power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as *thou hast given him*.” John the Baptist, who bore witness of Christ, looked not upon him in any other view than as the Son of God. *St. John*, ch. i. ver. 34: “And I saw and bare record,” (said John the Baptist, pointing out the person of Jesus,) “that *this is the Son of God*.” *John*, ch. viii. ver. 42: “I proceeded forth and came from God; *neither came I of myself, but /161 he send me*.” And in numerous passages Jesus declares, that, before he assumed the office of the Messiah in this world, he was entirely subject to and obedient to the Father, from whom he received the commission to come to this world for the salvation of mankind. But apparently with the very view of anticipating any misapprehension of his nature on the part of his disciples, to whom he had declared the wonderful extent of the powers committed to him by the Father, he tells them, *John*, ch. xiv. ver. 28,

Jn 17:5

Jn 17:24

Jn 9:35–38

Jn 17:1f.

Jn 1:34

Jn 8:42

Jn 14:28

“The Father is greater than I.” It would have been idle to have informed them of a truth, of which as Jews they would never have entertained the smallest question, that in his mere corporeal nature Jesus was inferior to his Maker; and it must therefore have been his spiritual nature, of which he here avowed the inferiority to that of God.

§118 “The Son” is a term which, when used without being referred to another proper name found in the context, implies invariable the Son of God throughout the whole New Testament, especially when associated with the epithet “The Father;” so the latter epithet, when it stands alone “the Father of the universe.” *Matthew*, ch. xxviii. ver. 19: “Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” Ch. xi. ver. 27: “No man knoweth the Son but the Father,” &c. Vide rest of the Gospel.—It is true, indeed, that the angels of God and some of the ancients of the human race, as /162 well as the children of Israel, are honoured in the sacred writings with the name of “Sons of God.” *Job*, ch. i. ver. 6: “There was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord.” *Genesis*, ch. vi. ver. 2: “The Sons of God saw the daughters of men, that they were fair.” *Hosea*, ch. i. ver. 10: “Then it shall be said unto them, ye are *the sons of the living God*.” Yet the epithet “Son of God,” with the definite article prefixed, is appropriated to Christ, the first-born of every creature, as a distinct mark of honour which *he alone* deserves.

§119 The Saviour having declared that unity existed between the Father and himself, *John*, ch. x ver. 30, “I and my Father are one,” a doubt arose with regard to the sense in which the unity affirmed in those words should be accepted. This Jesus removes by defining the unity so expressed as a subsisting concord of will and design, such as existed amongst his apostles, and not identity of being: vide ch. xvii. ver. 11, of *John*, “Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, *that they may be one, as we are*.” Ver. 22: “The glory which thou gavest me I have given them: *that they may be one, even as we are one*.” Should any one understand by these texts real unity and identity, he must believe that there existed a similar identity between each and all of the Apostles;—nay, even that the disciples also were included in the Godhead, which in that case would consist of a great many times the number of persons ascribed to the Trinity. *John*, /163 ch. xvii. vers. 20–23: “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.—That *they may be one, even as we are one. I in them, and thou in me*: that they may be made *perfect in one*.” I know not how it is possible for those who profess obedience to the word of Christ to overlook the explanation he has here so clearly given of the nature of the unity existing between him and the Father, and to adopt a contrary system, apparently introduced by some Heathen

writers to suit their polytheistical prejudices; but I doubt not the Editor of the Friend of India will admit the necessity of giving preference to divine authority over any human opinion, however prevailing it may be.

The Saviour meant unity in design and will by the assertion also, that he was in God, or dwelt in God, and God in him. *John*, ch. x. ver. 38: "That ye may know, and believe, that the Father is in me, and I in him," as evidently appears from the following passages:—*John*, ch. xiv. ver. 20: "At that day ye shall know," (addressing his Apostles,) "that I am in my Father, and *ye in me, and I in you.*" Ch. xvii. ver. 21: "That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be *one in us.*" *John*, ch. vi. ver. 56. "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, *dwelleth in me, and I in him.*" 1 *John*, ch. iv. ver. 15: "Whosoever /164 shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God—God *dwelleth in him, and he in God.*" There appear but three modes in which such passages are capable of interpretation. 1st, as conveying the doctrine that the Supreme Being, the Son, and the Apostles, were to be absorbed mutually as drops of water into one whole; which is conformable to the doctrines of that sect of Hindoo Metaphysics who maintain, that in the end the human soul is absorbed into the Godhead; but is quite inconsistent with the faith of all denominations of Christians. 2dly, As proving an identity of nature, with distinction of person, between the Father, the Son, and the Apostles;—a doctrine equally inconsistent with the belief of every Christian, as multiplying the number of persons of the Godhead far beyond what has ever been proposed by any sect: or 3dly, As expressing *that unity* which is said to exist wherever there are found perfect concord, harmony, love, and obedience, such as the Son evinced towards the Father, and taught the disciples to display towards the divine will.—That the language of our Saviour can be understood in this last sense solely, will, I trust, be readily acknowledged by every candid expounder of the sacred writings, as being the only one alike warranted by the common use of words, and capable of of apprehension by the human understanding. Had not experience, indeed, too clearly proved that such metaphorical expressions, when taken singly and without attention to their contexts, may be made the founda-/165tion of doctrines quite at variance with the tenor of the rest of the Scriptures, I should have had no hesitation in submitting indiscriminately the whole of the doctrines of the New Testament to my countrymen; as I should have felt no apprehension that even the most ignorant of them, if left to the guidance of their own unprejudiced views of the matter, could misconceive the clear and distinct assertions they every where contain of the unity of God and subordinate nature of his messenger Jesus Christ. Many of these have been already quoted; to which may be added the following: *John*, ch. xvii. ver. 3: "This is life eternal, that they might know *thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.*" Here Jesus in addressing the Father declares, that the means to be afforded for eternal salvation,

§120

Jn 10:38

Jn 14:20

Jn 17:6-26

Jn 6:56

1 Jn 4:15

Jn 17:3

were a knowledge of God, and of himself as the anointed messenger of God. Also,  
 Jn 19:17 ch. xix. ver. 17, Christ saith, "Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one,  
 that is God." Here Jesus, pure as he was and without reproach, thinks it necessary  
 to check the man who applies to him an epithet justly due to God only.—Ch. xiv.  
 Jn 14:1 ver. 1: "Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God; believe *also* in me." In  
 these words Jesus commands his disciples to put their trust in God, and further to  
 believe in him as the Messenger of God; and thus plainly distinguishes himself from  
 the Godhead. Nor can it for a moment be understood by the following passage,  
 Jn 14:9 *John*, ch. xiv. ver. 9: "He that hath seen me hath /166 seen the Father," that God  
 was literally and materially visible in the Son—a doctrine which would be directly  
 contrary to the spirit of the religion taught by Jesus, and by all the Prophets of God.  
 Jn 4:24 Vide *John*, ch. iv. ver. 24: "God is a Spirit." The Apostles also maintained a belief  
 of the immateriality and invisibility of God. 1 *Tim.* ch. vi. ver. 16: "Whom no  
 1 *Tm* 6:16 man hath seen nor can see." 1 *John* ch. iv. ver. 12: "No man hath seen God at any  
 1 *Jn* 4:12 time." Besides, Jesus explains himself in the two passages immediately succeeding,  
 that by the phrase "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father," he meant only, that  
 whosoever saw him and the works performed by him, witnessed proofs of the entire  
 concord of his words and actions with the will and design of the Father, and ought  
 therefore to have admitted the truth of his mission from God. *John*, ch. xiv. ver.  
 Jn 14:9–11 9: "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father. How sayest thou then, Shew us the  
 Father?" Ver. 10: "Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me?  
 The words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself; but the Father, that dwelleth  
 in me, he doeth the works." Ver. 11: "Believe me, that I am in the Father, and the  
 Father in me: or else believe me for the very works' sake." We have already seen  
 in what sense the expression "dwelleth in me" must be understood, unless we admit  
 that all true followers of Christ are admitted as portions of the Godhead. *John*, ch.  
 Jn 6:56 vi. ver. 56: He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, /167 dwelleth in me, and  
 1 *Jn* 4:12 I in him." 1 *John*, ch. iv. ver. 12: "I we love one another, God dwelleth in us."  
 §121 For my conviction, and for the satisfaction of those who consider the Precepts of  
 Jn 17:11 Jesus as a guide to peace and happiness, his word, "They may be one as we are," *John*,  
 ch. xvii. ver. 11, in defining the nature of the unity between God and Jesus, fully  
 suffices. Disgusted with the puerile and unsociable system of Hindoo idolatry, and  
 dissatisfied at the cruelty allowed by Moossulmanism against Non-moossulmans, I,  
 on my searching after the truth of Christianity, felt for a length of time very much  
 perplexed with the difference of sentiments found among the followers of Christ (I  
 mean Trinitarians and Unitarians, the grand division of them), until I met with the  
 explanation of the unity given by the divine Teacher himself as a guide to peace and  
 happiness. Besides, when the Jews misunderstood the phrase used by the Saviour,  
 Jn 10:22–38 "I and my Father are one," and accused him of blasphemy, (ch. x. ver. 33: "But

for blasphemy, and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God,") Jesus, in answer to the accusation, denied having made himself God, saying, vers. 34–36, "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 Scripture cannot be broken; say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because *I said, I am the Son of God?*" How was /168 it possible that Jesus, the founder of truth and true religion, should have *disavowed* the charge of making himself God by representing himself as the *Son*, honoured with sanctification *by the Father*, and *sent by him* to this world, if he were the true living God, possessed of everlasting sanctification, independently of another being? From this and all other local evidence the Pharisees and chief priests, though inveterate enemies of the Saviour, accused him to Pilate of having made himself the Son of God and King of the Jews; but relinquished the charge of making himself equal to God, or having ascribed himself divine nature; although the latter (i. e. making himself God) was better calculated to excite the horror of the people. Vide *John*, ch. xix. ver. 7: "The Jews answered him, We have a law, and by our law he ought to die; because he made himself the Son of God." Vide *Matthew*, ch. xxvii. ver. 37: "And set up over his head his accusation written, This is Jesus, the King of the Jews." Ver. 43: "HE TRUSTED IN GOD; let him deliver him now, if he will have him: for he said, I am the Son of God." That the epithet God is frequently applied in the sacred Scriptures otherwise than to the Supreme Being, as pointed out by Jesus, may be shewn by the following out of many instances to be found in the Bible. *Deut.* ch. x. ver. 17: "For the Lord your God is GOD OF GODS, and Lord of Lords," &c. Ch. xxxii. ver. 21: "They have moved me to jealousy with *that which* /169 *is not God.*" *Exodus*, ch. xxii. ver. 28: "*Thou shalt not revile the Gods*, nor curse the ruler of thy people."<sup>1</sup> *Joshua*, ch. xxii. ver. 22: "The Lord *God of Gods* knoweth." *Psalms* lxxxii. ver. 1: "God standeth in the congregation of the mighty; *he judgeth among the Gods.*" 6: "I have said, *Ye are Gods*; and all of you are children of the Most High." *Psalms* cxxxvi. ver. 2: "O give thanks unto *the God of Gods.*" *Isaiah*, ch. xli. ver. 23: "Shew the things that are to come hereafter, that we may know *that ye are Gods.*" *Psalms* xcvi. ver. 7: "*Worship him, all ye Gods.*" *Zephaniah*, ch. ii. ver. 11: "*He will famish all the Gods of the earth.*" *Exodus*, ch. iv. ver. 16: "God said to Moses, that he should be to Aaron *instead of God.*" Ch. vii. ver. 5<sup>2</sup>: "See, *I have made thee a God* to Pharaoh." Also *1 Corinth.* ch. viii. ver. 5: "As *there be Gods many* and Lords many;" and the verse already quoted from *John*, ch. x. vers. 34, 35: "Jesus answered, Is it not written in your Law, *Ye are Gods?* If he *call<sup>3</sup> them Gods*, to whom the word of God came," &c. In none of these

Jn 19:7  
Mt 27:37  
Mt 27:43  
Dt 10:17  
Dt 32:21  
Ex 22:28  
Jos 22:22; Ps 82  
Ps 130:2  
Is 41:23  
Ps 97:7  
Zp 2:11  
Ex 4:16; 7:1  
1 Co 8:5  
Jn 10:33–36

<sup>1</sup> Rammohan quotes KJV which follows LXX: θεοὺς οὐ κακολογήσεις (Ex 22:27). <sup>2</sup> Read: "ver. 1".

<sup>3</sup> Read: "called".

instances is it in any degree admissible, that by the epithet God it is implied, that the human beings to whom it was attached were thereby declared to be a portion of the Godhead. Moses was to be as a God to Aaron and a God to Pharaoh, by the express command of the Almighty; but no Christian will thence argue the equality of Moses with the Father of all things. On what principle, /170 then, can any stress be laid in defence of the deity of the Son on the prophetic expression quoted in Hebrews from Psalm xlv. ver. 6, “Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever;” especially when we find in the very next verse, words that declare his subordinate nature; “Thou lovest righteousness and hatest wickedness: therefore *God, thy God*, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows”? We cannot allow much weight to the phrase “for ever,” as establishing literally the eternal nature of the power of the Son, this phrase being often found metaphorically applied in the Scriptures to other created beings: as *Proverbs*, ch. xxix. ver. 14: “The king that faithfully judgeth the poor, his throne shall be established for ever.” *Deut.* ch. iv. ver. 40: “And that thou mayest prolong thy days in the earth, which the Lord thy God giveth thee, for ever.” Similar to this is the remarkable expression of Jesus to Mary after his resurrection, and therefore, at a time when no design can be conceived to have existed that could have been advanced by his any longer withholding the knowledge of his true nature, if anything remained unrevealed during the previous period of his mission on earth. *John*, ch. xx. ver. 17: “Go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto *my Father and your Father*, and to *my God and your God*.”

Heb 1:8f.  
(=Ps 45:6-8)

Pr 29:14

Dt 4:40

Jn 20:17

§122

Jn 20:28

Jn 20:31

§123

Jn 1:1

Dt 32:39

After a slight attention to the terms Lord and God being often applied to men in the Sacred /171 Writings, can any weight be allowed to the exclamation of the astonished disciple, *John*, ch. xx. ver. 28, “My Lord and my God;” especially as the apostle who relates the circumstance, within a few verses concludes by saying, ver. 31, “These are written that ye might believe that *Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God*;” but nowhere desires the readers of his Gospel to believe that Jesus is God? Does not common sense point out the inferiority and subordination of a Being, though called God, to one who is at the same time declared to be *his God, his Father, his Sanctifier, and his Promoter* to the state of exaltation?

The passage, *John*, ch. i. ver. 1, “The Word was God, and the Word was with God,” which contains the term God twice, may, according to such use of the term, be interpreted without involving inconsistency with itself, or the contradiction which it apparently implies with another most decisive passage in *Deut.* ch. xxxii. ver. 39, where Moses representeth God as declaring, that *with him there is no God*: “See now that I, even I am he; and *there is no God with me*;” if it should be understood to signify in both instances the Supreme Deity. Should we follow on the other hand the interpretation adopted by Trinitarian Christians, namely, that the Godhead, though it is one, yet consists of three persons, and consequently one substance of the Godhead



might abide with the other, both being equally God; we should in that /172 case be forced to view the Godhead in the same light as we consider mankind and other genera, for no doubt can exist of the unity of mankind:—the plurality of men consists in their persons; and therefore we may safely, under the same plea, support the unity of man, notwithstanding the plurality of persons included under the term mankind. In that case also Christians ought in conscience to refrain from accusing Hindoos of Polytheism; for every Hindoo we daily observe confesses the unity of the Godhead. They only advance a plausible excuse for their polytheism, which is, that notwithstanding the unity of the Godhead, it consists of millions of substances assuming different offices correspondent to the number of the various transactions superintended in the universe by Divine Providence, which they consider as infinitely more numerous than those of the Trinitarian scheme.

The Saviour in his appeal, “If I do not the works of my Father believe me not,” §124  
*John*, ch. x. ver. 37, meant of course the performance of works prescribed by the Jn 10:37f.  
 Father, and tending to his glory. A great number of passages in the Scriptures, a few of which I have already cited, and the constant practice of the Saviour, illustrate this fact beyond doubt. In raising Lazarus after he had died, Jesus prayed to the Father for the power of bringing him to life again, and thanked him for his compliance. *John*, ch. xi. ver. 41: “And Jesus lifted up his eyes, and said, Father, /173 I thank thee Jn 11:41  
 that thou hast heard me.” Besides, in declaring that whosoever believed [in] him would do not only the works he performed, but even works of greater importance, Jesus never can be supposed to have promised such believers equality in power with God, or to have exalted them above himself. *John*, ch. xiv. ver. 12: “Verily, verily, Jn 14:12  
 I say unto you, He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also, and greater works than these shall he do.” Ch. vi. ver. 29: “Jesus answered and said unto Jn 6:29  
 them, This is the work of God, that ye *believe* on him whom he hath sent.” It must be admitted that one, who can perform works of God independently of the Deity, is either greater than or equal in power to the Almighty. The wonderful works which Jesus was empowered to perform drew a great number of Jews to a belief in Jesus as the promised Messiah, and confirmed his apostles in their already acquired faith in the Saviour, and in the entire union of will and design that subsisted between him and the Father, as appears from the following passages: *John*, ch. vi. ver. 14: “Then Jn 6:14; 10:21  
 those men, when they had seen the miracle that Jesus did, said, This is of a truth that *Prophet that should come into the world.*” See also *John*, ch. x. ver. 21.

The Scriptures indeed in several places declare, that the Son was superior even §125  
 to the angels in heaven, living from the beginning of the world to eternity, and that the Father created all things by /174 him and for him. At the same time I must, in conformity to those very authorities, believe him as produced by the Supreme Deity among created beings. *John*, ch. v. ver. 26: “For as the Father hath life in himself, so Jn 5:26

Col 1:15 hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." *Colossians*, ch. i. ver. 15, "Who is the image of the invisible God, the *first-born of every creature.*" /175

CHAPTER III. SEPARATE CONSIDERATION OF THE SEVEN POSITIONS OF THE RE-VIEWER.

[1. On the ubiquity of Jesus.]<sup>1</sup>

IN attempting to support his first position, that Jesus was possessed of ubiquity, §126  
the Reverend Editor has quoted two passages. The first is, *St. John*, ch. iii. ver. 13:  
“*No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the* Jn 3:13  
*Son of man who is in heaven;*” wherein Jesus, as the Editor conceives, declares his  
location both in heaven and on the earth at one time. The Editor rests entirely the  
force of his argument upon the term “*is*,” in the above phrase “*who is in heaven*,” as  
signifying the presence of Jesus in heaven while he was conversing with Nicodemus  
on earth. This argument might perhaps carry some weight with it, were not the  
frequent use of the present tense in a preterite or future sense observed in the Sacred  
Writings, and were not a great number of other passages to determine that the term  
“*is*,” in this instance, must be understood in the past tense. *John*, ch. viii. ver. 58:  
“*Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am.*” Jn 8:58  
Here the same verb, though found in the form of the present tense, must obviously  
be taken in a preterite sense. *John*, ch. xi. ver. 8: “*His disci-/176ples say unto him,* Jn 11:8  
*Master, the Jews of late sought to stone thee, &c.;*” that is, His disciples *said* unto  
him. Ver. 38: “*Jesus therefore again groaning in himself cometh to the grave,*” *i. e.*  
*he came* to the grave. *Matthew*, ch. xxvi. ver. 2: “*Ye know that after two days is* Mt 16:2  
*the feast of the passover, and the Son of man is betrayed to be crucified;*” that is, the  
Son of man *is to be* betrayed and to be crucified. *Vide* the remainder of the chapter.  
*John*, ch. xiii. ver. 6: “*Then cometh he to Simon Peter, &c.;*” that is, *he came* to Simon  
Peter, &c. Again, *John*, ch. xvi ver. 32: “*That ye shall be scattered, every man to his* Jn 16:32  
*own, and shall leave me alone: yet I am not alone:*” *i. e.* yet *I shall not be* alone. So in  
all the prophecies contained in the Old, as well as in the New Testament, the future  
tense must frequently be understood where the terms used are those grammatically  
appropriated to the preterite: as *Matthew*, ch. ii. ver. 18, “*In Rama was there a* Mt 2:15, 18  
*voice heard,*” that is, *will there be* a voice heard. Ver. 15: “*Out of Egypt have I called*  
*my Son,*” *i. e.* *I will call* my Son. After a diligent attention to the following passage,  
no one will, I presume, scruple to conclude that the Son was actually absent from  
heaven during his locality on the earth, and consequently the phrase quoted by the  
Editor is applicable only to the past time. *John*, ch. vi. ver. 62: “*What and if ye shall* Jn 6:62  
*see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before.*” The verb *was*, accompanied  
with the term *before* in this passage, positively implies the absence of Jesus /177  
from heaven during his stay on the earth. Ch. xvi. ver. 7: “*Nevertheless I tell you* Jn 16:7, 5

<sup>1</sup> §65

Jn 16:28 the truth; it is expedient for you that I go away. If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you.” Ver. 5: “But now I go my way to him that sent me.” Ver. 28: “I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again, I leave the world, and go to the Father.” Ch. xiii. ver. 36: “Jesus answered him, Whither I go, thou canst not follow me now, but thou shalt follow me afterwards.” Ch. xiii. ver. 1: “Jesus knew that his hour was come that he should depart out of this world unto the Father.” For further conviction I may safely refer even to the preceding terms of the verse relied on by the Editor:—“No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man.” For the attribute of omnipresence is quite inconsistent with the human notions of the ascent and descent effected by the Son of Man. Is it possible to reconcile the contents of hundreds of such passages, consistent with reason and conformable to the established order of interpretation, to the apparent meaning of a single phrase, that, taken literally, is totally opposed to common sense? For to a being named *the Son*, or *the created*, (the one term implying the other,) and sent from one mansion to another, the attribute of ubiquity can never be justly ascribed.

§127 Besides, in examining the original Greek Testament, we find in the phrase in question, “Who is /178 in heaven,” that the present participle ὄν, “being,” is used in lieu of ἐστὶ, “is,” viz. Ὁ ὄν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ; a true translation of which should be, “the ens” or “being in heaven:” and as the nominative case ὁ ὄν, “the being,” requires a verb to complete the sense, it should be connected with the nearest verb ἀναβέβηκεν, “hath ascended,” no other verb in fact existing in the sentence.<sup>1</sup>

Mt 18:20 The whole verse in the original runs thus: Καὶ οὐδεὶς ἀναβέβηκεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ [ἐκ] τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὁ ὄν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ. A verbal translation of the above would run thus: “And no one hath ascended into heaven, if not the out of heaven descender,—the Son of man—the being in heaven;” which words, arranged according to the rules of English grammar should run thus: “And no one, except the descender from heaven, the Son of man, the being in heaven, hath ascended into heaven.” In this case the presence of the Son in heaven must be understood as referring to the time of his ascent, and not to that of his addressing himself to Nicodemus—an explanation which, though it does not serve to establish the omnipresence of the Son urged by the Editor, ought to be satisfactory to an impartial mind.\* The second passage which the /179 Editor quotes on this subject is, *Matthew*, ch. xviii. 20: “For where two or three are gathered together in my name

\* See Bishop Middleton’s “Doctrine of the Greek Article,” Part I. page 42, Note: “We are to refer the time of the participle to the time of the act, &c. implied in the verb; for past, present, and future cannot

<sup>1</sup> London1823 gives a correct version of the Greek text. The Greek letters and accents in Ghose are misprinted and hardly readable.

there *am* I in the midst of them.” Is it not evident that the Saviour meant here, by being in the midst of two or three of his disciples, his guidance to them when joined in searching for the truth, without preferring any claim to ubiquity? We find similar expressions in the Scriptures, wherein the guidance of the Prophets of God is also meant by words that would imply their presence. *Luke*, ch. xvi. ver. 29: “Abraham saith unto him, *They have* Moses and the Prophets; let them hear them.” No one will suppose that this expression is intended to signify that the Jews actually had Moses and the Prophets in person among them, or that they could hear them speak in the literal and not in the figurative sense of the words; nor can any one deduce the omnipresence of Moses and the Prophets from such expressions./180

Lk 16:29

[2. On the incomprehensibility of the nature of Jesus.]<sup>1</sup>

The second position advanced by the Reverend Editor is, that “*Jesus ascribes to himself a knowledge and an incomprehensibility of nature equal to that of God, and peculiar to God alone;*” and in attempting to substantiate this point he quotes *Matthew*, ch. xi. ver. 27: “No man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him.” Here the Editor seems to rest on two grounds; 1st, That God is incomprehensible to man; 2ndly, That incomprehensibility of nature is peculiar to God alone:—whence the Rev. Editor draws his inference, that Jesus knowing the nature of God and being himself possessed of an incomprehensible nature, is equal with God. Now I should wish to know if the Editor, by the term “incomprehensible,” understands a total impossibility of comprehension in any degree, or only the impossibility of attaining to a perfect knowledge of God. If the former, I must be under the necessity of denying such a total incomprehensibility of the Godhead; for the very passage cited by the Editor, declares God to be comprehensible not to the Son alone, but also to every one who would receive revelation from the Son; and in this case the latter part of the passage, “*He whomsoever the Son will reveal him,*” must be acknowledged as convey-

§128

Mt 11:27

be meant otherwise than in respect to that act.”<sup>2</sup> *Leviticus*, ch. vii. ver. 23 [33]: ‘Ο προσφέρων—αυτῷ ἔσται ὁ βραχίον ὁ δεξιὸς “The offering (person) for him shall be the right shoulder.” Ch. xiv. ver. 47: ‘Ο ἔσθων—πλυνεῖ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ. “The eating (person) shall wash his clothes.” These present participles are referred to a time present with respect to the act of the verbs connected with them; but future with respect to the command of God. *John*, ch. i. ver. 49<sup>3</sup>: ‘Οντα—εἶδόν σε, “I saw thee when thou wast.” Moreover, we frequently find the present participle used in the past sense, even without reference to the time of the verb. *John*, ch. ix. ver. 25: Τυφλὸς ὢν ἄρτι βλέπω. “Being blind now I see,” that is, “Having been blind now I see.”

<sup>1</sup> §66

<sup>2</sup> See Middleton, *Doctrine*, 23. The Bishop observes against H. Tooke that there is a connection between the time of the full verb and the participle within a sentence. The following examples are Rammohan’s own applications of this rule and not part of Middleton’s work on the referred page.

<sup>3</sup> Read: “48”.

ing an exception to the assertion made in the former part of the sentence, “Neither knoweth *any man* the Father,” &c. /181

- §129 We find also the following passages in *John*, ch. xiv. vers. 16, 17, “And I will pray  
Jn 14:16f. the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever: even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: *but ye know him;*”—wherein Jesus ascribes to his disciples a knowledge of the Holy Ghost, whom the Editor considers one of the persons of the Godhead, possessed of the same nature with God. But if the Editor understands by the passage he has quoted, the incomprehensibility of the real nature of the Godhead, I admit the position, but deny his inference, that such an incomprehensibility proves the nature of the object to be divine, as being peculiar to God alone: for it appears evident that a knowledge of the real nature even of a common leaf, or a visible star, surpasses human comprehension; how then can a simple assertion, setting forth the incomprehensibility of an object, be considered as establishing its identity with God?
- Mk 13:32 In *Mark*, ch. xiii. ver. 32, “But of that day and that hour *knoweth* no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the *Son*, but the Father,” we have a passage, which, though it affirms in a stronger manner an *ignorance of the day* of resurrection, than that already quoted does of God, yet will not, I presume, be considered by any one as conveying the slightest insinuation of the divine nature of that day; though time is a common object of adoration amongst idolators. In treating of this point
- Mt 11:28–30 the Editor quotes /182 another text, *Matthew*, ch. xi. ver. 28, “Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest;” wherein Jesus declares his power of affording rest, which the Editor considers as peculiar to God.<sup>1</sup> All the prophets, as well as Jesus, were from time to time sent by the Almighty to afford mental rest to mankind, by imparting to them the comforts of divine revelation; and by so doing they only fulfilled the commission given them by God: but no one ever supposed that in doing so they established claims to be considered incarnations of the Divine essence. *Proverbs*, ch. xxix. ver. 17: “Correct thy son, and he shall give thee rest: yea, he shall give delight unto thy soul.” Revelation guides us to a sure belief, that it is God that affords peace of mind, effects cures of the body, and bestows all sorts of comforts to his creatures. “I thank thee,” (says Jesus, *Matthew*, ch. xi. ver. 25,) “O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes.” Both our perceptions, indeed, and sacred authorities point out, that he lavishes all these gifts on us through prophets, physicians, and other physical causes, that are not considered by any sect as of a divine nature.
- Pr 29:17
- Mt 11:25

---

<sup>1</sup> §66.

[3. On Jesus forgiving sins in an independent manner.]<sup>1</sup>

The third position is, that Jesus exercised in an independent manner, the prerogative of forgiving sins, which is peculiar to God alone; and the Reverend Editor quotes the passage, *Mark*, ch. ii. ver. 5, “Thy sins be forgiven thee;” and the 9th verse, /183 “For whether is it easier to say, Thy sins be forgiven thee, or to say, Arise and walk?” Taking those texts as the grounds of his position, I therefore beg call the attention of the Editor to the passage almost immediately following, in which the evangelical writer intimates, that this power of forgiving sins, as well as of healing men, was given by the Almighty: “But when the multitude saw it, they marvelled, and glorified God, *who had given* such power unto *men*.”<sup>2</sup> Does not this passage convey an express declaration, that Jesus was as much dependent on God in exercising the power of forgiving sins and healing the sick, as the prophets who came forth from God before him? The apostles, who witnessed the power of forgiving sins in the Saviour, were thoroughly impressed with a belief that it was the Almighty Father who forgave sins through the Son. *Acts*, ch. v. vers. 31, 32: “*Him hath God exalted* with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, *and forgiveness of sins*. And we are his witness of these things.” Ch. xiii. ver. 38: “Be it known, therefore, men and brethren, that *through this man*, (meaning the Saviour,) is preached unto you the *forgiveness of sins*.” I know not how far religious zeal in the breasts of many of the followers of Christ may excuse them in encroaching upon the prerogatives which revelation and reason ascribe to the Divine Majesty alone; but Jesus himself clearly avows, that the power of forgiving sins had its source and origin /184 in God alone, as appears from his petitioning the Father to forgive those that were guilty of bringing the death of the cross upon him, the greatest of all imaginable crimes. *Luke*, ch. xxiii. ver. 34: “Father, forgive them,” (says Jesus,) “for they know not what they do;” and from his directing all those that followed him to pray the Father alone for forgiveness of sins. *Luke*, ch. xi. ver. 4: “And forgive us our sins.” *Matthew*, ch. vi. ver. 14: “If ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will forgive you.”

[4. Jesus is almighty.]<sup>3</sup>

The fourth position advanced by the Editor is, that “**Almighty power is also claimed by Jesus in the most unequivocal manner.**” In endeavouring to demonstrate this, the Editor notices three passages of *John*, (ch. v. vers. 21-23,) “As the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will. For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son: that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father.” A candid inquirer after truth must, I think, feel surprised and disappointed, that in quoting these texts,

<sup>1</sup> §67    <sup>2</sup> Rammohan starts with Mark’s version of this story, but switches to Matthew here.    <sup>3</sup> §68

Jn 5:22

the Editor should have overlooked the force of the words in which the Son declares that he hath received the commission to judge from the Father: “For the Father judgeth no man, but *hath committed all judgment unto the Son.*” I am ready to admit, indeed, that, taken simply as they stand, the words, “As the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will,” and, “That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father,” might very readily be understood as implying an assertion of equality with the Father. But this affords one of numerous instances of the danger of resting an opinion on the apparent meaning of the words of insulated passages of Scripture, without attention to the context; for I am convinced that no unprejudiced person can peruse the verses preceding and subsequent to those quoted by the Editor, without feeling that a more explicit disavowal of equality with God can hardly be expressed by language than that which they contain. I must therefore beg permission to give the entire passage in this place, though some parts of it have been quoted before in support of arguments already discussed. It is to be observed, that the occasion of the expressions here made use of by Jesus, was the accusation brought against him by the Jews, that he had made himself equal with God. *John*, ch. v. vers. 19-36: “Then answered

Jn 5:19-36

Jesus, and said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, *The Son can do nothing of himself*; but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise. For the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things that himself doeth: and he will shew him greater works than these, that ye may marvel. For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will. For the Father judgeth no man, but hath /186 committed all judgment unto the Son: that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father who hath sent him. Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and *believeth on him that sent me*, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life. Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live. For as the Father hath life in himself, *so hath he given to the Son* to have life in himself; and *hath given him authority* to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man. Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in which all that are in the grave shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation. *I can of mine ownself 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 who hath sent me.* If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true. There is another that beareth witness of me; and I know that the witness which he witnesseth of me is true. Ye sent unto John, and he bare witness unto the truth. But I receive not testimony from man: but



these things I say, that ye might be saved. He was a burning and a shining light: and ye were willing for a season to rejoice in his light. But I have greater witness /187 than that of John: for the works which the *Father hath given me to finish*, the same works that I do, *bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me.*”

It would have been strange indeed had Jesus, in repelling the accusation of blasphemy, which had wrought on the minds of the Jews so far that they sought to kill him, confirmed their assertion, that he made himself equal with God, and thus prematurely endangered his own life; but we find that so far from being further incensed by the explanation above quoted, they seem to have quietly acquiesced in his appeal to their own Scriptures, that the Messiah should have all the power and authority which he asserted the Father had given to himself. Ver. 46: “For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me.” The only text in the writings of Moses that refers to the nature of the Messiah, is that of *Deuteronomy*, ch. xviii. vers. 15 and 18, quoted by St. Peter in the Acts of the Apostles, ch. iii. ver. 22, and by St. Stephen, ch. vii. ver. 37, Moses said to the children of Israel, “The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, *like unto me: unto him ye shall hearken.*” The words which the Lord addressed to Moses were exactly of the same import: “I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, *like unto thee,*” &c. It was, no doubt, to this remarkable passage that Jesus referred, and nothing can more distinctly prove the light in which he wished to be considered, namely, that of a Messenger /188 or Prophet of God. But this is not the only instance in which Jesus entirely disclaims the attribute of omnipotence. On many other particular occasions he declares, in the strongest language, his want of almighty power, and his constant need of divine influence. *Matthew*, ch. xx. ver. 23: “And he said unto them, Ye shall drink indeed of my cup, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with: but to sit on my right hand, and on my left is *not mine to give*; but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared of my Father.” Ch. xii. ver. 28: “But if I cast out devils *by the Spirit of God*, then the kingdom of God is come unto you.” Ch. xxvi. ver. 39: “And he went a little further, and fell on his face, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as you wilt.” Ver. 42: “He went away again the second time, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if this cup may not pass away from me, except I drink it, thy will be done.”, *Luke*, ch. xxii. ver. 32: “But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not,” &c. *John*, ch. xii. ver. 27: “Father, save me from this hour.” Whosoever honours, God cannot, I presume, consistently refuse to honour his Prophet, whom he dignifies with the name of “Son of God;” and as he honours God, he will also honour that Prophet, though he be well aware of the distinction

§132

Jn 5:46

Dt 18:15–18;  
Ac 3:22; 7:37

Mt 20:23

Mt 12:28

Mt 26:39,42

Lk 22:32

Jn 12:27

<sup>1</sup> Compare Surah 4:80 and §138.

between the Almighty and his chosen Son.<sup>1</sup> The honour paid to the Prophet may in this sense be fairly considered the test of the real degree of respect /189 entertained for God—as Jesus saith, *Matthew*, ch. x. ver. 40, “He that receiveth you, receiveth me; and he that receiveth me, receiveth him that sent me.” The obvious meaning of which words is, As far as men listen to your instructions, they listen to mine, and in so far they receive the commandments of God who hath sent me. Prejudice alone could, I think, infer from such expressions, that those who received the Apostles were literally receiving God himself under their form and substance. Equally demonstrative of prejudice, I conceive, would it be to deduce the identity or equality of the Father and the Son from the following passage, *John*, ch. v. ver. 23: “That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father who hath sent him.” For in this very passage the Son is represented as the Messenger of the Father, and for that reason only entitled to honour. That the preposition<sup>2</sup> “as” implies here, as in many other places, likeness in nature and quality, and not in exact degree of honour, is illustrated by its obvious meaning in the last verse of *Matthew* v., “Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect;” for by these words no one can conceive, that equality in degree of perfection between God and the disciples is intended to be enjoined.

[5. On the judgment of the world by Jesus.]<sup>3</sup>

§133 The fifth position is, that his heavenly Father had committed to Jesus the final judgment of all who have lived since the creation. I readily admit the /190 correctness of this position, and consider the fact as confirming the opinion maintained by me, and by numerous other followers of Christ, as to the Son’s total dependence on the commission of God for his power in administering such judgment. I agree also with the Reverend Editor, in esteeming the nature of this office most important; and that nothing but the gift of supernatural wisdom can qualify a being to judge the conduct of thousands of millions of individuals, living at different times from the beginning of the world to the day of resurrection. It is however perfectly consistent with the omnipotence and wisdom of God, who is declared by revelation to be “able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham,” (*Matthew*, ch. iii. ver. 9,) and with whom all things are possible, (*Luke*, ch. i. ver. 37,) to bestow wisdom equal to the important nature of this office on the first-born of every creature, whom he has anointed and exalted even above his angels. But the Editor goes much further than I am willing to follow him, in concluding the omniscience of the Son, from the circumstance of his distributing final judgment; since Jesus not only disclaimed that attribute, but even expressly avowed that he received his qualifications for exercising judgment from God. With respect to his disclaiming omniscience, see *Mark*, ch. xiii. ver. 32:

<sup>2</sup> Ghose: “preposition [conj.?]”. <sup>3</sup> §69

“But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.” Omniscience, as the Editor must be well aware, has no limit; but /191 here Jesus expressly declares, that he is ignorant of the day appointed by the Father for the resurrection and judgment. What words can be more expressly declaratory than these of the finite nature of the knowledge granted to Jesus, however its extent may actually surpass our limited capacity? As a proof that his judicial authority is derived from God, see *John*, ch. v. vers. 26 and 27: “For as the Father hath life in himself, so *hath he given* to the Son to have life in himself; and *hath given him authority* to execute judgment also.” Ver. 30: “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 hath sent me.” Is it possible to misunderstand the assertion contained in these words, that both the authority and the ability to judge are gifts bestowed on the Son by the omnipotent Father?

[6. On the worship accepted by Jesus.]<sup>1</sup>

The sixth position is, that in several instances Jesus accepted worship “[due to no man, but to God alone;](#)” and instances of his receiving worship from a blind man, a leper, from mariners, and from his disciples, are adduced from the evangelical writings.—Every one must admit that the word “worship,” both in common acceptation and in the Scriptural writings, is used sometimes as implying an external mark of religious reverence paid to God, and at other times, as signifying merely the token of civil respect due to superiors; and that concurrent circumstances in every instance determine the real sense in which /192 the word should be taken. Among the Prophets of God, Jesus was not the only one that permitted himself to be worshipped, as we find Daniel the Prophet allowing himself such worship. *Daniel*, ch. ii. ver. 46: “Then the king Nebuchadnezzar fell upon his face, and worshipped Daniel.” Daniel, like Jesus, neither rebuked the man who worshipped him, nor did he feel indignant at such a tribute of respect; yet we cannot find any subsequent assertion that he had offended God by suffering himself to be the object of the king’s *worship* in this instance. Besides, Jesus himself uses the word worship in the latter sense, (I mean that of civil reverence,) in one of the evangelical parables, where he represents a servant as worshipping his master. *Matthew*, ch. xviii. ver. 26: “The servant therefore fell down and worshipped him.” From the circumstance of Jesus positively commanding human beings to worship God alone in spirit, and not in any form or shape, either human or angelic; as *John*, ch. iv. ver. 24: “God is Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and truth.” *Matthew*, ch. iv. ver. 10: “Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.” And from the circumstance of his rebuking the man who called him “good master,” on the ground

<sup>1</sup> §§70-71

that the term “good” should be peculiarly applied to God alone, (*Matt.* ch. xiv. ver. 17,) we necessarily conclude that Jesus accepted worship only as a mark of human respect and acknowledgment of gratitude. Let us moreover /193 ascertain from the context, the sentiments which the blind man, the leper, the mariners, and the disciples of Jesus, entertained of his nature; and we can no longer hesitate to believe, that they meant by the worship they offered, only the manifestation of their reverence for him as a superior indeed, yet still as a created being. The question is, Did those that offered worship to Jesus evince that they believed him to be God, or one of the three persons of the Godhead, and equal to God? Nothing of the kind—the blind man, after his cure, spoke of Jesus as a prophet, and a righteous man, and believed him when he said he was the Son of God. *John*, ch. ix. ver. 31: “Now we know,” (says the blind man,) “that God heareth not sinners: but if any man be a worshipper of God, and doeth his will, him he heareth.” Ver. 33: “If this man were not of God, he could do nothing.” And in answer to the question of Jesus, “Dost thou believe on the Son of God?” he answers, “Lord, I believe. And he worshipped him,” ver. 38. The unclean spirit which is said in Mark to have worshipped Jesus, “Cried with a loud voice, and said, What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of the most high God? I adjure thee by God, that thou torment me not.” *Mark*, ch. v. ver. 7. This adjuration would have been absurd if Jesus were himself addressed as God; and clearly shews, that the worship offered, was to deprecate the power of a being whose nature was subordinate to that of God, by /194 whose name he was adjured.<sup>1</sup> The leper, too, glorified God, while to Jesus he gave only thanks for being the instrument of his cure. *Luke*, ch. xvii. vers. 15, 16: “And one of them, when he saw that he was healed, turned back, and with a loud voice glorified God, and fell down on his face at his feet, giving him thanks.”<sup>2</sup> The mariners who worshipped Jesus, declared at the same instant, “Of a truth thou art the Son of God.” *Matthew* ch. xiv. ver. 33. The woman of Canaan, who is also stated in *Matthew*, ch. xv. ver. 25, to have worshipped Jesus, addressed him, ver. 22, as “the son of David,” by which term she certainly would not have designated a being whom she worshipped as God.<sup>3</sup> Peter, the most celebrated of disciples, shewed his faith in acknowledging Jesus merely as the Christ, or in other words with the same exact sense, *the anointed* of God—which is certainly far from implying “very God.” *Mark*, ch. viii. ver. 29. Even after the crucifixion we find the disciples conversing of Jesus only as “a prophet, mighty in deed and in word before

<sup>1</sup> Marshman did not bring this episode of the unclean spirit as a point in his review. Rammohan comes up with it by himself, probably to cover all ground.

<sup>2</sup> Marshman brought in §70 the story of the leper Mt 8:2–4, where the leper “worships” Jesus before he is healed. Rammohan refers to Lk 17:11–19 and so can distinguish between glorifying God and thanking Jesus.

<sup>3</sup> Also the story of the canaanite woman was not brought up by Marshman.

God and all the people." *Luke*, ch. xxiv. ver. 19. It was Jesus himself risen from the dead whom they addressed, yet throughout the remainder of the chapter, which concludes with the account of his being carried up to heaven, they are only further taught that this prophet was the promised Messiah, but by no means that it was their duty to worship him as God. Peter, in the name of all disciples declares, *John*, ch. vi. ver. 69. "We believe and are sure that thou art [that] Christ, the Son of the living God." And as already observed, the disciple John declares, that the object of the Gospel is, "that it may be believed that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." *John* ch. xx. ver. 31. When the leper prayed to Jesus for cure, he addressed him only with the term Κυριός (*Matthew*, ch. viii. ver. 2,) which in Greek is used as synonymous to Lord or Master, and often applied to superior persons.

Every Christian is morally bound to evince obedience to the commandments of Jesus, and exert himself to follow his example. It behoves us, therefore, to ascertain, what his commandments are with regard to the object of sacred worship and prayer, and in what manner he himself performed those solemn religious duties. The very act of prayer indeed implies an acknowledgement of inferiority to the being adored; but though Trinitarians affirm that such devotion was paid by Jesus only in his human capacity, his form of prayer ought still to be sufficient to guide human creatures as to the Being to whom their prayers should be addressed. Let us examine, therefore, whether Jesus in the acknowledged human capacity ever offered worship or prayer to what Trinitarians term the second or third person of the Godhead, or once directed his followers to worship or pray to either of them. But so far from finding a single direction of the kind, we observe on the contrary, that Jesus strictly enjoins us to worship the Father alone in that form of prayer which he offered for our guidance. *Matthew*, ch. vi. ver. 9: "After this manner therefore pray ye, *Our Father* which art in heaven," &c. "Pray to *thy Father* which is in secret: and *thy Father*, which seeth in secret, shall reward thee openly." In the same way, when the Saviour himself prays, he addresses the Father alone. *Matthew*, ch. xxvi. ver. 53: "Thinkest thou," says Jesus to Peter, "that I cannot now *pray to my Father*?" *John*, ch. xvi. ver. 26: "I will *pray the Father* for you." *Luke*, ch. xxii. ver. 41, 42: "And he (the Saviour), was withdrawn from them about a stone's cast, and kneeled down, and prayed, saying, *Father*, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me." *Mark*, ch. xiv. vers. 35, 36: "And fell on the ground, and prayed, that if it were possible the hour might pass from him. And he said, *Abba, Father*, all things are possible unto thee." *Luke*, ch. vi. ver. 12: "He went out unto a mountain to pray, and continued all night *in prayer to God*." *Luke*, ch. x. ver. 21: "In that hour Jesus rejoiced in spirit, and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth." *John*, ch. xi. ver. 41: "And Jesus lifted up his eyes, and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me." *Matthew*, ch. xxvii. ver. 46: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" *John*, ch. iv. ver.

Jn 4:22 22: "Ye worship ye know not what; we know what we worship." No creed drawn up by men, nor opinion entertained by any sect, can by an unbiassed searcher after the /197 true doctrines of Christianity, be suffered to set aside the express authority and constant example of the gracious author of this religion.

[7. The trinitarian formula.]<sup>1</sup>

§136 The last position is, that Jesus associated his own name with that of God in the rite of baptism, intended to remain in force to the end of the world, and ordained by the passage, *Matthew*, ch. xxviii. ver. 19, "Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." A profession of belief in God is unquestionably common to all the religions supposed to have been founded upon the authority of the Old Testament; but each is distinguished from the other by a public profession of faith in their respective founders, expressing such profession in a language that may clearly exhibit the inferior nature of those founders to the Divine Being, of whom they declare themselves the messengers. This system has been carried on from the first, and was no doubt intended to serve as a perpetual distinguishing mark of faith. The Jews claim that they have revelation, rendering a belief not in God alone, but in Moses also, incumbent upon them. *Exodus*, ch. xiv. 31: "The people feared the Lord, and believed the Lord, and his servant Moses." But the term "his servant Moses," in this passage, suffices to prove the subordination of Moses, though declared, equally with God, to be an object of their belief. In like manner Mohummudans, in the first acknowledgement of that system of religion, are directed to profess /198 faith in God, and also in Mohummud, his messenger, in the following form: لا اله الا الله محمد رسول الله "There is no God except the true God, Mohummud is his messenger." The term "his messenger" removes every doubt of Mohummud's identity or equality with God; so the epithet "Son" found in the passage, "Baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son," &c. ought to be understood and admitted by every one as expressing the created nature of Christ, though the most highly exalted among all creatures. If baptism were administered to one embracing Christianity in the name of the Father and the Holy Ghost, he would thereby no more become enrolled as a Christian, than as a Jew or as a Mohummudan; for both of them, in common with Christians, would readily submit to be baptized in the name of God and his prevailing influence over the universe. But as Christianity requires peculiarly a faith in Jesus, as the promised Messiah, the gracious Saviour enjoins baptism in the name of *the Son* also, so as to distinguish his happy followers from the Jews and the rest of the people. A mere association of names in divine commandments therefore never can be considered as tending to prove identity or equality between the subjects of those names:—such junction of names is found fre-

Mt 28:16–20

Ex 14:31

<sup>1</sup> §73

quently in the Sacred Writings without establishing unity among the persons whom those names imply.

The Editor quotes the following passage, *Matthew*, ch. xxviii. ver. 18: “All power in heaven and /199 earth is delivered unto me,”<sup>1</sup> recommending it as a sure proof of the deity of Jesus. I regret very much that the force of the expression “is delivered unto me,” found in this passage, should have escaped the discerning notice of the Reverend Editor. Does not the term “delivered” shew evidently an entire dependence of Jesus upon the Being who has committed to him such power? Is it consistent with the nature of an omnipotent God to exercise power delivered to him by another being, or to confess that the power he possesses has been received by him from another?

§137  
Mt 28:18

As to the question of the Editor, “Did Mohumud, arrogant as he was, ever make such a declaration as Jesus did, namely, that ‘I am with you always even to the end of the world?’”<sup>2</sup> I will not renew the subject, as it has been already discussed in examining the first position. I only entreat the attention of the Editor to the following assertions of Mohumud, known to almost all Moosulmans who have the least knowledge of their own religion:<sup>3</sup>

§138

ان الله عزّ وجلّ بعثني رحمة وهدى للعالمين “Truly the great and glorious God raised me as *mercy* and *guidance* to *worlds*.”<sup>4</sup>

كنت اول النبيين في الخلق واخرهم في البعث “I was the first of all Prophets in creation, and the last in appearance.”<sup>5</sup>

كنت نبياً وادم في الماء والطين “I was a Prophet when Adam was in earth and water.”<sup>6</sup> /200

<sup>1</sup> §72.

<sup>2</sup> §74

<sup>3</sup> The following quotations are hadiths of various authority, and they are, against Rammohun’s words, not generally acknowledged, although they might have been known and acknowledged in Bengali Islam in that time. I am indebted to Dr. Şuayip Seven, *University of Münster, Zentrum für Islamische Theologie*, who took the time to explain to me the origin and meaning of these sayings, and to Ms. Meriam Adami, who helped me with the spelling and typesetting.

<sup>4</sup> Ghose: ان الله عزّ وجلّ بعثني رحمة وهدى للعالمين. In Ghose’s edition the verb is missing, although the meaning can be guessed from the context. This hadith is actually a short form of Surah 21:107, but it is also known in some minor hadith collections (Dr. Şuayip Seven).

<sup>5</sup> Ghose: كنت اول النبيين في الخلق واخرهم في البعث. The difference is merely a question of calligraphic style. This hadith is quoted in some classical works, e.g. *dalā’il an-nubuwwa* (Abū Nu’aim al-Isfahānī) and *tafsīr al-qur’an* (Ibn Abi Ḥātim). The next hadith is thought to be another, more correct version of the same saying (Dr. Şuayip Seven).

<sup>6</sup> This version is not known as an authentic hadith in any collection, although it is often quoted. There is a similar authentic hadith (at-Tirmidī, *sunan*, No. 3609) where the Prophet is asked when he was destined to be prophet. He answered: “When Adam was between soul and body.” Therefore, according to Dr. Şuayip Seven, this hadith is about the predestination of the Prophet, and not about his prenatal

أنا سيّد المرسلين ولا فخر فيه “I am the Lord of those that were sent by God. This is no boast of me.”<sup>1</sup>

إنّما ظلّي علي روس امتي “My shadow is on the head only of my followers.”<sup>2</sup>

من رأني فتد راء الله “He who has seen me has seen God.”<sup>3</sup>

من اطاعني فتد اطاع الله و من عصاني فعصي الله “He who has obeyed me, has obeyed God: and he who has sinned against me, has sinned against God.”<sup>4</sup>

§139 It is, however, fortunate for Moosulmans, that from want of familiarity and intimate connexion between the primitive Mohummuddans and their contemporary heathens, the doctrines of Monotheism taught by Mohummud, and entertained by his followers, have not been corrupted by polytheistical notions of Pagans, nor have heathen modes of worship or festivals been introduced among Moosulmans of Arabia and Turkey as a part of their religion. Besides, metaphorical expressions having been very common among Oriental nations, Mohummuddans could not fail to understand them in their proper sense, although these expressions may throw great difficulty in the way of an European Commentator even of profound learning. /201

---

existence, although some mystics have speculated about the latter. How Rammohan and the Muslims he is referring to, understood the meaning, remains a question.

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Şuayip Seven could not find a hadith with this exact words, although there is “I am the Lord of Adam’s children on the day of resurrection. This is no boast of me” (Muslim, *ṣaḥīh*, No. 2278; at-Tirmidī, *sunan*, No. 3148). The question whether Muhammad is superior to the other prophets, is discussed in several hadiths and Surah 2:253.

<sup>2</sup> According to Dr. Şuayip Seven this is also not a known hadith in the authentic collections. Muslim, *ṣaḥīh*, No. 6713, speaks of God’s shadow on the resurrection day.

<sup>3</sup> According to Dr. Şuayip Seven this is not a known hadith in the authentic collections, and it contradicts other teachings about the Prophet who is a mere man according to Surah 18:110. It is interesting that this saying which seems to resound Jn 14:9, is familiar to Ms. Adami from Tunesian tradition.

<sup>4</sup> This hadith resounds Surah 4:80. Obedience to God is connected to obedience to his messenger (Dr. Şuayip Seven).



## CHAPTER IV. INQUIRY INTO THE DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT.

ALL the texts collected by the Reverend Editor in his review from the authority of the divine Teacher, in favour of the second important doctrine of the cross, implying the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus as an atonement for the sins of mankind are as follow:<sup>1</sup> “I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever.” His giving his “flesh for the life of the world.” “I lay down my life for my sheep.” “The Son of man is come to give his life a ransom for many.” Is any one of these passages, I would ask, in the shape of an explicit commandment, or are they more than a mere statement of facts requiring figurative interpretation? For it is obvious that an attempt to take them in their direct sense, especially the first, (“I am the living bread;—if any man eat of this,” &c.) would be amount to gross absurdity. Do they reasonably convey anything more than the idea, that Jesus was invested with a divine commission to deliver instructions leading to eternal beatitude, which whosoever should receive should live for ever? And that the Saviour, foreseeing that the imparting of those instructions would, by exciting the /202 anger and enmity of the superstitious Jews, cause his life to be destroyed, yet hesitated not to persevere in their promulgation; as if a king, who hazards his life to procure freedom and peace for his subjects, were to address himself to them, saying, “I lay down my life for you.” This interpretation is fully confirmed by the following passages. *Luke*, ch. iv. ver. 43: “And he said unto them, I must preach the kingdom of God to other cities also; *for therefore am I sent.*” Ch. ii. vers. 47—49: “And all that heard him were astonished at his understanding and answers. And when they (his parents) saw him, they were amazed: and his mother said unto him, Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us? Behold, thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing. And he said unto them, How is it that ye sought me? wist ye not that *I must be about my Father’s business?*” Wherein Jesus declares, that the sole object of his mission was to preach and impart divine instructions. Again, after having instructed his disciples in the divine law and will, as appears from the following text, “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*, ch. xvii. ver. 8.) Jesus in his communing with God manifests that he had completed the object of his mission by imparting divine commandments to mankind. “I have glorified thee on the earth, *I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do.*” Had /203 his death on the cross been the work, or part of the work, for the performance of which Jesus was sent into this world, he as the founder of truth would not have declared himself to have finished that work prior to his death.

§140

Jn 6:22–58;  
Jn 10:14–18;  
Mk 10:45

Lk 4:43

Lk 2:47–49

Jn 17:4–8

<sup>1</sup> §80.

§141

That Jesus should ride on a colt, should receive an offer of vinegar to drink, and should be wounded with a spear after he had delivered up the ghost, as well as his death on the cross, were events prophesied in the Old Testament, and consequently these were fulfilled by Jesus. Vide *Luke*, ch. xxiv. vers. 26 and 27: "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning at Moses and all the Prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself." But we are unhappily at a loss to discover any other design in each of these events, which happened to Jesus before his ascent to heaven. I am therefore sorry that I must plead my inability to make a satisfactory reply to the question of the Editor, "[Had ever Jesus transgressed his heavenly Father's will, that he underwent such afflictions?](#)"<sup>1</sup> I can only say, that we find in the Scriptures that several other Prophets in common with Jesus suffered great afflictions, and some even death, as predicted. But I know not whether those afflictions were the consequences of the sins committed by them or by their parents, or whether these distresses were experienced by them through some divine purpose unknown to us; as some scriptural authorities shew beyond doubt, that /204 man may be made liable to suffering for some secret divine purpose, without his or his parents having perpetrated any remarkable crime. (*John*, ch. ix, ver. 3: "Jesus answered, Neither hath this man sinned nor his parents; but that the works of God should be made manifest in him.") The latter alternative (namely, that the righteous Prophets suffered afflictions and even death for some divine purpose, known thoroughly to God alone) seems more consistent with the contents of the sacred writings, such as follow: *Mark*, ch. xii. vers. 1—9: "And he began to speak unto them by parables. A certain man planted a vineyard, and set a hedge about it, and digged a place for the wine fat, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into a far country. And at the season he sent to the husbandmen a servant, that he might receive from the husbandmen of the fruit of the vineyard. And they caught him, and beat him, and sent him away empty. And again he sent unto them another servant; and at him they cast stones, and wounded him in the head, and sent him away shamefully handled. And again he sent another; and him they killed, and many others; beating some, and killing some. Having yet therefore one Son, his well-beloved, he sent him also last unto them, saying, They will reverence my Son. But these husbandmen said among themselves, This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and the inheritance shall be ours. And they took him, and killed him and cast him out of the vineyard. What shall /205 therefore the Lord of the vineyard do? He will come and destroy the husbandmen, and will give the vineyard unto others." *John*, ch. xv. vers. 21, 22: "But all these things will they do

Lk 24:26f.

Jn 9:3

Mk 12:1–9

Jn 15:21–24

<sup>1</sup> "But why numbered with transgressors? Had he ever transgressed his heavenly Father's will?", §81. Marshman was referring to Lk 22:37 where Jesus quotes Is 53:12 at the Last Supper.

unto you for my name's sake, because they know not him that sent me. If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin: but now they have no cloke for their sin." This parable and these passages give countenance to the idea, that God suffered his Prophets, and Jesus, his beloved Son, to be cruelly treated and slain by the Jews, for the purpose of taking away every excuse that they might offer for their guilt.

In explaining the objects of Jesus's death on the cross, the Editor confidently assumes, that "If we view Jesus Christ as atoning for the sins of men, we have every thing perfectly in character: he became incarnate to accomplish that which could have been effected by neither men nor angels."<sup>1</sup> I should therefore wish to know whether Jesus, whom the Editor represents as God incarnate, suffered death and pain for the sins of men in his divine nature, or in his human capacity? The former must be highly inconsistent with the nature of God, which, we are persuaded to believe by reason and tradition, is above being rendered liable to death or pain; since the difference we draw between God, and the objects that are not God, is, that one cannot be subjected to death or termination, and the other is finite and liable to mortality. That the effects of Christ's appearance /206 on earth, whether with respect to the salvation or condemnation of mankind, were finite, and therefore suitable to the nature of a finite being to accomplish, is evident from the fact, that to the present time millions of human beings are daily passing through the world, whom the doctrines he taught have never reached, and who of course must be considered as excluded from the benefit of his having died for the remission of their sins. The latter, namely, that Jesus suffered death and pain in his human capacity as an atonement for the offences of others, seems totally inconsistent with the justice ascribed to God, and even at variance with those principles of equity required of men; for it would be a piece of gross iniquity to afflict one innocent being who had all the human feelings, and who had never transgressed the will of God, with the death of the cross for the crimes committed by others, especially when he declares such great aversion to it, as is manifest from the following passages. *Matthew*, ch. xxvi. vers. 37, 39, 42 and 43: "And he took with him Peter and the two sons of Zebedee, and began to be sorrowful and very heavy. And prayed, saying, O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup (meaning death) pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt. He went away again the second time, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if this cup may not pass away from me, except I drink it, thy will be done." *Mark*, ch. xiv. ver. 36: "And he said, Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee; take away /207 this cup from me: nevertheless not what I will, but what thou wilt." *Luke*, ch. xxii. vers. 42 and 44: "Saying, Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless not my

§142

Mt 26:36-46

Mk 14:36

Lk 22:42-44

<sup>1</sup> §75

will, but thine, be done. And being in agony he prayed more earnestly: and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood, falling down to the ground.” *John*, ch. xii. ver. 27: “Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour: but for this cause came I unto this hour.” Do not these passages evidently shew, that Jesus in his human capacity (according to the Trinitarian phrase) felt averse to death and pain, and that he earnestly prayed that he might not be subjected to it? Jesus, however, knowing that the will of the Father render such death unavoidable, yielded to it as predicted. *John*, ch. xi.<sup>1</sup> vers. 17 and 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*.” *Matthew*, ch. xxvi. vers. 53 and 54: “Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels? But how then shall the scripture be fulfilled, that thus it must be?” The iniquity of one’s being sentenced to death as an atonement for the fault committed by another, is so palpable, that although in many countries the human race think themselves justified in detaining /208 the persons of those men who, voluntarily making themselves responsible for the debt or the persons of others, fail to fulfil their engagements; nevertheless, every just man among them would shudder at the idea of one’s being put to death for a crime committed by another, even if the innocent man should willingly offer his life in behalf of that other.

§143 In endeavouring to prove Jesus’s atonement for sin by his death, the Reverend Editor urges, “Is he called the Saviour of men because he gave them moral precepts, by obeying which they might obtain the Divine favour, with the enjoyment of heaven as their just desert? or, because he died in their stead, to atone for their sins and procure for them every blessing, &c.? If Jesus be termed a Saviour merely because he instructed men, he has this honour in common with Moses and Elijah and John the Baptist, neither of whom however assumed the title of Saviour.”<sup>2</sup> We find the title “Saviour” applied frequently in the divine writings to those persons who had been endued with the power of saving people, either by inculcating doctrines, or affording protection to them, although none of them atoned for the sins of mankind by their death. *Obadiah*, ver. 21: “And *saviours* shall come up on mount Zion to judge the mount of Esau; and the kingdom shall be the Lord’s.” *Nehemiah*, ch. ix. ver. 27: “And according to thy manifold mercies thou gavest them *saviours*, who saved them out of the hand of their enemies.” *2 Kings*, ch. xiii. ver. 5: “The Lord /209 gave Israel a *saviour*, so that they went out from under the hand of the Syrians.” How could, therefore, the Editor, a diligent student of the Bible, lay such a stress upon the

<sup>1</sup> Read: “ch. x.” <sup>2</sup> §75

application of the term “Saviour” to Jesus, as to adduce it as a proof of the doctrine of the atonement; especially when Jesus himself declares frequently, that he saved the people solely through the inculcation of the word of God? *John*, ch. xv. ver. 3: “Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you.” Ch. v. ver. 24: “He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life.” Ch. vi. ver. 63: “The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life:”—wherein Jesus represents himself as a Saviour, or a distributor of eternal life, in his capacity of divine teacher.

Jesus is of course justly termed and esteemed a Saviour, for having instructed men in the Divine will and law, never before so fully revealed. Would it degrade Jesus to revere him as a divine teacher, because Moses and the Prophets before him delivered to the people divine instructions? Or would it depreciate the dignity of Jesus, to believe that he in common with several other prophets underwent afflictions and death? Such an idea is indeed unscriptural, for God represents the Christ as a Prophet equal to Moses, (*Deut.* ch. xviii. ver. 18.) Jesus declares himself to have come to fulfil the law taught by Moses, (*Matthew*, ch. v. ver. 7,) “Think not that I am come to destroy the Law and the Prophets, I am not come to destroy but to fulfil;” and strictly commands his disciples and the people at large to obey whatever Moses had taught. Ch. xxiii. vers. 2, 3: “Saying, the Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses’ seat: all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not.”

I am sorry that I cannot, without offending my conscience, agree with the Reverend Editor in the opinion that “If Jesus be esteemed merely a teacher, the greater degree of honour must be given to Moses, for it was in reality his law that Jesus explained and established.”<sup>1</sup>

It is true that Moses began to erect the everlasting edifice of true religion, consisting of a knowledge of the unity of God, and obedience to his will and commandments; but Jesus of Nazareth has completed the structure, and rendered his law perfect. To convince the Editor of this fact, I beg to call his attention to the following instances found even in a single chapter, as exhibiting the perfection to which Jesus brought the Law given by Moses and other Prophets. *Matthew*. ch. v. vers. 21, 22: “Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment: but I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause, shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire.” Vers. 27, 28: “Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery: but I

<sup>1</sup> §75

say unto you, that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery.” Vers. 31, 32: “It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement: but I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery.” Vers. 38, 39: “Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: but I say unto you, that ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also.” Vers. 43–45: “Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy: but I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you, and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.”<sup>1</sup> Now I hope I may be justified in expressing my belief, (though it varies from the declaration made by the Editor,) that no *greater* honour can be justly given to any teacher of the will of God than what is due to the *author* of the doctrines just quoted, which, with a power no /212 less than standing miracles could produce, carry with them proofs of their divine origin to the conviction of the high and low, the learned and unlearned.

§147 The Editor, in page 101,\* lays much stress on circumstances, the very minuteness of which, he thinks, “[serves to enhance their value as testimonies.](#)”<sup>2</sup> He alludes to the epithet “Lamb of God” having been twice applied to Jesus by John the Baptist, two of whose disciples were thereby induced to become followers of Jesus. This is considered by the Editor as implying an admission on the part of Christ, that as a lamb, particularly the Paschal Lamb, was used in sacrifice as an atonement for sins, he also came into the world to sacrifice his life as an atonement for sin. We find, however, the term “lamb,” as well as “sheep,” applied in other places, where no allusion to the sacrificial lamb can be well imagined, and from which we infer that these were epithets generally applied to innocence subjected to persecution; a meaning which sufficiently accords with the use of the word lamb in the instance in question. We have those terms applied by Jesus to his disciples in *John*, ch. xxi. vers. 15–17, where he commands Simon Peter “to feed his lambs.” “to feed his sheep;” and in ch. x. vers. 26, 27, “Ye believe not, because ye are not my sheep.”—“My sheep hear my voice.” Now many of the apostles suffered death in consequence of their endeavours to withdraw men from /213 sin: but the Editor will not thence, I presume, maintain, though it follow from his argument, that the term “lamb” was

Jn 21:15–17  
Jn 10:26f.

\* [London edition, page 37.]

<sup>1</sup> Again, just like in the *Precepts*, the antithesis about swearing is omitted. The antithesis of non-resistance is stripped of all jurisdictional aspects.

<sup>2</sup> §76.

applied to them, to shew that by their death, they also atoned for the sins of mankind.

The Reverend Editor might have spared the arguments he has adduced to prove, that Jesus was sent into this world as the long-expected Messiah, intended to suffer death and difficulties like other prophets who went before him; as the Editor may find in the compilation in question, as well as in its defence, Jesus of Nazareth represented as “The Son of God,” a term synonymous with that of Messiah, the highest of all the prophets; and his life declares him to have been, as represented in the Scriptures, pure as light, innocent as a lamb, necessary for eternal life as bread for a temporal one, and great as the angels of God, or rather greater than they. He also might have omitted to quote such authority as shews, that Christ, being a mediator between God and men, “declared that whatsoever they (his Apostles) shall ask in his name, the Father will give them;”<sup>1</sup> for the Compiler, in his defence of the Precepts of Jesus, repeatedly acknowledged Christ as the Redeemer, Mediator, and Intercessor with God, in behalf of his followers. But such intercession does not, I presume, tend to a proof of the deity or the atonement of Jesus, as interpreted by the Editor; for God is represented in the sacred books to have often shewn mercy to mankind for righteous men’s sakes; how much more, then, would he naturally /214 manifest his favour towards those who might petition him in the name of one, whom he anointed and exalted over all creatures and prophets! *Genesis*, ch. xxx. ver. 27: “I have learned by experience, that the Lord hath blessed me for thy sake.”<sup>2</sup> *Jeremiah*, ch. xxvii. ver. 18: “But if they be Prophets, and if the word of the Lord be with them, let them now make intercessions to the Lord of hosts.” Moreover, we find angels declared to have been endued with the power of pardoning and redeeming men on various occasions. *Genesis*, ch. xlviii. ver. 16: “The Angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads!”<sup>3</sup> *Exodus*, ch. xxiii vers. 20, 21: “Behold, I send an Angel before thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not; for he will not pardon your transgressions: for my name is in him.”

Gn 30:27

Jr 27:18

Gn 48:15f.

Ex 23:20f.

With regard to this doctrine I have carefully noticed every argument advanced by the Editor, from the authority of Jesus himself, in its support; and have adduced such arguments as may be used by those that reject that doctrine, and which they rest on the authority of the same Divine Teacher; leaving the decision of the subject to the discreet judgment of the public, but declining to deliver any opinion, as an individual, as to the merits thereof. /215

§148

<sup>1</sup> §84    <sup>2</sup> Laban talks to Joseph, presuming that Joseph’s presence made him prosper.

<sup>3</sup> Jacob/Israel remembers the angel he had wrestled with and who blessed him (Gn 32:30).



CHAPTER V. ON THE DOCTRINES AND MIRACULOUS NARRATIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

§149 I REGRET that the Editor should have accused the Compiler of having charged “on the dogmas or doctrines of Christianity those wars and that bloodshed which have occurred between nations merely termed Christians.”<sup>1</sup> The Compiler in his defence of the precepts of Jesus, has ascribed such disputes and contentions not to anything contained in the Scriptures, but to the different interpretations of dogmas which he esteemed not essential for salvation. In order to convince the Editor of the accuracy of my assertion, I entreat his attention to page 18, line 22, and page 22, line 24, of my defence of the compiled Precepts, under the designation of “An Appeal to the Christian Public.”\*

§150 The Editor observes, that “wars and bloodshed existed before the promulgation of Christianity in the world; neither Christianity, therefore, nor its dogmas, created the causes of wars and bloodshed. They existed in the human mind long before its doctrines were published;” and that “quarrels and feuds between the Arians and the Orthodox in the fourth and fifth centuries were little more than that struggles /216 for power and wealth.”<sup>2</sup> Although human frailty and want of perfection in men are in fact esteemed as the first and original cause of their improper conduct and wicked deeds, yet in the ordinary acceptation of the term “cause,” good or evil acts are invariably attributed to their immediate motives, ascertained from circumstantial evidence; and these acts are consequently held to entitle their respective agents to praise or reproach.—But as the motives of actions and the secrets of the human heart are in truth known to God alone, it is indeed beyond my power to establish in a satisfactory manner, that the majority of the primitive Arians and Trinitarians were excited by their mistaken religious zeal to slay each other, and not by a desire of power and worldly advancement. I would appeal, however, to the Editor himself, whether it would not be indeed very illiberal to suppose, that almost all the Christian world should for a period of two hundred years have been weak or wicked enough to engage wilfully in causing the blood of each other to be shed under the cloak of religion, and merely for worldly motives. ,But as this must be a matter of opinion, I beg to shew that which has been entertained on the subject by one of the highest

---

\* [See above, p. 117, line 113, and p. 120, lines 16–20.]<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> §92    <sup>2</sup> §92.

<sup>3</sup> “It has been the different interpretations of the dogmas that have given rise to such keen disputes amongst the followers of Jesus”, §31; “Not dwelling upon those matters, an observance of which is not absolutely ordained, and the interpretations of which, instead of introducing peace and happiness, have generally given rise to disputes and controversies”, §32.



authorities against the Trinitarians who have written on the history of Christianity. I allude to Dr. Mosheim whose words I here give, and I entreat my readers to draw their own inferences from them:<sup>1</sup>

Volume I. page 419: “After the death of Con-/217stantine the Great, one of his sons, Constantius, who in the division of the empire became ruler of the East, was warmly attached to the Arian party, whose principles were also zealously adopted by the Empress, and indeed by the whole court. On the other hand, Constantine and Constantius<sup>2</sup>, Emperors of the West, maintained the decrees of the Council of Nice throughout all the provinces where their jurisdiction extended<sup>3</sup>.—Hence arose endless animosities and seditions, treacherous plots, and open acts of injustice and violence between the two contending parties: Council was assembled against Council, and their jarring and contradictory decrees spread perplexity and confusion throughout the Christian world.”<sup>4</sup> Page 420: “His (Gratian’s) zeal for their interest, though fervent and active, was surpassed by that of his successor Theodosius the Great, who raised the secular arm against the Arians with a terrible degree of violence, drove them from their churches, and enacted laws, whose severity exposed them to the greatest calamities.”<sup>5</sup> It is difficult to conceive what other motives than those of mistaken zeal for a particular doctrine could have influenced the mind of an Emperor like Theodosius to such acts of cruelty and violence: but however that may be, it is obvious that if such a mode of interpreting conduct be adopted, it is difficult to say where we are to stop. The devotion even of the Apostles and Martyrs of Christianity may be attributed to a pursuit after power over the minds and respect in the eyes of men, and all dis-/218tinction of good and evil character be considered as futile and without foundation. With respect to the final success of the Trinitarian party, it appears to me the event naturally to have been expected. For, to the people of those ages, doctrines that resembled the polytheistical belief that till then prevailed, must have been more acceptable than those which were diametrically opposed to such notions. The idea of God in human form was easy and familiar: Emperors and Empresses had altars raised to them even during their lives and after death were enrolled as divinities. Perhaps too something may justly be

<sup>1</sup> Johannes Lorenz Mosheim (1693-1755), German church historian. The following quotes are from Mosheim’s *Ecclesiastical History*, published 1726 as *Institutionum historiae ecclesiasticae libri IV* in Germany, and translated and published in England by Archibald Maclaine in 1764.

<sup>2</sup> London1823 gives on p. xxiv an Erratum for this: “The author hat inadvertently inserted the name of *Constantius* instead of *Constans*. It was thought best to leave the error uncorrected in the text, and to notice it here.”

<sup>3</sup> London1823: “throughout all the provinces between the two contending parties.” This is an error. Our text follows Ghose, Nag/Burman and Mosheim/MacLaine, *Ecclesiastical History*, 320.

<sup>4</sup> Mosheim/MacLaine, *Ecclesiastical History*, 320.

<sup>5</sup> Mosheim/MacLaine, *Ecclesiastical History*, 321.

attributed to a certain degree of pride and satisfaction in the idea, that the religion they had begun to profess was dictated immediately by the Deity himself, rather than by any subordinate agency. There had not been among the Heathens any class of mankind to whom they were accustomed to look up with the devotion familiarly entertained by the Jews towards Moses and their Prophets, and they were consequently ready to elevate to a God any being who rose in their estimation above the level of mankind.

§152 The violence and outrages which Roman Catholics and Protestants have experienced from each other, were not of course, as observed by the Editor, owing in their origin to the adoption of different interpretations [respecting the deity of Christ or of the Holy Ghost](#);<sup>1</sup> but they were the immediate consequences of the different sentiments they have held with respect to the doctrine of an exclusive /219 power of granting absolution, and leading to eternal life, being vested in St. Peter and his successors. What great mischief has however been produced, and how many lives have from time to time been destroyed, from the difference of sentiments held by the parties with regard to this doctrine, which even the Editor himself does not deem an essential point of religion!

§153 The Editor in p. 114\* argues, as a proof of the importance of the doctrines of the Gospel, that Christ taught them, fully foreseeing that they would be the subject of dispute; and quotes him saying that he came not to send peace on the earth, but a sword.<sup>2</sup> The whole of the 10th chap. of Matthew, from which the Editor quotes the passage here alluded to, consists of the instructions delivered by Jesus to the twelve Apostles, when he sent them forth to preach the kingdom of heaven to the lost sheep of the house of Israel;<sup>3</sup> but has no allusion, that I can perceive, to eternal dissensions amongst those who were already or might afterwards become Christians. That Jesus foresaw, as one of the primary effects of preaching the Gospel, that great dissensions would arise—that he was aware that the great question of confessing him to be the Messiah or not, would be as a sword between a man and his father, the daughter and her mother, and the daughter-in-law and her mother-in-law, is evident. But this seems to me by no means /220 to prove that Jesus, as supposed by the Editor, “longed or [almost longed](#)” to see a fire kindled in the earth respecting doctrines not essential to the salvation of mankind. Nor would it have been any reason for suppressing the

Mt 10:5f.

Mt 10:34–39

---

\* [London edition, page 56.]

<sup>1</sup> “Between the Papists and Protestants there was never any dispute respecting the Deity of Christ or of the Holy Spirit”, §92.

<sup>2</sup> §93.

<sup>3</sup> “These twelve Jesus sent forth, and commanded them, saying, Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into *any* city of the Samaritans enter ye not: But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel”, Mt 10:5f. (KJV).

most trivial of his sayings, that priestcraft working on the ignorance and superstition, the bigotry or intolerance of mankind, should have wrested his words to evil purposes.—As observed by the Editor himself, the mischief lay originally in human nature, not in any part of the doctrines of Christ; but as those dissensions are now perpetuated principally by education, a cause essentially distinct from their origin, the case is entirely altered. The corruption of the human heart cannot be totally removed; but the evil effects that spring from human institutions may be avoided, when their real sources are known. After the secret and immediate causes of persecution have passed away, the differences of opinion which have been the declared grounds of hostility are handed down by the teachers of different sects; and as already repeatedly avowed, it was with the view of evading, not those questions concerning which Jesus spoke and which distinguish his followers from all other, but those which have from time to time been seized upon to excite enmities still existing amongst fellow-Christians, that the Compiler confined himself to those Precepts, concerning which all mankind must be of one accord.

As to the question of the Editor, “It can scarcely be unknown to the Compiler, that the very being of /221 a God has been for numerous ages the subject of dispute among the most learned of his own country; does he account this a sufficient reason for suppressing this doctrine? He knows that he does not. Why then should he omit the *doctrines* of Christ and his Apostles, because men have made them the subject of dispute?”<sup>1</sup> For a direct answer to this question, I beg to refer the Reverend Editor to the Appeal of the Compiler, page 27, wherein he will find that he assigns not one, but two circumstances, as concurring to form the motive of his having omitted certain doctrines of Christianity in his selection.—1st, that they are the subject of disputes and contention.—2ndly, that they are not essential to religion.\* It is therefore obvious, that the analogy between the omission of certain dogmas, and that of the being of a God, has been unfairly drawn by the Editor. Admitting that the doctrines of Christianity and the existence of a God are equally liable to disputes, it should be recollected that the former are, in the estimation of the Compiler, not essential to religion; while the latter is acknowledged by him, in common with the professors of every faith, to be the foundation of all religion, as distinctly stated in his Introduction to the selected Precepts of Jesus. Every system of religion adopts the idea

§154

---

\* [See above, p. 125.]<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> §93.

<sup>2</sup> “It is on account of these passages being such as were the ordinary foundation of the arguments of the opponents of Christianity, or the sources of the interminable controversies that have let to heart-burnings and even bloodshed amongst Christians, that they were not included in his selection; and they were omitted the more readily, as he considered them not essential to religion”, §37.

of a God, and avows this as its fundamental principle, though they differ from one another in representing the nature /222 and attributes of the Deity. The Compiler therefore could have no motive for suppressing the doctrine of the being of a God, though disputed by a few pretended literary men; and he has consequently never hesitated to inculcate with all his power the idea of one God to the learned and unlearned of his own country, taking care at the same time, as much as possible, not to enter into particulars as to the real nature, essence, attributes, person, or substance of the Godhead, those being points above his comprehension, and liable to interminable disputes. The Reverend Editor thus expresses his surprise at the conduct of the Compiler, in omitting in his selection the miraculous relations of the Gospel:—  
“We cannot but wonder that his miracles should not have found greater favour in the eyes of the Compiler of this selection, while the amazing weight which Jesus himself attaches to them, could scarcely have escaped his notice:”<sup>1</sup> and in order to prove the importance of the miracles ascribed to Jesus, the Editor quotes three instances,<sup>2</sup> in the first of which Jesus referred John the Baptist to his wonderful miracles; in the second, he called the attention of unbelieving Jews to his miraculous works as a proof of his divine mission; in the third, he recommends Philip the Apostle to the evidence of his miracles. But after a slight attention to the circumstances in which those appeals were made, it appears clearly, that in these and other instances Jesus referred to his miracles those persons only who either *scrupled to believe*, or doubted him /223 as the promised Messiah, or required of him some sign to confirm their faith.<sup>3</sup> Vide  
Mt 11:2–6 *Matthew*, ch. xi. vers. 2–4: “When John had heard in the prison the works of Christ, he sent two of his disciples, and said unto him, Art thou he that should come, or do we *look for another*? Jesus answered and said unto them, Go and shew John those things which ye do hear and see.”  
Jn 10:37f. *John*, ch. x. vers. 37 and 38, Jesus says to those Jews who accused him of blasphemy, “If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But *if I do*, though ye believe not me, *believe the works*.” In reply to the request  
Jn 14:8–11 of Philip, who, being discontented with the doctrines Jesus inculcated, said, “Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us;” Jesus answered and said, “Believe me, that I am in the Father and the Father in me, *or else* believe me for the very works’ sake.” (*John*, ch. xiv. ver. 11.) Jesus even speaks in terms of reproach of those that seek for miracles for their conviction as to his divine mission. *Matthew*, ch. xii. ver. 39:  
Mt 12:39 “But he answered and said unto them, An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign.” Moreover he blesses them, who, without having recourse to the proofs

<sup>1</sup> §§94-95. <sup>2</sup> §95.

<sup>3</sup> Rammohan is merely elaborating his point from Appeal, §29: “Miracles must have had a powerful effect on the minds of those who witnessed them, and who without some such evidence were disposed to question the authority of the teacher of those doctrines. [...] Had his doctrines of themselves made not their due impression, the aid of miracles would not have been requisite, nor had recourse to.”

of miracles, profess their belief on him. *John*, ch. xx. ver. 29: “Jesus said unto him, Thomas, because thou hast seen me thou hast believed; *blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.*” Jn 20:29

Under these circumstances, and from the experience that nothing but the sublimity of the Precepts /224 of Jesus had at first drawn the attention of the Compiler himself towards Christianity, and excited his veneration for the author of this religion, without aid from miraculous relations, he omitted in his compilation the mention of the miracles performed by Jesus, without meaning to express doubts of their authenticity, or intending to slight them by such an omission. §155

I regret therefore, that the Editor should have suffered any part of his valuable time to be spent in advancing several arguments, in the concluding part of his Review, to establish the truth of the miraculous statements of the New Testament. But as this discussion applies to the evidence of miracles generally, it may be worth considering. Arguments adduced by the Editor amount to this: “If all social, political, mercantile, and judicial transactions be allowed to rest upon testimony; why should not the validity of Christian miracles be concluded from the testimony of the Apostles and others, and be relied upon by all the nations of the world”.<sup>1</sup> The Editor must be well aware, that the enemies to revelation draw a line of distinction on the subject of proofs by testimony, between the current events of nature familiar to the senses of mankind, and within the scope of human exertions; and extraordinary facts beyond the limits of common experience, and ascribed to a direct interposition of Divine power suspending the usual course of nature. If all assertions were to be indiscriminately admitted as facts, merely /225 because they are testified by numbers, how can we dispute the truth of those miracles which are said to have been performed by persons esteemed holy amongst natives of this country? The Compiler has never placed the miracles related in the New Testament on a footing with the extravagant tales of his countrymen, but distinctly expressed his persuasion that they (Christian miracles) would be apt at best to carry little weight with those whose imaginations had been accustomed to dwell on narrations much more wonderful, and supported by testimony which they have been taught to regard with a reverence that they cannot be expected at all once to bestow on the Apostles. See Introduction to the Precepts, and Appeal, p. 17.\* The very same line of argument indeed pursued by the Editor

\* [Present edition, page 115.]<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This is not a quotation of Marshman, but Rammohan’s summary of Marshman’s argument in §§97-99.

<sup>2</sup> “Miraculous relations, which are much less wonderful than the fabricated tales handed down to the natives of Asia”, Precepts, §2; “In this country, the bare report of such miracles could have given no support to the weight of the doctrines; for as the Compiler has stated in his Introduction, miracles infinitely more wonderful are related of their gods and saints, on authorities that the Hindoos must deem superior to those of the Apostles”, Appeal, §29.

would equally avail the Hindoos. Have they not accounts and records handed down to them relating to the wonderful miracles stated to have been performed by their saints, such as Ugustyu, Vushistu, and Gotum; and their gods incarnate, such as Ram, Krishnu, and Nursingh<sup>1</sup>; in presence of their contemporary friends and enemies, the wise and the ignorant, the select and the multitude?—Could not the Hindoos quote in support of their narrated miracles, authorities from the histories of their most inveterate enemies the Jeins, who join the Hindoos entirely in acknowledging the truth and credibility of their miraculous /226 accounts? The only difference which subsists between these two parties on this subject is, that the Hindoos consider the power of performing miracles given to their gods and saints by the Supreme Deity, and the Jeins declare that they performed all those astonishing works by *Asooree Shukti*, or by demoniac power. Moosulmans on the other hand can produce records written and testified by contemporaries of Mohummud, both friends and enemies, who are represented as eye-witnesses of the miracles ascribed to him; such as his dividing the moon into two parts, and walking in sunshine without casting a shadow. They can assert, too, that several of those witnesses suffered the greatest calamities, and some even death, in defence of that religion; some before the attempts of Mohummud at conquest, others after his commencing such attempts, and others after his death. On mature consideration of all those circumstances, the Compiler hopes he may be allowed to remain still of opinion, that the miraculous relations found in the divine writings would be apt at best to carry little weight with them, when imparted to the Hindoos at large in the present state of their minds: but as no other religion can produce any thing that may stand in competition with the Precepts of Jesus, much less that can be pretended to be superior to them, the Compiler deemed it incumbent upon him to introduce these among his countrymen as a Guide to Peace and Happiness. /227

---

<sup>1</sup> Nārasimha.

CHAPTER VI. ON THE IMPERSONALITY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.  
MISCELLANEOUS REMARKS.

I WILL now inquire into the justness of the conclusion drawn by the Editor in his attempt to prove the Deity of the Holy Ghost, from the circumstance of his name being associated with that of the Father in the rite of Baptism. This subject is incidentally brought forward in the course of the arguments he has adduced respecting the nature of Jesus, where he observes, “It is needless to add that this testimony of Jesus, (the associating of his own name and that of the Holy Ghost with the name of the Father,) is equally decisive respecting the Deity of the Holy Ghost.”<sup>1</sup> I have hitherto omitted to notice this question among other matters in review, reserving it for the express purpose of a distinct and separate examination. It seems to me in the first place rather singular, that the Reverend Editor, after having filled up many pages with numerous arguments in his endeavour to establish the Godhead of Jesus, should have noticed in so short and abrupt a manner, the question of the Deity of the Holy Ghost, although the Editor equally esteems them both as distinct persons of the Deity. I wonder, in the next place, /228 how the learned Editor could suppose a mere association of names in a rite to be sufficient to prove the identity of their subjects. I am indeed sorry I cannot, without overlooking a great many scriptural authorities, and defying reason totally, join the Editor in the opinion, that the association of the name of the Holy Spirit with that of the Father of the Universe, in the rite of Baptism, is “decisive” of, or even allusive to the separate personality of the Spirit. §157

2 *Chronicles*, ch. xx. ver. 20: “Jehoshaphat stood and said, Hear me, O Judah, and ye inhabitants of Jerusalem; Believe in the Lord your God, so shall ye be established; believe his prophets, so shall ye prosper:” wherein the name of the Prophets of God is associated with that of the Deity himself in the profession of belief, which is considered by Christians of all denominations more essential than an external symbol of Christianity. Again, in *Jeremiah*, ch. xxx. ver. 9, “But they shall serve the Lord their God, and David their King, whom I will raise up unto them,” the Lord joins his name with that of David in the act of religious service, which is in its strictest sense esteemed due to God alone. Would it not therefore be unscriptural to make an attempt to prove the Deity of the Prophets, or David, under the plea that their names are associated with that of God in religious observances? But we must do so, were we to follow the process of reasoning adopted by the Reverend Editor. The kind of evidence on which the Editor relies in this instance, would be- /229 sides suit admirably the purposes of those who might seek in the sacred Scriptures, grounds §158  
2 Ch 20:20

<sup>1</sup> §74

for justifying idolatry. Fire worshippers, for instance, insisting on the literal sense of the words, might refer to that text in the 3d chapter of Matthew, repeated in *Luke*, ch. iii. ver. 16, in which it is announced, that Jesus Christ will baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire. If the association in the rite of Baptism of the names of the Son and Holy Ghost, with that of the Father, proves their divinity; it is clear, that fire also, being associated with the Holy Ghost in the same rite, must likewise be considered as a part of the Godhead.

§159 God is invariably represented in revelation as the main object of belief, receiving worship and prayers that proceed from the heart through the first-born of every

creature, the Messiah, ("No man cometh unto the Father but by me." *John*, ch. xiv. ver. 6,) and leading such as worship him in spirit to righteous conduct, and ultimately to salvation, through his guiding influence, which is called the Holy spirit, ("when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth," *John*, ch. xiv. ver. 13). There is therefore a moral obligation on those who avow the truth of such revelation to profess their belief in God as the sole object of worship; and in the Son, through whom they, as Christians, should offer divine homage; and also in the holy influence of God, from which they should expect direction in the path of righteousness, as the consequence of their sincere /230 prayer and supplication.

Mt 28:16-20 For the same reason also, in publicly adopting this religion, it is proper that those who receive it should be baptized in the name of the Father, who is the object of worship; of the Son, who is the mediator; and of that influence by which spiritual blessings are conveyed to mankind, designated in the Scriptures as the Comforter, Spirit of truth, or Holy Spirit. As God is declared through his Holy Spirit to have led to righteousness such as sought heartily his will, so he is equally represented to have through his wrath afflicted rebels against his authority, and to have prospered through his infinite mercy those who manifested obedience to him; as appears from the following passages. *2 Kings*, ch. xxiv. ver. 20: "For through the *anger* of the Lord it came to pass in Jerusalem, until he had cast them out from his presence." *Psalms*

xc. ver. 7: "For we are consumed by thine *anger*, and by thy *wrath* are we troubled."

Ps 90:7 *Psalms* xxi. ver. 7: "And through the *mercy* of the Most High he shall not be moved."

Ps 21:7 *Psalms* vi. ver. 4: "Return, O Lord, deliver my soul: O save me for thy *mercy's* sake."

Nor can we legitimately infer the idea of the self-existence or distinct personality of

Lk 12:12 the Holy Ghost, from such metaphorical language as the following: "The Holy Ghost shall teach you," *Luke*, ch. xii. ver. 12. "The Holy Ghost is come upon you," *Acts*,

Ac 1:8 ch. i. ver. 8. "The Comforter, who is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send,"

Jn 14:26 *John*, ch. xiv. ver. 26. For we find expressions of a similar nature applied to other

Ps 57:3; 85:10; 100:5; 33:22; 36:5; 108:4

attributions of God, personifying them equally with the Holy Spirit. *Psalms*, lvii.

ver. 3: "God shall *send* forth his *mercy* and his *truth*." *Ps.* lxxxv. ver. 10: "*Mercy* and

*truth* are *met* together." *Ps.* c. ver. 5: "The Lord is good, his *mercy* is *everlasting*." *Ps.*



xxxiii. ver. 22: "Let thy *mercy*, O Lord, be upon us." *Ps.* xxxvi. ver. 5: "Thy *mercy*, O Lord, is in the heavens." *Ps.* cviii. ver. 4: "For thy *mercy* is great above the heavens." *Ezekiel*, ch. vii. ver. 3: "I will *send my anger* upon thee." *2 Chronicles*, ch. xxiv. ver. 18, "*Wrath* came upon Judah for this trespass."

Ezk 7:3  
2 Ch 24:18  
§160

Were every attribute ascribed to the Deity, which is found personified, to be therefore considered as a distinct personage, it would be difficult to avoid forming a very strange notion of the theology of the Bible. It appears indeed to me impossible to view the Holy Spirit as very God, without coming to ideas respecting the nature of the Deity, little different from some of those most generally and justly condemned as found amongst Polytheists. Take for instance, *Matthew*, ch. i. ver. 18<sup>1</sup>, where it is said, that Mary was found with child of the Holy Ghost. Ver. 20: "That which is conceived in her, is of the Holy Ghost." *Luke*, ch. i. ver. 35: "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee." In interpreting these passages according to the opinion maintained by the Editor, we should necessarily be drawn to the idea that God came upon Mary, and that the child /232 which she bore was in reality begotten of him.—Is this idea, I would beg to know, consistent with the perfect nature of the righteous God? Or rather, is not such a notion of the Godhead's having had intercourse with a human female, as horrible as the sentiments entertained by ancient and modern heathens respecting the Deity? On the other hand, if we understand those passages, merely that miraculous influence of God came upon Mary, so that, though a virgin, she bore a child, every thing would stand consistent with our belief of the divine power, without shocking our ideas of the purity of the Deity, inculcated alike by reason and revelation. This mode of interpretation is indeed confirmed by the very passage of *Luke* above quoted, "The power of the Highest shall overshadow thee;" plainly and simply declaring, that it was the power of God which gave birth to the child, contrary to the ordinary course of nature.<sup>2</sup> If by the term "Holy Ghost" be meant a third distinct person of the Godhead, equal in power and glory with the Father of all; I am at a loss to know what Trinitarians understand by such expressions as the following. *Matthew*, ch. iii. ver. 11, and *Luke*, ch. iii. ver. 16: "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." *Acts*, ch. x. ver. 38: "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power." *Matthew*, ch. xii. ver. 28: "I cast out the devils by the Spirit of God." Ver. 31: "All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy against the /233 Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men." *Luke*, ch. iv. ver. 1: "And Jesus, being full of the Holy Ghost, returned from Jordan." If the term

Mt 1:18–21

Lk 1:26–38

Mt 3:11; Lk 3:16

Ac 10:38

Mt 12:22–32

Lk 4:1

<sup>1</sup> Read: "ver. 11"

<sup>2</sup> This is a different interpretation than the one given by Rammohan in the *Brahmunical Magazine*, see Rammohan, *Brahmunical*, II, 163.

“Holy Ghost” be synonymous with the third person of the Godhead, and “Christ” with the second person, the foregoing passages may be read as follows: “He, the second person, shall baptize you with third person of the Godhead, and with fire.” “God anointed Jesus of Nazareth, (the second person of the Godhead), with the third person of the Godhead, and with power.” “I (the second person of the Godhead), cast out devils by the third person of the Godhead.” “All manner of sin and blasphemy, even against the first and second person of the Godhead, shall be forgiven unto men; but blasphemy against the third person of the Godhead shall not be forgiven unto men.” “Jesus (the second person of the Godhead), being full of the third person of the Godhead, returned from Jordan.” But little reflection is, I should suppose, necessary to enable any one to perceive the inconsistency of such paraphrases as the foregoing, and the reasonableness of adopting the usual mode of scriptural interpretation of the original texts, according to which the foregoing passages may be understood as follows: “He shall baptize you with the spirit of truth and purity.” “God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with his holy influence and power.” “I cast out devils by the influence of God.” “All manner of sin and blasphemy even against the Christ, the first-born of every creature, /234 shall be forgiven to men; but blasphemy against the power of God shall not be forgiven unto men.” “Jesus being full of the influence of God, returned from Jordan.” Still more dangerous to true religion would it be to interpret, according to the Trinitarian mode, the passages which describe the descent of the Holy Ghost upon Jesus on the occasion of his baptism. *Luke*, ch. iii. ver. 22: “And the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon him.” For if we believe that the Spirit, in the form of a dove, or in any other *bodily shape*, was really the third person of the Godhead, how can we justly charge with absurdity the Hindoo legends of the Divinity having the form of a fish or of any other animal?

Lk 3:22

§161

It ought to be remarked, with respect to the text above quoted, denouncing eternal wrath on those who blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, that the occasion on which the term was made use of by Christ was the accusation of the Jews, that his miracles were the effects of an influence of a nature directly opposite to that of God, namely, the power of Beelzebub, the Prince of Devils. The Jews alleged that he was possessed of an unclean or diabolical spirit. (“Because they said, He hath an unclean spirit,” *Mark*, ch. iii. ver. 30. “They said, This fellow doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub, the prince of the devils,” *Matthew*, ch. xii. ver. 24.) Jesus affirms, that the Spirit which enabled him to do those wonderful works was a holy /235 Spirit; and that whatever language they might hold with respect to himself, blasphemy against that power by which he did those miracles would not be forgiven. “All manner of sins and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it

Mk 3:23–30;  
Mt 12:22–32

shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in the world to come.”

Were the words “all manner of blasphemy,” in the passage in question, received as including blasphemy against the Father, the term must be thus understood: “All manner of blasphemy against man and the Father, and even blasphemy against the Son, shall be forgiven; but blasphemy against the Holy Ghost must not be forgiven:” and consequently the interpretation would amount to an admission of the superiority of the Son and the Holy Ghost to the Father, an opinion which no sect of Christians has hitherto formed. In the above-quoted passage, therefore, the exception of the Holy Ghost must exclude blasphemy against the Father, and the whole should be thus interpreted:—All manner of blasphemy against men and angels, even against the first-born of every creature, shall be forgiven;<sup>1</sup> but blasphemy against the power of God, by which Jesus declared himself to have cast out devils, shall not be forgiven. For further illustration I quote /236 here the whole passage of *Matthew*, ch. xii. vers. 24—37: “But when the Pharisees heard it, they said, This fellow doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub, the prince of the devils. And Jesus knew their thoughts, and said unto them, Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand. And if Satan cast out Satan, he is divided against himself; how shall then his kingdom stand? And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out? therefore they shall be your judges. But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you. Or else how can one enter into a strong man’s house, and spoil his goods, except he first bind the strong man? and then he will spoil his house. He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad. Wherefore I say unto you, All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come. Either make the tree good, and his fruit good; or else make the tree corrupt, and his fruit corrupt: for the tree is known by his fruit. O generation of vipers, how can ye, being evil, speak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart /237 the mouth speaketh. A good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things: and an evil man out of the evil treasure bringeth forth evil things. But I say unto you, That every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment. For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned.” *Mark*, ch. iii. vers. 29, 30: “But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation: because they said, He hath

<sup>1</sup> Ghose: “shall not be forgiven”, which is an error.

an unclean spirit.”

§163 Is it not evident from the above authority of Jesus himself, that the term “Holy Ghost” is synonymous to the prevailing influence of God? And had not the power by which Jesus performed his miracles the same origin, and was it not of the same nature as that by which the children of Israel performed theirs? “If I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out? therefore they shall be your judges.” It may not be without use to notice here, that frequent instances are related in the Scriptures of the influence of the Spirit of God, in leading righteous men to truth, before Jesus had commenced the performance of his divine commission, and even before he had appeared in this world; in the same manner as it afterwards operated in guiding his true followers to the way of God, subsequent to his ascent to heaven, in consequence of his repeated intercession with the Father. This will /238

Lk 1:15, 41, 67 fully appear from the following passages, *Luke*, ch. i. ver. 15: “And he (John the Baptist) shall be filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother’s womb.” Ver. 41: “And it came to pass, that when Elizabeth heard the salutation of Mary, the babe leaped in her womb; and Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Ghost.” Ver. 67: “And his (John’s) father Zacharias was filled with the Holy Ghost, and prophesied,” &c.

Lk 2:25f. Ch. ii. vers. 25, 26: “And, behold, there was a man in Jerusalem, whose name was Simeon; and the same man was just and devout, waiting for the consolation of Israel; and the Holy Ghost was upon him. And it was revealed unto him by the Holy Ghost, that he should not see death, before he had seen the Lord’s Christ. And he came by the Spirit into the temple.” *Mark*, ch. xii. ver. 36: “David himself said by the Holy Ghost, The Lord said to my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool.” The Evangelist Matthew employs a similar expression, ch.

Mk 12:36 xxii. ver. 43: “How then doth David in spirit call him Lord?” *Luke*, ch. iv. ver. 1: “And Jesus, being full of the Holy Ghost, returned from Jordan, and was led by the Spirit into the wilderness.” It must not, therefore, be supposed, that the manifestation of this holy attribute of God is peculiar to the Christian dispensation. We find in the Scriptures the term “God” applied figuratively in a finite sense to Christ, and to some other superiors, as I have already noticed in page 169:<sup>1</sup> a circumstance /239 which may possibly have tended to confirm such as are rendered from their early impressions partial to the doctrine of the Trinity, in their prepossessed notions of the deity of Jesus. But with respect to the Holy Ghost, I must confess my inability to find a single passage in the whole Scriptures, in which the Spirit is addressed as God, or as a person of God, so as to afford to believers of the Trinity an excuse for their profession of the Godhead of the Holy Ghost. The only authorities they quote to this effect that I have met with are as follow: *Acts* ch. v. vers. 3, 4: “Peter said,

Ac 5:3f.

<sup>1</sup> §121.

Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost? Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God.” From which they conclude, He that lieth to the Holy Ghost, lieth to God.<sup>1</sup> *John*, ch. xv. ver. 26: “But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, who proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me.” As to the first of these texts, I need only remark, that in any sin or blasphemy against one of the attributes of God is of course reckoned a sin or blasphemy against God himself. But this admission amounts neither to a recognition of the self-existence of the attribute, nor of its identity with God. With respect to the mission of the Spirit of truth as a proof of its being a separate existence, and not merely an expression for the influence of God, the passage in question if so taken will thus run: “But when God is come, whom I (God) will send unto you from God, even God who /240 proceedeth from God, &c.” Can there be an idea more polytheistical than what flows from these words? Yet those that maintain this interpretation, express their detestation of Polytheism. If with a view to soften the unreasonableness of this interpretation they think themselves justified in having recourse to the term “mystery,” they cannot without injustice accuse Hindoos, the believers of numerous Gods under one Godhead, of absurdity, when they plead mystery in defence of their Polytheism; for under the plea of mystery every appearance of unreasonableness may be easily removed.

Jn 15:26

I find to my great surprise, that the plural form of expression in the 26th verse of the first chapter of Genesis, “And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness,” has been quoted by some divines as tending to prove the doctrine of the Deity of the Holy Ghost, and that of the Son with the Deity of the Father of the universe, commonly called the doctrine of the Trinity. It could scarcely be believed, if the fact were not too notorious, that such eminent scholars as some of those divines undoubtedly were, could be liable to such a mistake, as to rely on this verse as a ground of argument in support of the Trinity. It shews how easily prejudice in favour of an already acquired opinion gets the better of learning, and how successfully it darkens the sphere of truth. Were we even to disregard totally the idiom of the Hebrew, Arabic, and of almost all Asiatic languages, in which the plural /241 number is often used for the singular, to express the respect due to the person denoted by the noun; and to understand the term “our image” “and our likeness,” found in the verse as conveying a plural meaning, the quotation would still by no means answer their purpose; for the verse in question would in that case imply a plurality of Gods, without determining whether their number was three or three hundred, and of course without specifying their persons.—No middle point in the

§164

Gn 1:26f.

<sup>1</sup> Jones, *Catholic Doctrine*, 45f. Jones also gives an argument against Clarke about this verse on this pages.

unlimited series of number being determined, it would be almost necessary for the purpose of obtaining some fixed number, as implied by those terms, to adopt either two, the lowest degree of plurality in the first personal pronoun both in Hebrew and Arabic, or to take the highest number of Gods with which human imagination has peopled the heavens. In the former case the verse cited might countenance the doctrine of the duality of the Godhead entertained by Zirdusht and his followers, representing the God of goodness, and the God of evil, to have jointly created man, composed of a mixed nature of good and evil propensities;<sup>1</sup> in the latter it would be consistent with the Hindoo system of religion; but there is nothing in the words that can be with any justice construed as pointing to Trinity. These are not the only difficulties attending the interpretation of those terms:—if they should be viewed in any other than a singular sense, they would involve contradiction with the very next verse: “So God created man in his own image;” in which the /242 singular number is distinctly used; and in *Deut.* ch. iv. ver. 4, “The Lord our God is one Lord;” and also with the spirit of the whole of the Old Testament.

Dt 4:4

§165

To those who are tolerably versed in Hebrew and Arabic, (which is only a refined Hebrew,) it is a well known fact, that in the Jewish and Mohummudan Scriptures, as well as in common discourse, the plural form is often used in a singular sense when the superiority of the subject of discourse is intended to be kept in view: this is sufficiently apparent from the following quotations taken both from the Old Testament in Hebrew, and from the Qoran. *Exodus*, ch. xxi. ver. 4. In the original Hebrew Scripture **אם אדניו יחו לו אשה** “If his masters (meaning his master) have given him a wife.” Verse 6, Hebrew, **והנישו אדניו אל האלהים** “Then his masters (that is, his master) shall bring him unto the judges.” Verse 29th, **ואם שור ננח הוא מתמל שלשם והועד** “But if the ox were wont to push with his horn in time past, and it has been testified to his owners,” (that is, to his owner).—*Isaiah*, ch. vi. ver. 8, Hebrew, **את מי ואם שור ננח הוא מתמל שלשם והועד** “To whom shall I send? and who will go for us?” (that is, for me).

Ex 21

Is 6:8

§166

Surah 50:16;  
54:49

So also in the Qoran, **نحن اقربن من حنل الوريد** “We are (meaning I am) nearer than the jugular vein.” **انا خلقناه بقدر** “Surely we (meaning I) created every thing in proportion.”<sup>2</sup> In these two texts of the Qoran, God is represented to have spoken /243 in the plural number, although Mohummud cannot be supposed to have employed a mode of expression which he could have supposed capable of being considered favourable to Trinity.

§167

But what are we to think of such reasoning as that which finds a confirmation of the doctrine of the Trinity in the thrice repeated term “holy,” in verse 3d, chapter

<sup>1</sup> Rammohan is referring to the dualistic cosmology of Zoroastrianism and explains it with two creating gods.

<sup>2</sup> These verses are only partly quoted to serve as grammatical examples.

vith of *Isaiah*? Following this mode of argument, the repetitions of the term “Eli, Eli,” or “My God, my God,” by Jesus in his human nature, in *Matthew*, ch. xxvii. ver. 46, equally establishes the duality of the Godhead. So also the holy name of the Supreme Deity being composed of four letters, in the Hebrew יהוה; in Greek θεός; in Latin Deus; in Arabic الله; and in Sunscrit ब्रह्म<sup>1</sup>, clearly denotes the quadrality of the Godhead!!!<sup>2</sup> But these and all similar modes of argument that have been resorted to, are worthy of notice only as they serve to exhibit the extraordinary force of prejudice and superstition.

Is 6:3  
Mt 27:46

The most extraordinary circumstance is, that some should quote in support of the Trinity, the following sentence: “For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one;” representing it as the 7th verse, chap. vth, of the first epistle of John. This is supposed to have been at first composed as a paraphrase upon what stands as verse 8th of the same chapter, (“and there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood; and /244 these three agree in one;”) and met with approbation. It was however for a length of time known only in oral circulation; but was afterwards placed in the margin of some editions, and at last introduced into the text, most probably in the fifteenth century, as an original verse. From that time it has been the common practice to insert this verse amongst those which are collected in support of the Trinitarian doctrine. It may have served in this way to confirm and strengthen prejudice, though few biblical critics ever attached the smallest value to it either way. This interpretation is so modern and so obvious, that several Trinitarian Editors and Commentators of the Bible, such as Griesbach and Michaelis, (who never allowed their zeal for their sect to overcome the prudence and candour with which they were endowed,) have omitted to insert it in their late works on the New Testament; knowing perhaps that such an interpolation, so far from strengthening the doctrine they maintain, has excited great doubts as to the accuracy of other passages generally relied upon for its support.<sup>3</sup>

§168  
1 Jn 5:7

We have already, I trust, seen distinctly that none of the lessons taught by Christ to his disciples teach us to believe in him as God; but as most Trinitarian authors

§169

<sup>1</sup> Brahma – meaning Brahman according to today’s understanding.

<sup>2</sup> By this argument we can clearly see that e. g. Germans are Quadralians (“Gott”), but the English are the only real Trinitarians (“God”). *Editor*.

<sup>3</sup> Rammohan mentions here the German biblical scholars Johann Jakob Griesbach (1745-1812) as editor and Johann David Michaelis (1717-1791) as commentator of the New Testament. Translations of their works in English were available in this time. Griesbach, *NT Graece Vol. II*, 519, omits this spurious Trinitarian formula in his *Novum Testamentum* and explains this in an Appendix, Griesbach, *NT Graece Vol. II*, 630-652. Michaelis writes in his *Introduction to the New Testament* about 1 Jn 5:7: “the verse is rejected by every ancient Greek manuscript, and absolutely inadmissible”, Michaelis, *Introduction*, Vol. I, Part I, 274.

assert that this doctrine was fully revealed by his Apostles speaking under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, it may be worth while to examine whether it be included by them amongst the doctrines of the Christian religion. This question may /245 be immediately determined by referring to the history of the Acts of the Apostles; for if the doctrine of the Trinity had been considered by them as an essential part of what they were commanded to teach, we should certainly find it insisted upon in the discourses they addressed to their converts. But we shall look in vain for any expression amongst those reported by Luke, that indicates the profession of such a belief by the Apostles themselves; far less that they exacted an acknowledgment of its truth, from those whom they admitted by the rite of Baptism into the faith of Christianity.

§170 Acts, ch. ii. ver. 22: "Ye men of Israel, hear these words; Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know;" 32, "This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses." 36, "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." Ch. iii. 22 and 23: "For Moses truly said unto the Fathers, a Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things, whatsoever he shall say unto you. And it shall come to pass, that every soul, which will not hear that Prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people." Ch. iv. ver. 12: "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must /246 be saved." Vers. Ac 2:22-36 26 and 27: "The kings of the earth stood up, and the rulers were gathered together against the Lord, and against his Christ. For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed," &c. Ch. v. ver. 31: "Him has God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins." Ch. vii. ver. 56: "And said, behold, I see the heavens open, and the Son of man standing on the right-hand of God." Ch. viii. vers. 37 and 38: "And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him." Ch. x. ver. 38: "How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power." Ver. 42: "And he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he who was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead." Ch. xiii. ver. 38: "Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins." Ch. xvii. ver. 3:

<sup>1</sup> Rammohan gives samples from speeches of Peter (Ac 2; 3; 4:8-12; 5; 10) and Paul (Ac 13; 17), from a congregational prayer (Ac 4:24-30) and from the stories of the deacons Stephen and Philip (Ac 7; 10).



“Opening and alleging, that Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead; and that this Jesus, whom I preach unto you, is Christ.”<sup>1</sup> Ac 17:3

Thus we find the Apostles never hesitated to hazard their lives by declaring before the Jews that their master was a Prophet, expected Messiah, the /247 Son of the living God: which was equally offensive to their countrymen, as if they called him God himself; yet in none of the Sermons do we ever find them representing him as the true God. In the same manner Jesus himself never assumed that character to himself, although he repeatedly avowed that he was the Messiah, the Son of God, whereby he knew that according to their law he would draw the penalty of death upon himself. As to the nature of those doctrines of Christianity deemed essential in the earliest times, I shall content myself with making a few extracts from the Ecclesiastical History of Mosheim, a celebrated author among Trinitarians, which will prove that the doctrine of the Trinity, so zealously maintained as fundamental by the generality of modern Christians, made not its appearance as an essential, or even secondary article of Christian faith, until the commencement of the fourth century; and then it was introduced after long and violent discussions by the authority of a monarch. Mosheim, Vol. I. p. 100: “Nor in this first century was the distinction made between Christians of a more or less perfect order which took place afterwards: whoever acknowledged Christ as the Saviour of mankind, and made solemn profession of his confidence in him, was immediately baptized, and received into the Church.”<sup>2</sup> P. 411: “Soon after its commencement, even in the year 317, a new contention arose in Egypt upon a subject of much higher importance, /248 and with consequences of a yet more pernicious nature; the subject of this fatal controversy, which kindled such deplorable division throughout the Christian world, was the doctrine of three persons of the Godhead; a doctrine which in the 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 the 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 the distinction that subsists between them, are matters that hitherto were neither disputed nor explained, with respect to which the Church had consequently observed a profound silence:—nothing was declared to be the faith of Christians in this matter, nor were there any modes of expression prescribed as requisite to be used in speaking of the mystery. Hence

<sup>2</sup> This passage is to be found in the New York edition Vol. I on page 88. Mosheim writes about the equality of the primitive Christians and the development of offices and hierarchical orders in the first century.

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 the Holy Ghost, each one following his respective opinion with the utmost liberty.”<sup>1</sup> On this quotation I beg leave to remark, that if, in the first and purest ages of Christianity, the followers of Christ entertained such different opinions /249 on the subject of the distinction between Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, without incurring the charge of heresy and heterodoxy, and without even breaking the tie of Christian affection towards each other, it is a melancholy contrast that the same freedom of opinion on this subject is not now allowed, nor the same mutual forbearance maintained amongst those who call themselves Christians. Mosheim, p. 412: “In an assembly of Presbyters of Alexandria, the Bishop of that city, whose name was Alexander, expressed his sentiments on 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 subtile turn, and remarkable for his eloquence.”<sup>2</sup> Page 414: “The Emperor Constantine, looking upon the subject of this controversy as a matter of small importance, and as little connected with the fundamental and essential doctrines of religion, contented himself at first with addressing a letter to the contending parties, in which he admonished them to put an end to their disputes; but when the Prince saw that his admonitions were without effect, and that troubles and commotions, which the passions of men too often mingle with religious disputes, were spreading and increasing daily throughout the empire, he assembled at length, in the year 325, the famous Council of Nice in Bithynia, wherein the deputies of the Church /250 Universal were summoned to put an end to this controversy. In this general council, after many keen debates and violent efforts of the two parties, the doctrine of Arius was condemned; Christ declared consubstantial or of the same essence with the Father; the vanquished Presbyter banished among the Illyrians, and his followers compelled to give their assent to the creed or confession of faith which was composed by this council.”<sup>3</sup> It must not escape the notice of my readers, that so late as the year 314, the doctrine of the Son being of the same nature with the Father, was supposed to be a

<sup>1</sup> Mosheim/MacLaine, *Ecclesiastical History*, 314f. Mosheim introduces into the Christological dispute about Arius in the 4<sup>th</sup> century, after concluding the description of the Donatists. Rammohan quotes here extensively from Mosheim’s work about the history of the Council of Nice. He omits only some small steps of the controversy, the description of Origen’s and Arius’ theology and the reasoning about Arius’ character. On page 315 Rammohan’s text differs from the source (Mosheim: “nothing was dictated to be the faith”). London1823 reads “declared to the faith”, Ghose and Nag/Burman read “declared to be the faith”, which is probably correct.

<sup>2</sup> Mosheim/MacLaine, *Ecclesiastical History*, 315. <sup>3</sup> Mosheim/MacLaine, *Ecclesiastical History*, 316f.

matter of small importance, and little connected with the fundamental and essential doctrines of religion.

The reason for the majority being in favour of the three persons of the Godhead at the Council of Nice, may be easily accounted for, as I noticed before. More than nine-tenths of the Christians of that age, including the emperor and princes, were Gentile converts, to whom the idea of a plurality of Gods was most familiar and acceptable, and to whose reason as well as practice the worship of a deity in the human shape was perfectly consonant, as appears from the following quotation, as well as from the Roman and Grecian histories. Mosheim, [Vol. I.] p. 25: "The deities of almost all nations were either ancient heroes renowned for noble exploits and worthy deeds, or kings and generals who had founded empires, or women become illustrious by remarkable actions or useful inventions: the merit of these distinguished /251 and eminent persons, contemplated by their posterity with an enthusiastic gratitude, was the reason of their being exalted to celestial honours."<sup>1</sup> We find also in the Acts of the Apostles, Paul declared to be God by the people of Melita, and both Paul and Barnabas regarded as gods by the inhabitants of Lystra; and the Saviour was ranked in the number of false gods even by professed Heathens. *Acts*, ch. xxviii. ver. 6: "Howbeit they looked when he (Paul) should have swollen or fallen down dead suddenly; but after they had looked a great while, and saw no harm come to him, they changed their minds, and said he was a God." *Acts*, ch. xiv. ver. 11: "The gods are come down to us in the likeness of men." Mosheim, [Vol. I.] p. 65: "Many who were not willing to adopt the whole of the doctrines of Christianity, were nevertheless, as appears from undoubted records, so struck with the account of his life and actions, and so charmed with the sublime purity of his precepts, that they numbered him (Jesus) among the greatest heroes, nay, even among the gods themselves."<sup>2</sup> Page 66: "So illustrious was the fame of Christ's power grown after his resurrection from the dead, and the miraculous gifts shed from on high upon his apostles, that the Emperor Tiberius is said to have proposed his being enrolled among the gods of Rome, which the opposition of the senate hindered from taking effect."<sup>3</sup> If some of the Heathens from the nature of their superstitions could rank Jesus among their false gods, it is no wonder if others, /252 when nominally converted to Christianity, should have placed him on an equality with the true God, and should have passed a decree, constituting him one of the persons of the Godhead.<sup>4</sup> These facts coincide entirely with my own

§172

Ac 28:6

Ac 14:11

<sup>1</sup> Mosheim/MacLaine, *Ecclesiastical History*, 33f.

<sup>2</sup> Mosheim/MacLaine, *Ecclesiastical History*, 62f. Slight differences in the text, e. g. "they ranked him in the number of the greatest heroes" etc.

<sup>3</sup> Mosheim/MacLaine, *Ecclesiastical History*, 63. Mosheim gives some references about the truth of this story (Eusebius and Irenaeus).

<sup>4</sup> Mosheim does not associate the old Roman Paganism with the Trinity. These conclusions are drawn

firm persuasion of the impossibility, that a doctrine so inconsistent with the evidence of the senses as that of three persons in one being, should ever gain the sincere assent of any one, into whose mind it has not been instilled in early education. Early impressions alone can induce a Christian to believe that three are one, and one is three; just as by the same means a Hindu is made to believe that millions are one, and one is millions; and to imagine that an inanimate idol is a living substance, and capable of assuming various forms. As I have sought to attain the truths of Christianity from the words of the author of this religion, and from the undisputed instructions of his holy apostles, and not from a parent or tutor, I cannot help refusing my assent to any doctrine which I do not find scriptural.

§173 Before concluding, I beg to revert to one or two arguments respecting the nature of Jesus Christ, which have been already partly touched upon. It is maintained that his nature was double, being divine as Son of God, and human as Son of man—that in the former capacity he performed miracles and exercised authority over the wind and the sea, and as man was subject to and experienced human feelings, joy and sorrow, pleasure and pain.<sup>1</sup> Is it possible to consider a being in the human shape, acting daily in a manner required by the nature of the human race, as the invisible God, above mortality and all the feelings of mortal beings, form a mere figurative application of the terms “Son of God,” or “God,” to him, and from the circumstance of his performing wonderful works contrary to the usual course of nature? If so, what can prevent one from esteeming Moses and others, as possessed of both divine and human nature? since Moses likewise is called God distinctly, (*Exodus*, ch. vii. ver. 1: “I have made thee a God to Pharaoh;”) and he is also called man, (“wherewith Moses, the man of God, blessed Israel,” *Deut.* ch. xxxiii. ver. 1); and consequently it may be alleged, that in his divine capacity Moses performed miracles, and commanded the heavens and the earth, (“Give ear, O ye heavens, and I will speak; and hear, O earth, the words of my mouth,” *Deut.* ch. xxxii. ver. 1; “For it (the word of Moses) is not a vain thing for you, because *it is your life*,” ver. 47;) and that in his human capacity he suffered death and other miseries. Neither Jesus nor Moses declared, “I

Ex 7:1

Dt 33:1

Dt 32:1

Dt 32:47

by Rammohan by connecting Mosheim’s description of the state of religion in pre-Christian era with the Nicean creed.

<sup>1</sup> Rammohan describes the dogma of the hypostatic union, formulated at the Council of Chalcedon 451. Leo of Rome’s Letter about Eutyches, which was accepted by the Council sounds like Rammohan’s description: “Agit enim utraque forma cum alterius communione quod proprium est, verbo scilicet operate quod verbi est, et carne exequente quod carnis est. Unum horum coruscet miraculis, aliud subcumbit iniuriis”, COD I, *Conciliorum Oecumenicum Decreta. Band 1. Konzilien des ersten Jahrtausends. Vom Konzil von Nizäa (325) bis zum vierten Konzil von Konstantinopel (869/70)*, 79. Mosheim/MacLaine, *Ecclesiastical History*, 385f. writes: “The following doctrine, which is at this time almost generally received, was inculcated upon Christians as the object of faith, viz. ‘that in Christ *two distinct persons* were united in *one person*, and that without any change, mixture, or confusion.’”

say so, and perform this as God; and I say so, and perform that as man.” If we give so great a latitude to the modes of reasoning employed to justify the idea of one being possessed of two sorts of consciousness, as God and man, two sorts of minds, divine and human; and two sets of souls, eternal and perishable; then we shall not only be at a loss to know /254 what is rational and what is absurd, but shall find our senses and experience of little or no use to us. The mode of interpreting the Scriptures which is universally adopted, is this, that when two terms seemingly contradictory are applied to one person, then that which is most consistent with reason and with the context should be taken in a literal, and the other in a figurative sense. Thus God is declared to be immaterial, and yet to have hands, eyes, &c. The latter expressions taken literally, being inconsistent with reason, and with other passages of the Scriptures, are understood as metaphorically implying his power and knowledge, while the former is interpreted in its strict and literal sense: in like manner the term “Lord God”, &c. applied to any other than the Supreme Being, must be figuratively understood. Were any one, in defiance of this general mode of interpretation, to insist that the term “God,” applied to Jesus, should be taken in its literal sense, and that consequently Jesus should be actually considered God in the human shape, he would not only acknowledge the same intimate connexion of matter with God, that exists between matter and the human soul, but also would necessarily justify the application of such phrases as “Mother of God”<sup>1</sup> to the Virgin Mary, and “Brother of God” to James and others, which are highly derogatory to the character of the Supreme Author of the universe; and it is the use of phrases similar to these which has rendered the religion of the Hindoos so grossly /255 absurd and contemptible. To admit that all things, whether possible or impossible to our understanding, are possible for God, is certainly favourable to the idea of a mixed nature of God and man;<sup>2</sup> but at the same time would be highly detrimental both to religion and society; for all sorts of positions and tales, however impossible they may be, might in that case be advanced and supported on the same plea.

I now conclude my reply with noticing in a brief manner the modes of illustrations that Trinitarians adopt both in conversation and in writing in support of the

§174

<sup>1</sup> This is exactly the main decision of the Council of Ephesus (431), see COD I, *Conciliarum Oecumenicum Decreta. Band 1. Konzilien des ersten Jahrtausends. Vom Konzil von Nizäa (325) bis zum vierten Konzil von Konstantinopel (869/70)*, 69f. But they did not deal with the brothers of Jesus. Rammohan point seems to be that Protestants are inconsistent in defending the dogma of the hypostatic union but not using the title Mother of God.

<sup>2</sup> The Council of Chalcedon was exactly excluding the idea of a mixed nature. COD I, *Conciliarum Oecumenicum Decreta. Band 1. Konzilien des ersten Jahrtausends. Vom Konzil von Nizäa (325) bis zum vierten Konzil von Konstantinopel (869/70)*, 84: The heretics “autem confusionem et temperamentum introducetes et unam naturam esse carnis et divinitatis stulte configentes es passibilem Unigeniti divinam naturam per confusionem prodigiöse dicentes”.

unity of the Godhead, in consistency with the distinction of three persons. 1st, That as the soul, will, and perception, though they are three things, yet are in fact one, so God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, though distinct persons, are to be esteemed as one. Admitting for a moment the propriety of this analogy, it serves to destroy totally their position, as to the three existences of the Godhead being distinct substances; for, according to the established system of theology, the soul is believed to be the substance, and will and perceptions its properties, which have no distinct existence; in the same manner as weight and locality are the properties of matter, without having existence as separate substances. If this analogy then were to hold good, the Father would be acknowledged as a separate existence like the soul, but the Son and the Holy Spirit must be considered his attributes, as will and perception are of the soul: a doctrine which resembles that of the heretic Sabellius<sup>1</sup> and the early Egyptian Christians.

§175 It is therefore necessary, that, in endeavouring to prove the reasonableness of the idea respecting the unity of the three distinct substances of the Godhead, from comparison between them, and the soul and its will and perception, they should establish first that the soul, will, and perception, are three substances, and that they are at the same time one; and then should draw such an analogy, shewing the possibility of the position which they assume.

§176 2ndly, That as notwithstanding the distinct existence of the sun, his rays of light and his rays of heat, they are considered as one; so God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, though separate substances, are one. Were we to admit the separate existence of heat, a point still disputed amongst philosophers, it would serve as an analogy so far as these three distinct substances, though different in nature, are connected together; but by no means would answer the purpose of illustrating their position, that these distinct persons are one in nature and essence: for the sun is acknowledged to be a compact body; rays of light are fluid substances subject to absorption, and frequently found emanating from other bodies as well as the sun; and heat, an existence of which the most remarkable property is its power of expanding other substances, is frequently unaccompanied by the rays of the sun. But it is universally acknowledged, that whatever argument tends to prove a distinction between substances, must necessarily overturn their unity in essence and existence; and therefore the unity in nature and essence which they assert to exist in the three persons of the Godhead not being found in the sun, light, and heat, the analogy

<sup>1</sup> Maybe Rammohan draws from Mosheim/MacLaine, *Ecclesiastical History*, 238: "Sabellius maintained, that a certain *energy* only, proceeding from the Supreme Parent, or a certain portion of the divine nature, was united to the Son of God, and the man Jesus; and he considered, in the same manner, the *Holy Ghost*, as a portion of the everlasting Father." Maybe he also has another source about Sabellius. He will mention him again in the *Final Appeal*, §581.

attempted to be drawn must be abandoned. Again, it is advanced, that as a single substance possesses various qualities, and consequently is viewed differently; so the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, are in fact one God; yet the Deity in his capacity of Creator of the world is called the Father, and in his capacity of Mediator is termed the Son, in which he is generally supposed inferior to the Father; and in his office of sanctification is named the Holy Ghost, in which he is deemed inferior to both. I know not whether to consider such an argument as reasoning, or as a mockery of reason; since it justifies us in believing, that one and the same being in one of his capacities is superior to himself, and again in reference to another quality is inferior to himself; that he is in one case his own beloved Son, and then in another capacity is at the disposal of himself according to the entreaty of his Son. This mode of arguing after all serves to deny the Trinity, which represents the Godhead as consisting of three distinct persons, and not as one person possessing different attributes, which it is the object of the Trinitarians to prove. They allege the united state of the soul and the body as analogous to the union of the Father and the Son; but no one who believes in /258 the separate existence of the soul, can for a moment suppose it to be of the same essence as the body: so that unless they admit the immateriality of the Father alone, and assert the materiality of the Son in his pre-existent state, this illustration also must be set aside.

Some allege, that as the Son of Man designates human nature, so the Son of God expresses the nature of God. Were we to admit the term "God" as a common noun, and not a proper name, and Godhead as a genus like mankind, &c., and that Jesus was actually begotten of the Deity, this mode of reasoning would stand good; but Godhead must in this case be brought to a level with other genera, capable of performing animal functions, &c. §177

Some represent God as a compound substance, consisting of three parts, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, a representation in support of which they can offer no scriptural authority. I would however wish to know, whether these parts (Father, Son and Spirit) are of the same nature and existence, or each possessed of a different nature or essence. In the former case, there would be a total impossibility of composition; for composition absolutely requires articles or parts of different identity and essence; nothing being capable of composition with itself. Besides, the idea of such a compound substance is inconsistent with that distinct personality of Father, Son, and Spirit, which they maintain.—In the latter case, (that is, the Father, the Son, and the Holy /259 Spirit, being of different natures,) a composition of these three parts is not impossible; but it destroys the opinion which they entertain respecting the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, being of the same nature and essence, and of course implies, that the Godhead is liable to divisibility. §178

The argument so adduced by them would include in reality a denial of the ep- §179

ithet God to each part of the Godhead; for no portion of an existence, either ideal or perceptible in a true sense, can be called the existence itself; as it is one of the first axioms of abstract truth, that a part is less than the whole: but we find in the Scriptures the Father consistently called God in the strict and full signification of the term. *John*, ch. xvii. ver. 3: "This is life eternal, that they may know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." *1 Cor.* ch. xv. ver. 24: "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father." *1 Cor.* ch. viii. ver. 6: "To us there is but one God, the Father." *Ephesians*, ch. iv. vers. 5, 6: "One Lord, one faith, one baptism; one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all."

§180 Another argument which has great weight with that sect is, that unless Jesus is God and man, he cannot be considered as qualified to perform the office of mediator between God and man; because it is only by this compound character that he intercedes for guilty creatures with their offended God.<sup>1</sup>—/260 This mode of reasoning is most evidently opposed to common sense, as well as to the Scriptures; though their zeal in support of the Trinity has not permitted them to see it. I say, opposed to common sense; because we observe, that when any one feels angry with and inclined to punish one of a herd of cattle which may have trespassed on his grounds, or when a rider wishes to chastise his horse on account of its viciousness, it is his friend or neighbour generally who intercedes in its behalf, and is successful in procuring mercy to the offending animal, in his simple nature, without assuming in addition that of the creature in whose behalf he intercedes.—I say, opposed to scripture; because we find in the sacred writings, that Abraham, Moses, and other Prophets, stood mediators and interceded successfully in behalf of an offending people with their offended God; but none of them possessed the double nature of God and man. *Numb.* ch. xi. vers. 1, 2: "When the people complained it displeased the Lord; and the Lord heard it, and his anger was kindled, and the fire of the Lord burned among them, and consumed them that were in the uttermost parts of the camp. And the people cried unto Moses; and when Moses prayed unto the Lord, the fire was quenched." *Nb* 11:1f. Ch. xiv. vers. 19, 20, Moses prayed to the Lord, "Pardon, I beseech thee, the iniquity of this people, according unto the greatness of thy mercy, and as thou hast forgiven this people, from Egypt even until now. And the Lord said, I have pardoned them according /261 to thy word." *Nb* 14:19f. Ch. xxi. ver. 7: "Therefore the people came to Moses, and said, We have sinned, for we have spoken against the Lord, and against thee: pray unto the Lord that he taketh away the serpents from us: and Moses prayed for the people." *Nb* 21:7. *Exod.* ch. xxxii. ver. 30: "And it came to pass on the morrow, that Moses said unto the people, Ye have sinned a great sin, and now I will go up unto *Ex* 32:30

<sup>1</sup> This resembles the reasoning of Anselm of Canterbury's *Cur Deus Homo*.



the Lord, peradventure I shall make an atonement for your sins." *Gen.* ch. xviii. ver. 32: "And he (Abraham) said, O let not the Lord be angry, and I will speak yet but this once—Peradventure ten shall be found there. And he said, I will not destroy it for ten's sake." I find several others performing the office of mediator and intercessor in common with Jesus, as I noticed before; and indeed this seems to have been an office common to all Prophets: but none of them is supposed to have been clothed with Godhead and manhood in union. *Jeremiah*, ch. xxvii. ver. 18: "But if they be Prophets, and if the word of the Lord be with them, let them now make intercession to the Lord of Hosts," &c. *Deuter.* ch. v. ver. 5: "I (Moses) stood between the Lord and you at that time, to shew you the word of the Lord." I regret very much that a sect generally so enlightened should on the one hand have supposed the divine and human natures to be so diametrically opposed to each other, that it is morally impossible for God even to accept intercession from a mere human being in behalf of the human race, and on /262 the other hand should have advanced that the Deity joined to his own nature that of man, and was made flesh, possessing all the members and exercising all the functions of man—propositions which are morally inconsistent with each other.

To avoid the supposed dishonour attached to the appointment of a mediator less than divine, the Deity is declared by them to have assumed the human shape, and to have subjected himself to the feelings and inclinations natural to the human species; which is not only inconsistent with the immutable nature of God, but highly derogatory to the honour and glory which we are taught to ascribe to him. §181

Other arguments of the same nature are frequently advanced, but they are all together much fewer in number, and far less convincing, than those which are commonly brought forward by Hindoos to support their Polytheism. Since, then, in evincing the truth and excellence of the Precepts of Jesus, there is no need of the aid of metaphysical arguments, and since as a last resource they do not depend for their support on the ground of mystery, the Compiler has in the discharge of his duty towards his countrymen, properly introduced them as a Guide to Peace and Happiness. /263 §182

APPENDIX. NO. I. ON THE QUOTATIONS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT CONTAINED IN THE NEW.

§183 It cannot have escaped the notice of attentive readers of the Scriptures, that the bare quotations in the New Testament from the Old, when unaccompanied with their respective contexts, are liable to be misunderstood. Those who are not well versed in the sacred writings, finding in those references such phrases as apparently corroborate their already acquired opinions, not only lay stress upon them, in support of the sentiments generally adopted, but even lead others very often, though unintentionally, into great errors.

§184 Thus *Matthew* ii. 15: “Out of Egypt have I called my Son.” The Evangelist refers to chapter xi. verse 1 of *Hosea*; which, though really applied to Israel, represented there as the Son of God, is used by the apostle in reference to the Saviour, in consideration of a near resemblance between their circumstances in this instance:—both Israel and Jesus were carried into Egypt and recalled from thence, and both were denominated in the Scriptures as the “Son of God.” The passage of *Hosea* thus runs from chapter xi. vers. 1st to the 3d: “When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my Son out of Egypt. As they called them, so they went from them: they sacrificed unto Baalim, and burnt incense to graven images. I taught Ephraim also to go, taking them by their arms; but they knew not that I healed them.” In which Israel, who is represented as a child of God, is declared to have sacrificed to Baalim, and to have burnt incense to graven images—circumstances which cannot justly be ascribed to the Saviour.

§185 With a view, therefore, to remove the possibility of such errors, and to convince my readers that all the references in the New Testament with their contexts manifest the unity of God and natural inferiority of the Messiah to the Father of the universe, I have endeavoured to arrange them methodically,<sup>1</sup> beginning with such quotations as were made by Jesus himself, agreeably to the proposal of the Reverend Editor.

*Quotations by Jesus himself exactly agreeing with the Hebrew.*

§186 *Matthew* iv. 4, “Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God:” the same in *Luke* iv. 4, compared with *Deut.* viii. 3, “And he humbled thee, and suffered thee to hunger, and fed thee with manna,

<sup>1</sup> This appendix is based on Thomas Randolph’s *The Prophecies, and Other Texts, Cited in the New Testament, &c.* Randolph compared all quotations in three columns, Hebrew, New Testament and Septuagint. Rammohan selected the quotations made by Jesus from the gospels and used Randolph’s system to assort them. Only in three cases he differs. The short interpretations Rammohan occasionally adds, are his own and not from Randolph.

which thou knewest not, neither did thy fathers know; that he might make thee know, that man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord doth man live.”

*Matthew* iv. 7, “Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God”—compared with *Deut.* vi. 16, 17, “Ye shall not tempt the Lord your God, as ye tempted him in Massah. Ye shall diligently keep the commandments of the Lord your God, and his testimonies, and his statutes, which he hath commanded thee.” /265 §187  
Mt 4:7; Dt 6:16f.

*Matthew* ix. 13, “But go ye and learn what that meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice”—compared with *Hosea* vi. 5, 6, “Therefore have I hewed them by the prophets; I have slain them by the words of my mouth: and thy judgments are as the light that goeth forth. For I desired mercy, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings.” §188  
Mt 9:13; Ho 6:5f.

*Matthew* xix. 19, xxii. 39, “Honour thy father and thy mother: and, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself”—compared with *Exodus* xx. 12, “Honour thy father and mother, that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee”—and *Leviticus* xix. 18, “Thou shalt not avenge nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people; but thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself: I am the Lord.”<sup>1</sup> §189  
Mt 19:19; 22:39; Ex 20:12; Lv 19:18

*Matthew* xxi. 42, “The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner: this is the *Lord’s doing*, and it is marvellous in our eyes;”—the same in *Mark* xii. 10, *Luke* xx. 17, compared with *Psalms* cxviii. 22, 23, “I (says David) will praise thee; for thou hast heard me, and art become my salvation. The stone which the builders refused is become the headstone of the corner. This is the Lord’s doing; it is marvellous in our eyes.” To decide whether this passage is principally applied to David, and in the way of accommodation to Jesus, or originally to Jesus himself, is entirely left to the discretion of my readers; but it is evident in either case, that it is God that has *raised the stone so rejected*. §190  
Mt 21:42; Mk 12:10; Lk 20:17; Ps 118:22f.

*Matthew* xxii. 44, “The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool:” the same in *Mark* xii. 36, *Luke* xx. 42, compared with *Psalms* cx. 1, 2: “The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit /266 thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool. The Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies.” This passage is simply applied to the Messiah, manifesting that the victory gained by him over his enemies was entirely owing to the influence of God. §191  
Mt 22:44; Mk 12:36; Lk 20:42; Ps 110:1f.

*John* x. 35, “Ye are gods”—compared with *Psalms* lxxxii. 1, 6, 7, “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: but ye shall die like men, and fall like §192  
Jn 10:33–36; Ps 82

<sup>1</sup> Randolph, *Prophecies*, 4, lists this quotation as No. 19 and 20. Unlike Rammohan, he puts 19 in the category 2 “Agreeing nearly with the Hebrew”, Randolph, *Prophecies*, 25.

one of the princes;” wherein Jesus shews from this quotation, that the term God is figuratively applicable in the Scriptures to creatures of a superior nature.

*Quotations made by Jesus himself, nearly agreeing with the Hebrew.*

§193 *Matthew* iv. 10, “Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only thou shalt serve”—compared with *Deut.* vi. 13, “Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve him, and shalt swear by his name.”  
Mt 4:10; Dt 6:13

§194 *Matthew* xiii. 14, “By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive”—compared with *Isaiah* vi. 9, and its context, “I heard the voice of the Lord, saying, Whom shall I send, and who will go for us? Then said I, (Isaiah,) Here am I, send me. And he said, Go and tell this people, Hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not.” This censure has original reference to the conduct of the people to whom Isaiah was sent, but it is applied by Jesus in an accommodated sense to that of the Jews of his time. /267  
Mt 13:14; Is 6:9

§195 *Matthew* xix. 5, “For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh”—compared with *Genesis* ii. 23, “And Adam said, This is now bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called woman; because she was taken out of man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh.”  
Mt 19:5; Gn 2:23

§196 *Matthew* xix. 18, 19, “Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Honour thy father and thy mother: and, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself”—compared with *Exodus* xx. 12–16, “Honour thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord giveth thee. Thou shalt not kill. Thou shalt not commit adultery. Thou shalt not steal. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.”  
Mt 19:18f.; Ex 10:12–16

§197 *Matthew* xxii. 32, “I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob”—compared with *Exodus* iii. 6, “Moreover he said, I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. And Moses hid his face; for he was afraid to look upon God.”  
Mt 22:32; Ex 3:6

§198 *Matthew* xxii. 37, “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy mind:” the same in *Mark* xii. 30, *Luke* x. 27, compared with *Deut.* vi. 5, “And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might.”  
Mt 22:37–40; Mk 12:30; Lk 10:27; Dt 6:5

*Matthew* xxvi. 31, “Then saith Jesus unto them, All ye shall be offended because of me this night: for it is written, I will smite the Shepherd, and the sheep of the /268 flock shall be scattered abroad”—compared with *Zechariah* xiii. 7, “Awake, O sword, against my Shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow,\* saith the Lord of hosts: smite the Shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered; and I will turn mine hand upon the little ones.” §199  
Mt 26:31; Zc 13:7

Verse 7 was originally applied to Agrippa, (אגריפה) the last king of the Jews, whose subjects were scattered after he had been smitten with the sword,<sup>1</sup> and in an accommodated sense is applied by Jesus to himself, whose disciples were in like manner dispersed, while he was suffering afflictions from his enemies—or is directly applicable to Jesus; but in both cases his total subordination and submission to the Father of the universe is too obvious to be disputed. §200

*John* vi. 45, “It is written in the Prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man, therefore, that hath heard and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me”—compared with *Isaiah* liv. 13, “And all thy children shall be taught of the Lord; and great shall be the peace of thy children.” §201  
Jn 6:45; Is 54:13

*John* xiii. 18, “I speak not of you all; I know whom I have chosen: but that the Scripture may be fulfilled, He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heels against me”—compared with *Psalms* xli. 9, “Mine own familiar friend, in whom I trusted, which did eat of my bread, hath lifted up his heel against me,” is immediately applicable to David and his friend Ahithophel, who betrayed him; and secondarily, to Jesus, and Judas, his traitorous apostle. /269 §202  
Jn 13:18; Ps 41:10

*John* xv. 25, “But this cometh to pass, that the word might be fulfilled that is written in their law, They hated me without a cause”—compared with *Psalms* cix. 2, 3, “They have spoken against me with a lying tongue. They compassed me about also with words of hatred; and fought against me without a cause.” Verse 3d was originally applied to David and his enemies, and in an accommodated sense to Jesus and the Jews of his day. §203  
Jn 15:25; Ps 109:2f.

\* The word עמית found in the original Hebrew scripture, signifies one that lives near another; therefore the word “fellow” in the English translation is not altogether correct, as justly observed by Archbishop Newcome.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> There seems to be a Jewish interpretation in the background, although I was not able to trace an exact source.

<sup>2</sup> Newcome translated “the man *who is* near unto me”. The 1809 edition of Newcome’s text contains also Blayney’s comment to *Zc* 13:7: “—the man *who is* near unto me] This passage has been usually understood to predict the sufferings and death of Christ. I have no conception that it has the most distant relation thereto. Yet some have gone so far as to find in the word עמית a proof of the divinity of Christ’s person, Cocceii. *Lex. in verbum*. But all that can be made of עמית is, that it may signify a *neighbour*, one that is *near* or *next* to another, or that bears some kind of *correspondency* or resemblance to him, but exclusive of the idea of *parity*”, Newcome, *Attempt*, 336. This was probably read by Rammohan.

*Quotation made by Jesus himself, agreeing with the Hebrew in sense, but not in words.*

§204 *Matthew* xxi. 16, “Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise”—compared with *Ps.* viii. 2, and its preceding verse, “Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings though hast ordained strength, because of thine enemies; that thou mightest still the enemy and the avenger.”

Mt 21:16; Ps 8:1f.

*Quotation taken from combined Passages of Scripture.*

§205 *Matthew* xxi. 13, “And said unto them, It is written, My house shall be called the house of prayer: but you have made it a den of thieves”—compared with *Isaiah* lvi. 17<sup>1</sup>, “For mine house shall be called the house of prayer for all people.” Ch. vii. 11, “Is this house which is called by my name become a den of robbers in your eyes?”<sup>2</sup>

Mt 21:13; Is 56:7;  
7:11

*Quotation differing from the Hebrew, but agreeing with the Septuagint.*

§206 *Matthew* xv. 7–9, “Ye hypocrites, well did Esaias prophesy of you, saying, This people draweth nigh unto /270 me with their mouth, and honoureth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me. But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men”—compared with *Isaiah* xxix. 13, which in the Septuagint corresponds exactly with the Gospel, but which in verse 9, differs from the original Hebrew, thus translated in the common version: “And their fear toward me is taught by the precepts of men.”

Mt 15:7–9; Is  
29:13

*Quotations in which there is reason to suspect a different Reading in Hebrew, or that the Apostles understood the words in a sense different from that expressed in our Lexicons.*

§207 *Matthew* xi. 10, “This is he of whom it is written, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, who shall prepare thy way before thee”—compared with *Malachi* iii. 1, “Behold I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me.” *Matthew* xxvi. 31, “I will smite the Shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad”—compared with *Zechariah* vii. 8,<sup>3</sup> “Smite the Shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered.”

Mt 11:10; Ml 3:1

Mt 26:31; Zc 13:7

§208 *Luke* iv. 8, “Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve”—compared with *Deut.* vi. 13, “Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve him.”<sup>4</sup>

Lk 4:8; Dt 6:13

<sup>1</sup> Read: “lvi. 7”. <sup>2</sup> This quotation is not in Randolph’s work, but added by Rammohan himself.

<sup>3</sup> Read: “xiii. 7”. Ghose is correct.

<sup>4</sup> Randolph, *Prophecies*, 2, lists this quotation as No. 9 and puts it in the category 2 “Agreeing nearly with the Hebrew”, Randolph, *Prophecies*, 25. In the annotation, Randolph remarks, that the New Testa-

*Quotations slightly varying from the Septuagint.*

*Luke* iv. 18, 19, “The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and *recovering of sight to the blind*; to set at liberty them that are bruised; to /271 preach the acceptable year of the Lord”—compared with *Isaiah* lxi. 1, 2, “The Spirit of the Lord is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek: he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord.” Lk 4:18f.; Is 61:1f. §209

Now I beg the attention of my readers to these quotations ascribed to Jesus himself, and appeal to them, whether he assumed in any of these references the character of the Deity, or even equality with him. I am certain that they will find nothing of the kind: Jesus declared himself in these instances entirely subordinate to the Almighty God, and subject to his authority, and frequently compared himself to David or some of the other Prophets. /272 §210

---

ment “translates אִירָח by προσκυχθήσεως instead of φοβηθήσῃ.” This apparently motivated Rammohan to put it in this category (“the Apostles understood the word in a sense different”).

[APPENDIX.] NO. II. ON THE REFERENCES MADE TO THE OLD TESTAMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE DEITY OF JESUS.

§211 TRINITARIAN Divines quote *John* i. 14, “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,” as a reference to *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,”—though the evangelist John *made not allusion* to this passage of *Isaiah* in the verse in question. The passage of *Isaiah* thus referred to was applied to *Hezekiah*, the son of Ahaz, figuratively designated as the son of the virgin, the daughter of Zion, to wit Jerusalem, foretold by the Prophet as the deliverer of the city from the hands of its enemies, though its utter destruction was then threatened by the kings of Syria and Israel. The words “a virgin,” according to the English translation, are “the virgin,” both in the original Hebrew and in the Greek of the Gospel of *Matthew*, as well as in the Septuagint. But unless Ahaz was aware of the allusion of the Prophet, the use of the definite article in this passage must be quite inexplicable; and no one will content for a moment, that it was given to that wicked king to understand that the mother of Christ was the virgin alluded to; what then could Ahaz have comprehended by the expression “the virgin”? On /273 referring to 2 *Kings* xix. 21, we find the same Prophet make use of the very expression, where he informs the king, *Hezekiah*, of the denunciation of God against Sennacherib, the blasphemous king of Assyria, who was at that time besieging Jerusalem. “This is the word that the Lord hath spoken concerning him; *The virgin*, the daughter of Zion, hath despised thee, and laughed thee to scorn.”—It is impossible to conceive that these words, expressly spoken of the king of Assyria, bear any allusion to the virgin, the mother of Christ; and it illustrates clearly the otherwise obscure expression of the Prophet addressed to Ahaz, when he foretold to him the happy reign of his successor Hezekiah. In *Isaiah* x. 32, “He (the king of Assyria) shall shake his hand against the mount of the daughter of Zion, the hill of Jerusalem.” The epithet “The daughter of Zion,” which in the last passage was used as synonymous with “the virgin,” here signifies Jerusalem itself, in which sense it was commonly used in the figurative language of the Prophet, and no doubt well understood by Ahaz: for we find the same words in many other passages used to signify either a city or the people of a city. *Isaiah* xxiii. 12: “And he said, Thou shalt no more rejoice, O thou oppressed *virgin*, daughter of Zion.” Ch. xlvii. 1: “Come down, and sit in the dust, O *virgin* daughter of Babylon.”—*Jeremiah* xiv. 17: “Therefore thou shalt say this word unto them: Let mine eyes run down with tears night and day, and let them not cease; for the *virgin* daughter of my people is broken with a great breach.” Ch. xviii. 13: “Therefore thus said the Lord; Ask ye now

Jn 1:14  
Is 9:6f.  
2 K 19:21  
Is 10:32  
Is 23:12  
Is 47:1  
Jr 14:17  
Jr 18:13



among the heathen, who hath heard such things: the *virgin* of Israel hath done a very horrible thing.” Ch. xxxi. 4: “Again I will build thee, and thou shalt be build, O *virgin* of Israel: thou /274 shalt again be adorned with thy tabrets, and shalt go forth in the dances of them that make merry.” Ver. 13: “Then shall the *virgin* rejoice in the dance,” &c. Ver. 21: “Set thee up waymarks, make thee high heaps: set thine heart toward the highway, even the way which thou wentest: turn again, O *virgin* of Israel, turn again to these thy cities.” *Lam.* i. 15: “The Lord hath trodden the *virgin*, the daughter of Judah, as in a wine-press.” Ch. ii. 13: “What thing shall I take to witness for thee? what thing shall I liken to thee, O daughter of Jerusalem? what thing shall I liken to thee, O *virgin* daughter of Zion? for thy breach is great like the sea; who can heal thee?” *Amos* v. 2: “The *virgin* of Israel is fallen, she shall no more rise: she is forsaken upon her land; there is none to raise her up.”

Jr 31

Lm 1:15

Lm 2:13

Am 5:2

To shew that the passages in question, as well as all that is foretold in this and the succeeding chapters, refer to the reign of Hezekiah, nothing more than a comparison of them with the records of that reign is requisite. I shall therefore lay before my readers all those verses in these chapters that are commonly referred to by Trinitarians as alluding to the coming of Christ, with their contexts, together with such parts of the history of the reign of Hezekiah as appear to me to be clearly indicated by those passages.

§212

*Isaiah* vii. 1: “And it came to pass in the days of Ahaz, the son of Jotham, the son of Uzziah, king of Judah, that Rezin the king of Syria, and Pekah the son of Remaliah, king of Israel, went up toward Jerusalem to war against it, but could not prevail against it. 2, And it was told the house of David, saying, Syria is confederate with Ephraim. And his heart was moved, and the heart of his people, as the trees of the wood are moved with the wind. /275 3, Then said the Lord unto Isaiah, Go forth now to meet Ahaz, thou, and Shearjashub thy son, at the end of the conduit of the upper pool in the highway of the fuller’s field; 4, And say unto him, Take heed, and be quiet; fear not, neither be fainthearted for the two tails of these smoking firebrands, for the fierce anger of Rezin with Syria, and of the son of Remaliah. 5, Because Syria, Ephraim, and the son of Remaliah, have taken evil counsel against thee, saying, 6, Let us go up against Judah, and vex it, and let us make a breach therein for us, and set a king in the midst of it, *even* the son of Tabeal: 7, Thus saith the Lord God, It shall not stand, neither shall it come to pass. 8, For the head of Syria is Damascus, and the head of Damascus is Rezin; and within threescore and five years shall Ephraim be broken, that it be not a people. 9, And the head of Ephraim is Samaria, and the head of Samaria is Remaliah’s son. If ye will not believe, surely ye shall not be established. 10, Moreover the Lord spake again unto Ahaz, saying, 11, Ask thee a sign of the Lord thy God; ask it either in the depth, or in the height above. 12, But Ahaz said, I will not ask, neither will I tempt the Lord. 13, And he

§213

Is 7:1-17

said, Hear ye now, O house of David, Is it a small thing for you to weary men, but will ye weary my God also? 14, Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. 15, Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil, and choose the good. 16, For before the child shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings. 17, The Lord shall bring upon thee, and upon thy people, and upon thy father's house, /276 days that have not come, from the day that Ephraim departed from Judah; even the king of Assyria."

§214 Chap. viii. 5: "The Lord spake also unto me again, saying, 6, Forasmuch as this people refuseth the waters of Shiloah that go softly, and rejoice in Rezin and Remaliah's son; 7, Now therefore, behold, the Lord bringeth up upon them the waters of the river, strong and many, even the king of Assyria, and all his glory: and he shall come up over all his channels, and go over all his banks: 8, And he shall pass through Judah; he shall overflow and go over,—he shall reach even to the neck; and the stretching out of his wings shall fill the breadth of thy land, O Immanuel."

Is 8:5-8

§215 Chap. ix. 1: "Nevertheless, the dimness shall not be such as was in her vexation, when at the first he lightly afflicted the land of Zebulun, and the land of Naphtali, and afterward did more grievously afflict her by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, in Galilee of the nations. 2, The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light: they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined. 3, Thou hast multiplied the nation, and not increased the joy: they joy before thee according to the joy in harvest, and as men rejoice when they divide the spoil. 4, For thou hast broken the yoke of his burden, and the staff of his shoulder, the rod of his oppressor, as in the day of Midian. 5, For every battle of the warrior is with confused noise, and garments rolled in blood; but this shall be with burning and fuel of fire. 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. 7, /277 Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end,\* upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this."

Is 9:1-7

§216 Chap. x. 5: "O Assyrian, the rod of mine anger, and the staff in their hand is

---

\* Those that are at all versed in scriptural language will attach no weight to the terms "no end" and "for ever," found in ch. v. 7; for the former often signifies plenteousness, and the latter long but not eternal duration. Vide Eccl. iv. 16: "There is no end of all the people, even of all that have been before them." Isaiah ii. 7: "Neither is there any end of their treasure, neither is there any end of their chariots." Nahum ii. 9: "There is none end of their store." Ch. iii. 3: "And there is none end of their corpses." Psalm cxlv. 2, 9: "I will praise thy name for *ever and ever*." Deut. xv. 17: "And he shall be thy servant *for ever*."

mine indignation. 6, I will send him against an hypocritical nation, and against the people of my wrath will I give him a charge, to take the spoil, and to take the prey, and to tread them down like the mire of the streets. 7, Howbeit he meaneth not so, neither doth his heart think so, but it is in his heart to destroy and cut off nations not a few. 8, For he saith, Are not my princes altogether kings? 9, Is not Calno as Carchemish? is not Hamath as Arpad? is not Samaria as Damascus?\* 10, As my hand hath found the kingdoms of the idols, and whose graven images did excel them of Jerusalem and of Samaria; 11, Shall I not, as I have done unto Samaria and her idols, so do to Jerusalem and her idols? 12, Wherefore it shall come to pass, that, when the Lord hath performed his whole work upon mount Zion and on Jerusalem, I will punish the fruit of the stout /278 heart of the king of Assyria, and the glory of his high looks.”—16, “Therefore shall the Lord, the Lord of hosts, send among his fat ones leanness; and under his glory he shall kindle a burning like the burning of a fire. And the light of Israel shall be for a fire, and his *Holy One* for a flame: and it shall burn and devour his thorns and his briars in one day.”—24, “Therefore thus saith the Lord God of hosts, O my people that dwellest in Zion, be not afraid of the Assyrian: he shall smite thee with a rod, and shall lift up his staff against thee, after the manner of Egypt. 25, For yet a very little while, and the indignation shall cease, and mine anger in their destruction.” 27,<sup>†</sup> “And it shall come to pass in that day, that his burden shall be taken away from off thy shoulder, and his yoke from off thy neck, and the yoke shall be destroyed because of the anointing.”

Is 10

2 Kings xviii. 1: “Now it came to pass in the third year of Hoshea son of Elah king of Israel, that Hezekiah the son of Ahaz king of Judah began to reign. 2, Twenty and five years old was he when he began to reign; and he reigned twenty and nine years in Jerusalem: his mother’s name also was Abi, the daughter of Zachariah. 3, And he did that which was right in the sight of the Lord, according to all that David his father did. 4, He removed the high places, and brake the images, and cut down the groves, and brake in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made: for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense to it; and he called it Nehushtan. 5, He trusted in the Lord God of Israel; so that *after him* was none like him among all the kings of Judah, nor any that /279 were *before him*. 6, For he clave to the Lord, and departed not from following him, but kept his commandments, which the Lord commanded Moses. 7, And the Lord was with him: and he prospered whithersoever he went forth: and he rebelled against the king of Assyria and served him not. 8, He smote the Philistines, even unto Gaza, and the borders thereof, from the tower

§217

2 K 18

\* Compare vers. 9—11, with the historical relation of the vain boastings of the Assyrian, narrated in 2 Kings xviii. 33—35.

† Compare with 2 Kings xvi. 7, “So Ahaz sent messengers to Tiglath-pileser King of Assyria, saying, I am thy servant and thy son,” &c., and ch. xviii. 7, as above.

of the watchmen to the fenced city.”—17, “And the king of Assyria sent Tartan, and Rabсарis, and Rab-shakeh, from Lachish to king Hezekiah, with a great host against Jerusalem. And they went up and came to Jerusalem. And when they were come up, they came and stood by the conduit of the upper pool, which is in the highway of the fuller’s field.”—28, “Then Rab-shakeh stood, and cried with a loud voice in the Jews’ language, and spake, saying, Hear the word of the great king, the king of Assyria: 29, Thus saith the king, Let not Hezekiah deceive you: for he shall not be able to deliver you out of his hand: 30, Neither let Hezekiah make you trust in the Lord, saying, The Lord will surely deliver us, and this city shall not be delivered into the hand of the king of Assyria. 31, Harken not to Hezekiah: for thus saith the king of Assyria, Make an agreement with me by a present, and come out to me, and then eat ye every man of his own vine, and every one of his fig tree, and drink ye every one the waters of his cistern: 32, Until I come and take you away to a land like your own land; a land of corn and wine, a land of bread and vineyards, a land of oil-olive and of honey, that ye may live, and not die; and hearken not unto Hezekiah, when he persuadeth you, saying, The Lord will deliver us. 33, Hath any of the gods of the nations delivered at all his land out of the hand of the king of Assyria? 34, Where are the gods of Hamath, and of Arpad? where /280 are the gods of Sepharvaim, Hena, and Ivah? have they delivered Samaria out of mine hand? 35, Who are they among all the gods of the countries that have delivered their country out of mine hand, that the Lord should deliver Jerusalem out of mine hand?”

§218 Chap. xix. 15: “And Hezekiah prayed before the Lord, and said, O Lord God of  
2 K 19 Israel, which dwellest between the cherubims, thou art the God, even thou alone, of all the kingdoms of the earth; thou hast made heaven and earth. 16, Lord, bow down thine ear, and hear: open, Lord, thine eyes, and see: and hear the words of Sennacherib, which hath sent him to reproach the living God.” 19, “Now therefore, O Lord our God, I beseech thee save thou us out of his hand, that all the kingdoms of the earth may know that thou art the Lord God, even thou only. 20, Then Isaiah the son of Amoz sent to Hezekiah, saying, Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, That which thou hast prayed to me against Sennacherib king of Assyria I have heard. 21, This is the word that the Lord hath spoken concerning him; *The virgin, the daughter of Zion*, hath despised thee, and laughed thee to scorn; the daughter of Jerusalem hath shaken her head at thee. 22, Whom hast thou reproached and blasphemed? and against whom hast thou exalted thy voice, and lifted up thine eyes on high? even against the Holy One of Israel. 23, By thy messengers thou hast reproached the Lord, and hast said, With the multitude of my chariots I am come up to the height of the mountains, to the sides of Lebanon, and will cut down the tall cedar trees thereof, and the choice fir trees thereof: and I will enter into the lodgings of his borders, and into the forest of his Carmel.”—27, “But I know thy abode, and thy going out, and thy

coming in, and thy rage against me. 28, Because thy rage against me and thy /281 tumult is come up into mine ears, therefore I will put my hook in thy nose, and my bridle in thy lips, and I will turn thee back by the way by which thou camest.” 32, “Therefore thus saith the Lord concerning the king of Assyria, He shall not come into this city, nor shoot an arrow there, nor come before it with shield, nor cast a bank against it. 33, By the way that he came, by the same shall he return, and shall not come into this city, saith the Lord. 34, For I will defend this city, to save it, for mine own sake, and for my servant David’s sake. 35, And it came to pass that night, that the angel of the Lord went out, and smote in the camp of the Assyrians an hundred fourscore and five thousand: and when they arose early in the morning, behold, they were all dead corpses. 36, So Sennacherib king of Assyria departed, and went and returned, and dwelt at Nineveh. 37, And it came to pass, as he was worshipping in the house of Nisroch his god, that Adrammelech and Sharezer his sons smote him with the sword; and they escaped into the land of Armenia: and Esar-haddon his son reigned in his stead.”

2 Chron. xxx. 24: “For Hezekiah king of Judah did give to the congregation a thousand bullocks, and seven thousand sheep; and the princes gave to the congregation a thousand bullocks, and ten thousand sheep: and a great number of priests sanctified themselves. 25, And all the congregation of Judah, with the priests and the Levites, and all the congregation that came out of Israel, and the strangers that came out of the land of Israel, and that dwelt in Judah, rejoiced. 26, So there was great joy in Jerusalem; for since the time of Solomon, the son of David king of Israel, there was not the like in Jerusalem. 27, Then the priests the Levites arose and blessed the /282 people: and their voice was heard, and their prayer came up to his holy dwelling-place, even unto heaven.” §219  
2 Ch 30:24–27

Chap. xxxi. 20: “And thus did Hezekiah throughout all Judah, and wrought that which was good and right and truth before the Lord his God. 21, And in every work that he began in the service of the house of God, and in the law, and in the commandments, to seek his God, he did it with all his heart, and prospered.” §220  
2 Ch 31:20f.

Chap. xxxii. 23: “And many brought gifts unto the Lord to Jerusalem, and presents to Hezekiah king of Judah: so that he was magnified in the sight of all nations from thenceforth.” 33, “And Hezekiah slept with his fathers, and they buried him in the chiefest of the sepulchres of the sons of David: and all Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem did him honour at his death. And Manasseh his son reigned in his stead.” §221  
2 Ch 32:23, 33

If, as is declared by Trinitarians, the child promised in ch. vii. 14, be the same that is alluded to in ch. ix. 6, and ch. x. 17, it is quite evident from the context, that he was to be the deliverer of the Jews from the hands of the king of Assyria, and was to be distinguished by the excellence of his administration and the respect in which he §222

was to be held by all nations. Making allowance for the hyperbolic style of Eastern nations, nothing can more aptly apply as prophecy than these passages do to the reign of Hezekiah, as described in the above extracts from *Kings* and *Chronicles*. But what, it may be asked, had the birth of Christ to do with the destruction of the king of Assyria? or how could it be said that before he “knew to refuse the evil and choose the good,” the land of Syria and of Israel should be deserted of their respective kings Rezin and Pekah, who where gathered to their fathers many years before his birth?  
/283

§223 This illustrious son of Ahaz was not the only king among the select nation of God, that was honoured with such names as Hezekiah or “God my strength,” and “Emmanuel” or “God with us;” and also with such epithets as “Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, and the Prince of Peace.” We find several other chiefs of that tribe that used to walk in the way of God, dignified in Scripture with epithets of a similar import. *Genesis xxxii. 28*: “And he said, Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel (Prince of God): for as a prince hast thou power with God and with men, and hast prevailed.” *Psalms lxxxix. 18*: “For the Lord is our defence; and THE HOLY ONE of Israel is our king. 19, Then thou spakest in vision to thy Holy One, and saidst, I have laid help upon one that is mighty: I have exalted one chosen out of the people. 20, I have found David my servant; with my holy oil have I anointed him: 27, Also I will make him MY FIRSTBORN, higher than the kings of the earth.”

Gn 32:28

Ps 89:18-27

§224 As to the word “a virgin,” found in the English translation, I request my readers to advert to the original Hebrew העלמה “the virgin,” as well as to the Greek both of the Septuagint and the Gospel of Matthew, ἡ παρθένος “the virgin,” leaving it to them to judge, whether a translation which so entirely perverts the meaning preserved throughout, by men whom we cannot suspect of ignorance of the original language, must not have proceeded from a previous determination to apply the term “virgin,” as found in the Prophet, to the mother of Christ, in order that the high titles applied to Hezekiah might in the most unqualified manner be understood of Jesus.

§225 The Evangelist Matthew referred in his Gospel to *Isaiah vii. 14*, merely for the purpose of accommodation; /284 the Son of Ahaz and the Saviour resembling each other, in each being the means, at different periods, though in different senses, of establishing the throne of the house of David. In the same manner he referred to *Hosea xi. 1*, in ch. ii. 15 of his Gospel, and in many other instances. How inconsistent is it that a sect, which maintains the omniscience and omnipotence of Jesus, should apply to him a passage, by which he is made subject to such a degree of ignorance, as not to be able at one period to distinguish between good and evil. (*Isaiah vii. 16*: “For before the child shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the good,” &c.) Admitting that these quotations in *Isaiah* were originally applicable to Jesus, they

Mt 1:23f.

Mt 2:15

cannot assist in proving the Deity of the Messiah; just as they fall short of proving the divinity of Hezekiah when applied to him:—for we find in the sacred writings the name of God, and even the term Jehovah, the peculiar name of God, applied as an appellation to others, without establishing any arguments for asserting the Deity of those to whom such names are given. *Jeremiah* xxxiii. 16: “In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely: and this is the name wherewith she shall be called, JEHOVAH OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.” In the English version, the word Jehovah is rendered “Lord” in this and in other passages.—*Exodus* xvii. 15: “And Moses built an altar, and called the name of it Jehovahnissi, or ‘JEHOVAH MY BANNER.’” It is fortunate that some sect has not hitherto arisen, maintaining the Deity of Jerusalem, or of the altar of Moses, from the authority of the passages just mentioned.

Jr 33:16

Ex 17:15

In the Epistle to the Hebrews, ch. i. 8, 9, reference is made to *Psalm* xlv. 6, 7, “Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever, &c. Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest /285 wickedness: therefore God, thy God hath anointed thee,” &c. I have frequently noticed that the term “God” in an inferior sense is often applied in the Scriptures to the Messiah and other distinguished persons; but it deserves particularly to be noticed in this instance, that the Messiah, in whatever sense he is declared God, is in the very same sense described in ch. v. 6 (“God thy God”) as *having a God superior to him*, and by whom he *was appointed* to the office of Messiah.

§226

Heb 1:8f.

(=Ps 45:6–8)

*Supposed application of the term “Jehovah” to Jesus in references made to the Old Testament.*

*Luke* i. 16, 17: “And many of the children of Israel shall he (John the Baptist) turn to the Lord their God. And he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just; to make ready a people prepared for the Lord”—compared with *Isaiah* xl. 3, “The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of Jehovah, make straight in the desert a highway for our God:” and also in *Malachi* iii. 1, “Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith Jehovah of hosts.” From this, it is concluded by Trinitarians, that because the Prophet John described as the forerunner of Jehovah, and in the evangelist as the forerunner of Jesus, therefore

§227

Lk 1:16f.

Is 40:3

Ml 3:1

<sup>1</sup> Jones, *Catholic Doctrine*, 4-6, uses Lk 1:76, Mt 11:10, Lk 1:16f., Mt 3:11 and Ml 3:1 and concludes: “John the Baptist goes before the *face of the Lord*, that is, of the *Highest*, whose *prophet* he is, to prepare *his way*. But, he was sent as a Messenger before the *face of Christ*, to prepare *his way*; who, therefore, is the *Lord*, and the *Highest*.”

Jesus must be Jehovah.<sup>1</sup>

§228 In reply to this, it may be simply observed, that we find in the Prophet distinct and separate mention of Jehovah and of the Messiah as the messenger of the covenant; /286 John therefore ought to be considered as the forerunner of both, in the same manner as a commander sent in advance to occupy a strong post in the country of the enemy, may be said to be preparing the way for the battles of his king, or of the general whom the king places at the head of his army.

§229 They also refer to *Isaiah* vi. 5, "For mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of hosts"—comparing it with *John* xii. 41, "These things said Isaiah, when he saw his glory, and spake of him." The passage in the evangelist is more correctly explained by referring to *John* viii. 56, "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day," which cannot be understood of ocular vision, but prophetic anticipation; whereas the glory seen in the vision of Isaiah was that of God himself in the delivery of the commands given to the Prophet on that occasion.<sup>2</sup>

§230 *Corinthians* i. 30, "But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness," &c. is compared with *Jeremiah* xxiii. 6, "He shall be called Jehovah our righteousness." In reply to which I only refer my reader again to the passage in *Jeremiah* xxxiii. 16, in which Jerusalem also is called "Jehovah our righteousness," and to the phrase "*is made unto us of God*" found in the passage in question, and expressing the inferiority of Jesus to God. Also *2 Cor.* v. 21, "That we might be made the righteousness of God in him," where St. Paul says, that all Christians may be made the righteousness of God.

§231 Mr. Brown, a celebrated Trinitarian Commentator, retains the common version of *Jeremiah* xxiii. 6, and applies it to Jesus, whom he supposes to be "Jehovah our righteousness." But in ch. xxxiii. 16, where the construction in the original Hebrew is precisely the same, he /287 alters the version, and thus renders it in the margin, "he who shall call her is Jehovah our righteousness," instead of applying the phrase "Jehovah is our righteousness" to Jerusalem, in the same manner as he had applied it to Jesus in the former passage.<sup>3</sup>—I therefore deem it necessary to give the original Hebrew of both texts, and a verbal translation of them. The reader will judge how strongly the judgment of the learned Commentator was biassed in support of a favourite doctrine. *Jer.* xxiii. 6, אשר יקראו בשם זוה יהוה צדקנו "In his days shall be saved Judah, and Israel shall dwell in safety, and this his name which (man) shall call him, Jehovah our righteousness." *Jer.* xxxiii. 16, אשר יקראו לה יהוה צדקנו "In those

<sup>2</sup> Jones, *Catholic Doctrine*, 2, is using Is 6:5 and Jn 12:41.

<sup>3</sup> Brown, *Self-Interpreting Bible*, 793, gives "he who shall call her is Jehovah our righteousness," as literal translation from the Hebrew in the margin.



days shall be saved Judah, and Jerusalem shall dwell in savety, and this (name) which (man) shall call her, Jehovah, our righteousness.

In altering the common translation of the latter passage, Mr. Brown first disregards the stop after **לה יקרא** that is, “shall call her;” which, by separating the two parts of the sentence, prevents Jehovah from being employed as the agent of the verb “shall call.” 2ndly, He entirely neglects the established mode of construction, by leaving **זה** or “this,” untranslated, and by omitting to point out the name by which Jerusalem should be called. 3dly, He totally overlooks the idiom of the Hebrew, in which verbs are often employed unaccompanied with their agent, when no specific agent is intended, as appears from the following passages:—

*Gen.* xxv. 26, **וְאַחֲרַי כֵּן יֵצֵא אֲחִיו וַיְדוּ אִחֻזָּה בְּעֵקֶב עָשׂוּ וַיִּקְרָא שְׁמוֹ יַעֲקֹב** “And after that came his brother out, and his hand took hold on Esau’s heel, and (man) called his /288 name Jacob.” 2 *Samuel* ii. 16, **וַיִּחְזְקוּ אִישׁ בְּרֹאשׁ רֵעֵהוּ וַחֲרָבוֹ בְּצַד רֵעֵהוּ וַיִּפְּלוּ יַחְדָּו**, “And they caught every one his fellow

by the head, and thrust his sword in his fellow’s side; so they fell down together: wherefore (man) called that place Helkath Hazurem, which is Gibeon.” *Genesis* xvi. 14, **עַל כֵּן קָרָא לְבָאֵר בְּאֵר לַחַי רֹאִי** “Wherefore (man) called the well Beer-lahai-roi.”

They again adduce *Isaiah* xlv. 23, “Unto me (God) every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear”—compared with *Romans* xiv. 10, 12, “But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? For we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ. For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God.” Between the Prophet and the Apostle there is a perfect agreement in substance, since both declare that it is to God that every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall confess, through him before whose judgment-seat we shall all stand:—for at the same time both Jesus and his Apostles inform us, that we must stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, because the Father has committed the office of final judgment to him.—From this passage, they say, it appears that Jesus swore by himself, and that thereby he is proved to be God, according to the rule, that it is God only that can swear by himself.<sup>2</sup> But how can they escape the context, which expressly informs us, that “the Lord” (Jehovah), and not Jesus, swore in this manner? We must not however overlook what the Apostle says in his epistle to the *Philippians*, ch. ii. 9–11, where he declares, that at the name of Jesus every knee shall /289 bow and every tongue shall confess; but neither must we forget, that Jesus is declared to have been exalted to these honours by God, and that the only

§232

§233

Gn 25:26

2 S 2:16

Gn 16:14

§234

Is 45:23

Rm 14:10–12

Ph 2:5–11

Ph 2:5–11

Ph 2:5–11

Ph 2:5–11

Ph 2:5–11

Ph 2:5–11

Ph 2:5–11

Ph 2:5–11

Ph 2:5–11

Ph 2:5–11

Ph 2:5–11

Ph 2:5–11

Ph 2:5–11

Ph 2:5–11

Ph 2:5–11

Ph 2:5–11

Ph 2:5–11

Ph 2:5–11

Ph 2:5–11

Ph 2:5–11

Ph 2:5–11

<sup>1</sup> We follow London1823 in reading the correct form **יֵצֵא** instead of **יֵצֵא**.

<sup>2</sup> The first part of the verse Is 45:23 runs “I have sworn by myself” (speaks God). Jones, *Catholic Doctrine*, 38: “Christ, therefore, has sworn by HIMSELF: so that if the Apostle’s rule Heb 6:13 be applied, he must for this reason be GOD, and there can be NO GREATER.”

confession required is that he is Lord, which office confession of his dignity is to the glory of God the Father. 9, “Wherefore God also hath highly *exalted* him, and *given* him a name which is above every name; 10, That at the name of Jesus every knee shall bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; 11, And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.”

§235 Some have adopted a most extraordinary way of establishing the deity of Jesus. And epithet or act, however common it may be, ascribed to God in the Sacred Writings, and also to Christ in the New Testament, is adduced by them as proof of his deity; and I observe with the utmost surprise, that the prejudice of many Christians in favour of the doctrine of the Trinity induces them to lay stress upon such sophisms. For instance, *Isaiah* xliii. 3, “For I am the Lord thy God, the Holy one of Israel, thy Saviour”—compared with *2 Peter* iii. 18, “Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.” The conclusion they draw from these passages is, that unless Jesus were God, he could not be a Saviour:<sup>1</sup> but how futile this reasoning is will clearly appear from the following passages: *Nehemiah* ix. 27, “Thou gavest them saviours, who saved them.” *Obad.* 27, “And saviours shall come up on Mount Zion.” *2 Kings* xiii. 5, “And the Lord gave Israel a Saviour, so they went out from under the hand of the Syrians: and the children of Israel dwelt in their tents, as beforetime.” *Isaiah* xix. 19, 20, “In that day shall there be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar at the border thereof to the Lord. And it shall be for a sign /290 and for a witness unto the Lord of Hosts in the land of Egypt: for they shall cry unto the Lord because of the oppressors, and he shall send them a Saviour, and a great one, and he shall deliver them.” If this argument possesses any force, then it would lead us to acknowledge the deity not only of Jesus, but that of those different individuals to whom the term “Saviours” or “Saviour” is applied in the above citations. The phrase in *Isaiah*, “Besides me there is no Saviour,” is easily accounted for by considering, that all those who have been instrumental in effecting the deliverance of their fellow-creatures from evils of whatever nature were dependent themselves upon God, and only instruments in his hands; and thus all appearance of inconsistency is removed.

§236 Again, *Ps.* xxiii. 1, “Jehovah is my Shepherd”—compared with *John* x. 16, “And other sheep I have, which are not of his [this] fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold, and one Shepherd.” In the former text, David declared God to be his shepherd or protector; in the latter, Jesus represents himself as the one shepherd of the one fold of Christians, some of whom

<sup>1</sup> Jones, *Catholic Doctrine*, 3f., uses *Is* 43:11 and *2 P* 3:18: “Jesus Christ is a *Saviour*, therefore he is *Jehovah*, the Lord—Jesus Christ is *Jehovah*, therefore he is *the Saviour*.”

were already attached to him, and others were afterwards to become converts: but Trinitarian writers thus conclude from these passages: if Christ be not one with Jehova, he could not be called a Shepherd, and thus there would be two shepherds: but a little reflection on the following passages will convince every unbiassed person, that Moses is called a shepherd in like manner, and his followers a flock; and that the term “shepherd” is applied to others also, without conveying the idea of their unity with Jehova. *Isaiah* lxiii. 11, “Then he remembered the days of old, Moses and his people, saying, Where is he that brought them up out of /291 the sea with the shepherd of his flock?” *Ezekiel* xxxiv. 23, 24, “And I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even *my servant* David; he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd. And I the Lord will be their God, and my *servant David* a prince among them. I the Lord have spoken it.” If they insist (though without any ground) upon interpreting the name David as put for Jesus, they must still attribute his shepherdship over his flock to divine commission, and must relinquish the idea of unity between God the employer, and the Messiah his *servant*. *Jeremiah* xxiii. 4, “I will set up shepherds over them, which shall feed them: and they shall fear no more, nor be dismayed, neither shall they be lacking, saith the Lord.”

Is 63:11  
Ezk 34:23f.

Jr 23:4

*Psalms* lxxviii. 56, “They tempted and provoked the most high God”—compared with [1] *Cor.* x. 9, “Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted.” They thus conclude: the former passage declares the most high God to have been tempted by rebellious Israelites, and in the latter, Jesus is represented to have been the person tempted by some of them, consequently Jesus is the most high God.<sup>1</sup> How far cannot prejudice lead astray men of sense! Is it not an insult to reason, to infer the deity of Jesus from the circumstance of his being in common with God, tempted by Israel and others? Are we not all, in common with Jesus, liable to be tempted both by men and by Satan? *Hebrews* iv. 15, “For we have not an high priest who cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points *tempted like as we are*, yet without sin.” *Genesis* xxii. 1, “And it came to pass after these things, that God did tempt Abraham.” Can the liability to temptation common to God, to Jesus, to Abraham, and to all mankind, be of any /292 avail to prove the divinity and unity of these respective subjects of temptation?

§237  
Ps 78:56; 1 Co 10:9

Heb 4:15

Gn 22:1

We find Moses in common with God is spoken against by the rebellious Israelites. *Numb.* xxi. 5, “And the people (Israel) spoke against God, and against Moses.” Are we to conclude upon this ground, that [because] God as well as Moses is declared to have been spoken against by Israel, that Moses therefore is God himself? In the

§238  
Nb 21:5

<sup>1</sup> Jones, *Catholic Doctrine*, 6: “These texts do both relate to the same rebellious acts of the *Israelites* in the *wilderness*. In the *former* of them, the person they *tempted* is called the *most High God*: in the *latter* he is called *Christ*: therefore *Christ* is the *most High God*.”

same text quoted by them, we find the most high God provoked also—(they tempted and provoked the most high God)—so we find Moses and David provoked at different times. *Numbers*<sup>1</sup> xxi. 1, “And Satan stood up against Israel, and provoked David;” and *Psalm* cvi. 32, 33, “It went ill with Moses for their sakes: because they provoked his spirit, so that he spake unadvisedly with his lips.” Can any one from the circumstance of Moses and David having been the subjects of provocation, in common with God, be justified in attempting to prove the deity of either of them?

1 Ch 21:1  
Ps 106:32f.

§239

*Ps. [Isaiah]* liv. 5, “Thy Maker is thine husband, the Lord of hosts is his name”—compared with *John* iii. 29, “He that hath the bride is the bridegroom,” &c. [*Eph.*] v. 23, “For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the Church,” &c. From these they infer, that as the Church is one bride, so on the other hand there is one husband, who is termed in one place God, and in another place Christ.<sup>2</sup> My readers will be pleased to examine the language employed in these two instances: in the one, God is represented as the husband of all his creatures, and in the other, Christ is declared to be the husband or the head of his followers; there is, therefore, an inequality of authority evidently ascribed to God and to Jesus. Moreover, Christ himself shews the /293 relation that existed between him and his Church, and himself and God, in *John* xv. 1, “I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman”—[5,] “I am the vine, ye are the branches.” Would it not be highly unreasonable to set at defiance the distinction drawn by Jesus between God, himself, and his Church, and to attempt a conclusion directly contrary to his authority, and unsupported by revelation?

Is 54:5; Jn 3:29;  
Ep 5:23

Jn 15:1–8

§240

*Revelation* xxii. 13, “I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last”—compared with *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 beside me there is no God.” From a comparison of these verses they conclude, that there is no God besides him who is the first and the last; but Jesus is the first and the last; therefore besides Jesus there is no other God.<sup>3</sup> I must embrace this opportunity of laying before my readers the context of the verse in Revelation, which will, I presume, shew to every unbiassed mind how the verse in question has been misapplied; since the verse cited in defence of the deity of Jesus, when considered in relation to the passages that precede and follow it, most clearly declares his inferiority and his distinct nature from the Father. *Revelation* xxii. 6, “And he (the angel) said unto me, These sayings are faithful and true: and the Lord God of the holy prophets sent his

Rv 22:6–16; Is  
44:6–8

<sup>1</sup> Read: “*Chronicles*”.

<sup>2</sup> Jones, *Catholic Doctrine*, 7: “And the Church, which is the *Bride of Christ*, can no more have two distinct husbands, than *Christ* can have two distinct Churches.

<sup>3</sup> Jones, *Catholic Doctrine*, 3: “There is no God besides him who is *the first and the last*: but, *Jesus* is *the first and the last*; therefore *besides Jesus* there is no other God.”

angel to shew unto his servants the things which must shortly be done. 7, Behold, I come quickly: blessed is he that keepeth the sayings of the prophecy of this book. 8, And I John saw these things and heard them. And when I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel which shewed me these things. 9, Then saith he unto me, See thou do it not: for I am thy fellow-servant, and of /294 thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book: worship God. 10, And he saith unto me, Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book: for the time is at hand. 11, He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still. 12, And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be. 13, I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last. 14, Blessed are they that do *his* commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city. 15, For without are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie. 16, I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star.”

If they ascribe verse 13, (“I am Alpha and Omega,” &c.) to Jesus, and not to the angel mentioned in the above passage, they must also unavoidably ascribe to Jesus the passage coming immediately before or after it, including of course verse the 9th, “Then saith he unto me, See thou do it not: for I am thy fellow-servant,” &c., for there is but one agent described by the pronoun “*He*” in the whole train of the verses above quoted, who is pointed out clearly by the repetition of the phrase, “Behold I come quickly,” in verses 7th and 12th. In this case the passage, although it speaks of Jesus as Alpha and Omega, &c., yet must be considered as denying him the divine nature, and ranking him among the chosen servants of God (“For I am thy fellow-servant”). If they ascribe all the verses of chap. xxii. as far as verse the 16th, to the /295 angel, they cannot justify themselves in founding their conclusion with regard to the deity of Jesus upon the force of verse the 13th, “I am Alpha and Omega,” &c., which in the latter case can bear no relation to Christ, since their system requires them to apply it to an inferior angel. I beg the attention of my readers to five particular circumstances in this instance. 1st, That the angel whom the Lord sent, as intimated in verse the 6th, was intended to shew his servants in general things that would shortly happen; and the angel sent by Jesus, as found in verse 16th, was to testify to John and other disciples the things relating to the churches. 2dly, Jesus declares in verse 16th, and in the subsequent verses, that he is the offspring of David, and that it is God that has the power of punishing any one who either takes away from or adds any thing to his revelation. 3dly, That the passage in *Revelation* xxii. 13, is not parallel to that contained in the prophecy of *Isaiah* xliv. 6, since the phrase

§241

“*Besides me there is no God*,” which is found in the latter, and upon which the whole controversy turns, is not contained in the former. 4thly, That when the angel rejected the worship of John addressed to himself, he ordered him to worship God, without mentioning the name either jointly or separately of the Lamb, by which Jesus is distinguished throughout the Revelation:—“Worship God,” ver. 9. 5thly, in the very next verse, after the speaker, whether Jesus or an angel, describes himself as Alpha and Omega, he uses the expression, “Blessed are they that do *his* commandments,” clearly indicating the existence of another being to whose *commandments* obedience is required.

§242 It is worth noticing here, that the terms “Alpha and Omega, beginning and end,” are in a quite finite sense justly /296 applicable to Jesus as the first of all created existences, and the last of those who will be required to resign the authority with which he is invested by the Father. See *Colossians* i. 15, “The first-born of every creature;” 1 *Corinthians* xv. 28, “Then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him.”

§243 *Isaiah* xl. 10, “Behold, the Lord God will come with a strong hand, and his arm shall rule for him: behold, his reward is with him, and his work before him”—is compared with *Revelation* xxii. 12, “I come quickly; and my reward is with me.” From the circumstance of the common application of the phrase, “his reward is with him,” to God and to Jesus, they infer the deity of the latter;<sup>1</sup> in answer to which I beg to refer my readers to the foregoing paragraphs illustrating verse 11th, which immediately precedes the verse in question of the *Revelation*, and also to *John* v. 30, 22, “As I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father who hath sent me. The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son;” and to *Matthew* xvi. 27, “For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works.” Do not these passages point out evidently, that the power of exercising judgment and of distributing rewards *has been given* to Jesus by the Almighty, and that Jesus possesses this authority in behalf of the *Father* of the universe?

§244 *Ephesians* iv. 8, “When he (Christ) ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men”—compared with *Psalms* lxxviii. 18, “Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive: thou hast received gifts for men, yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them.” The Jews are of opinion /297 that David in this verse spoke of Moses, who when he ascended to Mount Sinai, received gifts (i. e. the divine commandments) for men, even for the

<sup>1</sup> Jones, *Catholic Doctrine*, 41, uses *Is* 40:10 and *Rv* 22:12 and explains: “Amen, even so come LORD JESUS.”

rebellious Israelites; in this case the Apostle Paul in his epistle, must have applied the verse in an accommodated sense to Jesus. The verse in the Psalm may be directly applied to Jesus, who, on his ascension, received gifts of pardon even for those who had rebelled against him. Mr. Brown, a celebrated Trinitarian Commentator, and several others, consider the 18th verse in this *Psalm*, and verse 8th in this chapter of *Ephesians*, as immediately applicable to Jesus as the Messiah.<sup>1</sup> But another writer, Mr. Jones, with a view to establish the deity of Christ by a comparison of *Ephesians* iv. 8, with *Psalm* lxxviii. 18, omits carefully the latter part of the verse, (“Thou hast received gifts for men, yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them,”) which is altogether inapplicable to God, and quotes only the first part of the verse, (“thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive;”) and thence draws this conclusion—“The Scripture here (in the Epistle referred to) expressly affirms the person who ascends, &c. to be the Lord God.”<sup>2</sup> From a view of the whole verse, the sense must, according to this mode of reasoning, be as follows—“The person who ascended on high, and who *received* gifts for men, *that the Lord God* might dwell among them, is the Lord God;” an interpretation, which as implying that the Lord God ascended and received gifts from a Being of course superior to himself, in order that he might dwell among men, is equally absurd and unscriptural.

*Zechariah* xii. 10, as found in the English Version, “In that day they shall look upon me whom they have pierced”—compared with *John* xix. 37, “They shall look /298 on him whom they pierced;” from which comparison he has thus concluded—“As it stands in the Prophet, the Lord Jehovah was to be pierced; so that unless the man Christ who hung upon the cross was also the Lord Jehovah, the Evangelist is found to be a false witness, in applying to him a prophecy that could not possibly be fulfilled in him.”<sup>3</sup> In order to shew the source of Mr. Jones’s error, I beg to lay before my readers the verse in Hebrew, and a translation thereof from the Arabic Bible<sup>4</sup>, as well as a correct translation into English.

ושפכתי על בית דויד ועל יושב ירושלם רוח חן ותחנונים והבישו אלי את אשר דקרו וספרו  
 עליו כמספד על היחיד והמר עליו כהמר על הבכור

§245

Zc 12:10, Jn 19:37

<sup>1</sup> Brown, *Self-Interpreting Bible*, 595: “We have in [Ps 68] High praises to him [...] 3—10: for the easy conquest of their Canaanitish enemies; his fixing his temple on mount Zion; for the ascension of Christ to glory, to receive gifts for men; and for the spread of the gospel among Jews and Gentiles, by means of the apostles;—while the obstinate Jews are severely punished”.

<sup>2</sup> Jones, *Catholic Doctrine*, 38f.: “Yet the Scripture here referred to, expressly affirms the person who *ascended*, &c. to be the Lord God.”

<sup>3</sup> Correctly quoted from Jones, *Catholic Doctrine*, 40f.

<sup>4</sup> Rammohan uses the Arabic translation from *Biblia sacra polyglotta*, Vol. III, Zc XII, 10, p. 135, which is (nonvocalized): وَأَصَبَّ عَلِيَّ بَيْتِ دَاوُدَ وَعَلَى سَكَّانِ أَيْرُوشَلِيمَ رُوحَ النِّعْمَةِ وَالرَّأْفَةِ وَيَنْظُرُونَ إِلَيَّ مِنْ أَجْلِ أَنَّهُمْ رَقَصُوا وَيُنُوحُونَ عَلَيْهِمْ مَنَاحَةً مِثْلَ عَلِيٍّ وَحَيْدٍ وَيَتَوَجَّعُونَ وَجَعًا مِثْلَ عَلِيٍّ بِكَرِّ

واصب علي بيت داود و علي سكان اروشليم ورح النعمة و الرافة و ينظرون اليّ من  
اجل أنّهم رقصوا وينوحون عليهم مناحة مثل علي وحيد و يتوجعون وجعا مثل علي بكر

§246 “And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplication: and they shall look *toward me on account of him whom* they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him as one mourneth for his own son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his first-born.” This translation is strongly confirmed by the Septuagint<sup>1</sup>, whose words I subjoin with a literal rendering—

§247 Καὶ ἐπιβλέψονται πρὸς με ἀνθ’ ὧν κατωρχήσαντο.

“And they shall look *towards me*, on *account of* those whom they pierced.”<sup>2</sup>

§248 In the Prophet the Lord speaks of Israel at the approach of their restoration, when they will look up to God for /299 mercy on account of their cruelty to the Messiah, whom they pierced, and for whom they will mourn and lament. Hence the prophecy in question has been fulfilled in Jesus, without representing the Lord (Jehovah) as the object pierced; and consequently no false testimony is chargeable upon John the Evangelist, who, by changing the object of the verse from “me” found in the Hebrew and Septuagint into “him,” we may suppose had in view the general import rather than the particular expressions of the prophecy, pointing out that they looked to the Messiah also, whom they had pierced. Without referring to the Hebrew phrase, which shews beyond doubt the inaccuracy of the English translation of the verse, common sense is, I presume, sufficient to shew, that since in the last two clauses in the verse under consideration the Lord God speaks of the Messiah in the third person—(“for him they (i. e. the Israelites) will mourn and lament,”) he must be supposed to have spoken of the same third person as pierced by them unjustly, and thus to have pointed out the cause of their lamentation. If Jehova had been pierced, he would have been mentioned throughout in the first person, also as the object of lamentation and bitterness.

§249 1 Peter ii. 6, “Wherefore also it is contained in the Scripture, Behold, *I lay in Zion* a chief corner-stone, elect, precious: and he that believeth on him shall not be confounded. 7, Unto you therefore which believe he is precious: but unto them who are disobedient, the stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner, 8, And a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence, even to them which stumble at the word, being disobedient; whereunto also they were

1 P 2:6-8

<sup>1</sup> Rammohan uses the Septuagint from *Biblia sacra polyglotta, Vol. III, Zc XII, 10, p. 134.*

<sup>2</sup> The translation he gives is not correct. Neither the Arabic nor the Greek contain the word for “pierced”. رقصوا and κατωρχήσαντο mean rather “danced”, the Greek also “mocked” in the sense of a mocking dance. The Arabic text is therefore a translation of the Septuagint which differs in this verse from the Hebrew. My thanks for the explanation of the Arabic text goes to Ms. Meriam Adami.



appointed”—compared with *Isaiah* xxviii. 16, “Therefore thus saith /300 the Lord God, Behold *I lay in Zion* for a foundation, a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone, a sure foundation; he that believeth shall not make haste;” and *Isaiah* viii. 13, “Sanctify the Lord of hosts himself; let him be your fear, and let him be your dread. 14, And he shall be for a sanctuary; but for a stone of stumbling, and for a rock of offence, to both the houses of Israel; for a gin and for a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem.”<sup>1</sup>

Is 28:16

Is 8:13f.

These passages shew, that the Lord God placed the Messiah as a corner-stone for the temple, and that whoever stumbles at that stone so exalted by the Almighty, stumbles at or disobeys him who has thus placed it. But Mr. Jones omits the words found in 1 *Peter* ii. 6, and *Isaiah* xxviii. 16, “*I lay in Zion* a chief corner-stone, precious,” &c. which shew the created nature of the Messiah, and after quoting a part of vers. 7 and 8 of 1 *Peter*, ch. ii. (“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,”) and only verse 13th and part of the 14th of ch. viii. of *Isaiah*, he has thus concludes:—“This stone of stumbling and rock of offence, as it appears from the latter text, (the text in *Peter*,) is no other than Christ, the same stone which the builders rejected. Therefore Christ is the Lord of hosts himself.”<sup>2</sup>—Here the Apostle *Peter*, in conformity with the Prophet, represents God as the founder of the corner-stone, and Jesus as the same corner-stone, which, though it be disallowed by the Jews, yet is *made* by the same founder, the head of the corner; but the Jews from their disobedience stumbled directly at the stone so exalted, rendering it a stone of stumbling and rock of offence; and hereby they stumbled secondarily at the founder of this stone, and offended the Lord God; who, though he was the rock of /301 defence of Israel, (rock of refuge, *Psalms* xciv. 24,) became a stone of stumbling and [a] rock of offence.

§250

Thus in *Luke* x. 16, Jesus declares to his disciples, “He that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me;” intimating by these words, that contempt for the holy doctrines which Christ commissioned his disciples to teach, argued contempt for him by whom Christ himself was sent; but no one will thence infer the deity of those disciples. In vers. 6 and 7 in question, and in ver. 4 of the same chapter of *Peter*, (“To whom coming as unto a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God and precious,”) Jesus is distinctly declared to be “a stone of stumbling,” “a living stone chosen of God;” the indefinite article “a” here denoting that he is only one of many such stones. It is surprising that Mr. Jones

§251

Lk 10:16

<sup>1</sup> Jones, *Catholic Doctrine*, 1f., is using Is 8:13f. and 1 P 2:7f.

<sup>2</sup> “The *Stone of Stumbling* and *Rock of Offence*, as the former text affirms, is the *Lord of Hosts himself*; a name which the *Arians* allow to no other but the one, only, true, and supreme God. But, this *Stone of Stumbling* and *Rock of Offence*, as it appears from the latter text, is no other than *Christ*, the same stone which the *builders refused*”, Jones, *Catholic Doctrine*, 2.

could overlook these phrases, and conclude upon the identity of Jesus with God from metaphorical language, which represents God as “a stumbling stone” of Israel, and Jesus a stumbling stone of those who never believed him. That there is nothing peculiar in Jesus being called a stone or a shepherd, see *Genesis* xlix. 24, where in a metaphorical sense Joseph is called “the shepherd and the stone of Israel.”

Gn 49:24

§252

The Hebrew language, in common with other Asiatic tongues, frequently indulges in metaphor; and consequently the Old Testament, written in that language, abounds with expressions which cannot be taken in their literal sense. This indeed Jesus himself points out in *John* x. 34–36, in which he justifies the assumption of the title of Son of God, to denote that he was sanctified and sent of the Father, by shewing that in the Scriptures the name even of God was sometimes metaphorically applied to men of power or exalted rank. Hence we find /302 epithets which in their strict sense in their most common application are peculiar to God, applied to inferior beings, as I have already noticed. But the Scripture avoids affording the least pretext of misunderstanding the real nature of such objects, by various adjuncts and epithets of obvious meaning, quite inapplicable to the Deity. It is melancholy, however, to observe, how frequently men overlook the idiom of the language of Scripture, and (apparently misled by the force of preconceived notions) set aside every expression that modifies those that suit their peculiar ideas.

Jn 10:33–36

§253

Were we to admit common phrases applied both to God and to Jesus as a proof of the divinity of the latter, we must upon the same ground be led to acknowledge the deity of Moses, of David, and of other Prophets, who are in common with God the subjects of peculiar phrases. Moses in *Deut.* xxx. 15 declares, “See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil.” So Jehovah declares in *Jeremiah* xxi. 8, “Behold, I set before you the way of life, and the way of death.” In conformity to this mode of argument adopted by Trinitarian writers, we should thus conclude from these passages—unless Moses were one with Jehovah, he could not in his own name employ the same authoritative phrase which is used by Jehovah. In the same manner the term worship is equally applied to God and David in *Chronicles* xxix. 20, “And David said to all the congregation, Now bless the Lord your God. And all the congregation blessed the Lord God of their fathers, and bowed down their heads, and worshipped the Lord and the king.” Whence, according to their mode of argument, every one must find himself justified in drawing the following conclusion: God is the only object of worship—but the term worship /303 is in the Bible applied to David—David must therefore be acknowledged as God.

Dt 30:15

Jr 21:8

1 Ch 29:20

§254

I have now noticed all the arguments founded on Scripture that I have heard of as advanced in support of the doctrine of the Trinity, except such as appeared to me so futile as to be unworthy of remark; and in the course of my examination have plainly stated the grounds on which I conceive them to be inadmissible. Perhaps my

opinions may subject me to the severe censure of those who dissent from me, and some will be ready to discover particular motives for my presuming to differ from the great majority of Christian teachers of the present day in my view of Christianity, with the doctrines of which I have become but recently acquainted.—Personal interest can hardly be alleged as likely to have actuated me, and therefore the love of distinction or notoriety may perhaps be resorted to, to account for conduct which they wish it to be believed honest conviction could never direct.—In reply to such an accusation, I can only protest in the most solemn manner, that even in the belief that I have been successful in combating the doctrine of Trinitarians, I cannot assume to myself the smallest merit:—for what credit can be gained in proving that one is not three, and that the same being cannot be at once man and God; or in opposing those who maintain, that all who do not admit doctrines so incomprehensible must be therefore subjected by the All-merciful to eternal punishment? It is too true to be denied, that we are led by the force of the senses to believe many things that we cannot fully understand. But where the evidence of sense does not compel us, how can we believe what is not only beyond our comprehension, but contrary to it and to the common course of nature, and directly against revelation; which declares positively the unity of /304 God, as well as his incomprehensibility; but no where ascribes to him any number of persons, or any portion of magnitude? *Job xxxvi.* 26, “Behold God is great, and we know him not.” *Ch. xxxvii.* 23, “Touching the Almighty, we cannot find him out.”<sup>1</sup> *Psalms cxlv.* 3, “His greatness is unsearchable.” Neither are my attempts owing to a strong hope of removing early impressions from the breasts of those, whose education instilled certain ideas into their minds from the moment they became capable of receiving them; for notwithstanding great and long-continued exertions on my part to do away Hindoo polytheism, though palpably gross and absurd, my success has been very partial. This experience, therefore, it may be suggested, ought to have been sufficient to discourage me from any other attempt of the kind; but it is my reverence for Christianity, and for the author of this religion, that has induced me to endeavour to vindicate it from the charge of Polytheism as far as my limited capacity and knowledge extend. It is indeed mortifying to my feelings to find a religion, that from its sublime doctrines and pure morality should be respected above all other systems, reduced almost to a level with Hindoo theology, merely by human creeds and prejudices; and from this cause brought to a comparison with the Paganism of ancient Greece; which, while it included a plurality of Gods, yet maintained that Θεὸς ἑστὶν εἷς, or “God is one,” and that their numerous divine *persons* were all comprehended in that one Deity.

*Jb 36:26; 37:23*  
*Ps 145:3*

Having derived my own opinions on this subject entirely from the Scriptures

§255

<sup>1</sup> Rammohan used the same verses from Job already in §38 in the same sense.

themselves, I may perhaps be excused for the confidence with which I maintain them against those of so great a majority, who appeal to the same authority for theirs; inasmuch as I attribute the /305 different views, not to any inferiority of judgment compared with my own limited ability, but to the powerful effects of early religious impressions; for when these are deep, reason is seldom allowed its natural scope in examining them to the bottom. Were it a practice among Christians to study first the books of the Old Testament as found arranged in order, and to acquire a knowledge of the true force of scriptural phrases and expressions without attending to interpretations given by any sect; and then to study the New Testament, comparing the one with the other, Christianity would not any longer be liable to be encroached upon by human opinions.

§256 I have often observed that English divines, when arguing with those that think freely on religion, quote the names of Locke and Newton as defenders of Christianity; but they totally forget that the Christianity which those illustrious persons professed did not contain the doctrine of the Trinity, which our divines esteem as the fundamental principle of this religion. For the conviction of the public as to the accuracy of this assertion, I beg to be allowed to extract here a few lines of their respective works, referring my readers to their publications upon religion for more complete information.<sup>1</sup>

§257 *Locke's Works*, Vol. VII. p. 421: "But that neither he nor others may mistake my book, this is that in short which it says—1st, That there is a faith that makes men Christians—2dly, That this faith is the believing 'Jesus of Nazareth to be the Messiah'—3rdly, That the believing Jesus to be the Messiah, includes in it a receiving him for our Lord and King, promised and sent from God; and so lays upon all his subjects an absolute and indispensable necessity of assenting to all that they can attain of the /306 knowledge that he taught, and of sincere obedience to all that he commanded."<sup>2</sup>

§258 *Sir I. Newton's Observations upon the Prophecies*, p. 262: "The Beasts and Elders therefore represent the Christians of all nations; and the worship of these Christians in their churches is here represented under the form of worshipping God and the Lamb in the Temple, God for his benefaction in creating all things, and the Lamb for his benefaction in redeeming us with his blood:—God as sitting upon the throne and

---

<sup>1</sup> Rammohan claims Locke and Newton as supporters of his anti-Trinitarian, maybe even his own Arian view of the Bible. This was a point of discussion in Rammohan's time. Manuscripts of Newton, available in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, show that Rammohan was right. See Wiles, *Archetypal Heresy*, 70-94, who sees Locke and Newton as proponents of British Arianism.

<sup>2</sup> This is a quotation from Locke's *Second Vindication of the Reasonableness of Christianity*, see Locke, *Works II*, 669. Rammohan explains his understanding of these words more in §785.

living for ever, and the Lamb exalted above all by the merits of his death.”<sup>1</sup>

It cannot be alleged that these personages, in imitation of several Grecian philosophers, published these sentiments only in conformity to the vulgar opinion, and to the established religion of their country; for both the vulgar opinion and the religion of the government of England in their days were directly opposite to the opinions which these celebrated men entertained.

§259

The mention of the name of Sir Isaac Newton, one of the greatest mathematicians (if not the greatest) that ever existed, has brought into my recollection a mathematical argument which I some time ago heard a divine adduce in support of the Trinity, and which I feel inclined to consider here, though I am afraid some of my readers may censure me for repeating an argument of this kind. It is as follows: that as three lines compose one triangle, so three persons compose one Deity. It is astonishing that a mind so conversant with mathematical truth as was that of Sir Isaac Newton, did not discover this argument in favour of the possible existence of a Trinity, brought to light by Trinitarians, considering that it must have lain so much in his way. If it did occur to him, its force may /307 possibly have given way to some such considerations as the following:—This analogy between the Godhead and a triangle, in the first instance, denies to God, equally with a line, any real existence; for extension of all kinds, abstracted from position or relative situation, exists only in idea. Secondly, it destroys the unity which they attempt to establish between Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; for the three sides of a triangle are conceived of as separate existences. Thirdly, it denies to each of the three persons of God, the epithet “God,” inasmuch as each side cannot be designated a triangle; though the Father of the universe is invariably called God in the strict sense of the term. Fourthly, it will afford to that sect among Hindoos who suppose God to consist of four persons or चतुर्ब्रह्मण्यक<sup>2</sup>, an opportunity of using the same mode of arguing, to shew the reasonableness of their sentiments, by comparing the compound Deity with the four sides of a quadrilateral figure. Fifthly, this manner of arguing may be esteemed better adapted to support the Polytheism of the majority of Hindoos, who believe in numerous persons under one Godhead; for instead of comparing the Godhead with a triangle, a figure containing the fewest sides, and thereby proving the three persons of the Godhead, they might compare God with a polygon, more suitable to the dignified rank of the Deity,

§260

<sup>1</sup> This is a quotation from Newton’s *Observations upon the Prophecies of Holy Writ; particularly the Prophecies of Daniel and the Apocalypse of St. John*. Newton comments on Rv 5:1–10, see Newton, *Observations*, 455. Rammohan omitted one word: “The beasts and elders therefore represent the primitive Christians of all nations;” etc. This is either a mistake, or he wants to point out that this reflection is not only valid for the *primitive* Christians but still for the actual church. He reflects more on this passage in §786.

<sup>2</sup> Caturbyühātmake.

and thus establish the consistency with reason, of the belief, that the Godhead may be composed of numerous persons. Sixthly, this mode of illustration would, in fact, equally suit the Atheist as the Polytheist. For as the Trinity is represented by the three sides of a triangle, so the eternal revolution of nature without any divine person may be compared to the circle, which is considered as having no sides or angles: or, Seventhly, as some great mathematicians consider the circle as a poly-/308gon, having an infinite number of sides, the illustration of the Trinitarian doctrine by the form of the triangle will by analogy justify those sects, who maintain the existence of an infinite number of persons in the Godhead, in referring for an illustration of their opinions to the circular, or rather perhaps to the globular figure, in which is to be found an infinity of circles, formed each of an infinite number of sides.

[Trinity in Judaism and in the Old Testament? – On Serle’s *Horæ Solitariae*.]


§261 As I was concluding this Appendix, a friend to the doctrine of the Trinity kindly lent me Serle’s “*Horæ Solitariae*.” I confine here my attention only to four or five arguments, which the author has adduced in the beginning of his work, and that for several reasons. 1st, Because a deliberate attention to the nature of the first-mentioned arguments may furnish the reader with a general idea of the rest, and justify me in neglecting them. 2ndly, Because such of the others as seem to me at all worthy of notice have been already considered and replied to; and 3rdly, Because I am unwilling to protract further discussion, which has already grown to a length far beyond my original intention.

§262 At page 10, Mr Serle alleges, that “God says by Moses in the book of Genesis, In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth; and then just afterwards, the Spirit moved upon the face of the waters. Here are three persons in one power; the beginning, God, and the Spirit.”<sup>1</sup> If a bare mention of the word “beginning” and “spirit,” (or properly speaking, “wind,”) in the two first verses of Genesis, justifies the numbering of them as two persons of God, how can we conscientiously omit the “water” mentioned in the same verse as coexistent with “spirit,” making it the fourth person, and darkness, which is mentioned before spirit, as a fifth person of God: and if under /309 any pretence we are justified in classing “beginning,” an abstract relation, as a person of God, how can we deny the same dignity to the “end,” which is equally an abstract relation? Nay, the very words of chap. i. 8, of Revelation might be quoted to prove one of the persons of God to be the “ending:”—“I am Alpha and


Rv 1:8

<sup>1</sup> Serle is actually quoting Aponius, La Bigne, *Biblioth. Patr. (Min.)* Tom. iv. His point is to prove that the doctrine of the Trinity has been kept from early Christianity on and that even the true believers among the Jews believed in the Trinity (“GOD’s People were *Christians* even in the Time of the Patriarchs”, Serle, *Horæ*, 466). Serle continues with the explanation: “Some of the old Jewish Expositors translate *Beginning* by *Wisdom*, and understand by it, as *Aponius* does, a Person in the Godhead”, see Serle, *Horæ*, 467.

Omega, the BEGINNING and the ENDING, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.” We have then God, the Beginning, the Spirit, and the Ending, four persons at least whom we must admit into the Godhead, if Mr. Serle’s opinion have any foundation.

Page 12, “They (the ancient Chaldee Jews and Cabalists) expressed their idea of the Trinity by this particular type,  where the three jods denote Jah, Jah, Jah, or that each of three persons (according to our Athanasian Creed) is by himself Jah or Lord:—the point  $\daleth$  (kametz) as common to each, implies the divine nature in which the three persons equally existed; and the circle, inclosing all, was intended to exhibit the perfect unity, eternity, and conjunction, of the whole Trinity.” This type, if it existed at any time, can bear various interpretations, Theistical, Polytheistical, or Atheistical; but in Hebrew and Chaldee, the sign which is generally used to denote the Deity has two jods only; a reference to the Targums of Jonathan and Onkelos, written in the Chaldee language, and to other Targums in Hebrew and Chaldee, will establish the fact beyond doubt. This practice, which, according to Mr. Serle’s mode of arguing, establishes the duality of God, is entirely overlooked by him.<sup>1</sup> §263

In the same page again he says, that “in a very ancient book of the Jews, the first person, or Hypostasis, is described as כתר Kather, the crown, or admirable and pro-/310found intelligence; the second person חכמה Chochma, wisdom, or the intelligence illuminating the creation, and the second glory; and the third person בינה Binah, or the sanctifying intelligence, the worker of faith and the father of it.”<sup>2</sup> He immediately after this assertion notices in page 13, “they believed, taught, and adored three primordial existences in the Godhead, which they called sometimes מדרות middoth, or *properties*, and sometimes ספירות sephiroth, or *numerations*.”<sup>3</sup> The §264

<sup>1</sup> The Text in the 1787 edition runs like this: “For some time after the Christian *Æra*, their Writers expressed the Divine Name, or rather delineated it, by an *Ænigma*, which, at first Sight, impresses the Mind with a Notion of the Trinity, and which is confirmed by some of their own Explications. It was according to the following Type:  The three *Jods* denoted JAH, JAH, JAH; or that each of the three Persons (like the Expression in our *Athanasian Creed*) is by himself JAH or LORD: The Point T *Kametz*, as common to each, implied the divine Essence, in which the three Persons equally existed: And the *Circle*, inclosing all, exhibited the perfect *Unity*, *Eternity*, and *Conjunction*, of the whole *Trinity* in Coexistence, Operation, and Attributes. The later Jews, finding the Advantage which the Christians took against them from this significant Type, have changed it for Two *Jods* (\*\*) in order to ward off the Evidence of their Fathers against themselves. Unhappy Men! They have now been for a long Season indeed, without the true GOD”, Serle, *Horæ*, 470.

<sup>2</sup> The 1787 edition runs like this: Kirchner “cites the *Jetzirah* [...] where the *first* Person or Hypostasis is described as כתר *Kather*, the *Crown*, or admirable and profound Intelligence; the *second* person חכמה *Chochhma*, *wisdom*, or the Intelligence illuminating the Creation, and the second Glory; and the *third* person בינה *Binah*, or the sanctifying Intelligence, the Builder of Faith and the Author of it”, Serle, *Horæ*, 471.

<sup>3</sup> The 1787 edition runs like this: “They believed, taught, and adored three *primordial Existences* in

force of truth here impels the author to contradict himself directly; since he at one time asserts that the Jews believed them to be the three *persons* of God, and again forgetting what he said, he affirms that the Jews called them *properties*, or *numeration* of properties. The fact is, that when the intercourse between the Jews and Greeks was great, the former, in imitation of some of the latter, entertained the idea that the Supreme Deity used ten superior intelligences or qualities in the creation of the world; namely, כתר *Crown*—חכמה *Wisdom*—בינה *Understanding*—גדולה *Greatness*—גבורה *Mightiness*—הפארת *Beauty*—נצה *Everlasting*—הוד *Glory*—יסוד *Foundation*—מלכות *Kingdom*.<sup>\*</sup> But a Godhead consisting of ten persons not suiting Mr. Serle's hypothesis, he omits the seven last, and mentions only the three first, which he denominates a proof of the Trinity.

§265 Inpage 14, Mr. Serle represents "R. Simeon and the famous Jonathan treating  
Is 6:3 upon the Trisagion, or thrice holy, in the 6th chapter of *Isaiah*," as saying, "that the first Holy implies the Father, the second Holy the Son, and the third Holy the Holy Ghost."<sup>1</sup> I therefore give the /311 commentary of Jonathan,<sup>†</sup> which I have been so fortunate as to procure, in order to shew how zeal in behalf of the Trinity has sometimes led men to forget the claims of care and prudence. Jonathan's targum on the term "Holy" thrice repeated in *Isaiah* vi. 3, is as follows: קדיש בשמי מרומא קדיש בית שכנתיה קדיש על ארעא עובד גבורהיה קדיש לעלם ולעלמי עלמיה "Holy in the most high heavens, the place of his glory—Holy upon the earth, the work of his power—Holy for ever and ever and ever."<sup>2</sup>

§266 Again, in page 14, he says, that "The Jews before Christ had a title for the Godhead consisting of twelve letters, which Maimonides, the most learned of all their writers, owns to have been a compounded name, or name (as it was common among

<sup>\*</sup> This opinion is still to be found in the conversation as well as writings of the learned amongst Eastern theologians.

<sup>†</sup> The copy which is now in my hands was printed in London, by Thomas Roycroft, in the year 1656. It contains, besides the targum of Jonathan, the original Hebrew text, together with the Septuagint, Syriac, and Arabic translations, each accompanied with a Latin interpretation.

the אין סוף, *the Infinite*, or *Eternal Godhead*, which they called sometimes מדות *Middoth*, or *Properties*, sometimes פנים, or *Faces* (whence the Greek προσωπα, *Persons*) and sometimes ספירות *Sephiroth*, or *Numerations*, which, as some of them notwithstanding have said, is by no means an Objection to the divine Unity", Serle, *Horæ*, 472.

<sup>1</sup> The 1787 edition runs like this: "The same Rabbi [R. Simeon Ben Jochai], and Jonathan the *Chaldee Paraphrast*, who both wrote many Years before Christ, commenting on *Isaiah* vi. 1. where the Lord [Adonai] is represented sitting upon a Throne, apply the Passage to the *Messiah*. And the former of these has this remarkable Exposition of the *Trisagion*, or *Thrice Holy*, in the third Verse of the same Chapter: קדש זה אב קדש זה בן קדש זה רוח הקדש: h. e. 'HOLY, that is, the FATHER; HOLY that is, the SON; HOLY that is, the HOLY SPIRIT", Serle, *Horæ*, 477.

<sup>2</sup> Correct quotation from *Biblia sacra polyglotta*, Vol. III, Is VI, 3, p.16.



the Rabbins) composed of the initial letters of the names. Galatinus from R. Hakkadosh, (who lived about A. D. 150, or rather from Porchetus Salvaticus, or Raymundus Martini,) believes that these twelve letters were **אב, בן, ורוח הקדש**, i. e. Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.<sup>1</sup>

There is no impossibility in the existence of a name of God consisting of twelve letters, as is stated to have been the case on the authority of Maimonides, because we find different names of God, consisting of various numbers of letters. But Mr. Serle, on the authority of Galatinus, a Christian writer, represents these twelve letters as expressing the names of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. I therefore make a few remarks on this head. 1st, Mr. Serle himself expresses his doubts respecting the source /312 from which Galatinus had obtained his information, "*whether from R. Hakkadosh, from Porchetus Salvaticus, or from Raymundus Martini.*" 2ndly, The construction of this sentence of twelve letters, is conformable to the European style of writing, but is quite foreign to Hebrew idiom, which requires a conjunction before **בן**, or Son; but the omission of this shews that it must have been invented by one more accustomed to the idiom of European languages, than to that of the Hebrew. 3rdly, Maimonides, the original authority of Mr. Serle, owns that these twelve letters were the initials of other names; whereas Mr. Serle in the explanation of them represents them as composing in themselves three complete names, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, instead of giving a name for each of the twelve letters. §267

I am not aware how many arguments and illustrations of similar weight and importance to those already discussed may still remain, that have not been brought to my notice; but I trust the inquiry has proceeded sufficiently far to justify me in still adhering to the unity of God as the doctrine taught alike in the Old and in the New Testaments. §268

I now conclude this Appendix, with repeating my prayer, that a day may soon arrive, when religion shall not be a cause of difference between man and man, and when every one will regard the Precepts of Jesus as the sole Guide to Peace and Happiness. /313 §269

---

<sup>1</sup> Rammohan is summarising Serle's text from p. 473-4, where he is telling the reader about a secret Book, "entitled **גלוי רזייה**, or *Revealer of Secrets*, written by Rabbi *Hakkadosh*, but which Book no learned Christian can find at present, nor will any Jew, if it exists, acknowledge or communicate it". This book is supposed to contain this trinitarian interpretation of the name of God, which is kept as a secret by the Jews.

[P. S. Prideaux' Interpretation of Is 9:6f.]

§270

Is 9:6f.

P. S. Dr. Prideaux, in the fourth volume of his "Connection," (which has very lately come into my hands,) takes a different view of Isaiah, ch. ix. vers. 6, 7, from that which has been offered in the preceding pages. After quoting the words of the prophet according to the English Version, he says, "Christians all hold that this is spoken of the Messiah; and Jonathan, in the Targum which is truly his, doth on that place say the same."<sup>1</sup> Hereby he gives out that this prophecy, including the epithets "Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, and the Prince of Peace," is applied by Jonathan, as by Christians, to the Messiah:—I therefore give here the explanation given by Jonathan to verses 6 and 7, which will sufficiently shew the error Dr. Prideaux has committed.

אמר נביא לבית דוד ארי רבי אתיליד לנא בר אתיהיב לנא וקביל אוריחא עלוהי למשרא  
ואתקרי שמייה מן קדם מפליא עצה אלהא גברא קים לעלמיא משיחא דשלמא יסני עלנא  
ביומיה: סני רבו לעבדי אוריחא ולנשרי שלמא ליתסוף על כורסי דור ועל מלכותיה לאתקנא  
יחיה ולמבנה בדינא ובזכותא מכען ועד עלמא במימרא דיי צבאות תתעבר דא:

"The prophet says, to the house of David a child is born, to us a son is given, and he will take upon himself the preservation of the law; from the presence of the causer of wonderful counsels, the great God enduring for ever, his name will be called the anointed, (in Heb. Messiah,) in whose days peace shall be multiplied upon us." "Greatness shall be multiplied to those who obey the law, and to those who keep peace, there will be no end to the throne of David and of his government: for establishing and for building it with judgment and with justice now and for ever."<sup>2</sup>

/314

§271

2 K 20:19

2 Ch 32:26

1 S 12:3

2 S 23:1

2 S 22:51

Here Jonathan, in direct opposition to Christians, denies to the Son so born, the epithets "Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, and Everlasting Father;" and applies to him only the title of "the Prince of Peace," (nearly synonymous with Messiah,) on account of his preserving peace during his reign, as was promised of the Messiah. (2 Kings xx. 19, "Is it not good (says Hezekiah) if peace and truth be in my days?" 2 Chron. xxxii. 26, "The wrath of the Lord came not upon them in the days of Hezekiah.") This application of the term anointed (or Messiah) is made to Hezekiah in the same manner as to other eminent kings, often called Messiah in the Sacred Writings:—1 Samuel xii. 3, "Behold here I am! witness against me before the Lord, and his anointed (or his Messiah), the king." 2 Samuel xxiii. 1, "David the son of Jesse said, and the man who was raised up on high, the Messiah of the God of Jacob," &c. Ch. xxii. 51, "He is the tower of salvation for his King, and sheweth mercy to his

<sup>1</sup> Prideaux, *Old and New Testament Vol. II*, 353.

<sup>2</sup> Rammohan quotes correctly from *Biblia sacra polyglotta, Vol. III*, Targum Jonathan, Is IX, 6f., p. 14-16, and than adds his own English translation. This translation has been criticised by Yates, *Defence*, 210-213.

Messiah, unto David, and to his seed for evermore." 1 Samuel ii. 10, "The Lord shall judge the ends of the earth; and he shall give strength unto his King, and exalt the horn of his Messiah." Psalm xx. 6, "Now know I that the Lord saveth his Messiah." Isaiah xlv. 1, "Thus saith the Lord to his Messiah, to Cyrus." The reign of Hezekiah was so accompanied with peace and success, that some Jewish commentators entertained the opinion that Hezekiah was really the last Messiah promised by God.

1 S 2:10  
Ps 20:6  
Is 45:1

R. Hillel, אמר רבי הלל אין להם משיח לישראל שכבר אכלוהו בימי הזקיה: §272

"There is no Messiah for the Israelites, for they enjoyed it (i. e. they had him) at the time of Hezekiah." /315

If Trinitarians still insist, in defiance of the above authorities, and under pretence of the word "anointed" or "Messiah," found in the Targum of Jonathan, that his interpretation should be understood of the expected Messiah, then as far as depends upon the interpretation given by him of verses 6 and 7, they must be compelled to relinquish the idea that he expected a divine deliverer. Moreover, all other celebrated Jewish writers, some of whom are more ancient than Jonathan, apply the passage in question to Hezekiah, some of them differing however from him in the application of the epithets contained in verse 6.

§273

Talmud Sanhedrin, ch. 11, "God said, Let Hezekiah, who has five names, take vengeance upon the king of Assyria, who has taken upon himself five names also." R. Sholomo follows the annotation made by Shammai. "For a child is born, &c. Though Ahaz was wicked, his son, who was born to him to be a king in his stead, shall be righteous, the government of God and his yoke shall be on his shoulder, because he shall obey the law and keep the commandments thereof, and shall incline his shoulder to the burden of God.—And he calls his name, &c. God, who is the wonderful counsellor, and the mighty and everlasting Father, called his name the Prince of Peace, for peace and truth shall be in his days." /316

§274

The reader will not suppose the application of the terms "wonderful counsellor, mighty God, everlasting Father, and prince of peace," to Hezekiah, to be unscriptural when he refers to page 283<sup>1</sup> of this work, and considers the following passages, in which the same epithets are used for human beings, and even for inanimate objects. 2 Chron. ii. 9, "The house which I am about to build shall be wonderful great." Micah

§275

2 Ch 2:9

\* It is worth noticing that "to be called" and "to be" do not invariably signify the same thing; since the former does not always imply that the thing is in reality what it is called, but the use of it is justified when the thing is merely *taken notice of* in that view. See Luke i. 36, "This is the sixth month with her who was called (that is, reputed) barren." Isaiah lxi. 3, "That they might be called (or accounted) trees of righteousness." This is more especially the case when the phrase "to be called" has for its subject not a person, but the *name* of a person. See Deut. xxv. 10, "And his name shall be called in Israel, the house of him that hath his shoe loosed." Genesis xlviii. 16, "Let my name be named on them."

<sup>1</sup> §223.

Mi 4:9; Gn 13:6  
 Jg 9:13  
 2 Th 2:4  
 Gn 49:26

iv. 9, "Is there no king in thee? Is thy counsellor perished?" Genesis xiii. 6, "Hear us: thou art a Mighty Prince amongst us." Judges ix. 13, "Should I leave my wine which cheereth God and man?" that is, master and servant. 2 Thess. ii. 4, "Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God." Gen. xlix. 26, "To the utmost bound of the everlasting hills." 1 Samuel iv. 8, "Who shall deliver us out of the hands of these *mighty gods*?" which Cruden interprets of the Jewish ark.<sup>1</sup> Isaiah xii. 11-28, [xlili. 28,] "Therefore I have profaned the princes of the sanctuary."

1 S 4:8  
 Is 43:28  
 §276

I wonder how those who found their opinion respecting the Trinity on terms applied in common to God and creatures, can possibly overlook the plain meaning of the term "Son," or "Only-begotten," continually applied to the Saviour throughout the whole of the New Testament; for should we understand the term God, in its strict sense, as denoting the First Cause, (that is, a being not born nor begotten,) we must necessarily confess that the idea of God is as incompatible with the idea of the "Son," or /317 "Only-begotten," as entity is with non-entity; and therefore that to apply both terms to the same being will amount to the grossest solecism in language.

§277

As to their assertion, that there are found in the Scriptures two sets of terms and phrases, one declaring the humanity of Jesus and another to his deity, and that he must therefore be acknowledged to have possessed a twofold nature, human and divine, I have fully noticed it in pp. 167—169, 252, 253,<sup>2</sup> pointing out such passages as contain two sets of terms and phrases applied also to Moses and even to the chiefs of Israel and to others; and that, if it is insisted upon, that each word in the Sacred Writings should be taken in its strict sense, Moses and others, equally with the Saviour, must be considered as gods, and the religion of the Jews and Christians will appear as Polytheistical as that of the Heathens.

§278

Although there is the strictest consistency between all the passages in the sacred books, Trinitarians, with a view to support their opinion, charge them first with inconsistency, and then attempt to reconcile the alleged contradiction by introducing the doctrine of the union of two natures, divine and human, in one person, forgetting that at the same time the greatest incongruity exists between the nature of God and man, according to both revelation and common sense.

§279

If Christianity inculcated a doctrine which represents God as consisting of three persons, and appearing sometimes in the human form, at other times in a bodily shape like a dove, no Hindoo, in my humble opinion, who searches after truth, can conscientiously profess it in preference to Hindooism; for that which renders the

<sup>1</sup> Rammohan probably refers to Cruden's *Complete Concordance*, although I could not find the exact passage where Cruden "interprets" the "mighty Gods" to be "the Jewish ark". It is clear that in the biblical text the Philistines hear the cheering of the Israelites when the ark of the covenant comes into their camp, and *they* interpret this as their welcoming their mighty God(s).

<sup>2</sup> §121, §173.

modern Hindoo system of religion absurd and detestable, is, that it represents the divine nature, though one, একং ব্রহ্ম<sup>1</sup>, as /318 consisting of many persons, capable of assuming different forms for the discharge of different offices. I am, however, most firmly convinced, that Christianity is entirely free from every trace of Polytheism, whether gross or refined. I therefore enjoy the approbation of my conscience in publishing the Precepts of this religion as the source of Peace and Happiness.

Finis.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Ekam brahma*, One Brahman.



# 7 Marshman: Review of the Second Appeal

## Editorial Introduction

After Rammohan's *Second Appeal*, the *Calcutta Unitarian Committee* was founded by Rammohan, Adam and their followers in September 1821. The danger of Rammohan's teachings for the development of the Baptist Mission became visible. Marshman published an answer to the *Second Appeal* in December 1821 in the belated No. IV of the *Quarterly Series*. Little later also in the *Baptist Mission Press* appeared a volume edited by William Yates, *A Defence of Some Important Scripture Doctrines*, an independent collection of articles against the *Second Appeal*. Yates could not follow Rammohan's course anymore, and he was under pressure from Serampore to distance himself from the Brahmin's teachings.

Marshman's aim was to defend the orthodox positions of Christianity by disproving Rammohan's interpretations and covering all arguments of his opponent. He used less other literature than Rammohan, partly because he did not have access (§374), partly because he was not interested in the interpretations of human philosophers (§439).

At one point a hint could be found that Marshman was not the only writer ("Editors" in §438). This could refer to a participation of William Ward or Marshman's son John Clark. Nevertheless, Marshman was always taken as the responsible author.

In his text the Missionary claimed to use the hermeneutical method of his opponent to beat him at his own game (§299), but it is clear that he only partly understood the danger of Rammohan's approach to the Bible. While Rammohan's idea was to read the New Testament from the Old Testament's monotheism, Marshman was rather comparing both parts of the Bible and in many instances interpreting the Old Testament from the New Testament's perspective, as for him the author of the whole Bible was the Holy Spirit (§408).

Marshman's understanding of the divine name, written by him as "Jehova", plays an important role in his argument. For him this name could refer to Father, Son and Holy Spirit alike, and in many verses of the Old Testament he can find Jesus

as “Jehova”, “the Angel of the Covenant” or “the Angel of the Lord”. This Trinitarian interpretation of the whole Bible was common in this time for conservative theologians.

The basis for this edition is the *The Friend of India. Quarterly Series. Vol. I., No. IV. June, 1821, published in December 1821*, pp. 501-628. The headlines of chapters and sections are mostly taken from the 1822 reprint of Marshman’s text. They have been inserted here for a better orientation and structure for the reader. As they don’t belong to the original text in the *Friend of India*, they are marked with [brackets]. At some points, quotation marks had to be added because of errors and omissions in the original print. Quotations within quotations have been marked with single quotation marks (‘-’).



[Introduction]

/501 ART. IV.—*A Second Appeal to the Christian Public in defence of the Precepts of Jesus.* By Rammohun Roy, pp. 173. Calcutta, 1821. §280

WHEN in our first Quarterly Number of the “Friend of India” we reviewed the “Precepts of Jesus,” and the first “Appeal to the Christian Public;” as we felt some doubt whether their Author fully believed the Deity of Christ, we adduced a few passages from the Scripture tending to confirm this doctrine. In doing this, we, to meet his views, confined ourselves to the Gospels from which he had selected the Precepts of Jesus, endeavouring to do it in such a spirit as might encourage him to enquire further after truth. We feel thankful that this appeared to him so evident as “to encourage him in examining further into the fundamental principles of Christianity in a manner agreeable to his own feelings.”<sup>1</sup> Happy should we be could we feel equal pleasure in the result; but this Second Appeal to the Christian Public confirms all that we before only feared. It contains no less than an entire rejection of the doctrines /502 of the Atonement, the Deity of Christ, and the ever-blessed Trinity, as doctrines not to be found in the Sacred Scriptures, and we are told in the concluding page, that “if Christianity inculcated a doctrine which represents God as consisting of Three Persons, and appearing sometimes in the human form, at other times in a bodily shape like a dove, no Hindoo who searches after truth can conscientiously profess it in preference to Hindooism.”<sup>2</sup>—Assured however that theses doctrines have produced the only fruits of righteousness yet seen on earth, and this in exact proportion as they have been believed and realized, we feel constrained, as friends of India, to examine thoroughly our Author’s reasons for rejecting them, which we hope to do in the spirit of genuine Christianity and with the seriousness of those who feel the weight of the Psalmist’s enquiry, “If the foundations be destroyed, what shall the righteous do?” Should what we may advance happily lead him to re-consider the subject and find the truth as it is in Jesus, this will afford us more solid satisfaction than the empty applause of a whole world; with which feelings he may rest assured that no expression will be intentionally admitted that can give him a moment’s pain, unless it be that salutary pain which may flow from the effect of truth on the mind. Ps 11:3

We have before us a work of a Hundred and Seventy-three Pages, to an examination of which we can scarcely devote half that number: and while to leave a single page unnoticed, might by some be deemed equivalent to leaving it unanswered, the mere transcription of the passages to be answered, were it done in every instance, would occupy nearly all the room we can give the reply itself. We shall therefore adduce such evidence for these doctrines, as if sound, will render every thing urged against them nugatory, though not particularly noticed. §282

<sup>1</sup> §103. <sup>2</sup> §279.

§283 Our author attributes his success in discovering what he deems “Christianity not encroached upon by human opinions,” to his having “sought to attain the truths of Christianity from the words of the Author of this religion, and from the undisputed instructions of his holy Apostles, and not from a parent or tutor,” p. 108; which course he thinks has preserved his mind from “the powerful effects of early religious impressions,” p. 161. To this may be added the mode of perusing the Scriptures which he recommends and which we may hence presume he has himself adopted, that of “studying first the books of the Old Testament as found arranged in order, and acquiring a knowledge of the true force of scriptural phrases and expressions without attending to interpretations given by any sect—and then studying the New Testament, comparing the one with the other,” p. 161. These circumstances he thinks enable him to maintain with confidence his opinions against so great a majority of Christian teachers found in nearly all denominations, “who appeal to the same authority for theirs.” Whether this freedom from “the powerful effects of early religious impressions,” has enabled him to discover the truth of Scripture in its most important doctrines, more fully in three or four years than others have done by the most unremitting study in thirty or forty,—yea so as to prove that the most learned and pious in every age of the church have been so completely mistaken as to transform the pure religion of Jesus into the most horrible idolatry, we will carefully examine. Could it be relied on indeed, his compendious method would deserve notice with a view to Christian education, as, on his plan, the most certain way of enabling any one to discover in a superior manner the truths and doctrines of Christianity, is, to leave him till the age of thirty or forty without any religious impression.<sup>1</sup>

§284 But are early religious impressions the only source of mistake? Is not the human heart the fabricator of its own prejudices? The partiality of friendship will often so blind a man’s eyes as to prevent his crediting the clearest facts relative to an opposite party, though completely within the reach of investigation. Of this we have examples not only in political matters, where truths and facts received by one side are treated with the utmost contempt by the other; but in private disputes, in which facts come under our own view. Yea in some cases does not prejudice so completely pervade the mind as to blind us even to our own interests, and cause us to regard as false, facts known to be true by all our friends? Above all, does not that principle of self-righteousness which cleaves to all by nature, often blind a man to the clearest truths, because they are unpalatable? If this be the case, may it not be wise in our author to examine whether some secret bias of this kind, may not have caused him to mistake respecting doctrines in their own nature of the most humbling tendency? But supposing the mind to be free from every bias, is it not a fact that the Scriptures,

---

<sup>1</sup> Marshman in this paragraph is dealing with Rammohan’s claims in §255 and §172.

composed as they are of a Series of Writings which occupied sixteen centuries in their delivery, require the most diligent study before any man can so fully digest them as conscientiously to teach doctrines directly opposed to those held by the mass of real Christians in every age? Much may be discovered at a first perusal; but such are the depth and sublimity of Scripture doctrines, that every new perusal to the end of life fully repays the humble mind. It is more than thirty five years since the writer of these lines began to examine them with an earnest desire,<sup>1</sup> as far as he knows his own feelings, to find out precisely the doctrines of Scripture that he might rest on them the weight of his own salvation: and though he does not presume to deny that the author of this Appeal may have gained more in one year's perusal of the Scriptures than others in ten, still as his study of them is so recent, he can scarcely forbear intreating him to peruse them anew before he finally reject those truths which the great body /505 of the learned and pious have concurred in deeming fully contained in the Sacred Scriptures, and essential to salvation.

On examining this "Second Appeal to the Christian Public" we find the Author saying (page 8,) that to deem "the most excellent precepts, the most perfect law, incapable of leading men to happiness and peace unless by causing them to take refuge in the doctrine of the cross" is setting at defiance the express commandments of Jesus; which he insists is done by the doctrine that "the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus on the cross is an atonement for the sins of mankind."<sup>2</sup> We confess that when we first saw this sentence, we could scarcely believe our own eyes. A further examination however, painfully convinced us that we had not mistaken his meaning; for he does affirm that Christ's death was not intended as an atonement for sin; that men's own imperfect obedience to the Divine law, although the best and wisest of them "are constantly neglecting the duty they owe to the Creator and their fellow-creatures,"<sup>3</sup> p. 9. is yet sufficient to procure salvation, particularly if united with "repentance," which according to him, "is declared the only means of procuring forgiveness of our failures."<sup>4</sup> As the First and Fourth Chapters of this Second Appeal are levelled against the Atonement of Christ, therefore, and this doctrine is held up to ridicule in the latter part of the Sixth, while the Second and Third, with the Appendix, are directed principally against the Deity of Christ, (the Fifth having little

§285

<sup>1</sup> 1783-1794 Marshman worked as a weaver and studied the scriptures and Luther's and puritan commentaries, before he came to Bristol. Here he is referring to this time when he tried to prepare himself for his baptism through these studies.

<sup>2</sup> §110: "Yet this we must do, if we are to adopt the position of the Editor, found in his Review, page 111, 'That the most excellent precepts, the most perfect law, can never lead to happiness and peace, unless by causing men to take refuge in the doctrine of the cross;' meaning, I presume, the doctrine of the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus on the cross, as an atonement for the sins of mankind."

<sup>3</sup> §112. <sup>4</sup> §112.

on either of these doctrines,) we intreat permission before entering on the proof of Christ's Deity, to examining our author's opinion of the Atonement, and to establish that doctrine on Scripture evidence;—and if this should unavoidably imply the Deity of the Redeemer, the fault will not be ours, as we shall not have created this evidence, it having been deposited on record many centuries ago.

[Chapter I. On the Atonement]

[Section I. The impossibility of a Sinner's being justified by the Divine Law]

§286 We commence with our Author's First Chapter:<sup>1</sup> and here we can scarcely conceive how a man so intelligent, should have /506 mistaken so completely the nature of the Divine Law, which must be immutable, as to suppose it can reward or even forbear to punish *disobedience*. Yet this mistake evidently forms the foundation of all his opposition to the atonement of Christ. That the Divine Law punishes all disobedience however slight it may be, is evident from Paul's declaration, Rom. i. 17. "The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against *all* ungodliness and unrighteousness of men." Such indeed is the nature of an immutable law, that if it be violated but *once*, its penalty is incurred, which the offender must suffer, or the law be set aside. Hence one violation of it destroys for ever that obedience which might deserve reward: he who has kept the law has not broken it, and he who has broken it, cannot have kept it. That the same man therefore should incur its penalty for *violating* it, and also deserves its reward for *keeping* it, is an outrage on common sense. This will clearly appear if we refer to human laws, imperfect as they are. Were a man at the age of seventy to commit a murder, he would be a violator of the law against murder though his life had been previously spotless; and for that one act he must receive condign punishment, or the law be set aside. The enquiry would not be, whether he had been every day stained with murder, but whether he had been once guilty of that crime. Nay were he to live a hundred years afterwards without perpetrating another murder, unless pardoned he would still be a murderer whose life the law demanded. Apply this to the Divine law and we shall find that the man who violates it once, must be for ever characterized as its violator, though he should never repeat the crime. For him therefore to be rewarded as one who had kept the Divine law, would be directly contrary to righteousness. That repentance makes not the least alteration in a law, is self-evident. Human judges enquire not about the repentance of the robber or murderer; but respecting his /507 guilt. The Law indeed knows no repentance: to pardon a man on repentance, is, in his case to suspend the Law.

§287 This doctrine, the dictate of natural equity, our author might have found fully laid down in the Sacred Scriptures. Paul, Gal. iii, quoting from the Old Testament, says, "Cursed is every one that *continueth* not *in all* things written in the book of

<sup>1</sup> §§103-113: "General Defence of the Precepts in Question"

the Law to do them,” which fully confirms this doctrine; as “*all things*” include our duty to God as well as to man,—and a *continuance* in performing them is required if we would escape the curse. So then if there should be an omission of any of these even for a single hour, righteousness denounces the offender as accursed, just as the man who may perpetrate a murder though in less time, is justly deemed a murderer. Hence the Apostle, having proved that all violate the Divine law, declares that “as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse,” which is indeed granted by our author when he confesses that the best and the wisest of men are “**constantly neglecting the duty they owe to the Creator and their follow-creatures.**”<sup>1</sup>

§288

Rammohun Roy attempts to explain away this and other testimonies of this nature, by intimating p. 6, that St. Paul alludes to the Mosaic law;<sup>2</sup> by which we suppose he intends the *ceremonial* part of that law, for if he mean the moral part of the law given by Moses, this is precisely the law which he himself insists that the Saviour came to explain and establish. It happens unfortunately for him however, that the list of crimes in *Deut.* xxvii, to which the denunciation quoted by Paul is annexed, does not contain a single ceremonial transgression. Indeed had the whole of them been such, this circumstance would have been against him rather than in his favor. The reason why the neglect of a ceremonial command brings the curse on the offender is, that God has enjoined that ceremonial rite. But if the command of Almighty God be of such tremendous weight as to bring down his curse on /508 him who neglects a rite in itself indifferent, merely because He has made it the subject of a command, how much more must this be the case where a moral duty, the omission of which is in its own nature evil, is made the subject of his command! Our author we are certain was not prepared to assert, that to omit a mere ceremonial rite commanded of God, brought his indignation on the offender far more than the commission of incest or murder. Yet this he does assert when he affirms, that in all these passages Paul intends the ceremonial law alone.

This at once explains the declaration made *Rom.* iii. 20. “By the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in God’s sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin.” If our author will understand this to mean the ceremonial law alone, he must either deny that the moral law when broken does bring home to the mind a knowledge of sin,<sup>3</sup> or affirm that it does it in a far less degree; either of which is saying anew, that to be guilty of incest or murder has in it far less of sin than the omission of a mere ceremonial rite. This also enables us to understand *Rom.* iii. 19. “Now we know that what things the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law, that *every mouth*

§289

Rm 3:19f.

<sup>1</sup> §112. <sup>2</sup> §109.

<sup>3</sup> That the role of the law is to bring knowledge of human sin and guilt, is Pauline thinking (Rm 6:7), and the basic idea of the reformatory understanding of the law of God.

*may be stopped, and all the world become guilty before God.*” Does their being merely under the law render them guilty before God? By no means; the highest archangel is under the Divine law, but he is not therefore guilty before God, because he has ever obeyed the Divine commands. But for a sinner to be under the law, (and there is no man that liveth and sinneth not,) is precisely the same thing as for a murderer to be under the law forbidding murder; which, the moment it speaks, stops his mouth and brings him in guilty before his judge.

§290

Rm 3:10-18

Should our author wish for proof that all men are sinners, he may find it in the same chapter, *Rom.* iii. drawn from the source he recommends for prior perusal, the Old Testament, /509 “As it is written (in Psalm xiv.) There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. There is none that doeth good; no not one.”—Nor can they boast the absence of evil; for “Their throat is an open sepulchre,” or rather a sepulchre opened, sending forth its deadly stench on every side. “With their tongues they have used deceit. Their mouth is full of cursing and bitterness: and the way of peace have they not known.” Such is the description which the All-seeing God gave of man nearly three thousand years ago; and by repeating it at the end of a thousand years, he has fixed for ever his real character.

§291

Mt 9:13; Mk 2:17;

Lk 5:32

Let us now enquire; Did Jesus when on earth, regard men as perfectly righteous, or as sinners? This question he answers himself “I came not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance”—to seek and to save them that are lost. If knowing men to be sinners, he taught that those who had violated the Divine law, could still obtain eternal life as the reward of their future obedience, chequered constantly with new failures as our author acknowledges, he not only denied his own atonement, and contradicted all that the Prophets had declared respecting it; but he completely set aside the law which he declares that he came to establish. Let us however examine the case of the lawyer adduced p. 7.<sup>1</sup> by our author as a proof that Christ did this. And here it may not be improper to ask: Did Jesus who knew the hearts of all, regard this lawyer as perfectly sinless, and exception to all mankind, or as one righteous only in his own eyes? That the latter was really the case, will we think be evident on examination. Although of the same nature with those of whom Paul testified “There is none righteous, no not one,” he did not come to Jesus to enquire how he should be forgiven, but *what he should do* to inherit eternal life. In reply Jesus, with infinity propriety, taking him on his own principles as though he had been what he vainly imagined /510 himself, a sinless man who needed no Saviour, directs him to the whole of the Divine law, adding, “This do and thou shalt live.” And had he gone and sincerely attempted this, watching his own heart to discern those “[constant neglects of the duty he owed to the Creator and to his fellow-creatures](#)”<sup>2</sup> found according to

Lk 10:25-28

---

<sup>1</sup> §108. <sup>2</sup> §112.

our author in the best and wisest of men, he might in one hour have detected his own guilt, and have come to Jesus as one of those sinners whom he came to seek and to save. A little reflection indeed will convince us that this self-righteous man at the moment he received this direction, was in the actual breach of the Divine law. In what spirit did he make this enquiry? "He stood up and tempted Christ." Had he loved God with all his heart, would he have wished to tempt his prophet? for as such at least he must have regarded Christ, unless he wholly rejected the testimony God had given respecting him. Had he loved his neighbour as himself, would he have wished to tempt a righteous man who had never given him any cause of offence? Or had he loved all men, would he have stood enquiring who was his neighbour? What course then could our Lord have taken better calculated to open this man's eyes to his real state, than thus to take him on his own principles and set him actually to attempt that, on doing which he so vainly prided himself? Had Christ told him at once that he was a sinner, he might probably have replied as did another of these self-righteous persons, "All these things have I done from my youth up," but who, when by way of trial prescribed a step in which Levi the publican had found no kind of difficulty, that of leaving all for Christ, went away sorrowful, manifesting himself to be so complete a slave to the love of wealth and of human estimation, that he would not forego them even for treasure in heaven.

Mt 19:20; Lk 18:21

[Section II. General Remarks on the Evidence furnished by Scripture to the Atonement and the Deity of Christ]

We now come to the evidence on which rests Christ's Atonement for the sins of men, which our author so unhappily attempts to ridicule, insisting that Jesus himself declares "the sole object of his mission was to preach and impart divine instructions,"<sup>1</sup> p. 58;—that his suffering death for the offences of others "seems totally inconsistent with the justice ascribed to God and even at variance with those principles of equity required of men,"<sup>2</sup> p. 62;—that he himself declares frequently "that he saved the people solely through the inculcation of the word of God, representing himself as a Saviour, or a distributor of eternal life, in his capacity of divine teacher,"<sup>3</sup> and that "he is of course justly termed and esteemed a Saviour for having instructed men in the divine will and law never before so fully revealed,"<sup>4</sup> p. 65;—that "the term Lamb of God" is applied to him because he, as well as many of the apostles, being innocent was "subjected to persecution,"<sup>5</sup> p. 68;—that "he was sent into this world to suffer death and difficulties like other prophets who went before him," p. 69, while he was "pure as light, innocent as a lamb, necessary for eternal life as bread for a temporal one, and great as the angels of God, or rather greater than they,"<sup>6</sup> *ibid*, and that "the iniquity of one's being sentenced to death as an atonement for the fault

§292

<sup>1</sup> §140. <sup>2</sup> §142. <sup>3</sup> §143. <sup>4</sup> §144. <sup>5</sup> §147. <sup>6</sup> §147.



committed by another, is so palpable” that—“every just man would shudder at the idea of one’s being put to death for a crime committed by another, even if the innocent man should willingly offer his life in behalf of that other,”<sup>1</sup> p. 64. All these assertions we shall meet simply with Divine Testimony on this subject, from which there can be no appeal, and with which we think our author should have made himself *fully* acquainted before he published them to the world. Every one who reads them will not be aware that he has not; some will think it impossible that any man could have published them till he had most diligently examined every idea found in Scripture on this important subject, and hence, giving him credit for having thus done, will make no examination themselves. /512

§293

The evidence given in scripture to the existence of the Triune God, the Deity of the Son, and the Atonement of Christ for the sins of men, is to be found less in definitions and simple declarations, than as interwoven in precepts and commands, which is the case even with that which relates to the being of a God, all these doctrines being intended less for speculation than for that faith and cordial obedience which renovate the heart and produce the fruits of righteousness. The gratification of mere curiosity seems never to have been the object of Divine Revelation. Hence, of historical facts we are told—just as much as will be profitable to the mind. He who has given us history so ancient that profane history begins merely where it ends,—has developed the state of the antediluvian world,—and informed us that the angels who kept not their first estate, are reserved in chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day, could have added in a few pages, facts relative to that awful defection, to the state of mankind before the flood, or even to the history of the first ten centuries afterwards, which the literati of the present day would have deemed beyond all price. But this did not seem good to Him who has hidden from the wise and prudent those things which he has revealed unto babes. Hence we have scarcely a full creed given us in any part of the Scriptures. He who would believe to the saving of the soul, must in the very act unite to faith cordial obedience, in doing which, he finds at length that he has a complete creed given him in those precepts which he has been obeying from the heart. So just is that saying of our Lord’s, “He that *will do his* will shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself.” Doctrines delivered in the form of divine commands however, involve in themselves a far stronger kind of evidence, than as though delivered merely as speculative axioms. Had they been given as simple declarations, they would have committed the *veracity* of the revealer, but when given as com- /513mands, they also involve his *goodness*. He who knowingly declares a thorough villain to be a man of the strictest probity, utters a falsehood; but if he bring him to me as one to whom

2 P 2:4

Mt 11:25

Jn 7:17

---

<sup>1</sup> §142.



I may confide all my property, he ruins me at once. To declare of a man totally ignorant of medicine, that he is a most able physician, is a falsehood which deserves reprobation; but knowingly to introduce him to a friend near death, as one on whom he may rely for a cure, is deliberate murder. Thus to declare a thing true which is really false, misleads the soul; but to deliver it as a command leading to eternal life, is to be guilty of destroying for ever, an individual, a whole nation, and possibly successive generations.

The evidence which the scripture furnishes both of the Atonement and the Deity of the Son, while all is the dictate of the Holy Spirit, may be traced up to *Five different Sources*, equal in authenticity, but differing in clearness and fulness. First, If the doctrine of the atonement be found in the Scriptures, it is natural to expect that it will be either expressed or implied in the Old Testament. As men were sinners from the beginning, a doctrine so important must have entered into the religion of the ancient patriarchs and prophets. However much it might have been veiled under that obscure dispensation, still it must have existed, and must have formed the foundation both of their faith and practice. Evidence drawn from this source, it may be observed, if fully substantiated, unavoidably implies the truth of the doctrine, whatever be found on the subject in the New Testament. If it be predicted that the Son should appear in human nature and die for sinners, we may be certain that for them he died, if he became incarnate and died at all, little as may have been said on this subject by himself or his followers. And, we may add, if he be described in these ancient writings as equal in nature with the Father; since he changes not, even the silence of the New Testament writers on this subject could by no means invalidate the fact.—Secondly, our Lord’s own declarations furnish another source of evidence. Though when it displayed his own infinite love, he might have chosen to be silent on this subject, especially when his disciples even at his crucifixion knew not the Scriptures that he should rise from the dead, yet if in his humiliation he gave merely a hint, which, justly construed, would imply either his atonement or his deity, we need no farther testimony from one “in whom” according to our author, “dwelt all truth.”<sup>1</sup> Any application of a prediction, delivered in the Old Testament, respecting his atonement or deity, would be peculiarly conclusive, as it would assure us that we had not mistaken the meaning of the Holy Spirit in applying such passage to Jesus.—Thirdly, any declaration respecting his atonement or deity given by the Evangelists themselves, form another kind of evidence. Among other things which became the Saviour when he took on himself the form of a servant, was, the duty of acting conformably to that state: and although he could neither deny nor wholly conceal his Deity, he made it his chief business while on earth to serve and obey.

§294

§295

§296

<sup>1</sup> §109.

§297 But the Evangelists could say things respecting their beloved Lord which that propriety he never infringed, might forbid his saying while he dwelt on earth, a man of sorrows and acquainted with griefs. Hence every hint they give respecting Christ's Atonement or his Deity is irrefragable evidence; and their thus applying any passage in the Old Testament, renders its evidence incontrovertible, by assuring us that in our applying it we have neither mistaken the subject nor the person.—Fourthly, the writings of the Apostles exhibit their maturest ideas of the Redeemer. While they were guided by the Holy Spirit into all truth, they had on themselves the most awful responsibility which at any time ever attached to mortals. Entrusted on the one hand with the honor and glory of their Lord, whom they had seen lay down his life for them, they were on /515 the other entrusted with the temporal and eternal happiness of future generations. Hence if they forbore to speak the truth respecting Jesus, they degraded their Lord; if they exalted him beyond the truth, they ruined mankind throughout every future generation. And since they were aware that their writings and example would be imperative on all the future followers of Jesus, if in these circumstances they indulged in fancy while speaking of their Lord, instead of delivering to mankind the clear and sober truth respecting him, they deserved to be ranked among the basest of men. Whatever their practice and writings therefore declare or fairly imply respecting Jesus, may be relied on as indubitable evidence. This applies with particular force to the Apostle John. If we may rely on uncontradicted tradition, the circumstances in which he wrote were peculiarly important. Surviving all his fellow Apostles, he lived till nearly sixty years after the death of his beloved Lord; and wrote at a time when his Godhead was impugned by some, and his human nature by others. This adds new weight to every expression he uses in describing his nature, either in his Gospel or his Epistles; for if when he must have been conscious that the eyes of all the churches were upon him as the last of the personal disciples of Christ, he was not circumspect in the choice of his language when describing him,—if he even suffered an ambiguous expression to escape him in a tongue in which he had preached Christ at least for fifty years if it was not familiar to him from his infancy, instead of being termed John the Divine, as he has been by the concurrent voice of seventeen centuries, he more justly merited the epithet of, the hoary Deceiver. If then they in these circumstances apply to Jesus any passage in the Old Testament relative to the Atonement or the Deity of the Son, this is a decided  
§298 proof that in thus applying it, we are perfectly correct. Fifthly, in the book of Revelation we have evidence originating in a different source. /516 In vision, the truth and accuracy of the scenes in which rest on precisely the same authority with “the Precepts of Jesus,” we have the Saviour introduced in his majesty and glory, the heavenly world opened to our view, and the sentiments of the blessed above respecting Him expressed in the most unequivocal manner. On whatever is there

expressed therefore respecting the Atonement or the Deity of the Saviour, we may rely as being not only the truth itself,—but the grand exemplar of our own language and feelings, should we ever be permitted to join the blissful assembly above.

Respecting the whole of this evidence we may add, that as all originates in the Spirit of God, one passage which clearly proves either the Atonement or the Deity of Christ, is quite sufficient. The Spirit of Truth being the same, twenty passages cannot render the doctrine more true than one; and the only reason why we can wish more is, that if one stand alone, we *may possibly* have mistaken its meaning. Where evidence concurs therefore drawn from two of these sources, we have the most decided proof of its truth, as this vouches for its just application; and if these five kinds unite in any one fact, such security for its truth is given as is found no where else among men. Of these five sources of evidence, we in our last Review confined ourselves to the two contained in the Gospels. As by our author’s quoting them however, all the Scriptures are open to us, we may now avail ourselves of the whole. Still since he intimates that “were it a practice among Christians to study first the Old Testament as found arranged in order—and then to study the New Testament comparing the one with the other, Christianity would no longer be liable to be encroached upon by human opinions,”<sup>1</sup> we deem ourselves bound to adopt this mode, whatever be its disadvantages. In doing this we shall also examine those passages of Scripture on which he has animadverted in the Appendix, as these animadversions form the sinews of his work. /517

[Section III. Evidence borne to the Atonement by the Pentateuch]

We begin with the first Promise made to mankind, a passage which seems entirely to have escaped our author’s notice, although it well deserves it. This occurs Gen. iii. 15. “I will put enmity between thee and the women, and between thy seed and her seed: it, or he, shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.” Respecting this promise, common sense dictates that it must contain a meaning worthy the wisdom of the Promiser. This it cannot have if we confine it to the serpent considered as a reptile. What could a reptile feel relative to the fate of its offspring through future ages? Of what individual serpent did the seed of the woman break the head so as for it to bruise his heel? But man had been tempted to his ruin, and Divine wisdom and mercy required, that the Tempter should be the object of this threatening. This explains the promise. The destruction of the tempter’s power is threatened. But his power is seen in his causing men to sin. The destruction of his power therefore, is salvation to man: and “for this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil,” John ii. 8. Jesus then is the Seed of the Woman, who suffered from the malice of Satan while he on the cross destroyed his power by

<sup>1</sup> §255.

atonement for sin and reconciling man to God. If it be urged that man's being *delivered from the power* of sin is here intended, rather than an atonement for sin; we reply, that atonement for sin both precedes and originates deliverance from its power. Deliverance from sin is the greatest of all blessings; and man previously to atonement made, is, according to Paul, under God's righteous curse. But, till it be removed, curse excludes blessing, otherwise curse is no more curse. From this curse "Christ hath redeemed us, Gal. iii. being made a curse for us;—that we might receive the promised Spirit through faith;" which faith, changing the heart and purifying it from the love of all sin, destroys the power of Satan over the soul. This threatening then is a promise of /518 complete redemption; and as such we have reason to believe that our first parents themselves received it, and were reconciled to God through faith in the promised Saviour.

§301 This is illustrated by Gen. iv. 4. "And Abel he also brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof. And Jehovah had respect unto Abel and to his offering." Comparing this with Heb. xi. 4. we find that, "by faith Abel offered a more excellent sacrifice than Cain." We have then in the first human household a sacrifice offered and approved of God by such evident tokens that they are perceived not only by the sacrificer but by his brother. This tells us that if Sacrifices were not of Divine institution, they were sanctioned by the approbation of God in the very first instance. But what does a man say who brings a living victim and offers it in sacrifice? That he deserves death for his transgressions and offers this victim instead of himself. Indeed it is difficult to say on what other principle God, who preserveth man and beast, nor suffers a sparrow to fall to the ground without his permission, should approve the slaughter of an innocent animal, otherwise than for food.

§302 When sacrifices were publicly enjoined on Israel however, their design was fully developed. Aaron, Lev. xvi. 17, with the blood of the beast he had slain, enters alone into the holiest of all, and *makes atonement* for himself, his household, and all the congregation of Israel: and if we turn to the New Testament, we shall find the Apostle who wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews with the express design of conveying just ideas on this subject, declaring, ch. x. 4. "It is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins." If these sacrifices then were accepted of God as an atonement when he knew that it was impossible they should take away sins, he either accepted them as an atonement knowing that they were *no atonement*, and thereby encouraged a deceptive worship, or he accepted them with a view /519 to a real atonement. But the former idea while it would be blasphemy against God *who cannot lie*, would be fatal to all the religion of Abel, Noah, Abraham, Moses, and the other worthies of the Old Testament; as this, founded on sacrifices and constantly nourished by them, must have been founded wholly on falsehood. As sacrifices *did not* take away sin, although they believed that their sins were taken away, if

they did not look forward to Christ's atonement, their faith by which they "wrought righteousness," was founded on deception,—deception fostered by God himself. In the acceptance of sacrifices by the God of truth, a future Atonement which could take away sins, is therefore unavoidably implied. Heb 11:33

Moreover it was "by faith" that Abel offered a more excellent sacrifice than Cain." §303  
 This faith must have been founded on some declaration. We hitherto find nothing declared however, beside the first promise couched in the form of a threatening to the Tempter; and we are certain that Abel looked forward to Christ, as he is included in the same catalogue with Abraham who saw Christ's day and rejoiced, and Moses who esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt. God's gracious acceptance of these sacrifices then as really foretold the future atonement as the strongest declaration; for thereon was suspended the eternal hope of Abel and of all who after him offered sacrifices in like manner: and for God to have encouraged in them an unreal hope, would have been—to give a stone instead of bread and instead of a fish, a serpent. Heb 11:4

Here however we are not left to induction. On referring to Heb. x. we find §304  
 One thus speaking, "Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me. In burnt-offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure." Heb 10:5f.  
 Sacrifices considered in themselves then, were never desired by God, they were approved merely with a view to His making atonement for whom God had prepared a body. Who /520 this was, the apostle tells us, ch. ix. 26. "Christ hath once in the end of the world appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." We have thus the most direct evidence that Christ's future atonement furnished the only ground on which sacrifices were ever accepted: hence they ceased after he had offered himself a sacrifice for sin. Strange that in comparing the Old Testament with the New, this chain of facts should have escaped our author's notice. Heb 9:26

These receive additional confirmation from Noah's sacrifice on his coming out of the ark. This like Abel's, was a burnt-offering; and respecting it we are informed §305  
 Gen. viii. 21, that "God smelled a sweet savour;" by which is meant, that they were acceptable to him. This is also testified by His saying in his heart, "I will not again curse the ground for man's sake, although the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth." This testimony of the Divine approbation to sacrifices necessarily gave direction to the religion of the new world; but did the Almighty while he still declared Gn 8:20f.

<sup>1</sup> Compare to this statement Edwards, *History*, 83: "[All nations] had this custom [of sacrifices]; of which no other account can be given, but that they derived it from Noah, who had it from his ancestors, on whom God had enjoined it as a type of the great sacrifice of Christ. However, by this means all nations of the world had their minds possessed with this notion, that an atonement or sacrifice for sin was necessary; and a way was made for their more readily receiving that great doctrine of the gospel, which teaches us the atonement and sacrifice of Christ."

the existence of human depravity, declare himself propitiated by that which he knew was no atonement? Was he pleased with sacrifices in which he had no delight? or did he hereby direct the new race of mankind to One hereafter to come into the world and make a real atonement? The former is contrary to his righteous nature, the latter is subsequently confirmed by numerous testimonies. All the genuine religion of the new world then was founded on the future atonement.<sup>1</sup> Nor was it unfruitful; it originated, among other fruits, the piety of Job and his friends, which if their hope was unreal, was wholly the offspring of falsehood.

§306 Having mentioned Job, we may here advert to his testimony respecting the future redeemer, Job xix. 25. "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand in the latter day upon the earth." This plainly shews that the Messiah is not termed a Redeemer merely on account of his teaching or his /521 example: these could be of no value to Job who lived so long before his appearance on the earth. He must therefore have styled him his Redeemer on some other account. Was this his becoming an atonement, or his delivering him from his temporal calamities by his wisdom and almighty power? If the former, this proves the Atonement, if the latter, it proves the Deity of the Redeemer about to stand the latter day on the earth.

§307 Abraham adds additional evidence to the atonement. He is thus addressed, Gen. xii. "Get thee out of thy country and from thy kindred and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee: and I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee;—and thou shalt be a blessing—and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." This affords another proof that doctrines are often delivered in the form of commands; and that this, instead of lessening, enhances their weight. What could have been more dreadful than for Abraham to have left his country, his kindred, and every thing dear to human nature, and to have gone to a land in which neither he nor his posterity for above four centuries afterwards, were permitted to erect a building, or possess a foot of land except for a burying place,—upon a mere deception, and this originating in the God of the whole earth? Respecting this promise however if we consult Gal. iii. 13. "Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us, for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree, that the *blessing of Abraham* might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ;" we shall find that it fully foretels the atonement. Want of room constrains us to pass over the evidence furnished by Isaac and Jacob, and by that singular type of our Lord's priesthood recognized in the Psalms and in the New Testament, in the person of Melchizedeck king of Salem; nor are we able to notice that eminent prophecy respecting the Saviour delivered by Jacob on his death-bed. "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah—till *Shiloh come*." /522

§308 In Exodus we are introduced into a new scene. The children of Abraham had now become a nation, and in bringing them out of Egypt with a mighty hand, Jehovah,

the only true God, addressed himself in the most powerful manner to all the nations around. By the last plague he inflicted on Egypt he brought before Israel their own desert of death, and the atonement, the way of deliverance he had appointed for guilty man. This was done by the institution of the Passover. On this occasion the Israelites were directed to take a lamb for each house, chosen on the tenth, and slain on the fourteenth of the same month in the evening;—then to take the blood, and strike it on the lintel and the two side posts of the door; and afterwards to eat the flesh roasted, with unleavened bread and bitter herbs. Respecting the blood thus sprinkled on the door posts, God was pleased to say, ch. xii. 13. “And when I see the blood, I will pass over you, and the plague shall not be upon you to destroy you when I smite the land of Egypt.” This Passover they were commanded to keep every year throughout their generations; and it will be seen that this solemn rite, which taught them that they, deserving death, were preserved from the destroyer through the blood of a lamb, directed their attention to a nobler victim, when it is considered that He by whom this was commanded, knew it to be, “impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sin.” On turning to the New Testament according to our author’s suggestion, we not only find John Baptist pointing out Jesus as “the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world,” but Paul recognizing his death under this very figure, 1 Cor. v. 7. “For even Christ *our passover* was sacrificed for us;” and Peter confirming this testimony, 1 Pet. i. 18.—“Ye know that ye were redeemed—with the precious blood of Christ *as a lamb without blemish and without spot.*” Nay pursuing our research, we find, Rev. v. the ideas of the redeemed above coinciding with those of the apostles below. In the midst of the /523 throne and of the four beasts and the four and twenty elders stood “a Lamb as it had been slain” the Mediator between God and man. This Lamb all the blessed falling down adored, saying “Thou art worthy—for *thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood.*” It was not then on account of Christ’s innocence merely, that he was compared to a Lamb;<sup>1</sup> his being *sacrificed,—slain,—his redeeming them to God by his blood,* fixed on him the attention of the apostles and saints on earth, and of the blessed above. How different the opinion of our author respecting Christ from theirs who “see him as He is!” Rejecting his blood, he will hear of nothing but redemption by his instructions. Should he retain this opinion till death, how can he unite with them above?

Ex 12:1–14

Heb 10:4

Jn 1:29

1 Co 5:7

1 P 1:18f.

Rv 5:6–14

The family whom God had chosen to preserve the knowledge of himself, being now about to be embodied as a nation, laws and religious ceremonies were prescribed them by God himself, from which they were forbidden to swerve in the least

§309

<sup>1</sup> “We find, however, the term ‘lamb,’ as well as ‘sheep’ applied in other places, where no allusion to the sacrificial lamb can be well imagined, and from which we infer that these were epithets generally applied to innocence subjected to persecution; a meaning which sufficiently accords with the use of the word lamb in the instance in question”, §147.

degree. In these, sacrifices with the express view of *making atonement*, were ever prominent; and when we reflect that in these sacrifices themselves God had no pleasure, we are irresistibly led to the conclusion that they were intended to lead them forward to Him who should hereafter come in the body God had prepared him, and once in the end of the world, put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. To substantiate this we have only to examine the Mosaic ritual. A High Priest was appointed, who, arrayed in garments made for glory and beauty, and bearing on his ephod and his breast plate, engraven on precious stones, the names of the twelve tribes of Israel, appeared before God to bear their iniquities and even those of their holy things, that they might be acceptable before God. This High Priest however, dared not appear before God in his own righteousness; a bullock and a ram were slain for an atonement for him, the blood of which was afterwards applied to his right ear, his right /524 hand, and his right foot. When this atonement had been made to sanctify the high priest himself, he was to offer up morning and evening a lamb as a continual burnt-offering; which done, God declared that he would “dwell amongst them, and be their God.” In *Lev. ix. 7*, we find Moses thus commanding Aaron, “Go unto the altar and offer thy sin-offering and thy burnt-offering, and make an *atonement for thyself* and for the people; and offer the offerings of the people, and make an *atonement* for the people, as the Lord commanded; and ver. 23, 24, that this being done, the glory of the Lord appeared unto the people.” “And there came out a fire from before the Lord, and consumed upon the altar the burnt-offering and the fat”, in token of the Divine approbation. Yet this High Priest was permitted to come into the holiest of all only once in the year, and then not without blood.

§310 The Annual Scape Goat teaches the same doctrine. In *Lev. xvi.* we find Aaron directed to take of the congregation two kids of the goats for a sin-offering, and a ram for a burnt-offering. On these two goats he was to cast lots, that one might be for the Lord, and the other, “presented alive to the Lord to make an atonement with him, and then to be let go for a Scape Goat into the wilderness.” The first goat he was to kill, and sprinkle the blood on the mercy-seat within the veil. While this was doing, no one of the congregation was suffered to be within even the holy place. All were to remain without ’till Aaron had thus made an atonement for himself, his household, and all the congregation of Israel. He was then to lay his hands on the head of the living goat, and “confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel” putting them on the head of the goat, and by the hand of a fit person to send it away into the wilderness. This was made a perpetual statute in Israel “to make an atonement for all their sins once in every year.” Commands like these did more than merely foretel the Atonement of Christ. As He /525 who commanded them, had no pleasure in sacrifices, and knew that the blood of bulls and goats could not take away sins; without a view to a real atonement to express approbation at these being



offered, was to deceive the worshippers and leave them still in their sins. When we reflect that these included the best of men for the next fourteen centuries, with the prophets and all the succeeding writers of the Old Testament, can any thing be more dreadful than such a supposition?

But strong as is this reference, we need it not; we have *direct* evidence that this prefigured the atonement of Christ. The very plan our author lays down as the certain way to disprove this doctrine, that of comparing the Old Testament with the New,<sup>1</sup> renders this fact clear as the light. In Heb. ix. the Apostle takes up this subject, and after describing the high priest's entering alone once a year into the Holiest of all with blood, which he offered for himself and for the errors of the people, he says ver. 12. "But Christ being come a high priest of good things to come,—not by the blood of goats and calves, but by *his own blood*, hath entered once into the Holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us," adding ver. 15. "For this cause he is the Mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death for the redemption of *the transgression that were under the first* (the Old) *Testament*, they who are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." He further declares, that since Christ could not have offered himself often, without often suffering since the foundation of the world, he hath "appeared once in the the end of the world to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself;" an appealing to the most certain and solemn of all facts, the mortality of man and the judgment which follows, he adds; "So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them who look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation,"—among which number may our author and ourselves be found at the great and last day. /526

§311

Heb 9:7-15

Heb 9:25-28

In giving this brief view of the evidence for the atonement of Christ furnished by the Pentateuch, we have been constrained to omit a number of minuter facts, highly valuable in point of evidence, as here the minutest rite appointed of God becomes strong testimony. To some this kind of evidence may be new, as they have been accustomed to attach this term only to clear declaration or prediction. Our Lord however in discoursing with his disciples previously to his ascension, tells them; "These are the words which I spake unto you while yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which are written *in the law of Moses*, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms concerning me;" in this threefold division of the evidence respecting himself contained in the Old Testament, assigning this the first place. The declaration of Moses relative to Christ's being raised up a prophet like unto himself, as it is urged exclusively against Christ's Deity,<sup>2</sup> will be hereafter considered.

§312

Lk 24:44

[Section IV. The Psalms respecting the Atonement]

Of the other Two Divisions, on our author's plan, to which we shall strictly §313

<sup>1</sup> §255. <sup>2</sup> §132.

adhere, the Psalms come next. In briefly examining both them and the Prophets respecting Christ's Atonement, we shall omit those passages which refer exclusively to his Deity, reserving them for a separate examination. In doing this, as every passage in the Psalms or the Prophets which our Lord adduced as speaking of himself, he thereby made his own, we shall be able fully to gratify the wish our Author expresses p. 9, "As the reverend Editor has most fairly and justly confined himself to arguments founded on the authority of the Divine Teacher himself, I should hope to be allowed to beg him to point out in order to establish his position, even a single passage pronounced by Jesus enjoining a refuge in such a doctrine of the cross as all-sufficient or indispensable for our salvation."<sup>1</sup>

§314 We find the Psalms confirming every thing implied in the Mosaic ritual respecting the future Atonement. In them /527 the Redeemer is described in almost every situation. The Second Psalm opens with a view of things immediately after his resurrection. "Why do the heathen rage and the nations imagine a vain thing?" &c. &c. This rage was excited by the doctrine that Christ had made atonement for sinners, as we may learn by recurring to Acts iv. where the disciples, threatened by the rulers for preaching this doctrine, go to their own company and lift up their voices with one accord to God in the very words of this Psalm, adding, ver. 27. "For a truth, against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate with the Gentiles and the people of Israel were gathered together." Their application of this prophecy was confirmed by a visible token of the Divine approbation.

§315 Psalm xvi. 8–11, describes the feelings of the Redeemer in the *prospect of death*, as we are taught, Acts ii. 25–27, where the Holy Spirit recites the prophecy with a variation of phrase made thereby as really the word of God as the original prophecy. "For David speaketh concerning him (Jesus of Nazareth,) I foresaw the Lord always before my face, he is at my right hand that I should not be moved; therefore did my heart rejoice and my tongue was glad, moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope; because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." Here the circumstances which related to the death of Christ are noticed even to the fact that the body of Christ should not see that corruption which seizes other human bodies almost before the spirit has departed. Still in his humiliation the Holy Spirit recognizes his equality with the Father by styling him, "the Holy One," a term applied in Scripture only to the Sacred Three.

§316 In Psalm xxii. we have the words in which our Lord expressed himself while atoning for our sins, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" This Psalm is applied to /528 the Redeemer, Heb. ii. where, declaring that it *became* Him by whom are all things and for whom are all things to make the Captain of our salva-

---

<sup>1</sup> §111.

tion perfect through sufferings, Paul, ver. 11, from this Psalm demonstrates Christ's *human nature*; "For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are *all of one*, wherefore he is not ashamed to call them *brethren*; saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren." But what need of proving his *human*, if he had not a *Divine Nature*? of proving him man, if Paul had not adored him as God over all blessed for evermore? Did Paul ever attempt to prove his own human nature? or even that of Moses? Was it ever said that Elijah or Moses was not ashamed to call the saints of God *brethren*?

Ps 22:22;  
Heb 2:11f.

Psalm xxxi. gives us the words in which after declaring "It is finished," Christ *resigned his spirit* to his Heavenly Father, "Into thy hands I commit my spirit." But it is in the Fortieth Psalm as already mentioned, that the Son describes the joy and delight which he felt in assuming our nature that he might become a sacrifice for sin. "Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire, mine ears hast thou opened: burnt-offering and sin-offering hast thou not required." It was then faith in the *real* sacrifice which was required when sacrifices were commanded. "Then said I, lo I come: in the volume of the book it is written of me; I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea thy law is within my heart." This is applied to Christ, Heb. x. 4-7. Having laid down the immutable axiom, that it is not possible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sin, the Holy Spirit adds, "Wherefore when he cometh into the world he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, *but a body hast thou prepared me*." By these declarations various facts are established. They inform us that the *grand design* of the Son in becoming man, was that of being a SACRIFICE; which fully refutes our author's assertion p. 58, that "*the sole object of his mission was to preach and impart divine in-/529structions*."<sup>1</sup> How he could indeed affirm this with the following declaration before him, "*therefore doth my Father love me because I lay down my life that I may take it again*,"<sup>2</sup> we are at a loss to conceive. Did the Father love the Son for doing that which it was no part of his work to do? And was it no part of his work to do that for which he had received the Father's command?—They also demonstrate that the Son *DELIGHTED in offering himself a sacrifice*, which refutes that dreadful assertion that Jesus "*declared great aversion to the death of the cross*," and merely "*yielded to it as knowing that the will of his Father rendered such death unavoidable*."<sup>3</sup> That human nature in its pure state should tremble at the wrath of God, instead of despising it, was infinitely right; but that he who delighted to do his Father's will when he knew that this will was his dying on the cross in the body prepared for him, should yield thereto merely because the will of his Father rendered it unavoidable, is such a charge against the Prince of Life as makes us tremble for its author.—They furnish a complete answer to the declaration, p. 62, that it would be "*a piece of gross iniquity to afflict*

§317

Ps 31:6;  
Lk 23:46

Ps 40:7-9

Heb 10:4-7

Jn 10:17f.

<sup>1</sup> §140. <sup>2</sup> §142. <sup>3</sup> §142.

one innocent being who had all the human feelings, and who had never transgressed the will of God, with the death of the cross for the crimes committed by others;”<sup>1</sup> and p. 63 “that the iniquity of one’s being sentenced to death as an atonement for the fault committed by another, is such, that every just man would shudder at the idea of one’s being put to death for a crime committed by another, even if the innocent man should willingly offer his life in behalf of that other.”<sup>2</sup> This iniquity, if it be such, the Father *willed*, since he prepared the Son a body in which to suffer this “palpable injustice,” and loved him for laying down his life and perpetrating the act. But should not a creature, a worm of the dust, who cannot fully comprehend the mysteries of his own being, pause before he arraign his Maker of gross injustice, and charge him with having founded all religion /530 of the patriarchs and prophets,—of the apostles and primitive saints,—of the blessed in heaven throughout eternity, on an act of palpable iniquity? Has *he* then “searched out the Almighty to perfection?” Has he ascertained, Thus far canst thou go in extending mercy to man—but no farther, on pain of being guilty of gross iniquity? We forbear to enlarge;—we hope for his own sake that our author has affirmed all this merely through ignorance, not knowing the Scriptures. May his eyes be opened ere it be for ever too late.

Jb 11:7

§318

Ps 45:6–8

In Psalm xlv. we have the *Eternal Deity* of the Son fully revealed, while his *Incarnation* is spoken of as though actually effected. “Thou lovest righteousness and hatest wickedness, therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.” From this passage, it is evident, that our author’s act of “gross iniquity” was perpetrated by Him who loved righteousness and hated wickedness! But who is this about so to equalize himself with men as to be one among men, perfect in righteousness? Though it is not our present business to seek evidence of the Deity of Christ, we cannot shut our eyes against the effulgence which beams forth from these unsought testimonies; “Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever.” Alluding to this and other passages, we find the Holy Spirit thus speaking, Heb. i. 8–12. “But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever, a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom,—and Thou, Jehovah,<sup>3</sup> in the beginning hast laid the foundations of the earth and the heavens are the work of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment, and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up and they shall be changed; but *thou art the same*, and thy years shall not fail.” Here, He who cannot lie, ascribes to the Son, the *Names* peculiar to God, Jehovah, God;—the *Attributes* of God, eternity, immutability, almighty power;—and the *Works* of God, the creation and disposal /531 of the

Heb 1:8–12

<sup>1</sup> §142.    <sup>2</sup> §142.

<sup>3</sup> Verse Heb 1:10 does not contain “Jehovah”, but “Lord”. Hebrews quotes Ps 102:25 “Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth”, speaking to JHWH, so Marshman’s insertion is consistent in the context of Hebrews, although it is not the proper translation.

heavens and the earth. Thus the mode of studying the Scriptures which our author prescribes as purging “Christianity from all human opinions” declares the Son to be Jehovah, the unchangeable God, the Creator of heaven and earth. But he is still right: these are not *human* opinions respecting the Son; they are the testimony of Him who is from everlasting to everlasting, whose understanding is infinite, and who *cannot lie*. To his testimony, that of all the men on earth and all the angels in heaven can add nothing.<sup>1</sup>

In Psalm lxviii. the Son is represented on his *mediatorial throne*, after having humbled himself to dwell on earth. “Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive: thou hast received gifts for men, yea for the rebellious also, that Jehovah God might dwell among them.” This we find applied to Christ by Paul, Ephes. iv. only the Holy Spirit describes Him there as *giving* these gifts to men, by raising up apostles, evangelists, pastors, and teachers to the end of his mediatorial kingdom.<sup>2</sup>

§319  
Ps 68:18  
Ep 4:8

In Psalm lxix. Christ is described in his *deepest sufferings*. “Save me, O God; for the waters are come into my soul; I sink in deep mire, where there is no standing; I am come into deep waters, where the floods overflow me.”—The Holy Spirit is here pleased also to describe the *nature* of his sufferings by adding—“then I restored that which I took not away,” the honor and glory of that righteous law which sinners had violated. This Psalm is recognized as descriptive of Christ by the Evangelist John, ch. ii. 17; and by the Apostle Paul, Rom. xv. 3<sup>3</sup>—In Psalm lxxii. the *glorious effects* of the Redeemer’s sufferings are brought before us, in expressions never realized in Solomon’s reign. “In his days shall the righteous flourish, and abundance of peace as long as the moon endureth. Yea all kings shall fall down before him; all nations shall serve him:—men shall be blessed in him; all nations shall call him blessed.”/532

§320  
Ps 69:1–3

Psalm lxxxix. also contains predictions fulfilled neither in David nor his posterity. “Thou spakest in vision to thy Holy One, and saidst, I have laid help on one that is mighty, I have exalted one chosen out of the people.—His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established for ever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven.” Here we may ask, Where is the temporal throne of David now flourishing? Where are his seed to be even found on the earth? But has that failed which God swore by his holiness to fulfil? Yes, unless this prophecy be—

Jn 2:17; Rm 15:3;  
Ps 69:9f.

Ps 72

§321  
Ps 89:19, 36f.

<sup>1</sup> Rammohan commented on Heb 1:8f. in §121: “We cannot allow much weight to the phrase ‘for ever,’ as establishing literally the eternal nature of the power of the Son, this phrase being often found metaphorically applied in the Scriptures to other created beings”, and in §226: “I have frequently noticed that the term ‘God’ in an inferior sense is often applied in the Scriptures to the Messiah and other distinguished persons; but it deserves particularly to be noticed in this instance, that the Messiah, in whatever sense he is declared God, is in the very same sense described in ch. v. 6 (‘God thy God’) as *having a God superior to him*, and by whom he *was appointed* to the office of Messiah.”

<sup>2</sup> Rammohan commented on Ps 68:18/Ep 4:8 in §244.

<sup>3</sup> John and Paul refer to Ps 69:9f., not to the entire Psalm.

Ps 102 long to the *kingdom of Christ*. Psalm cii. describes anew the *sorrows* of the Redeemer when wounded for our transgressions, "My heart is smitten and withered, so that I forget to eat my bread. By reason of the voice of my groaning my bones cleave to my skin." In ver. 10 the cause of his sufferings is disclosed, "Because of thine indignation and thy wrath; for thou hast lifted me up and cast me down." While the reality of his human nature is demonstrated by those tremendous sufferings due to our iniquities, the Holy Spirit bears witness to his Deity, in that description which the Spirit applies to the Son, Heb. i. 7. "Thou Jehovah<sup>1</sup>, hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands." Such are the proofs of Christ's Deity which meet us while we are seeking evidence of his having been a man of sorrows.

Ps 118:22 §322 In Psalm cxviii. occurs that prophecy of our Lord which when quoted by himself struck his enemies dumb: "The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner." And in Psalm cx. we have both his *Priesthood* and his *Mediatorial Kingdom* brought before us; a Priest without atonement however, has no existence in the Old Testament. "Jehovah hath sworn and will not repent, thou art a *Priest* for ever after the order of Melchizedek." "Jehovah said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies /533 thy footstool." Want of room constrains us to close here our quotations from the Psalms, though so many passages remain unnoticed.

Ps 110:4, 1

[Section V. The Prophets examined respecting the Atonement]

§323 Notwithstanding the abundant evidence for the Atonement and even the Deity of Christ already adduced from the Pentateuch and the Psalms, it would be injuring the truth were we wholly to overlook the Prophets, the third division declared by our Lord to contain things concerning him inevitably requiring fulfilment: and we trust our readers will bear with that fulness of proof which God has given respecting this doctrine, when they reflect, that it is the only hope of salvation to guilty man, the soul of all the true religion ever seen on earth, and the grand theme of praise with the blessed above throughout eternity.

§324 The first passage we adduce from *Isaiah* relates to Christ's *birth*. Hitherto there had been a gradual and beautiful display of light respecting the Redeemer of men. After he was announced to our first parents, the nation was predicted from which he was to spring, then the tribe, and at length the particular family of that tribe, while the sacrificial services prefigured him daily, and the hymns of praise which embodied the piety and devotion of these ages, unfolded his *Godhead* as well as predicted his *Incarnation*. The Prophets at length fix the *place*, the *time*, and the *manner* of his birth, bearing new testimony to his Atonement, and interweaving therewith the glories of his Godhead. *Isaiah*, in chap. vii. predicting his birth, identifies his Divine

---

<sup>1</sup> See §318, note <sup>3</sup>.

and his human nature: “Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel.” This passage the Holy Spirit applies to Christ in Matt. i. 22, 23. Is 7:14f.  
 “Now all this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, behold a virgin shall conceive and bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Immanuel, which being interpreted is, “God with us.” Our author’s efforts to fix this prophecy on Hezekiah, together with that in chap. ix. Mt 1:22f.  
 “To us a child is born, to us a Son is given, and he shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace,” completely condemn his own cause. On these two passages he has expended no less than twelve pages of his Appendix.<sup>1</sup> Among other things he attempts to make us ashamed of Christ’s human nature: “How inconsistent is it,” says he, p. 140, “that a sect which maintains the omniscience and omnipotence of Christ, should apply to him a passage by which he is made object to such a degree of ignorance as not to be able at one period to distinguish between good and evil.”<sup>2</sup> Alas! he forgets that all the glories of his unchangeable Deity would have been of no avail to us, had it not been for his human nature, the reality of which is demonstrated by his sinless infirmities. How far the Son chose to sustain or remove these by his native omniscience and omnipotence, his own infinite wisdom decided; but had he wholly hidden them under the perfections of his Divine nature, the enemies of redemption would as certainly have denied his human nature, as they now attempt to deny that he is “God over all blessed for evermore.” To secure to Hezekiah in chap. ix. our author gives us a translation or rather a paraphrase of it by Jonathan in his Targum,<sup>3</sup> to which we shall merely oppose that given by Bishop Lowth, “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 Father of the Everlasting Age, the Prince of Peace.”<sup>4</sup> And to fix on “the illustrious son of Ahaz”<sup>5</sup> this in ch. vii. he insists p. 139. that the Heb. העלמה and the Greek ἡ παρθένος should have been translated, not “a virgin,” but, “the Virgin,”<sup>6</sup> suspecting our translators of “a previous determination to apply the term ‘virgin’ as found in the prophet to the mother of Christ, in order that the high titles applied to Hezekiah might /535 in the most unqualified manner

<sup>1</sup> §§211-225. <sup>2</sup> §225.

<sup>3</sup> §270; Rammohan argues against Prideaux, who claimed that Christians and Targum Jonathan agree that Is 9:5f. refers to the Messiah.

<sup>4</sup> Lowth, *Isaiah*, 20. The difference to KJV is the expression “Father of the Everlasting Age” instead of “everlasting Father”.

<sup>5</sup> §223.

<sup>6</sup> §211: “The words ‘a virgin,’ according to the English translation, are ‘the virgin,’ both in the original Hebrew and in the Greek of the Gospel of *Matthew*, as well as in the Septuagint.”

be understood of Jesus.”<sup>1</sup> But our translators are charged wrongfully; they had not the most distant idea of these high titles being ever intended for Hezekiah. It is true the ׀ emphatic of the Hebrew, is generally rendered in the Septuagint by the Greek Article; they are by no means equivalent in value, however as he may convince himself by referring to that excellent work on the Greek Article, for which the learned world is indebted to Dr. Middleton, now Bishop of Calcutta.<sup>2</sup>

§325 Our author would persuade us that the Evangelist Matthew ought not to be credited when he expressly declares, that all the circumstances of Jesus’s birth happened for the sake of fulfilling this prophecy “spoken of the Lord by the prophet.”<sup>3</sup> And since the credit of all the Evangelists rests on precisely the same foundation, should he succeed, who can rely on the “Precepts of Jesus?” But their credit is perfectly safe; a slight attention to the chronology of the Scripture would have saved him all this labor, by convincing him that Hezekiah *could not have been* the child at that time about to be conceived by the virgin, for this plain reason, that God never foretels *past things*, like the Hindoo sage Valmikee.<sup>4</sup> He claims it at his peculiar prerogative that he “declares *things to come*,” and the birth of Hezekiah was not then a thing to come, for *he was at least Six years old, when this prophecy was spoken!* This our author will see by merely comparing the fact that Ahaz reigned *Sixteen* years, with the following passage in 2 Chron. xxix. 1. “Hezekiah began to reign when he was *Five and Twenty years old.*” Hence after allowing that the last day of one year and the first day of another, might be meant, still *Hezekiah must then have been six if not SEVEN years old when this prophecy was delivered*, though it were spoken to Ahaz the first month of his reign.<sup>5</sup> Should not our author, before impugning the Deity of Christ on the ground of his superior knowledge of the Scriptures, have made himself pre-viously acquainted with their chronology, at least on a point of this nature, when it would have cost him so little trouble?

2 K 16:2; 2 Ch  
29:1

§326 Isa. xi. describes the Redeemer in terms that preclude the possibility of his Atone-

<sup>1</sup> §224.

<sup>2</sup> Rammohan quoted in another context Middleton’s work, see the note to §128. Marshman has in mind Middleton’s words about the Greek and Hebrew article: “The Hebrew ׀, though it corresponds in some of its uses with the ‘O’ of the Greeks, is yet on the whole, so dissimilar, that he who should translate a portion of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek, inserting the Greek Article where he found the Hebrew one, and no where else, would write a language almost as unlike Greek as is the Hebrew itself”, Middleton, *Doctrine*, 37.

<sup>3</sup> §225: “The Evangelist Matthew referred in his Gospel to *Isaiah* vii. 14, merely for the purpose of accommodation; the Son of Ahaz and the Saviour resembling each other, in each being the means, at different periods, though in different senses, of establishing the throne of the house of David.”

<sup>4</sup> Valmiki is the legendary author of the Ramayana. A translation of this classical text into English was made by Marshman and Carey in 1806, see Potts, *British Baptist*, 91.

<sup>5</sup> It was known to Christian scholars that the idea of Hezekiah being the promised child was refuted by several Jewish commentators because of his age, see Gill, *Exposition*, on Jes 7,14.



ment's being an act of palpable iniquity. The Spirit of the Lord was to rest on him as the spirit of wisdom and understanding; hence he could not be ignorant of the nature of the deed he was about to perform; and "to make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord." Does the fear of the Lord lead to acts of palpable iniquity? or did the Spirit of the Lord fail to do his office? The concluding words of this prophecy evince, that its entire fulfilment includes all we can desire for India; "the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of Jehovah as the waters cover the seas." Is 11:1-9

In chap. xix. another prediction is given respecting Christ's kingdom. "In that day there shall be an altar to Jehovah in the midst of the land of Egypt,—and it shall be for a sign and for a witness to Jehovah of Hosts in the land of Egypt; for they shall cry unto Jehovah because of their oppressors, and he shall send them a Saviour and a great one, and he shall deliver them." This passage our author quotes p. 145, in a manner somewhat singular. To invalidate the proof of Christ's Deity arising from his being termed, our Lord and Saviour, he has selected four passages wherein the term "Saviour" occurs, the first referring to Israel's being delivered by Gideon, Barak, and others; the second to its deliverance from the Syrians by the hand of Jerobeam, and the other two to Christ's future kingdom, of which this is one.<sup>1</sup> It surely required but little knowledge to discern, that a man's delivering his country does not elevate him to an equality with God, or that to overcome an invading enemy, is an act totally different from "saving sinners from their sins." But to disprove Christ's claim to Deity by quoting his own deeds *against himself*, is quite a new mode of proof. Should our author doubt whether /537 this prediction *does* belong to Christ, we ask him when, previously to his coming, did the Egyptians cry to Jehovah for deliverance? And when previously, was Israel the third with Egypt and Assyria, a blessing in the midst of the earth, whom Jehovah blessed, saying, Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel mine inheritance. §327  
Is 19:19f.  
  
Is 19:25

In chap. xxxv. the blessings of Christ's kingdom are described in the most glowing language. The wilderness and desert are represented as rejoicing abundantly from seeing the glory of Jehovah. This passage contains expressions which forbid its being restricted to the return from Babylon: we are not certain that the eyes of the blind were then opened, the ears of the deaf unstopped, the lame made to leap as a heart, and the tongue of the dumb to sing: but all these wonders were realized when Christ became incarnate. The ransomed of Jehovah are also described as "returning with everlasting joy on their hands." But who came to give his life a ransom for many? Surely not the Father, for he never became incarnate. Yet these are the ransomed of Jehovah. §328  
  
Is 35:5f.  
  
Is 35:10

In chap. xlii. we have a prediction applied to Christ by Luke, "He shall not cry, nor §329

---

<sup>1</sup> §235.

Is 42:2, 18–21;  
Mt 12:19

lift up nor cause his voice to be heard in the street;” nor is the cause of the Father’s being pleased with him, concealed; “The Lord is well pleased for his righteousness’ sake; he will magnify the law and make it honorable.” From Paul, 2 Cor. v. we learn however, that for those whom Christ justifies by his righteousness, he also atoned; “For he hath made him *to be sin for us* who knew no sin, that we might be made *the righteousness of God in him.*”

2 Co 5:21

§330

Want of room constrains us to omit numerous other prophecies, that we may hasten to ch. liii. This memorable part of Scripture which proved the conversion of a most bitter enemy to Christianity, the Earl of Rochester,<sup>1</sup> so fully describes the design of Christ’s death, that it would be sufficient evidence, did it stand alone. The prophet having declared /538 that he appeared to the Jews “like a root out of a dry ground, having no form nor comeliness;” informs us why he was thus a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief. It was through no sin of his own, “Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows;” but as though to prevent this being interpreted on his grief through our refusing his instructions, he adds; He was wounded for our *transgressions*, he was bruised for *our iniquities*. But why was this necessary? Is not our repentance sufficient to make atonement with the “All-merciful?”<sup>2</sup> Is it not the *only* means of procuring forgiveness for our failures? “All we like sheep have gone astray, and the Lord hath laid on *Him the iniquities of us all.*” But if the Lord deemed this *necessary*, it should seem, according to our author, that Divine wisdom was mistaken; and yet if God did it when it was *not necessary*, nothing could be more fatal to the Divine character. But was this the Father’s act? Was it not the Jews persecuting an innocent person? He was indeed innocent: he had done no violence, neither was deceit found in his mouth; “Yet *it pleased Jehovah to bruise him; He hath put him to grief.*” On this subject then the thoughts of the Divine mind are as remote from the ideas of our author as the east is from the west. He declares that it would be gross iniquity to afflict an innocent being, who had all the human feelings—with the death of the cross for the sins committed by others, nor would his willingly offering his life alter the case; even then “*the iniquity of being sentenced to death as an atonement for the faults committed by another, is yet palpable.*”<sup>3</sup> Yet God who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity, *wills* this, yea delights therein: “*It PLEASED Jehovah to BRUISE him.*” In this discordance of opinion between our author and his Maker we are constrained to say, “Let God be true,—and every man a liar.” The

Is 53

Rm 3:4

<sup>1</sup> John Wilmot, 2<sup>nd</sup> Earl of Rochester (1647-1680), was known for his death-bed conversion after hearing Is 53, as reported by Burnet, *Some Passages*, 140-143.

<sup>2</sup> Rammohan used this title for God in §113 and §254. There is a possibility that Marshman senses Rammohan’s connection to Muslim thought and therefore quotes it in inverted commas, showing his own distance to this expression.

<sup>3</sup> §142.

remaining testimonies to Christ's Atonement in Isaiah we are obliged to overlook; to notice a few of those in the other Prophets. /539

*Jeremiah*, ch. xxiii has the following prediction; "Behold the days come, saith Jehovah, that I will raise unto David a Righteous Branch; a king shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved and Israel shall dwell safely; and this is the name whereby he shall be called, *Jehovah our Righteousness*." No temporal king of the seed of David however, has since sat on the throne of Israel; nor is even the residence of the ten tribes at present certainly known.—Another passage, ch. xxxi. describes the Redeemer's *reign in the heart*, being quoted Heb. viii. "Behold the days come saith the Lord when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah. I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and will be their God, and they shall be my people—for I will *forgive their iniquities*, and I will remember their sins no more." As the *righteousness* of Christ by which sinners are justified before God, was expressed in the last prophecy, the forgiveness of sin and deliverance from its power, are the grand features in this. Thus Paul testifies 1 Cor. i. 30, that Christ "is made unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption." Our author deems the term "made of God" in this passage derogatory to the Deity of the Son,<sup>1</sup> forgetting that when the Son had condescended to become man, it became the Father to exercise authority over the Son "made under the Law," as well as over others. Will nothing please our author but the Son's acting *without*, or in other words *against* the Father? Before he makes this the proof of his Godhead however, he ought to prove the Father's Deity by his acting *without the Son*. But this he will never do; for "whatsoever the Father doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise."

*Ezekiel* also predicts the promised Redeemer. In ch. xxxiv. 13, he says "And I will set up one Shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David, and he shall be /540 their shepherd." David however was then laid in the grave and had seen corruption. In ver. 29, it is added,—“and I will raise up for them a Plant of Renown; and they shall no more be consumed with hunger in the land, neither bear the shame of the heathen any more.”

*Daniel* not only describes Christ's kingdom by the stone cut out without hands which increased till it filled the whole earth; but he defines the nature of his atonement and fixes the *time* when it should appear.<sup>2</sup> We may indeed here ask, what is that doctrine on which this everlasting kingdom is founded? Is it our repentance itself as an atonement? or the death of Christ? Let the angel decide who came forth

<sup>1</sup> Rammohan explains "the phrase 'is made unto us of God' found in the passage" as "expressing the inferiority of Jesus to God", §230.

<sup>2</sup> It was common to calculate the time of the incarnation from Dn 9:24–27, see as an example Gill, *Exposition*, on Dn 9:25.

Dn 9:24–27 to give Daniel skill and understanding therein; “Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon the holy city, to finish the transgression and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy—and after threescore and two weeks shall *Messiah be cut off, but not for himself*.” Christ then is here described as a *vicarious sacrifice* for the sins of men, and *his obedience* as that *everlasting righteousness* through which alone we stand justified before God. The Redeemer is also termed “the Most Holy,” a name which declares him Supreme in all moral perfections, the peculiar glory of the Divine Nature. Who is holy as Jehovah? Psalm xviii.

Ps 17:23

§334 *Hosea*, also ch. iii, has a prediction respecting Christ’s work and kingdom which can scarcely be misunderstood. “Afterwards shall the children of Israel return and seek the Lord their God, and David their King, and shall fear Jehovah and his goodness in the latter days.”

Ho 3:5

§335 The Prophet *Joel*, ch. ii. 28, predicts that outpouring of the Holy Spirit followed the atonement and ascension of Christ. “And it shall come to pass afterwards, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your /541 daughters shall prophecy,” &c. This Peter applied to the day of Pentecost, which application of it was followed by a most signal proof of Divine approbation; three thousand persons, some of the betrayers and murderers of Christ, being at one time converted to God.

Jl 2:28

Ac 2:17

§336 *Amos*, ch. ix. unites his testimony with that of the other prophets relative to the kingdom of Christ: “In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David which is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof, and I will raise up its ruins, and build it as in the days of old, that they may possess the remnant of Edom and of all the heathen which are called by my name, saith Jehovah.” This prophecy James applied to the call of the Gentiles, when the apostles had assembled to decide whether justification by faith alone should be the standing doctrine of the gospel; a question which it pleased not only them, but the Holy Spirit himself, to decide for ever in the affirmative.

Am 9:11f.

Ac 15:16f.

§337 Nor does *Obadiah* in his short prophecy wholly omit the Redeemer’s kingdom. He alludes thereto in ver. 21, one of the four passages which our author quotes to impugn Christ’s Deity by shewing that the term Saviour is applied to *others*!<sup>1</sup> “And Saviours shall come up on mount Zion to judge the mount of Esau; and the kingdom shall be Jehovah’s.” We may here ask him, when has the mount of Esau been so judged by any one beside Christ, as that the kingdom has in consequence become Jehovah’s? Does this refer to any thing but a display of Christ’s power in converting sinners? Should he reply, that as the plural number “Saviours” is used, this cannot refer to Christ, we ask him whether he has not, p. 98, affirmed that “[the plural form](#)

<sup>1</sup> §143; §235.

is often used in a singular sense,"<sup>1</sup> as, "If his masters, meaning his master, have given him a wife?" "Whom shall I send? and who shall go for us? (that is, for me.)" Which side will our author here take? Will he read this "and Saviours, that is, a Saviour, shall come /542 upon mount Zion," and thus declare himself so unacquainted with the Scriptures, that of the four instances he has adduced *against* the Saviour, two of them relate to him? or—acknowledge the Triune God?

*Micah* in chap. iv. describes Christ's kingdom nearly in the same terms with Isaiah; and in chap. v. he predicts the *place* of his birth "But thou Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me who is to be Ruler in Israel, whose goings forth have been of old, from everlasting." This testimony to the Eternal Deity of Christ given in connection with his birth as man, it is wrong to overlook. "From everlasting to everlasting thou art God," is the address of Moses to God; and, "Art thou not from everlasting, O Jehovah my God, mine Holy One?" that of *Habakkuk*, when addressing Him who is of purer eyes than to look on iniquity. Do not these three passages equally describe the Godhead?

Even *Nahum* does not overlook the Redeemer's kingdom. See ch. i. 15, "Behold upon the mountains the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace! O Judah, keep thy solemn feasts, perform thy vows; for the wicked shall no more pass through thee." And if *Habakkuk* has not expressly mentioned the Saviour, he was evidently no stranger to the doctrine founded on his atonement. His axiom "the just shall live by his faith," is adopted by Paul when declaring the peculiar excellence of the gospel, Rom. i. as it is written, "the just shall live by faith;" and again Gal. iii. 11. But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God is evident; "for the just shall live by faith." This prophet also predicts the universal prevalence of the Redeemer's doctrine, ch. ii. 14. "For the earth shall be filled with knowledge of Jehovah as the waters cover the seas."

*Zephaniah*, the last of the prophets who flourished before the captivity, in ch. iii, evidently foretels the coming of the /543 Redeemer. "The King of Israel, even Jehovah, is in the midst of thee: thou shalt not see evil any more." Who this King of Israel was who is also Jehovah, Nathaniel informs us, John i. "Thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel," a declaration which the meek and lowly Jesus received not only without reproof, but with marked approbation.

Haggai, Zachariah, and Malachi lived after the captivity, the two former somewhat above five centuries, and the latter four centuries before the birth of Christ. Being therefore of a later school, their predictions form a distinct branch of evidence, and so decided is it respecting both the Atonement and the Deity of Christ,

<sup>1</sup> §165.

Hg 2:6-9 that did it stand alone, it would be sufficient. To the people discouraged by the humble appearance of the new temple compared with the old, *Haggai* says, ch. ii. "Thus saith Jehovah; The Desire of all nations shall come, and I will fill this house with glory.—The glory of this latter house shall be greater than that of the former, saith Jehovah of Hosts." Wherein did this latter temple exceed the former in glory, but in Jehovah's coming into it clothed in our nature?

§342 *Zechariah's* predictions relative to the human nature and atonement of the Redeemer, can scarcely be examined without their testifying his Deity. In ch. iii. Jehovah says, "Behold I will bring forth my servant, The BRANCH—and *I will remove the*

Zc 3:8f. *iniquity of that land in one day.*" And in ch. vi. "Behold the man whose name is The BRANCH, he shall grow up out of his place: even he shall build the temple of Jehovah, and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and *the counsel of peace shall be between them both.*" Here we are constrained to enquire, What temple of Jehovah did the man whose name is the Branch build? No material temple certainly. He however changes the hearts of sinful men, and forms them "a holy temple unto the Lord." But to effect this in every age, he must be both omnipresent and omnipotent; the /544 very first step towards this being a work of almighty power,

2 Co 4:6 equal by Paul's testimony 2 Cor. iv. to that of "causing the light to shine out of darkness." He also "sits and rules on his throne." Yet who can sit and rule on this spiritual throne erected in the hearts of men, but he who is both omnipresent and almighty? And "*the counsel of peace is between them both.*" Who are these two counselling each other? The Father and the Son. But unless they were *equal* in counsel and wisdom, how could they counsel each other? What could a *creature* add to God in counsel? Is 40:13 "Who being his counsellor hath taught Him?" Does even a man ever take counsel with a creature of lower nature,—his horse—his dog—or any irrational creature?

§343 In ch. ix. 9, the prophet describes the *entry of Christ into Jerusalem*. "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout O daughter of Jerusalem, behold thy king cometh unto thee; he is just and having salvation; lowly and riding upon an ass and upon

Zc 9:9 a colt the foal of an ass." And in ch. xii. 10, he refers to *his crucifixion*; "And I will pour upon the house of David and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem the spirit of grace and supplication, and *they shall look upon me whom they have pierced*, and they shall mourn for him as one mourneth for his only son," &c. which prophecy

Jn 19:37 John identifies ch. xix. 37, "They shall look on *whom* they have pierced," a prophecy on which our author expends two pages in the vain hope of getting rid of the inference, that in the Old Testament Christ is termed Jehovah.<sup>1</sup> We say the *vain* hope, because the address of the Father to the Son, "Thy throne, O Jehovah<sup>2</sup>, is for ever

Heb 1:8

<sup>1</sup> §§245-248.

<sup>2</sup> As in §318 and §321, Marshman puts "Jehovah" in the Psalm verse quoted in Hebrews, see §318,

and ever,” with numerous other passages, would render his criticism on this page useless to his cause, were it perfectly sound. This criticism however we must intrust our reader’s permission to examine. The emendations of this passage which our author suggests are two, the first is that of changing “they shall look *on me whom* they have pierced,” for “they /545 shall look *toward me on account of him whom* they have pierced,” on the authority of the Greek and Arabic versions, to get rid of the fact which the text as it now stands inevitably implies, that as the speaker is Jehovah, *He* was Jehovah who was pierced for our sins. As though distrusting his Greek and Arabic auxiliaries however, he suggests another emendation on the authority of “common sense,” which is no other than that of changing the pronoun *me* in the text for the pronoun *him*.<sup>1</sup> Of these two he must give up one, for they cannot stand together, his Greek and Arabic friends being decidedly against his second emendation, as both of them retain the pronoun *me*. Should he prefer the first emendation, we must beg leave to inform him that the Greek and Arabic versions are nothing to the Original Text; they are versions made by no one knows whom, and of value precisely as far as they are supported by the Text itself. If however he will adduce Versions, we will point him not only to our own, which we think is exceeded by few, but to Jerome’s which is far more ancient than the Arabic, and allowed to be far more correct; and which as well as the English, perfectly agrees with the original “et aspicient ad *me quem* confixerunt.” And before our author alters the Original Text, he must prove that the particle **אֵת** *eth*, which the best Hebrew Grammars define, “a particle marking the accusative case governed by active verbs, or an emphatic particle denoting the very thing itself;”<sup>2</sup> is rendered *on account of*, and that not in one or two instances, but in the greater part of those places in which it occurs. But this he can never do. He will find it used almost times without number with the accusative case of the substantive; about twenty-six times in the sense of the preposition *with*, and nearly seventy times with the Relative pronoun here used **אֲשֶׁר** *asher*, “which or

note<sup>3</sup>. Yet, in Heb 1:10/Ps 102:25 the original Psalm contains יהוה. Ps 45:7 quoted in Heb 1:8 reads אֱלֹהִים. This insertion of “Jehovah” is difficult to defend. Rammohan attacks this in §559.

<sup>1</sup> §248: “Common sense is, I presume, sufficient to shew, that since in the last two clauses in the verse under consideration the Lord God speaks of the Messiah in the third person—(“for him they (i. e. the Israelites) will mourn and lament,”) he must be supposed to have spoken of the same third person as pierced by them unjustly, and thus to have pointed out the cause of their lamentation.”

Marshman seems to misunderstand Rammohan in this point. Rammohan does not suggest two possibilities, but only one: “And they shall look *towards me, on account of* those whom they pierced.” In §248 he continues to write about the pierced one in relation to the one lamented and mourned about: They should all be in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person, in opposite to יהוה looked upon (1<sup>st</sup> person). It’s misunderstandable, because his reflection about Jn 19:37, where everything is in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person, is in between. In short: there is no “second emendation”.

<sup>2</sup> I could not find a source for this. It could be from Marshman’s excellent memory summarizing the general opinion about **אֵת**.

whom,” and with scarcely one exception, in the exact sense given it in the passage by our English translators.

§344 We can however easily try our author’s emendation on a /546 few passages. This particle occurs with the relative pronoun in the following instances. Gen. ix. 24, Gn 9:24; Nb 22:6 “And Noah knew *what Ham* had done to him.” Numb. xxii. 6, “I know that *whom* thou blessest is blessed, and *whom* thou cursest is cursed.” Would these sentences be improved by reading them thus, “and Noah knew *on account of what* Ham had done to him.” “I know that *on account of whom* thou blessest is blessed, and *on account of whom* thou cursest is cursed?” We shall succeed no better if we render it *on account of* when united with a substantive. Thus the first verse of Genesis, “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth,” has this particle before “the heavens” and “the earth.” But were we to render it; In the beginning God created *on account of* the heavens, and *on account of* the earth, who would think the sense improved?

§345 Another prediction respecting Christ’s atonement is given by Zechariah in ch. Mt 26:31; Zc 13:7 xiii. which also opens on us the full blaze of his Deity; “Awake, O sword, against the man that it my fellow saith Jehovah of Hosts; smite the shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered.” To this passage our Lord directs his disciples when about to atone for their iniquities: “All of you shall be offended because of me this night; for it is written, I will smite the shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered.” To weaken the force of this passage our author advances a most evident truism: “It either was originally applied to Agrippa,” the fourth Edomitish king or ruler *after* the sceptre had departed from Judah, and slain *after* Jerusalem was trodden down by the gentiles,—“or is indirectly applicable to Jesus; but in both cases his total subordination and submission to the Father of the universe is fully implied.”<sup>1</sup> No one doubts that the Saviour placed himself in subjection to the Father when condescended to become subject to death. But the question is, what is he *by nature?* which question the Father here decides by calling him “fellow” or /547 “consociate.” Unable to deny this, our author merely hints in a note that עִמִּיתִי *Immithi* “fellow” “signifies one that lives near another; therefore the word ‘fellow’ in the English translation is not altogether correct, as justly observed by Abp. Newcome<sup>2</sup> in his improved version,” lately published by the Socinians in England.<sup>3</sup> This critique however if just, affords our author little help. When we consider that it is the eternal Jehovah who here terms the Son his “near

<sup>1</sup> §200. Marshman’s quotation is not correct. The original reads “directly applicable.” <sup>2</sup> §199.

<sup>3</sup> Marshman confuses Newcome’s translation and explanation of the Twelve Minor Prophets, published with annotations of Horsley and Blaney which was used by Rammohan (see §199, note), and the “Improved Version” of the New Testament, where the Unitarians used Newcome’s translation. This means that he did not examine any of these two sources. The Unitarian publisher of the *Final Appeal*, Thomas Rees, already criticised this: “Mr. Marshman has here allowed his zeal to outrun his knowledge”, Rammohan, *Precepts London 1823*, xix.



dweller,” it only carries us back to the declaration of Micah, “whose goings forth are from everlasting,” or forward to that of John “and the word was *with* God and the word was God.” *Immithi* however is derived from the root עַם *Im*, the meaning of which Parkhurst<sup>1</sup> thus gives, “to collect, gather together, consociate. As a noun fem. עַמִּית *Immith*, it denotes nearness of condition or situation; and עַמִּיתִי *Immithi* (the word here used,) a neighbour, a member of the same society.” We find it thus used in Lev. vi. 2, “If a soul sin and commit a trespass against the Lord, and lie unto his neighbour in that which was delivered unto him to keep, or *in fellowship*.” It is not easy to say how the word here could have been rendered more accurately than by “my fellow, my partner, or consociate.”<sup>2</sup> In the Syriac Version\* of the New Testament this root is employed both to *form* and to *explain* the sacred name Immanuel. The name itself is written “*Immanuel*,” and it is translated, ܐܡܢ ܐܠܗܝܢ *Imman Alohan*, “with-us our-God.” Thus the same root is used to denote the Redeemer’s union with us in human nature, when he was “made in all things like /548 unto us, yet without sin,” and his eternal union with his Father in his Divine Nature; which renders it clear that if in his human nature he was a man, in his Divine, *he is God*, equal with the Father, his fellow, his consociate in the Godhead.

Mi 1:5  
Jn 1:1

Heb 4:15

Zechariah has also another prediction, which renders it indisputable that the Son is termed Jehovah precisely like the Father. It occurs ch. ii. 8, 9. “For thus saith *Jehovah of Hosts*, After the glory hath He sent *me* unto the nations which spoiled you; for he that toucheth you toucheth the apple of his eye. For behold I will shake mine hand upon them and they shall be a spoil to their servants; and ye shall know that *Jehovah of Hosts* hath sent *me*.” Here it is self-evident that he *who sends*, and he *who is sent*, are by the Holy Spirit both styled “*Jehovah of Hosts*.”

§346  
Zc 2:8f.

With this accords the testimony of Malachi, ch. iii. 1. “Behold I (*Jehovah*) will send my messenger and he shall prepare the way before *me*: and *Jehovah* whom ye seek, shall suddenly come into his temple, even the messenger of the covenant whom ye delight in; behold he shall come, saith *Jehovah of Hosts*.” Here the messenger who prepares the way before “*Jehovah of Hosts*,” is predicted in the very terms used by the

§347  
Ml 3:1

\* It may not be improper to add respecting the Syriac version, that as it was the first ever made of the New Testament, it is expressed in the phrases used by the Apostles and Apostolic men. If Syriac was not spoken at Jerusalem, it certainly was at Antioch the capital of Syria, where the disciples were first called Christians, and from whence Paul and others were sent forth. And that the Gospels should be rendered into Syriac almost as soon as they appeared in Greek, was almost a thing of course, as well as those phrases should be used to express the nature of Christ, which were in common use in this flourishing primitive church.

<sup>1</sup> John Parkhurst (1728-1797), *An Hebrew and English Lexicon, Without Points* (1762).

<sup>2</sup> Marshman quotes these definitions from Parkhurst, *Hebrew*, 534f. Parkhurst comments for עַמִּית in Zc 13:7: “עַמִּית is applied to the *human nature associated* with the divine in the person of Christ”.

evangelist in describing John Baptist, which one alone identifies Christ as Jehovah of Hosts. But the prophet adds another distinct fact, "Jehovah whom ye seek shall suddenly come into his temple, even the Messenger of the Covenant whom ye delight in."<sup>1</sup> What can add to these testimonies of the Deity of the Son we cannot conceive.

Is 42:8

Jehovah is that Name which God declares to be peculiarly his own; Isaiah xlii. "I am Jehovah; that is my Name: and my glory will I not give to another, nor my praise to graven images," and yet in the passages we have adduced, to say nothing of others omitted for want of room, the Son is styled Jehovah no less than twelve or fourteen times. And if he who is Jehovah be not God, *there is no God in the universe*, Jehovah being witness, "Thus saith /549 Jehovah, the King of Israel and his Redeemer, Jehovah of Hosts," I am the first, I also am the last, and *beside me there is no God*.—Is there a God beside me? Yea there is no God; I know not any." Since then Jehova the Father distinctly sends Jehovah the Son, and declares, that beside Jehovah there is no God, we have the highest testimony in the universe that Jehovah, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, while distinct in person, are ONE in nature, even the TRIUNE GOD.

Is 44:6-8

§348

Thus by examining the Old Testament on the subject of Christ's Atonement, and comparing it with the New in every instance required, as our author suggests, although no passage has been considered which does not relate to the work or the kingdom of Christ, we have before us such a body of evidence, corroborated by the Apostles, the Evangelists, and by Christ himself, as indisputably confirms not only the doctrine of his Atonement, but that of his Deity. As already observed, this evidence from the Old Testament is of peculiar weight. The Prophecies nourished the faith and hope of the best of men for above seven hundred years, the Psalms embodied their devotion for a full thousand years, and Sacrifices offered by faith, formed the soul of all real religion from the very beginning of the world. For these then to have deceived men, would have destroyed the character of God, and the happiness of all righteous beings throughout eternity.

§349

Had our Lord himself made no direct declaration respecting the design of his death, his referring his disciples to those predictions already named would have been sufficient, particularly in their circumstances. Yet it is evident that direct intimations of this nature were not withheld: such were, his declaring to them that he came to *give his life a ransom for many*, his conversing with Moses and Elias concerning his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem, Luke ix. 31,—his declaring that the Son of Man should be betrayed into the hands of men, and be killed, and rise a-/550gain the third day,—that he was about to *give his flesh* for the life of the world,—and to lay down his life for his sheep; and, above all, his discourse with them at the last supper, when he said, "*This is my body which is broken for you. This is my*

Mt 20:28; Lk 9:31; Mt 17:22; Jn 6:51; 10:11

1 Co 11:24; Mt 26:28

<sup>1</sup> Rammohan dealt with this question of the messenger in §§227-228.

blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many *for the remission of sins.*" But his declaration to them, Luke xxiv. previously to his ascension, leaves nothing more to be desired: "*These are the words which I spake while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and the Psalms concerning me.*" And, displaying his deity anew by "opening their understandings that they might understand the Scriptures," he added, "Thus it is written, and thus it *behoved Christ to suffer*, and to rise from the dead the third day, and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations."<sup>1</sup>

Lk 24:44-47

The *Apostles'* maturest ideas respect Christ's death and Atonement have been seen in the various quotations already given from them. Were more necessary, the following passages, to which multitudes might be added, are sufficient to shew, that *salvation through his death alone* formed the soul of their doctrine and of all their hopes,—"*Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ, Rom. iii. 24—Jesus, was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification, ch. iv. 25.—When we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly, ch. v. 6.—We joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the Atonement, ver. 11.—God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses to them, 2 Cor. v. 19.—Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this evil world, Gal. i. 4.—We have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law; for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified, ch. ii. 17.—I do not frustrate the grace of God; for if righteousness comes by the law, Christ is dead in vain, ver. 21.—Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us, ch. iii. 13.—In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins, Ephes. i. 7.—I count all things loss, that I may win Christ, and be found in him, not having mine own righteousness which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith, Phil. iii. 9.—Jesus hath delivered us from the wrath to come, 1 Thes. i. 10.—The great God, even our Saviour Jesus Christ—gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works, Titus ii. 14.—Not by works of righteousness that we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, ch. iii. 5.—But Christ, not the blood of bulls and goats, but by his own blood, entered once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us, Heb. ch. ix. 12.—Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, such as silver and gold; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and spot. 1 Pet. i. 18,*

§350

Rm 3:24; 4:25;  
5:6-11

2 Co 5:19

Ga 1:4; 2:16-21;  
3:13f.

Ep 1:7

Ph 3:9

1 Th 1:10

Tt 2:14; 3:5

Heb 9:12

1 P 1:18f.; 2:24;  
3:18

<sup>1</sup> Rammohan in his §140 had already dealt with some of these passages, he will complain in §529 that Marshman does not answer to his observations.

19.—Who his own self bore our sins in his own body on the tree, ch. ii. 24.—Christ hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, ch. iii. 18.—The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sins. 1 John i. 7.—And he is the propitiation for our sins, and not for our sins only, but also for the sins of the whole world, ch. ii. 2.—Whoso transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ the same hath both the Father and the Son. 2 John, 9.—Keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life. Jude, 21—Unto him that loved us, and washed us in his own blood,—to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Rev. i. 5, 6.—Thou art /552 worthy, for thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, ch. v. 9.—These are they that have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. Rev. vii. 14.

1 Jn 1:7; J(2:2)

2 Jn 9

Jude 21

Rv 1:5f.; 5:9; 7:14

§351

We have now, on the plan suggested by our author himself, taken a general though a cursory view of the evidence found in the Scriptures, that the death of Jesus on the cross is an Atonement for the sins of men; and we have found this prefigured by Sacrifices enjoined of God and publicly approved by him while he had no delight in them, but had prepared a body for his son. We find Prophecies afterwards delivered relative to the future Redeemer which predict the nation, the tribe, the family, and at length the place, the time and manner of his birth, together with numerous circumstances respecting both his life and his death. The books which contain these predictions are the Sacred Writings, which nourish the faith and the piety of all in this period who truly worship God. If then Jesus did not offer himself a sacrifice for our sins, a double deception was practised on his worshippers by the God of truth: the sacrifices were an illusion, and the predictions, falsehood, and all the real religion on earth prior to Christ's coming, was the offspring of deceit. The Scriptures however go on to relate, that at length Jesus Christ is born of the nation, the tribe, the family, at the time and place, and in the manner predicted. He is pointed out as the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world. He himself refers to the prophecies as mentioning his vicarious death, and after his resurrection, commands his disciples to proclaim his death among all nations as the Atonement for sin. This they do every where, interweaving it into all their Epistles intended to guide Christians in future ages;—and one, the most venerable of them, represents it as the idea universally prevalent among the blessed in heaven. If then Jesus Christ did not make a real atonement for sin, all the religion of the patriarchs and prophets, /553 of the apostles and primitive saints, and even of the blessed in heaven, is built on deception,—the Old and the New Testament are full of falsehood,—and there has never been any true revelation given among men.

§352

But if the doctrine of Christ's Atonement, prefigured by sacrifices and confirmed by prophecy, has actually nourished all the rectitude of conduct, the genuine piety

and benevolence, found among men from the fall to the present day—if the Redeemer told the disciples that thus *it behoved him to suffer*, and commanded them to preach repentance and remission of sins through his name—and if the apostles filled with this doctrine their Epistles intended for the instruction of Christians to the end of time,—what shall we think of our author’s professing to derive his knowledge of Christianity immediately from the Old Testament compared with the New, while he declares that this doctrine is founded on the most palpable iniquity? What shall we say to his impugning, p. 108, the doctrine of Christ’s human and Divine Nature,<sup>1</sup> even after having acknowledged it in Chapter the Second<sup>2</sup>—and to his ridiculing his intercession, and the doctrine of his being qualified to perform the office of Mediator from his being God and man, by adducing a man’s forgiving his horse at a friend’s intercession?<sup>3</sup>—Yea what to his declaring, p. 118, that “for the Deity to have assumed a human shape, and to have been subjected to the feelings and inclinations natural to the human species, is inconsistent with the immutable nature of God?”<sup>4</sup> If he does not *know*, that this doctrine is contained in the Scriptures,—and charity forbids our imputing these declarations to any thing but ignorance, in what manner can he have compared the Old Testament with the New? And if this plain and obvious doctrine, which shines in every prophetic book in the Old Testament, and forms the basis of faith and practice throughout the New, has so completely escaped his research, how can we expect that he can have ascertained the truth respecting that doctrine, /554 which while confirmed in the fullest manner by the testimony of Him who cannot lie, still remains the deepest mystery in heaven and earth? To an examination of further evidence respecting this doctrine, and of our Author’s objections against it, we now intreat the attention of our readers.

[Chapter II. On the Deity of Christ]

[Section I. Evidence adduced from the Pentateuch]

In thus examining evidence for the Deity of Christ, which we are constrained to term *further* evidence, by the fact, that those predictions which have foretold his Atonement have fully declared his Divine Nature, we are not left to infer, that if the blood of bulls and goats *could not* take away sin, Divine justice required a sacrifice through whom God *could be just*, while the justifier of the sinner;<sup>5</sup> and that as there is a certain proportion between *all creatures* rational or irrational, but none between

§353

<sup>1</sup> §173.

<sup>2</sup> Marshman is probably alluding to §117: “It would have been idle to have informed them of a truth, of which, as Jews they would never have entertained the smallest question, that in his mere corporeal nature Jesus was inferior to his Maker; and it must therefore have been his spiritual nature, of which he here avowed the inferiority to that of God.” – Thus Rammohan can speak of “two natures” of Christ, although with a different meaning.

<sup>3</sup> §180. <sup>4</sup> §181. <sup>5</sup> Compare §10.

the highest archangel and his Creator, the blood of no mere creature could take away sin. We are *solemnly assured*, that it was Jehovah, the unchangeable God, the Creator of heaven and earth, for whom the Father prepared a body, before whom John Baptist was sent as his messenger, and against whom, as his fellow and consociate, the Father commanded his sword to awake—that it is Jehovah who is our righteousness, and in whom the seed of Israel are justified and glory,—and who, being King of God’s spiritual Israel, rules in their hearts as the omniscient and almighty Saviour. Thus instead of being left to prove, that no one but Jehovah the unchangeable God COULD atone for sin, justify the sinner, and change his heart, the Father himself witnesses that *it is Jehovah* whom He hath appointed to this glorious work. Should any one object that the Father has given Jehovah the Son to do what a *creature* could have accomplished as well this would not in the least affect the truth of the fact; it would be only a dispute respecting wisdom between Him whose understanding is infinite, and his creature the objector. The sole question then is, whether the Son be BY NATURE God, bringing omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence to /555 his work, as well as infinite rectitude and mercy—or whether he be *a mere creature*, elevated to a state to which by nature he had not the least right. In other words, did he *humble himself* by becoming in our nature the Mediator between God and man, or did he by this act *really exalt himself*, and attain a rank in the universe for which his original nature furnished him with neither pretension nor capacity. The Scriptures know nothing of an intermediate rank between the Creator and the creature, between finite and infinite; nor does it give us the least hint that God ever has imparted any one infinite perfection to a finite creature. This indeed is impossible in its own nature. That the *receiver* must be of equal capacity and extent with the *thing received*, is a self-evident maxim. Be it power or knowledge, when a finite being has received a portion equal to his limited capacity, what is to become of the remainder? It will still fill the capacity of another finite being:—of ten thousand,—of all in the universe. Will this exhaust it?—Then it was never infinite; for infinite has no end. There must then ever be an *infinite* disproportion between the capacity and power of the Father and the Son *if he be a creature*, even though “**he be great as the angels of God, or rather greater.**”<sup>1</sup>

§354

This question *can be decided only by Divine Testimony*. Our reasonings relative to the Nature of God the Father, the Son, or the Holy Spirit amount to—just nothing. We know nothing of the Godhead, but what God himself has revealed. This he declares, 1 Co 1:1  
 Cor. ii. 11. “The things of God knoweth no man but the Spirit of God.” What the Spirit of God has revealed in his word then, is alone the proper subject of examination:—and we have already seen what God has declared of the Son in these passages which have been adduced as speaking *of his work alone*. As far more however, is revealed

<sup>1</sup> §147.

respecting the nature of the Son, it would be doing injustice to the subject were we to overlook those passages /556 which exclusively testify to his Godhead. This Second Part ought indeed to be nothing more than an examination of our author's remarks on those passages of scripture; for if there be a single testimony, either in the Old Testament or the New, which he has not noticed, he has opposed the Deity of Christ without duly examining the subject.

Before we adduce further evidence we may observe, that as a righteous messenger of God *must act* righteously, such messenger cannot ascribe to himself deeds or attributes which belong to God alone. This did neither Moses, Elijah, nor any who wrought miracles either in the Old Testament or the New,—besides Jesus Christ; and so accurate were his ideas on this subject, that when the Jews ascribed to Moses the miracle of giving them manna, he at once denied it to have been his act, saying, “Verily verily I say unto you, *Moses gave you not that bread from heaven.*” As the Son also entered on his Mediatorial work as soon as sin entered into the world, we may naturally expect to find him in the Divine Records acting from the beginning distinctly from the Father, though in all things one with him. This we find to have been the case. In Gen xlvi. 16, we have One introduced as an Angel, to the distinctness of whom from the Father, our author bears the strongest testimony, by affirming, p. 70, that *Angels* dispensed pardon and redemption as well as Christ, with the view of invalidating his Deity, and quoting Gen. xlvi. 16, “The Angel that redeemed me from all evil bless the lads.” Thus early when does One appear in the scriptures *distinct* from the Father, and *able to redeem*.<sup>1</sup> This Angel it is easy to trace. In Gen. xxxi. 11, we find Jacob telling his family, “*The Angel of God* spake with me in a dream saying, *I am the God of Bethel*, where thou anointedst the pillar, and vowedst a vow unto me.” On recurring to this transaction in ch. xxviii. we are told, “Behold, *Jehovah* stood above the ladder and said, I am Jehovah, the God of Abraham thy Father, and /557 the God of Isaac, the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it and to thy seed.—And Jacob vowed a vow and said, If God will be with me and keep me in this way that I go—then shall *Jehovah* be my God.” This “Angel of God,” then is here termed both Jehovah and God, and by Jacob chosen as his God, being also the God of Abraham and Isaac. God himself recognizes this transaction in ch. xxxv. “And *God* said unto Jacob, arise, go up to Bethel, and dwell there, and make there an altar unto *God who appeared unto thee when thou fleddest from the face of Esau thy brother.*” If this be the Son speaking here, the Holy Spirit again calls him God; if it be the Father, by saying “*God who appeared unto thee at Bethel,*” the Father places the Angel on a perfect equality with himself. Jacob indeed in the very passage quoted

§355

Jn 6:31f.

Gn 48:15f.

Gn 31:11–13

Gn 28:12–21

Gn 35:1

<sup>1</sup> “Moreover, we find angels declared to have been endued with the power of pardoning and redeeming men on various occasions”, §147, quoting Gn 48:16 and Ex 23:20f.

Gn 48:15f. by our author to prove that “*angels have dispensed pardon and redemption to men,*” declares the Angel who redeemed him from all evil to be “the God before whom Abraham and Isaac had walked.” How must our author feel when on reviewing the context, he finds that he has been disproving Christ’s Deity, by shewing that the *God of Abraham* dispensed pardon and redemption as well as Christ!

§356 In Exodus iii. 2, the *Angel of the Lord* appears to Moses in a flame of fire out of the midst of an unconsumed bush,—“And when *Jehovah* saw that he turned aside to see, *God* called unto him out of the midst of the bush and said,—I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.” Here the Angel of the Lord speaking out of the midst of the bush, declares himself to be the same with Jacob’s redeeming Angel, the God of Abraham and Isaac. Should any one urge that it was not the Angel who thus called unto Moses, but God the Father, this would only confirm the equality of that Angel with the Father, since he declares himself to be precisely what Jacob terms the Redeeming Angel. Christ also John viii. declares /558 himself to be precisely what *Jehovah declares himself* in ver. 14. “Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you.” See Jn 8:24 John viii. 24. “If ye believe not that I AM,” (*he* being supplied) “ye shall die in your sins;” and ver. 58 “Verily verily I say unto you before Abraham was I AM.” The Jews at once understood him to declare himself God, and took up stones to stone him. Nor did Jesus hint that they had mistaken him; he rather chose to work a miracle to deliver himself from them. When we compare this with his solemn declaration before Pilate, “To this end was I born and for this cause came I into the world, that *I might bear witness to the truth,*” and reflect that had not this been the truth, he, from knowing their thoughts, was under the most sacred obligation to undeceive them, we can scarcely conceive a more solemn testimony to his equality with the Father.

§357 A third testimony however, fully confirms the fact that this Angel of the Lord who brought Israel out of Egypt; was the God of Abraham. It occurs Judges ii. 1. Jg 2:1f. “And *an Angel of the Lord* came up from Gilgal to Bochim and said, *I made you to go up out of Egypt* and have brought you unto the land *which I swore unto your fathers.*”

§358 To these a fourth may be added from Genesis xxii. 11, 12. “And *the Angel of the Lord* called unto Abraham out of heaven, and he said—Now I know that thou fearest God seeing *thou hast not withheld thy son thine only son from me.*” This fourfold testimony then demonstrates that this Angel is *Jehovah God*, that he entered into covenant with Abraham, and was worshipped by him, by Jacob, by Moses and the whole house of Israel, and that it was He of whom Moses declared Deut. xxxii. 12.—Dt 32:12 “*Jehovah alone did lead him, and there was no strange god with him.*” Moses also Dt 32:16 testifies that Christ is BY NATURE God when he further adds, “they have provoked me to jealousy with that which is *not God;*” for as the Apostles called on the Lord Jesus, teaching others to do /559 the same, had Christ not been by nature God, they



who were specially guided by his Holy Spirit, would have provoked God to jealousy with that which is not God. And in drawing the Galatians from the worship of those *who by nature were no Gods* to that of Jesus Christ, had HE not been *by nature* God, Paul would have drawn them from one idol to another. Such witness to the Son's being *BY NATURE* Jehovah God, from Abraham,—from Jacob—from Moses—from Paul,—yea from the Son, and even the Father, leaves nothing on this subject to be further desired.

Ga 4:8–11

*Job* also testifies that the Redeemer is God in ch. xix. 25, 26, "I know that my Redeemer liveth and that he shall stand in the latter day on the earth; and though after my skin worms devour this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God." Would we know whether by God, *Job* means some inferior deity, neither creature nor Creator; he tells us, ch. xiii. 3. "Surely I would speak to the *Almighty* and I desire to reason with *God*;" and ch. xi. 7. "Canst thou by searching find out *God*? Canst thou find out the *Almighty* to perfection?"

§359

Jb 19:25f.

Jb 13:3; 11:7

[Section II. The Psalms examined respecting Christ's Deity—Animadversions on certain passages, noticed]

In examining the *Psalms* respecting Christ's Deity we shall there find the future Redeemer repeatedly described by the *Names* peculiar to the Godhead, Jehovah, God, the Almighty, which the *Attributes* and the *Works* peculiar to God, are ascribed to him without the least hesitation. In the Second Psalm we omit for want of room the refulgent evidence to the Deity of the Son given in the body of the Psalm, to call the reader's attention to the last verse. "Kiss the Son lest he be angry and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. *Blessed* are all they who *trust* in him." This passage alone furnishes a variety of testimony to the Deity of the SON. Destruction to spiritual enemies is no where in Scripture described as arising from the wrath of a mere creature. Prophets denounced on men the wrath of God and pronounced on them a curse in his name; but here /560 the Holy Spirit describes the *Son's* wrath as causing destruction, and this for contempt of himself. With this agrees John's testimony, Rev. vi. "And the kings of the earth,—said to the mountains, Fall on us and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne and from *the wrath of the Lamb*." Further, they are termed *Blessed who trust in him*. Jeremiah however declares, ch. xvii. 5. "Thus saith Jehovah, *Cursed* be he that *trusteth in man*, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from Jehovah." If then it be cursed to trust in man, but blessed to trust in the Son, he is God over all blessed for evermore. Thus the first time "the Son" is mentioned by name, his Nature and Deity are fully ascertained. He is equal to Jehovah; Jeremiah in ver. 7. also adds, "Blessed is he that *trusteth in Jehovah*;" and this Psalm says, "Blessed are all they that *trust in the Son*." If then it be equally blessed to trust in the Son and in Jehovah, He is

§360

Ps 2:12

Rv 6:15–17

Jr 17:5–8

necessarily equal to Jehovah. Nor is it a trivial proof which results from Jeremiah's uniting trust in man with the heart's departing from the living God. The Apostles trusted in Christ, as did all primitive believers, Eph. i. "We who first trusted in Christ." Did this withdraw their hearts from the living God? Let Paul decide 1 Tim. vi. 17. "Charge them—to trust in the living God."

Ep 1:12

1 Tm 6:17

§361

Ps 24

Jn 1:3

1 Co 10:21-26

Dt 32:12

Ep 4:8

Ps 36:6; Col 1:17;

Heb 1:3

§362

Heb 1:8-12

Psalm xxiv. ascribes those *Works* to Jehovah which are elsewhere ascribed to the Son. "The earth is Jehovah's and the fulness thereof, the world and they that dwell therein; for he hath founded it upon the seas and established it upon the floods." In John ch. i. 3, we are informed that "all things were made by (the Son) and without him was not any thing made which was made." In *creating power* then Christ is equal to Jehovah. Further in 1 Cor. x. Paul says, "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils. Do we provoke the Lord to jealousy? Are we stronger than he? The Lord Jesus then is capable of being *provoked to jealousy* by /561 the worship of idols *equally with Jehovah*.<sup>1</sup> Deut xxxii. 12.—With reference to Christ Paul adds, Whatsoever is sold in the shambles eat—for the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof. If this Psalm then speak of Jehovah the Father, the same *absolute dominion* over the earth is here ascribed to the Son as to the Father; if of the Son, he is there termed Jehovah.—In ver. 8. one is about to enter heaven as the King of Glory who is also called "Jehovah, mighty in battle." In Ephes. iv. Jesus, elsewhere styled the Lord of Glory, ascends, having led captivity captive, which implies battle and victory.<sup>2</sup> Here also the Son is either described as equal in *might* to Jehovah, or as Jehovah himself.—In Psalm xxxvi. 6, we have, "O Jehovah, thou preservest man and beast." In Col i. 3. "by him all things consist," and in Heb. i. 2. "he upholds all things by the word of his power." The Son then is either equal to Jehovah in *preserving power*—or Jehovah himself.

We have noticed Psalm xlv. in considering the Atonement of Christ,<sup>3</sup> we now recur to it, with its explication by the Divine Spirit Heb. i. in proof of his Deity. "But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O Jehovah, is for ever and ever"<sup>4</sup>—and, ver. 10. "Thou, Jehovah<sup>5</sup>, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth and the heavens are the works of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou remainest: and they all shall wax old as doth a garment, and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up and they shall be changed; but thou art the same, and thy years fail not." This awful description of "the Son" from him who cannot lie, fixes for ever the Deity and Nature of "the Son of God." We have no occasion to shew that the phrases "Son," and the "Only Begotten," inevitably imply an equality of nature with the Father; whenever "the Son" may be hereafter mentioned in the Divine Records, we have merely to

<sup>1</sup> Rammohan dealt with this question of provoking God and Jesus in §§237-238. <sup>2</sup> Rammohan dealt with this verse in §244. <sup>3</sup> §318. <sup>4</sup> See §343, note <sup>2</sup>. <sup>5</sup> See §318, note <sup>3</sup>. Attacked by Rammohan in §561.

regard the term as the *proper Name* of One already described by Him who cannot lie, as Jehovah God, unchangeable, equally worthy of worship with /562 Himself—equally tremendous in his wrath—equally potent to bless—equally in sovereignty, in creating and preserving power. This passage also fully explains 1 Cor. xv. He shall deliver up the kingdom to God even the Father. His original throne as Jehovah God, is for ever and ever. His Mediatorial throne remains for a season, and then ceases. He had not yet emptied himself of his original glory, yet he is now Jehovah God, ever “the same.” Nothing then, to which his infinite love prompted him, could make any change in him. His humbling himself for thirty-three years could make no alteration in his nature. Him who is in his nature unchangeable, what can change?

1 Co 15:24

Psalm xxiii. 1. “Jehovah is my Shepherd I shall not want,” united with Christ’s declaration John x. 16.—“There shall be one fold and one Shepherd,” has cost our author a whole page with the hope of proving, that Christ cannot be meant here and hence cannot have been termed Jehovah. This speaks volumes against his system, as he hereby acknowledges that if Christ be really styled Jehovah, his cause is at once lost. As we have adduced so many other passages in which the Son is called Jehovah, we should have passed over this, had it not been for our author’s animadversion. He observes, p. 146. “David declared God to be his Shepherd. Jesus represents himself as the One shepherd of the one fold of *Christians*, some of whom were already attached to him, and others were afterwards to become converts.”<sup>1</sup> But was our author ignorant that David was also one of Christ’s fold,—and Moses—and Abraham? “But” adds he “the term shepherd is applied to others (Moses, &c.) without conveying the idea of their unity with Jehovah.” True; but did he never read of a *Chief Shepherd*, who when he shall appear will give the under shepherds a crown of glory? Above the Chief Shepherd however there can be no one. Unless therefore he place the Father *below* the Son, he must allow that the Son, /563 if not Jehovah the Shepherd of David, is at least ONE with him. It is strange that among these *other* shepherds beside Christ, he should rank Him described Ezek. xxxiv. 23. “And I will set up one Shepherd over them, even my *Servant David*.” Was he ignorant that David himself had seen corruption at least four centuries before this prophecy was delivered?<sup>2</sup> His conclusion however exceeds all. Adds he p. 147. “If they insist *though without any ground* upon interpreting this of Jesus, they must still attribute his shepherdship over his flock to Divine commission and must relinquish the idea of unity between God the employer, and the Messiah his *servant*.”<sup>3</sup> Yes, we must relinquish a *unity of*

§363

Ps 23:1; Jn 10:16

1 P 5:4

Ezk 34:23f.

<sup>1</sup> §236.

<sup>2</sup> Marshman observes that Rammohan doubts that Jesus is David in Ezk 34:23. Therefore he seems to presume that Rammohan claims the historical King David is referred to in this verse and attacks him on this grounds. Yet Rammohan does not claim to know the identity of this “servant David” (§236).

<sup>3</sup> §236.

*nature* between the Divine Father and the Messiah whom he sent, just as much as we do between Cyaxares, and Cyrus employed to lead his armies, between Vespasian and Titus, between George the Third and his Son, now George the Fourth.<sup>1</sup>

§364 Relative to Psalm lxxviii. 18. “Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive, thou hast received gifts for men; yea for the rebellious also, that Jehovah  
Ps 68 God might dwell among them,” our author, while he adduces the Jewish dream that  
Ep 4:8 it was Moses who ascended on high, i. e. to Sinai, and received gifts for men, the ten  
commands, still acknowledges that Paul “[must have applied the verse in an accommodated sense to Jesus.](#)”<sup>2</sup> But he p. 153 insists that it is [equally absurd and unscriptural](#)  
to interpret this passage so as to imply that the person who ascended on high and  
who received gifts for men that the Lord God might dwell among them, is the Lord  
God, because this would imply “[that the Lord God ascended and received gifts from a Being of course superior to himself.](#)”<sup>3</sup> By this he again tells us that if he who thus  
ascended on high be really Jehovah God, his cause is lost. While this however, has  
been abundantly proved already, to ascertain it here we have only to examine the  
context. The Psalm commences with an address to /564 God in the third person. “Let  
God arise, let his enemies be scattered.” At ver. 7th, he is addressed in the second  
person, “O God when thou wentest forth before thy people when thou didst march  
through the wilderness. The earth shook,” &c. The second person is retained till  
ver. 11. “Jehovah gave the word; great was the company of those who published it,”  
and is resumed again in this, the 18th verse; “Thou hast ascended on high,” &c. If  
one person be not addressed from the beginning, therefore, it is certain that he who  
ascended on high, identified by Paul as Christ, is “God who went forth before his  
people through the wilderness, before Sinai itself was moved.”

§365 On Psalm lxxxii. 6. “I said, ye are Gods,” quoted John x. 35, our author to invali-  
Ps 82; Jn 10:3–36 date Christ’s deity observes, “[Jesus shews from this quotation that the term God, is figuratively applied to creatures of a superior nature.](#)”<sup>4</sup> This displays an inaccuracy  
of idea and expression we should scarcely have expected in a work on the Deity of  
Christ. What creatures of a *superior* nature are here termed gods? Those that die  
like men. To whose nature is theirs superior? Only to that of the brutes. What how-  
ever is the *figurative* to the *real* application of the term God? If other gods die like  
men and perish from under the heavens, must Jehovah who made heaven and earth,

<sup>1</sup> Rammohan used this metaphore in §228. <sup>2</sup> §244.

<sup>3</sup> “From a view of the whole verse, the sense must, according to this mode of reasoning, be as follows—‘The person who ascended on high, and who *received gifts* for men, *that the Lord God* might dwell among them, is the Lord God;’ an interpretation, which as implying that the Lord God ascended and received gifts from a Being of course superior to himself, in order that he might dwell among men, is equally absurd and unscriptural”, §244.

<sup>4</sup> §192.

whose throne is for ever and ever?

Psalm lxxviii. 56. "They tempted and provoked the most high God," and 1 Cor. x. §366  
 9. "Neither let us tempt Christ as some of them also tempted;" have cost our author Ps 78:56; 1 Co  
 another page in attempting to disprove that Christ was the Most High God who was 10:9  
 with Israel in the wilderness. But if Christ was "he who went forth before his people Ps 68:7  
 through the wilderness," as has just been proved from Psalm lxviii. he was certainly  
*with them in the wilderness*, whether this be declared here or not. We cannot but  
 remark our author's inaccuracy however in stating his opponents' doctrine on this  
 /565 subject. Says he "how far cannot prejudice carry away men of sense? Are we  
 not all in common with Jesus liable to be tempted both by men and Satan?"<sup>1</sup> Then  
 follow proofs to shew that Abraham was also tempted, with this interrogation, "Can  
 the liability to temptation common to God, to Jesus, to Abraham, and all mankind,  
 be of any avail to prove the divinity and identity of those important objects?" Now  
 we never heard any one to prove the deity of Christ merely *from his being tempted*. It  
 is the Apostle's declaring that *Christ was He* who was *tempted in the wilderness*, and  
 hence the Most High God described by the Psalmist as tempted there, which is here  
 adduced. This fact, if "him" should be added after the sentence, "as some of them  
 also tempted," is proved by this passage, and if not, it is fully declared elsewhere.

The last passage from the Psalms on which our author offers any remark, is from §367  
 Psalm cx. "Jehovah said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand till I make thine Ps 110:1f.  
 enemies thy footstool," on which he observes, p. 122. "This passage is simply applied  
 to the Messiah manifesting that the victory gained by him over his enemies was  
 entirely owing to the influence of God."<sup>2</sup> To this we reply, that after the Son had  
 humbled himself so as to assume our nature and be appointed to the combat, it was  
 not to be expected that the Father would *forsake* him. But that Jesus had no might  
 of *his own*, which our author would fain prove, is not a fact. To the enquiry of the  
 church in Isaiah lxiii. "Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments Is 63:1-6  
 from Bozrah?" Christ, declaring himself "mighty to save," answers, "*mine own* arm  
 brought salvation unto me."<sup>3</sup> And in Rev. i. 8, he sets his might above doubt, "I am Rv 1:8  
 Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, saith the Lord, which is, and which  
 was, and which is to come, the Almighty." Surely he who is Almighty *needs* the aid  
 of none in subduing his enemies. /566

Having noticed every passage in the Psalms on which our author has made any §368  
 remark, we will adduce a few which have escaped his observation. Psalm lxxviii  
 affords new proof that the Angel of Bochim who caused Israel to go up out of Egypt,  
 and brought them into the land which he swore unto their fathers, is equal to the  
 Father in *might* and *forgiving mercy*, ver. 13. "He divided the sea, and caused them Ps 78:13-35

<sup>1</sup> §237. <sup>2</sup> §191. <sup>3</sup> This verse from Isaiah is used in the description of Christ in Rv 19:13.

to pass through, and made the waters to stand in a heap. He clave the rocks in the wilderness, and gave them drink as out of the great depths. And they sinned yet more against him by provoking the *Most High* in the wilderness. And they tempted *God* in their hearts by asking meat for their lusts.—When he slew them then they sought him, and they returned and enquired early after *God*; and they remembered that *God* was their rock, and the *High God their Redeemer.*” That the Son would have been with Israel in the wilderness, to rear that fabric of ceremonial worship, which should prefigure the sacrifice of himself and thus nourish their faith and hope for the intervening fifteen centuries, we might naturally have expected from his being the Redeemer of men, had it not been expressly declared. Paul in Heb. iii. 3, 6, confirms this fact, however, and anew declares his Godhead: “For this man was counted worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch as he who hath *builded the house* is worthy of more honor than the house. For every house is built by some man; but *he who built all things is God.*” Here if the Apostle does not wander from his subject to the creation of the world, the “all things” refer to the house which Christ built in the wilderness, and in which Moses was faithful; and even if he does, as all things were made by Christ, he still confirms his Deity. It is indeed as easy to prove that there is no God, as that he who brought Israel up out of Egypt and led them through the wilderness into the land he swore to give their fathers, is not God over all, blessed for evermore. /567

§369 Who that Angel was who brought Israel out of Egypt, we are anew told Psalm lxxxi. 9, 10. “There shall no *strange god* be in thee, neither shalt thou worship any strange god. *I am Jehovah thy God who brought thee out of the land of Egypt*; open thy mouth wide, and I will fill it.” And that the application of the Name Jehovah to the Son as well as the Father does not affect the *unity* of the Godhead, we learn from Psalm lxxxiii. 18. “That men may know that thou whose name *alone* is Jehovah, art the Most High over all the earth.” But how shall we explain these numerous passages which declare both the Father and the Son Jehovah? Our Lord himself explains them when he says, “I and my Father are ONE,”<sup>1</sup> and in no other way can they be explained without the Scripture’s contradicting itself: but our author properly insists p. 173, that “*there is the strictest consistency between all the passages in the Sacred Books.*”<sup>2</sup>

§370 Psalm xcv. ascribes anew to Him who created all things, not only the awful name Jehovah, but *worship* and *universal dominion* “For Jehovah is a great God and a great King above all Gods—O come, let us worship and bow down, let us kneel before Jehovah our *Maker*; for he is our God and we are the people of his pasture, and the sheep of his hand.” Here if the Son himself be not intended, who *made all things*, and without whom *was nothing made* which was made, the same language applied

<sup>1</sup> Rammohan dealt with this verse in §§119-120. <sup>2</sup> §278.

to the Father and the Son, demonstrates their equality, Psalm cxlvi. again identifies this equality, by ascribing to those who trust in Jehovah the blessedness ascribed in Psalm ii. to those who trust in the Son. "*Happy or blessed is he who hath the God of Jacob for his help, whose hope is in Jehovah his God, who made heaven and earth, the sea and all that therein is.*" Here if the Father be meant, he is again equalized with the Son; if the Son, he is anew styled Jehovah, the God of Jacob, who made heaven and earth. Ps 146:5f.

We proceed to those passages in the Prophets declaring /568 the Deity of Christ, on which our author has offered any animadversion. We may however, previously notice a passage or two in a book wholly overlooked by him, that of *Proverbs*. If in this book Christ be represented under the character of Wisdom, as divines have thought, and as seems implied in Christ's saying, Matth. xi. 19, "But Wisdom is justified of her children;" and Luke xi. 19, "Therefore said the Wisdom of the Lord, Behold I will send them prophets," fresh proof is here furnished to the Eternal Deity of the Son. In chap. viii. Wisdom declares, "Jehovah 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 he prepared the heavens I *was there*—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." These expressions can scarcely apply to an abstract quality, while the personification is not greater if Christ be understood here, than it is in John where he is described as the "Word," As he is "*the same*," necessarily self-existent, (no one else being "*the same*," but changeable at the will of another,) he was ever Jehovah God, self-existent and almighty; had he not, he could not have been "*the same*," he must have changed from non-existence to existence. Mt 11:19; Lk 11:49  
Pr 8:22–36  
Jn 1:1–3 §371

[Section III. The Prophets examined respecting Christ's Deity—Animadversions on certain passages, noticed]

In *Isaiah* the first passage descriptive of *Christ's Deity* on which our author animadverts is chap. vi. 5, 9. "In the year that king Uzziah died, I saw also Jehovah sitting upon a throne high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple. Above it stood the seraphim—and one cried to another Holy, holy, holy is Jehovah of Hosts, the whole earth is filled; with his glory.—Then said I, Woe is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips—and mine eyes have seen the King, Jehovah of Hosts.—Also I heard the voice of Jehovah saying, whom shall I send, and who will go for /569 us? Then I said, here am I; send me. And he said, go and tell this people, Hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not. Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and convert and be healed." As this glorious vision wherein the prophet received his Is 6:1–10 §372

commission, represented either the Father or the Son, we might have expected that it should be the Son, who had undertaken to redeem men, had founded the Israelitish church in the wilderness, and was now about to send a series of prophets to the only public body on earth which held the doctrine of his coming and atonement. Our author acknowledges that it must be applied by Jesus in *an accommodated* sense to the state of the Jews.<sup>1</sup> If however it applies in *any sense* to our Lord, its reference to him is sufficiently proved. John's decisive testimony to this fact, chap. xii. 41, "These things said Isaiah when he saw his glory and spoke of him," creates him much labor. To break its force he says p. 142 "The passage in the evangelist, is more correctly explained by referring it to John viii. 56. Your Father Abraham rejoiced to see my day,—which cannot be understood of oracular vision, but prophetic anticipation; whereas the glory seen in the vision of Isaiah was that of God himself in the delivery of the commands given to the Prophet on that occasion."<sup>2</sup> We may here ask, What has Abraham's *day* to do with Isaiah's vision? It is not the "*day*" of Christ which the Evangelist describes Isaiah as having seen,—but "his glory," which the Evangelist declares to be *Christ's*. He also fixes the *time* when Isaiah thus saw Christ's glory, even when it was said "he hath blinded their eyes and hardened their hearts, that they should not see with their eyes nor understand with their hearts and be converted and I should heal them." This was precisely when Isaiah saw this vision in /570 the temple. Since then, according to our author, this was "*a vision of God himself*," another is added to the many testimonies already given, that Jesus Christ is Jehovah.

Jn 12:41; 8:56

§373

To our author's criticism on Isaiah vii. 14. "Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a Son," &c. compared with chap. ix. 6. "For unto us a child is born," &c. we have already replied by shewing him, that a slight attention to the chronology of the Scriptures would have saved him this labor, by convincing him that Hezekiah must at that moment have been six if not seven years old; and that it is not the way of Him who rests his claim to Godhead on his declaring things to come, to *foretel* things already *past*, like Valmikee in the *Ramayuna*. His mode of shewing however that "*the illustrious Son of Ahaz*" was not the only king of the select nation of God who was honored with such names as—"Emmanuel, or God with us," and with such epithets as "*Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace*," deserves to be noticed. What instances does he bring that these names peculiar to God were applied to certain kings in Israel? Two: Gen. xxxii. 28: "Thy name shall be no more called Jacob; but Israel, God's Prince, (more properly a Prince with God) for as a prince hast thou power with men and with God and hast prevailed." And Psalm lxxxix. 18. "For Jehovah is our defence, and THE HOLY ONE of Israel our king."<sup>3</sup> But

Is 7:14-16; 9:6f.

Gn 32:28

Ps 89:18

<sup>1</sup> §194. <sup>2</sup> Marshman quotes §229, but reads "oracular" instead of "ocular". <sup>3</sup> §223.



who among the Israelitish kings was the Holy One of Israel? Is not the Holy One of Israel Jehovah himself? If not what does Isaiah mean in ch. xlv. 3.<sup>1</sup> “I am Jehovah thy God, *the Holy One of Israel*, thy Saviour.” The proof, then that “Emmanuel,” the Mighty God, the Prince of Peace, are applied to certain “[kings of this select nation](#),” is, that Jacob was called “Israel,” which is no name of God, and that Jehovah and the future Messiah are both styled the Hole One of Israel!<sup>2</sup> Is 43:3

Relative to Isaiah xxviii. 16—“Behold I lay in Zion for a /571 foundation, a stone, a tried stone, a sure foundation,” &c. compared with Isaiah viii. 13. “Sanctify Jehovah of Hosts himself; and let him be your fear and your dread. And he shall be for a sanctuary; but for a stumbling stone and for a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel;” and with 1 Peter ii. 8,—our author charges Mr. Jones with wilful omission for the sake of drawing this conclusion; “[this stone of stumbling and rock of offence is no other than Christ; therefore Christ is Jehova of hosts himself](#).”<sup>3</sup> Not having seen Mr. Jones’s comment, we are unable to say whether this charge is just or not; but we think no unfair means are needed to elicit this fact from this passage, nothing indeed beyond a clear statement of the context. The declaration is, that *Jehovah of Hosts* shall be for *a stumbling stone* and for a rock of offence to *the two houses of Israel*. But after the delivery of this prophecy, was he this to them prior to the coming of Christ? As the house of *Israel* was carried away captive for a few years after the delivery of this prophecy, if not a year or two before, it is doubtful whether they ever saw this prophecy while in their own land. But *Christ has been* a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence to all of every tribe for nearly eighteen centuries, while he has been for a sanctuary to all who have trusted in him. Christ is therefore the Jehovah of Hosts mentioned in this passage. As to his being *made* the head of the corner by his heavenly Father, this can no more affect his unchangeable Deity than his being made flesh. §374  
Is 8:13f.; 28:16  
1 P 2:6–8

Our author attempts to evade Isaiah xl. 3. “The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of Jehovah, make straight in the desert a highway for our God,” by coupling it with Malachi iii. 1. “Behold I will send my messenger and he shall prepare the way before *me* and Jehovah whom ye seek shall suddenly come into his temple, even the Messenger of the Covenant whom ye delight in,”<sup>4</sup>—and confining his animadversions to the latter, on which he says, “[In /572 reply it may be simply observed, that we find in the Prophet distinct and separate mention of Jehovah and of the Messiah as the Messenger of the Covenant. John therefore ought to be considered as the fore-runner of both in the same manner as a commander](#)” §375  
Is 40:3; Ml 3:1

<sup>1</sup> Read: “xl. 3.”

<sup>2</sup> Rammohan quoted Ps 89:18–20,27. His logic is that the God spoke to the Holy One (v. 19) who is the selected king David (v. 20). For Marshman this seems to be an innertrinitarian conversation.

<sup>3</sup> §250. <sup>4</sup> §227.

sent in advance to occupy a strong post in the country of the enemy, may be said to be preparing the way for the battles of his king, or of the general whom the king places at the head of his army:"<sup>1</sup> p. 141, 142. This observation delivers up his cause wholly, as he thereby acknowledges, and most justly, that if Christ be Jehovah, his opposition to his Deity is vain, and rests his all on two persons being mentioned for John to precede, Jehovah and the Angel or Messenger of the Covenant. Now had there been two mentioned, this Angel of the Covenant has been already shewn to be Jehovah as well as the Father. But the fact is that Malachi does not mention two. It is *Jehovah* who was suddenly to come into his temple; and afterwards Jehovah and the Messenger of the Covenant; are identified as the same person by the Prophet's adding "*He shall come,*" (not *they*).<sup>2</sup> That Jesus is Jehovah mentioned in Isaiah xl. 3. whose way John was sent to prepare, is confirmed by the testimony of Zachariah and John his son, both filled with the Holy Ghost.

§376 Our author also animadvert on ver. 10, in this chapter. "Behold Jehovah God will come with strong hand, and his arm shall rule for him; behold his reward is with him and his work before him," as compared with Rev. xxii. 12. "Behold I come quickly and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be;" and to invalidate the proof of Christ's Deity which results from his being there termed Jehovah, he refers to John v. 30, 32.<sup>3</sup> "As I hear I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not my own will but the will of him that sent me. The Father judges no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son," but omitting the clause "that all men should honor the Son even as they /573 honor the Father." He also quotes Matt. xvi. 27. "For the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels, and then he shall reward every man according to his works."<sup>4</sup> These passages, however, do not in the least affect the question, which is not, by what *authority* Christ rewards, but whether he be *the person described as rewarding*; and this, these very passages confirm Rev. xxii. 12. in which Christ claims this prerogative in the fullest manner: "Behold I come quickly, and my reward is with me to give to every man according as his work shall be." If we understand the Father as speaking in this passage of Isaiah, therefore, since Christ describes himself in precisely the same terms, this will prove his *equality* with the Father, which is equal fatal to our author's system. But that the Son is here intended is evident from the context: Jehovah God, who thus rewards, is there described as feeding his flock like a Shepherd, as stretching out the heavens like a curtain, and spreading them out as a tent to dwell in, as "Jehovah who created the heavens, God himself who formed the earth." Precisely the same language is applied to that "good Shepherd" who laid down his life for his sheep, and whom the

<sup>1</sup> §228. <sup>2</sup> Marshman seems to interpret ver. 1b/1c as a *parallelismus membrorum*. <sup>3</sup> Read: "22."

<sup>4</sup> §243.

Father, styling Jehovah, describes as having laid the foundations of the earth, and as about to fold up the heavens like a vesture, and change them like a garment in the end of time, while he himself is ever “the same.” The Son of Man’s coming in his Father’s glory, can make no alteration in his eternal nature. If he is Jehovah, as the Scriptures so fully testify, “*he changes not,*” which is also testified of Christ by Paul, “Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.” Neither his humbling himself, nor his receiving exaltation therefore, can in the least alter his nature. His glory he may for a season lay aside, but his Divine Nature he can never change;—he can no more cease to be the Most High than to be “the Most Holy.”

Heb 13:8

But why conceal the fact that he comes in *his own* glory as well as in his Father’s? This is declared Luke ix. 26. “The Son of Man shall come *in his own* glory and in his Father’s,” and Matt. xxv. 31, where he mentions his own glory alone, omitting his heavenly Father’s, “When the Son of Man shall come *in his glory* and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit on the throne of his glory.” What his own glory was, we have been already informed by Isaiah, who in vision “saw his glory and spake of him.” These declarations explain every passage in which power and authority are said to be given or committed to the Son. By becoming the Son of Man he emptied himself of his glory, and became of no reputation, being in the form of a servant, the direct opposite of Godhead, the distinguishing characteristic of which is, supreme dominion. In consideration of this the Father exalts him as *the Son of Man*, not only glorifying him with his own glory which he had with him before the world began, but with the Father’s glory also in appointing him the Sole Judge of all creatures. Of this the slightest reflection will convince us. Judgment originally belongs to both the Father and the Son. But the Son was pleased of his infinite mercy to *give himself* for our sins, and the Father was pleased to deliver to him *all power* in heaven and earth, and commit to him *all judgment, judging* no man *himself*, thus committing that work *wholly* to the Son, which by nature belongs to him in common with the Father. Further, all power as to providence and final judgment is committed to him not merely as the Son, but *as the Son of Man, the Mediator*, and *because he made himself* the Son of Man, as Paul testifies Phil. ii. 9. This Mediatorial kingdom however, ends with the final judgment, when delivering up this kingdom to the Father, he remains *with* him, Jehovah God on his throne, as before he laid aside his glory to become Mediator. But as the Father’s committing to the Son the entire work and glory of being the Final Judge of all, judging no man *himself*, does not /575 change his glorious nature, so the Son’s laying aside his glory and becoming man, in no way changes his original nature and Godhead. Hence when on earth, he was in heaven;<sup>1</sup> while he hung on the cross, he upheld all things

§377

Lk 9:26; Mt 25:31

Ph 2:5–11

<sup>1</sup> Marshman refers to Jn 3:13, see his own explanation §65.

by the word of his power.

§378

We come now to Isaiah xlv. 6. Thus saith Jehovah the King of Israel and his Redeemer, Jehovah of Hosts, I am the First, I also am the Last, and beside me there is no God, compared with Rev. i. 8. "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord—the Almighty;" in animadverting on which passage our author displays a degree of faith which exceeds any thing found among Trinitarians; it is, that the Son of God after receiving the worship of the highest archangel at God's express command, *forbids John* to worship him, after having declared himself to be Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last, the Almighty who searcheth the heart. As our author lays great stress on this passage,<sup>1</sup> we trust our readers will permit us to examine it thoroughly. In this book five persons address John at different times; two of the elders around the throne, two angels, and He who is the grand speaker throughout the book, who in ch. i. declares himself Alpha and Omega, the Lord Almighty, of whom John's mind is full, and whom he after the first chapter often introduces without the least notice, while he previously describes every other speaker with the utmost care. This is the cause with the first elder ch. v. 5, who said unto him, "Weep not; behold the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David hath prevailed to open the book;"—with the elder, ch. vii. 13, who asks John What are these arrayed in white robes?—with the angel ch. x. who had the little book and gave it him to read,—and particularly with the one of the seven angels having the last plagues, who shewed John the various things he saw, and respecting whom John says, ch. xix. 10. "I fell at his feet to /576 worship him. And he said unto me; See thou do it not: I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren that have testimony of Jesus: worship God." Our author is so delighted however with this angel's forbidding John to worship him, that notwithstanding his declaration that "[there is the strictest consistency between all the passages in the sacred books,](#)"<sup>2</sup> he insists that this fellow-servant of John's, after having forbidden John to worship him, assumes the Godhead and declares himself Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last, like Jehovah himself, Isaiah xlv. This involves the belief of the following things, that the Lamb whom the blessed constantly adore, crying "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God, Almighty," *forbad John* to worship him;—that while this Angel was shewing John the bride the Lamb's wife, he was himself the Lamb in the midst of the throne,—and while shewing him the holy city, this angel was the Lamb who at that moment was the temple and the light in the midst of the Holy city he was then shewing him;—that the Son by forbidding John to worship him as a thing in its nature evil, after the Father had commanded all the angels of God to worship him, charges his Heavenly Father with folly, although our author declares them to be "[ONE in will and design.](#)"<sup>3</sup> Surely no Trinitarian could

<sup>1</sup> §§240-242. <sup>2</sup> §278. <sup>3</sup> §119.

ever boast faith equal to this: nor is this its full extent, after this angel had forbidden the least act of worship to himself, he with blasphemous inconsistency, arrogates to himself the peculiar language and prerogative of God by declaring himself the First and the Last; the Sovereign Arbiter of the eternal destinies of men. If this be Christ, what must become of “the Precepts of Jesus?”

Internal evidence however demonstrates that this Angel neither said “behold I come quickly,” ver. 7, nor “I am Alpha and Omega,” ver. 13. By applying here the rule applied to every other work on earth, that when the speaker is not expressly named, his language designates him, every difficulty vanishes. In ver. 5, 6, of the preceding chapter, another speaker besides the angel is introduced in the same abrupt manner by, “*And he said unto me,*” who adds “I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end,” and whom we easily identify as He that sat on the throne, saying, “Behold, I make all things new.” He there also uses the very language found in chap. xxii. 6. “Write, for these words are true and faithful!” This continuity of the language, with the sameness of the manner in which John introduces the speaker in both chapters, as though he filled his whole soul, is in itself fully conclusive, particularly when contrasted with the pains he takes to introduce the angel in ver. 8. “And when I had heard and seen, I fell down before the feet of *the angel who shewed me these things.*” But this internal evidence is confirmed by another fact. It is declared chap. i. 1. that Jesus Christ sent and signified by *his Angel* to his servant John things which must shortly come to pass. But beside this angel there is no one sent to shew John these things; and John himself expressly identifies this as “the angel who shewed him these things.” This at once proves that it was not Christ the Angel of the Covenant, who forbade John to worship him,—but the angel whom HE SENT to “shew John these things,” and who was hence as much Christ’s servant as John himself. That the blasphemous inconsistency in which this supposition involved this creature-angel, did not lead our author to examine these facts, is an instance of prejudice of which he has produced no parallel in any Trinitarian.

There are but two passages on which our author offers any remark. One is chap. xlv. 23. “Unto me, (Jehovah) every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear;” as quoted Rom. xiv. “For we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ; for it is written, as I live saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God.” Here he observes, “*between the prophet and the apostle there is a perfect agreement in substance, since both declare that it is to God that every knee shall bow and every tongue shall confess, through him before whose judgment-seat we shall all stand.*”<sup>1</sup> We here beg leave to ask our author where the phrase “*through him*” is to be found?

§379

Rv 21:5f.

Rv 1:1; Rv 22:6f.

§380

Is 45:23; Rm 14:10-12

<sup>1</sup> §234.

It must be in the author's copy of the prophet and the apostle.—It is not in ours. But he adds, "From this passage they say, it appears that Jesus swore by himself, and that thereby he is approved and to be God according to the rule, that it is God only who can swear by himself. But how can they escape the context which expressly informs us that the Lord Jehovah, and not Jesus swore in this manner?"<sup>1</sup> We reply; merely by this, that the Son was Jehovah before he was Jesus; and that his becoming Jesus could not make him cease to be Jehovah. This context however proves that Jesus is Jehovah, did no other proof exist. He who thus swore by himself is, "Jehovah who created the heavens, God himself who formed the earth;" who we have already seen, is the Son of God.—It is also He who being a Saviour says, "Look unto me and be ye saved all ye the ends of the earth,—and Jesus is so pre-eminently the Saviour, that there is salvation in no other. Further, the 24th verse adds; "Surely shall one say, In Jehovah have I righteousness and strength;" and ver. 25. "In Jehovah shall all the seed of Israel be justified and shall glory." But the righteousness ascribed to the Father is rectitude of nature and character, never obedience to a law, this belonging to the Son who condescended to be made under the law. That righteousness in which sinners glory, is never called the Father's unless by accommodation, while it is *properly* the Son's, wrought out by his obedience in our nature to his Father's law. Jehovah therefore "in whom men have righteousness, are justified and glory," is no other than Christ, in whose righteousness Paul wished to be found and in /579 whom he gloried. Nothing then can be more complete than the evidence furnished by this context, that Jesus is Jehovah;—and we intreat our author solemnly to weigh the import of that awful declaration in ver. 24, "All that are incensed against him shall be ashamed."

Is 44:24

Is 45:23–25

§381

Is 54:5; Jn 3:29;  
Ep 5:23

The other passage is Isa. liv. 5, misprinted Ps. liv 5. "Thy Maker is thy husband, Jehovah of hosts is his name," compared with John iii. 29 "He that hath the bride is the bridegroom," and with Ephes. v. 23. "For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church." On these our author remarks p. 148. "From this they infer that as the church is one bride, so on the other hand there is one husband, who is termed in one place God, and in another place Christ. My readers will be pleased to examine the language employed in these two instances: in the one, God is represented as the husband of all his creatures, and in the other Christ is declared to be the husband or the head of his followers; there is therefore an inequality of authority evidently ascribed to God and to Jesus."<sup>2</sup> Had our author examined the context with sufficient care, he would have found that these to whom God here declares himself the husband, are so far from being "all his creatures" that they are only one branch of his church, the Gentiles, the children of the desolate in opposition to the Jews, the children of the married wife, als Paul would have taught

<sup>1</sup> §234. <sup>2</sup> §239.

him Gal. iv. 27.<sup>1</sup> If therefore he understand this passage of God the Father, the inequality authority is entirely *in favor of the Son*, who was the husband or head both of these Gentile converts and of those in the Jewish church. But the fact is, that Christ is here meant, for he not only addresses this part of his church as Jehovah her Redeemer in ver. 8, but in ver. 17 adds, “Their righteousness is of me, saith Jehovah,” which we have already shewn to be properly spoken of Christ.—We have now examined our author’s every objection to those passages usually ad-duced from Isaiah to prove that Christ is Jehovah: and the evidence that he is such, shines forth with such effulgence from these very passages, that limited as we are for room, we fear to detain our readers longer by noticing other passages in this prophecy which witness the same fact, particularly as we must notice those passages which our author impugns in the other prophets.

Ga 4:27

Our author p. 142 animadvert on *Jeremiah* xxiii. 5, 6. “Behold I will raise unto David a righteous Branch and a king shall reign and prosper—And this is the name whereby he shall be called, Jehovah our Righteousness,” as compared with 1 Cor. i. 30. Jesus Christ is made of God unto us wisdom, *righteousness*, &c. on which he adds, “I only refer my readers again to the passage Jer. xxxiii. 16, in which Jerusalem is also called “Jehovah our righteousness,” and to the phrase “*is made unto us of God*, found in the passage in question and expressing the inferiority of Jesus to God.”<sup>2</sup> To this we merely reply, That this does not at all affect the question in hand, which is simply whether this righteous Branch of David, this King who shall reign and prosper, *be Jesus Christ* or not; and to prove this, we need only call in the testimony of the Angel to Mary, Luke i. 33. “The Lord God shall give unto him the *throne of his father David*, and he *shall reign* over the house of Jacob for ever.” This testimony then, without any aid from 1 Cor. i. 30, declares that Jesus is Jehovah, this righteous Branch raised up to David and hence, *Jehovah our Righteousness*. Relative to his “being made of God righteous to us,” or in other words, to his righteousness being imputed to us by the Father for our justification, this can of course make no alteration in the Son’s eternal nature. If he was Jehovah before he became incarnate to “bring in everlasting righteousness,” which has been so fully testified, he must remain Jehovah for ever; for “Jehovah changeth not.”

§382

Jr 23:5f.; 1 Co 1:30

Lk 1:32f.

On ch. xxxiii. 16 which our author thus translates anew; /581 “**And this (name) which (man) shall call her, Jehovah our Righteousness,**”<sup>3</sup> we may observe, that it is the church of Christ, the holy Jerusalem, who bears this name to the honor of her glorious Head and Husband, who is indeed “Jehovah her Righteousness;” but

§383

Jr 33:16

<sup>1</sup> In Ga 4:27 Paul applies Is 54 to the church. Therefore from Marshman’s perspective Rammohan’s point applying 54:5 to the creatures because of the expression “thy maker” is invalid.

<sup>2</sup> §230. <sup>3</sup> §231.



no one beside our author ever thought it fortunate that an innumerable company of sinful human creatures have not been deified on this account. If the church be really Christ's spouse, it is not strange that her lord should permit her to bear his name. Nor does it furnish any occasion for mistake. In Isaiah iv. it is predicted that  
 Is 4:1 "seven women shall take hold of one man, saying, We will eat our own bread and wear our own apparel, only let us *be called by thy name* to take away our reproach." Had this man permitted them thus to bear his name, no one would have deemed these seven women or any among them, this very man himself; although all would hence have thought that there was some one to whom this name really belonged. In like manner, although this does not prove that the church is Jehovah, it does prove that there is One bearing that Name who has so loved her as to become "Jehovah her Righteousness."

§384 As our author to invalidate the fact that the sacred Name Jehovah so often given to Christ evinces his Deity, observes p. 140. "We find the name of God and even the name Jehovah applied as an appellative to others without establishing any argument for asserting their deity,"<sup>1</sup> and mentions Jer. xxxiii. and Exodus xviii. 12. in which Moses terms the altar Jehovah Nissi, adding the sneer just noticed, "It is fortunate that some sect has not hitherto arisen maintaining the Deity of Jerusalem and this altar of Moses;" it may not be amiss to offer a remark or two on the subject of *Names* given by God in scripture. Although many given by men have been sad misnomers, witness Zedekiah "God my righteousness," Absalom "Father of peace," and others; yet in every instance wherein God has given a name, it has been strictly descriptive of the person, the /582 thing or the circumstance to which it refers. But while some of these are *Simple names*, as Abraham, Israel, and the incommunicable Name Jehovah, the Self-existent, from the verb הוה *havah*, "to be, to exist," which is applied to *no one* throughout the Scriptures beside the Sacred Three, others are *Compound names* descriptive of *facts* relative to Jehovah, and given to both persons and things. These demonstrate the truth of these facts; but as they are not simply the name Jehovah, no one but our author supposes them proofs of Deity. Thus no one supposes that *Jehovah-jireh*, "the Lord will see or provide," given by Abraham to the place where he offered Isaac, was intended to deify that place, but to perpetuate the fact that the Lord did there provide a sacrifice instead of Isaac;—that *Jehovah-nissi*, "the Lord my banner," given by Moses to his altar, intended any thing more than that God was his banner against the Amalekites;—that *Jehovah-tsidkenu*, "Jehovah our Righteousness," the name man should call Jerusalem or Christ's church, was intended to deify her, but to demonstrate that her Lord and Head who is her Righteousness, is indeed Jehovah;—or that *Jehovah-shammah* "Jehovah there" in Ezekiel xlviij, which

<sup>1</sup> §225.



our translators have rendered, “the Lord is there,” was intended to deify the city he saw in vision; but to foretel that it should be Jehovah’s abode. These compound names however are not confined to such as include the name Jehovah; *Hephzibah*, “my delight in her” is precisely of the same kind, and confirms the fact that God’s delight is in his church. Yea *Magor-missabib*, “surrounded with terror” was given by God to Pashur, Jeremiah xx. to denote his being made a terror to himself and to all his friends. Compound names therefore do not of themselves express deity; but they express facts more strongly than simple assertions or propositions. Thus the compound name *Jehovah-tsidkenu*, Jehovah our Righteousness, given by the Holy Spirit to the Redeemer, perpetuates the glorious /583 truth, that the Son who created our righteousness by his own obedience to the divine law, is Jehovah; and *Immanuel* “God with us,” equally perpetuates the fact, that he who took our nature, is, God over all blessed evermore.

Ezk 48:35

These being all the passages in Jeremiah which our author has noticed, we beg leave to mention one in two which tend to illustrate not so much the Name, as the *Divine Nature* of the Son. In chap. v. 22, we have this expostulation, “Fear ye not me, saith Jehovah? Will ye not tremble at my presence, who have placed the sand for the bound of the sea by a perpetual decree that it cannot pass it; and though the waves toss themselves, yet can they not prevail?” This however is only a part of that work of creation ascribed to Him, who while on earth exercised absolute dominion over the winds and the waves in *no name beside his own*,—Our author to impugn the Deity of Christ, also urges p. 95, that “the epithet God is frequently applied in the Sacred Scriptures to others beside the Supreme being,”<sup>1</sup> adducing six instances wherein idols are termed gods, four wherein the term is applied to magistrates, and two wherein Moses is said to be a god to Pharoah and instead of God to Aaron. This objection Jeremiah cuts up, chap. x. 11, as already mentioned. The gods that have not made the heavens and the earth, even they shall perish from the earth and from under these heavens, which declaration sweeps away not only the gods of the heathen, but all magisterial gods, and even Moses himself as far as he aspired to the godhead. But from this general wreck of our author’s gods, Christ is exempted, he having “made these heavens and laid the foundation of the earth.”—In chap. xvii. God declares, “The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked, who can know it? I *Jehovah* search the heart; I try the reins, even to give every man according to his ways and according to the fruit of his doings.” He hereby informs us that he deems no one competent to the work of giving to eve-/584ry man “according as his works shall be,” who cannot search the heart and try the reins of the children of men. We are hence assured that the Father, who alone perfectly knows the Son, did not

§385

Jr 5:22

Jr 10:11

Jr 17:9f.

<sup>1</sup> §121.

commit to him *all judgment* so entirely as to judge *no man himself*, without knowing his infinite fitness for the work. Nor is he mistaken; the Son himself declares Rev.

Rv 2:23 ii. 23, “And all the churches shall know that I am he who searcheth the reins and hearts; and I will give to every one of you according to your works.”—In ch. xxiii.

Jr 23:24 24. God says, “Can any hide himself in secret places that I shall not see him, saith Jehovah? Do not I fill heaven and earth, saith Jehovah?” And of Christ Paul declares

Heb 4:13; 1:3 Heb. vi. “Neither ist there any creature *that is not manifest in his sight*; but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do;”<sup>1</sup> and Heb. i. 3, “that he not merely *fills all things*, but *upholds them* by the word of his power.”

§386 In *Ezekiel*, ch. xxviii. God says respecting a man who arrogated to himself the honors of godhead, “Son of man, say unto the Prince of Tyrus, thus saith Jehovah God, because thy heart is lifted up, and thou hast said, I am a god, I sit in the seat of God.—Yet thou art a man and not God, though thou set thy heart as God.—Behold thou shalt die the death of the uncircumcised by the hands of strangers; for I

Heb 1:8 have spoken it saith Jehovah.” How different the Father’s language to the Son! “Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever.” Does he then respect persons? Why this different language to the prince of Tyros and to Jesus, when both suffered themselves to be treated as God?

§387 Had our author examined the Prophet Daniel, he might have found a degree of proof respecting the Deity of the Son, as well as of his atonement, by no means unworthy of his notice. He declares ch. ii. that “God revealeth the deep and *the secret things*, he knoweth what *is in the darkness*.” Paul says of Christ 1 Cor. iv.

1 Co 4:5 5. “Judge nothing before the time, /585 until the Lord come who both *will bring to light the hidden things of darkness*, and will *make manifest the counsels of the heart*.” Our Lord himself however testifies that this is the work of God—Ye are they that

justify yourselves among men, but *God knoweth your hearts*; as does also Peter, Acts xv. 8. “And *God who knoweth your hearts* put no difference between us and them.”

We have here another threefold testimony that Christ is by *Nature* God—Christ’s kingdom also Dan. ch. i. and vii. breaks in pieces and consumes all other kingdoms, while itself is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away. In this kingdom however, he is *adored* and *worshipped* by every one of his subjects. If then he were not God BY NATURE, the Creator of heaven and earth, he and his kingdom must perish

from under the heavens:—We have already observed that in ch. ix. 24, He who is to make reconciliation for iniquity and bring in everlasting righteousness, is styled “the Most Holy” which declares him to be equal to the High and Holy One who inhabiteth

<sup>1</sup> Heb 4:12f. speaks about the word of God (“the word of God is quick and powerful” etc.). Marshman, like other Christian commentators understand this as a word about Christ, compare Gill, *Exposition*, to Heb 4:12: “This is to be understood of Christ, the essential Word of God; for the Word of God was a known name of the Messiah among the Jews”.

eternity,<sup>1</sup> witness Psalm xviii. “Who is holy as Jehovah?”<sup>2</sup> This inevitably proves his eternal Godhead. If “the High and Holy One inhabiteth eternity,” does not “the Most Holy?”

On *Hosea* xi. 1, “Out of Egypt have I called my Son,” quoted Matt. ii. 15, our author observes, p. 120. “Both Israel and Jesus were carried into Egypt and recalled from thence, and both were denominated in the Scriptures, the Son of God, but Israel who is represented as a child of God, is described to have sacrificed to Baalim, and to have burnt incense to graven images—circumstances which cannot justly be ascribed to the Saviour.”<sup>3</sup> The Evangelist’s quoting this passage plainly shews that it referred to Christ as well as to Israel; but the difference is manifest. Israel was God’s *adopted* son, constantly rebelling against his Father. Jesus was God’s *proper* Son, of the same nature with his Father, (as is every proper son), and did always the things that pleased Him:—*Hosea*, /586 ch. iii. 5. says “Afterward shall Israel return and seek Jehovah their God and *David their King*.” As David however had then been in his grave for more than two centuries; he could be sought only in heaven, in the same manner as God himself; but as our author does not allow of praying to deceased saints, who, unable to search the heart, cannot judge of the sincerity of prayers offered them, if we allow this prophecy any meaning, we are constrained to assign it to the Son of David who searches the heart, and is equally omnipotent as Jehovah to bless those who seek him.

On no other of the Prophets beside Zechariah and Malachi does our author offer any remark, and to his animadversions on these we have already replied. There are however several passages in the other Prophets by no means unworthy of his notice. *Joel* ch. ii. is quoted by Peter, Acts iii. “And whosoever shall call on the name of Jehovah shall be saved,” which Peter there applies to Jesus, Paul also addresses himself to all who in every place *call on the name of the Lord Jesus Christ*. This also proves Christ to be Jehovah.—*Amos* says, ch. iv. 13, “For lo he that formeth the mountains, and created the wind, and declareth unto man what is his thought, Jehovah the God of Hosts is his Name.” As these characteristics all unite in Jesus, we need no other testimony to his Godhead. *Zechariah* says ch. iii. 2, “and *Jehovah* said to Satan, *Jehovah* rebuke thee, O Satan, even Jehovah that hath chosen Jerusalem, rebuke thee. Is not this a brand plucked out of the fire?” This passage with ch. ii. 7, “thus saith Jehovah of Hosts, after the glory hath Jehovah sent me,” and ch. xiii. 7, “Awake O sword, against the man who is my fellow, saith Jehovah of Hosts;” form another threefold testimony to the *distinct personality* of the Son and his *equality* with the Father.

<sup>1</sup> §333. <sup>2</sup> This word is not found in Ps 18. Probably Marshman refers to verse 32: “who is God save the Lord?” <sup>3</sup> §184.

§388

Ho 11:1–3; Mt 2:15

Ho 3:5

§389

Jl 2:32; Ac 2:21; 1 Co 1:2

Am 4:13

Zc 3:2; 2:8; 13:7

§390 We have now met our author on his own ground, and in compliance with his own suggestion examined the books of the Old Testament in their order respecting the *Deity*, as well as /587 the Atonement of the Son of God. And although this has deprived us of those advantages which arise from selecting and condensing evidence, even this method has poured such a flood of light on the Deity of the Son and his Equality with the Father, as leaves nothing to be further desired. It is not the voice of one writer merely, it is the uniform language of the Divine Writers through a period of nearly sixteen hundred years. This body of evidence adduced, is not founded on one or two passages which criticism might hope to shake; it is founded on nearly Two Hundred different Testimonies, which nourished the faith and piety of the true worshippers of God age after age. All hope of shaking it therefore is totally vain. Could one or two of these testimonies be invalidated—or ten—or even twenty, this doctrine would still remain immoveable. This however is only one of the five sources of evidence mentioned, that furnished by the Old Testament; the testimony of Jesus—of the Evangelists,—of the Apostles—of the Blessed above in the book of Revelation, have been examined no farther than as confirming and illustrating this:—and we regret exceedingly, that after the utmost conciseness has been studied, our limits will allow us to take little more notice of the remaining evidence, than will be involved in briefly examining the objections of our author, contained in his Second and Third Chapters, to which we immediately proceed.

[Rammohun Roy's Second Chapter, "Natural Inferiority of the Son to the Father," examined]

§391 While all the objections to the Deity of Christ in these two Chapters are completely met by the body of evidence already adduced, as it may be satisfactory to some to see how weak these are, we will briefly notice them, although their desultory nature will compel us in doing it to repeat again and again the evidence already adduced. We may first observe that the question turns wholly on the Divine *Nature* of the Son, and if the body of evidence already submitted to /588 the reader, be decisive on this point, as he is "the same," his humbling himself to become man, can make no change in his nature. We may also add, that the season when he laid aside his glory and took on himself the form of a servant, was not the fittest to furnish proof of his Deity, since his infinite love and faithfulness would constrain him to act perfectly as a servant, a character as opposite to that of *deity* to which belongs supreme dominion, as the east is to the west. Hence while thus emptying himself of his glory, he of course gave no farther indications of his deity, than circumstances absolutely required.

§392 Our author's first objection is, "[Admitting for a moment, that the positions of the Editor are well founded, and that the Saviour was in possession of attributes and powers ascribed to God, have we not his own express and often repeated avowal,](#)

that all the powers he manifested were committed to him as the Son by the Father of the Universe.”<sup>1</sup> To this we a once answer; No. That he was appointed by the Father to act as Mediator between Him and sinners, we have already seen, for without this he could have been no Mediator between the Father and his offending creatures, unless he had acted as the Father’s *Lord* instead of his Equal or Consociate. But that he even as Mediator possessed a single power, perfection, or attribute, which was not eternally inherent in his Divine Nature, we not only deny; but we ask our author to point out *one attribute* or perfection in the Father himself, which from Scripture testimony, the Son has not been already shewn to possess. But to his argument. “The Sun although he is the most powerful and most splendid of all created beings, has yet no claim to be considered identical in nature with God who has given to the sun all the heat and animating warmth which he sheds on our globe.”<sup>2</sup> To this we reply. What is the sun to its Maker? If the sun has no claim to Godhead, has its Maker none? Yes /589 for our author says “*God has given to the sun all its light and animating warmth.*” But as all things were made *by Him* and without him was not *any thing* made that was made, this God is Jesus Christ!—Further, says our author “to effect a material change without the aid of physical means, is a power peculiar to God;”<sup>3</sup> yet this power Christ not only possessed, but *bestowed* on his apostles. Thus does our author confirm the Deity of Christ in his first attack thereon. As his asking, “Did God then deify man by bestowing on him his own likeness and sovereignty over all living creatures?” is in reality asking, Did God make him cease to be a creature by thus *creating* him? we presume he expects no answer.

The nineteen passages our author brings to disprove the Son’s deity,<sup>4</sup> by shewing, that while he thought it not robbery to be equal with God, he *really* emptied himself of his glory, took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men, and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, can prove nothing to his purpose, till they shew that his thus becoming incarnate, changed that Divine Nature which he possessed from eternity, and respecting which the Father testifies, Thou, Jehovah “art the same.”—That “the kingdom which Christ delivers up to his Father” in 1 Cor. xv. is the Mediatorial kingdom, has been already shewn from the Father’s own declaration, “Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever.” Not until a thousand years after this declaration was made, however, did the Son empty himself of his glory by assuming our nature; and his mediatorial kingdom is only for a season, yea he will have delivered it up to the Father *before* he fold up the heavens and change them as a vesture is changed. But *after* that period, his throne, as Jehovah God, remains for ever and ever. To say that

§393

Ph 2:5–11

Heb 1:12 (=Ps 102:27)

1 Co 15:24–28

Ps 45:7 (=Heb 1:8)

<sup>1</sup> §114. <sup>2</sup> §114. <sup>3</sup> §114. <sup>4</sup> In §115.

Ps 146:10 in the mouth of the Father “for ever and ever” means only a limited period,<sup>1</sup> is, to destroy the eternity of God himself. Thus, “Jehovah shall reign /590 for ever and ever,” that is, for a limited period, after which he ceases to reign, and there will be no God!

§394 Relative to Christ’s being the “First-born of every creature,” we reply with Dr. Owen<sup>2</sup>, whose work on Socinianism has never been answered:—“It is not said Christ is πρωτοκτιστος, first created; but πρωτοτοκος, the first-born: and Christ is so the *First-born*, as to be the ONLY *Begotten* Son of God, He is so the first-born of every creature, that he is *before* them all, *above* them all, *heir* to them all, and so *no one* of them.”<sup>3</sup> That the “first-born,” and the “First begotten from the dead” cannot be taken literally, is evident, for Christ in his human nature was neither the first-born of mankind, nor the *first* raised from the dead, as he himself raised Lazarus from the grave before he he rose from the dead himself. Both expressions therefore necessarily denote *pre-eminence*; and that they refer to his Human Nature is fully proved by the context, in which his creation of all things simply and absolutely, is most emphatically expressed: first, in general, “by him were all things created.” Then a distribution is made of these “all things” into all things that “are in heaven” and that “are in earth.” Then two terms are used which include all creatures whatever, namely “visible and invisible;” and as things *invisible*, being of the greatest eminence and dignity, might seem exempted from being created by Jesus Christ, an enumeration is made of these, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers. This done, the general fact is again repeated, “all things were created by him,” whether expressed in the enumeration or not—and it is added “all were created *for him*,” as is said of the Father, Rom. xi. 36, “For of him, and through him, and for him are all things; to whom be glory for ever and ever.” The whole is confirmed by a declaration completely fatal to the idea of his being a *creature*, “And he is *before* all things, and BY *him* all things consist.”<sup>4</sup> So also when John terms him “the first be-

Rm 11:36

Rv 1:5

<sup>1</sup> “We cannot allow much weight to the phrase “for ever,” as establishing literally the eternal nature of the power of the Son, this phrase being often found metaphorically applied in the Scriptures to other created beings”, §121. (Followed by several examples.)

<sup>2</sup> John Owen (1616-1683), congregationalist puritan Theologian, *Vindiciæ Evangelicæ* or *The Mystery of the Gospell vindicated, and Socianisme Examined*, 1655.

<sup>3</sup> “He is πρωτοτόκος πάσης κτίσεως *The first borne of every Creature: that is, before them all; above them all; heir of them all: and so none of them.* It is not said, He is πρωτοκτιστος, first created, but πρωτοτόκος, the first borne; now the term *first* in the Scripture, respects either what *follows*, and so denotes an *order* in the things spoken of, He that is the first being one of them, as *Adam* was the *first* man: or it respects things *going before*, in which sence it denyes all *order* or *series* of things in the same kind. So God is said to be the *first*, *Isa.* 41. 4. because before him there is none, *Isa.* 43. 11. And in this sence is Christ the *first borne*; so the *first borne*, as to be the *only begotten sonne of God.* *Ioh.* 1. 14”, Owen, *Vindiciæ*, 267.

<sup>4</sup> Marshman is paraphrasing Owen, *Vindiciæ*, 268, §7.

gotten from the dead," he /591 describes him as equally omnipotent with the Father to bless the churches with grace and peace,—the Searcher of hearts,—the Almighty.

We have already said that no "powers" or attributes, were or could be conferred §395  
 on the Son, seeing that before he condescended to lay aside his glory, and take on himself the form of a servant, he was Jehovah, the Almighty God, omniscient, omnipresent, the Creator and Upholder of all, adored and worshipped by the highest archangel. That certain "powers" therefore were conferred on Jesus, not as a man— Heb 1:6  
 but "as the Messiah, Christ, the anointed Son of God,"<sup>1</sup> is wholly groundless, for on Jehovah God, ever the same, no new "powers" could be conferred: and he was never man, but as the Messiah. "Powers" therefore distinct from authority, in other words natural attributes or perfections, he received none; they necessarily existed in himself from eternity; otherwise God, who cannot lie, could not have said of him, "Thou art the same," since the least addition of the least quality either before or after this period, must have dishonored the Divine veracity for ever.—Our author's saying that Jesus spoke of himself "as vested with high glory from the beginning of the world,"<sup>2</sup> instead of *before the foundation* of the world, is unworthy of him.<sup>3</sup> If it arose from carelessness, such carelessness was unworthy of one professing to investigate the doctrine.—If it did not, it was worse. Jn 17:24

His mention of the nature in which Christ "lived with God before the creation §396  
 of the world, and of course before his assuming the office of the Messiah"<sup>4</sup> in our nature, p. 17, is sufficiently curious; as is what he adds p. 18, that "in his mere corporeal nature Jesus was inferior to his maker, and it must therefore have been his spiritual nature of which he here avowed the inferiority to that of God,"<sup>5</sup>—for, afterwards he ridicules the idea of Christ's having two natures; see p. 108, 109, 118, 172!!!<sup>6</sup> We will simply state the doctrine of Scripture on these points:—Our Lord prays, "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with the glory I had with thee before the world was," which Micah declares was from everlasting—and the Father, by saying, "Thou art the same," that it was *from eternity*. But when he emptied himself of his glory, did he lay aside his *Divine Nature*, of which this glory was merely the shadow? Reflect for a moment on what the term glory implies. Understood either of praise or of grandeur, it is merely the *reflection* or *indication* of a *glorious nature*. When God the Father gave the Son glory, was it deserved glory or not? if not, it was glory of which he was unworthy, and which it was infinitely unworthy of God to bestow. But if it was *deserved* glory, it was that of which his Nature was worthy,—and the Mi 5:2; Heb 1:12

<sup>1</sup> §117. <sup>2</sup> §117.

<sup>3</sup> Rammohan quotes in §117 from Jn 17:24 ("thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world"), but talks about the Messiah vested with glory "from the beginning of the world". Yet Rammohan knows in the same §117 that Jesus lived with God before the creation.

<sup>4</sup> §117. <sup>5</sup> §117. <sup>6</sup> §142, §173, §180.

Father's giving it to him when no being existed beside the Sacred Three, was the Father's attestation to the Son's eternal Godhead. When men are exhorted "to give unto God the glory due to his name," are they exhorted to give to God, his almighty and eternal Godhead? or merely to acknowledge its existence? Thus by the Father's giving the Son glory before the world was, he testified that he necessarily possessed from eternity a Divine Nature worthy of that glory, even such as rendered him "the fellow, the consociate"<sup>1</sup> of the Father. John xvii. duly examined them, cuts up the idea to support which our author quotes this passage.

§397 Our author would fain have it granted him without his adducing the least proof, that the term Son necessarily implies an *inferiority of nature to the Father*. This however he asks in vain. Even the name "Son" implies an equality of *nature* with the Father. Among men the son may be inferior to the father in years, in knowledge, in office; but a *oneness of nature* with his father he must possess. Our question is indeed only about the NATURE of the Son. With Jehovah time and years can have no place;

"He fills his own eternal NOW, And sees our ages waste."<sup>2</sup> /593

Every idea of time is cut off by Micah's informing us that the Son is from everlasting,—by the Father's declaring, "Thou, O Jehovah, art the same." To fix a limited duration to the terms "everlasting" and "for ever and ever" respecting Jehovah the Son, would be equally fatal to the eternal existence of Jehovah the Father. He who penetrates eternity and fixes the time when Jehovah the Son was not, may by the same arguments prove that there was a time when Jehovah the Father was not, and when—*there was no God in the universe*. In Rev. i. 8. when he styles himself "Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the Almighty," Christ declares his own eternal existence in precisely the same terms used respecting the Father in a preceding verse, "Him who is, and was, and is to come."

§398 But we are wholly saved the Labor of ascertaining by inference the Deity of the Son. His nature is defined and ascertained in the Old Testament as fully as that of Moses, or Abraham, or any other individual. It is there declared, as we have already seen, that "the Son" whenever mentioned, designates a Being as tremendous in his wrath, and as potent to bless, as God the Father,—a Being who is Jehovah God, whose throne is for ever and ever, who hath created heaven and earth, who is adored by the highest archangel, and who is ever "the same." Hence whenever the Son is afterwards mentioned, the unchangeable Jehovah, the Almighty Creator of

<sup>1</sup> Reference to Zc 13:7, see §345.

<sup>2</sup> This is a line from Isaac Watts' hymn "Rise, rise, my soul, and leave the ground", praising God's Eternity compared to the creation, see Watts, *Hymns*, 119f.



all things is as really intended, as the Father of Isaac is intended by Abraham, the Hebrew lawgiver by Moses, or the father of Solomon by David. He who after this Divine testimony defines the Son differently, or affirms him to be any other than this, in effect says to the Divine Father, "In giving this testimony respecting the Son thou art mistaken. Although thine understanding is infinite, and thou alone knowest the Son, I who am of yesterday, and incapable of understanding fully my own nature, feel certain that thy testimo-<sup>594</sup>ny concerning the Son *cannot* be true, and that he *cannot* be what thou hast declared him." This is the precise language of every new definition of "the Son," and of every cavil at that already given of him by the Divine Father. But—let God be true, and every man a liar.

Rm 3:4

§399

Our author hints that in the Sacred Writings others have been termed "the Sons of God." This however only proves that Christ is BY NATURE the Son of God, while all others are sons of God *by adoption, or metaphorically*. Christ, Rom. viii. 32, is termed God's *Own Son* in opposition to believers who are sons by adoption. To shew that he is of the same nature and essence with the Father, the Holy Spirit also terms him not merely the *Only Son*, but the *Only begotten* Son of the Father, thereby cutting off all others termed sons from being of the same nature.<sup>1</sup> It is impossible indeed that He who is the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob,—who brought Israel out of Egypt into the land he had sworn to give their fathers,—who was worshipped by the patriarchs and prophets as the Maker of heaven and earth, and the giver of every blessing,—who is declared by the Father to be Jehovah God, and who declares himself to be the Almighty Searcher of hearts, should not be equal in nature to his heavenly Father.<sup>2</sup>

Rm 8:32

These testimonies incontestibly prove that the Son is not only one in "**will and design**" with the Father, "but one in Nature." The declaration John xvii. 22 "that they may be one, even as we are one," was made at a time and to persons totally different from that in John x. 30, "I and my Father are One." The latter was made to the gainsaying Jews, and the former in prayer to his heavenly Father, nor is there the least hint given that any doubt had arisen among the disciples respecting the expression "I and my Father are One." Further, Christ did not pray that his disciples might be *one* with *Him and his heavenly Father*, with which thought our author has so amused himself.<sup>3</sup> The one-<sup>595</sup>ness which Christ prayed they might obtain was, a *oneness among themselves* IN him and his Heavenly Father, of which he proposes the union between himself and his Father as the grand exemplar. But is there no other oneness between the Father and the Son than a concord of will and design? Does not this very comparism necessarily imply a *Oneness of Nature* between the

§400

Jn 17:22

Jn 10:30

<sup>1</sup> Jn 1:14, 18; 3:16; Heb 11:17; 1 Jn 4:9.

<sup>2</sup> Rammohan observes the difference between the various "sons of God" and "The Son" as well as Marshman, but not in the categories of "adoption", "begotten" and "by nature", see §118.

<sup>3</sup> §120.

Father and the Son? What is the basis of that union between the followers of Christ, which he prayed might become as perfect as that between the Son and the Father? Is it not a common human nature? Further, what completes their perfect union as Christians? Is it not their partaking of *one renewed nature*—nay, is not their union perfected in exact proportion as they *equally* partake of this renewed nature? If then a perfect equality in a renewed and righteous human nature, render Christ's disciples perfectly ONE, there must necessarily be a perfect equality of Divine Nature in its great exemplar, that between the Father and the Son, as the least difference here would render imperfect this ineffable concord of will and design. Instead of proving our author's point, therefore, this passage decidedly proves, that, with a Distinctness of Person, the most perfect Equality of Nature, essence, and holiness, must subsist between the Father and the Son. They are equally Jehovah, equally righteous and holy.

§401 Our author it seems has forborne “to submit indiscriminately the whole of the doctrines of the New Testament to his countrymen,”<sup>1</sup> from experience that “such metaphorical expressions when taken singly and without attention to their contexts, may be made the foundation of doctrines quite at variance with the tenor of the rest of the Scriptures”<sup>\*</sup> Did He then who gave the whole of the Scriptures to men, possess less benevolence, or less wisdom than our author? When he penned it, could he have been aware of the unavoidable import of this declaration? If he was, what can we think of his /596 humility? If he was not, what of his acquaintance with the subject?—Nor can we conceal our surprize that his supposing the sentence, “That they may be one, even as we are one,” to imply nothing more than a unity of will and design between Christ and the Father, should have removed all his perplexity respecting the “difference of sentiment found among the followers of Christ.”<sup>2</sup> How was it that he did not feel struck with the absurdity of *a creature's* creating all things and upholding them by the word of his power—of *a creature's* being the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,—of the highest archangel's being commanded to worship *a creature*—of the Father's declaring *a creature* Jehovah, the immutable God,— of *a creature's* declaring himself the Almighty, the Searcher of hearts? Had he found out a way to reconcile all these with Jesus's begin a *creature*, meek and lowly in heart “in whom dwelt all truth?”<sup>3</sup> with the veracity of God who cannot lie?—or was he ignorant that the

---

\* See p. 22.

<sup>1</sup> §120.

<sup>2</sup> “I, on my searching after the truth of Christianity, felt for a length of time very much perplexed with the difference of sentiments found among the followers of Christ (I mean Trinitarians and Unitarians, the grand division of them), until I met with the explanation of the unity given by the divine Teacher himself as a guide to peace and happiness”, §121.

<sup>3</sup> §109.

Scriptures contain these declarations?

Nothing can be more incorrect than his assertion p. 25, that Jesus in John x. §402  
 disavowed the charge of making himself God.<sup>1</sup> If he did indeed, the credit of the  
 Precepts of Jesus is gone for ever, for, with reverence it be spoken, their author, af-  
 ter having borne the fullest testimony to his equality with God in ch. v. and ch.  
 viii. at length prevaricates and retracts for fear of death. Such however was not the  
 Jews' opinion. The confession which our author terms *a disavowal*, was the very Jn 10:22-38  
 confession for which they sought again to take him, because they still thought he  
*made himself God*; and if in this they were mistaken, he refused to undeceive them,  
 although he thereby so endangered his life, that nothing but his Divine prescience  
 could have enabled him to foresee, that he should not fall a victim to their fury. Yet  
 had he died through refusing to rectify a mistake respecting his nature into which  
 he had himself led them, he who came into the world "that he might bear witness Jn 18:37  
 to the *truth*" would have perish-/597ed pertinaciously witnessing a gross falsehood.  
 This would also have been aggravated by the fact, that as he knew their thoughts,  
 he *knew* that they had mistaken his meaning, and that his merely saying, "I do not  
 intend to make myself equal with God," would have removed their mistake. Rather  
 than say this, however, he wrought a miracle to deliver himself out of their hands. Jn 10:39  
 Yea, he at last chose to die under this very charge rather than clear up the mistake,  
 if it was such. This was their last and grand charge, "We have a law, and by that Jn 19:7  
 law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God," which they esteemed  
*blasphemy* worthy of death. Our author therefore is incorrect when he says, that  
 although they accused him of being the Son of God, "they relinquished the charge of  
 his making himself equal with God,"<sup>2</sup> for he spends a page to prove, that a claim of  
 sonship to God which implied *no equality* with God, so far from being blasphemy,  
 was repeatedly made by good men in those Scriptures which they constantly stud-  
 ied. Whoever reads John x. from ver. 33 to the end, may perceive that our Lord's  
 reasoning is, "Certain even in the Scriptures have been styled gods without blas-  
 phemy. Is it blasphemy then for *me* to claim an equality with God, who am *really*  
 the Son of God, and do the works *God alone can do*, thereby proving that the Father  
 is in me and I in him?" So far were the Jews from deeming this a disavowal of his  
 equality with God, that they instantly sought again to take him as persisting in his  
 former testimony.

To our author's query, p. 27, [On what principle any stress can be laid in defence](#) §403  
[of Christ's Deity on the prophetic expression quoted Heb. i. from the Psalms, "Thy](#)  
[throne, O God, is for ever and ever,"](#)<sup>3</sup> we reply, merely on this principle, that it is  
 spoken by GOD WHO CANNOT LIE. But we are astonished at the reasoning which, Heb 1:8f.  
 (=Ps 45:6-8)

<sup>1</sup> §121. <sup>2</sup> §121. <sup>3</sup> §121.

because the phrase “for ever” *must* mean a limited time when applied to the throne of an earthly king, or the days of people, can attach little weight /598 thereto, when spoken by the everlasting God, of Him who “remaineth the same” when the heavens are folded up, and laid aside as a vesture—and we are shocked at the mind which could even distantly hint “that much weight could not be allowed” to the declaration of the only Being our author professes to worship.

§404 The expression of Jesus to Mary, John xx. 17, “Go to my brethren,” &c. only proves that He who upholds all things by the word of his power, having taken on him our nature, was not ashamed to call his faithful followers “brethren.”—The language of Thomas was deemed a declaration of Thomas’s faith by the Lord Jesus, who searcheth the hearts, and of whose precept Matt. v. 37, this would have been a flagrant breach had it been a vain exclamation. Was he deceived?

§405 Does John no where desire men to believe that Jesus is God?<sup>1</sup> What then is the meaning of, “the Word was God”—“I am Alpha and Omega, saith the Lord, which is, and was, and is to come, the Almighty”—“All the churches shall know that I am he who searcheth the reins and hearts”—“I will be his God”—“God is greater than our hearts, and knoweth all things”—“Thou knowest all things,”—Of equal authority is Paul’s reiterated declaration, “God our Saviour,” Peter’s, “the righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ,” and Jude’s, “To the only wise God our Saviour, be glory, and majesty, dominions, and power, both now and ever. Amen.”

§406 To our author’s enquiry, p. 28, respecting what common sense points out,<sup>2</sup> we reply, that his cause must be in a sad state when this enquiry is substituted for Scripture proof, and that common sense can easily understand how one *equal in Nature* to another may yet be *subordinate in Office*; for she sees it around her every day. Common sense, however, never flies in the face of Divine Testimony, which, as we have already seen, declares that He who is from everlasting, Jehovah God, the /599 Creator of all things, unchangeable in his nature, adored by angels, patriarchs, and prophets, condescended to be made flesh and made under the law for the redemption of sinful men. But common sense may very naturally ask, When did He who was “the Most Holy” before he was anointed Messiah, and who is ever “the same,” need moral sanctification?

§407 The apostle John wrote to demonstrate the Deity of Christ against the gainsayers of his day; and while his simplicity and integrity assure us, that he has not admitted one vague or ambiguous term, this chapter (John i.) contains that fulness of evidence respecting Christ’s Deity and humanity which will never be successfully impugned

<sup>1</sup> “[The Apostle] nowhere desires the readers of his Gospel to believe that Jesus is God”, §122.

<sup>2</sup> “Does not common sense point out the inferiority and subordination of a being, though called God, to one who is at the same time declared to be *his* God, *his* father, *his* sanctifier, and *his* promoter to the state of exaltation”, §122.

to the end of time. The very first clause “In the beginning was the Word,” which our author wisely keeps out of sight, declares the eternity of the Son, and demonstrates his Godhead, he who is necessarily existent from eternity being the Eternal God. His distinct *personality* is then shewn, “the Word was *with* God;” and lastly his *Deity* “the Word was *God*.” But the apostle does not stop here; he demonstrates his Divine Nature from his *Works*, “All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made.” He then describes his Humanity, “The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the *Only* begotten of the Father,” thus drawing a line of infinite distinction between him and all others termed the Sons of God. This passage alone is an answer to every thing said relative to Christ’s being subordinate to his Father, his growing in knowledge, &c. If he condescended *to be made flesh*, it became him to become an infant of days, and to be in all things like unto us, yet without sin. Still while thus incarnate, he was the Almighty Creator, upholding all things by the word of his power. In thus condescending to lay aside his glory and dwell in clay, indeed, he demonstrated his Godhead no less by his Almighty love and /600 pity, than by his Almighty power and wisdom in creating and upholding all things. For that child of man who can take advantage of his infinite condescension and pity in thus humbling himself, to impugne his Deity, we cannot but tremble.

Jn 1:1–18

The apparent contradiction implied with Deut. xxxii. 39, “I am he; and there is no god with me,” we leave with our author, and ask him; Even if John was unacquainted with this passage, was the Holy Spirit by whom he spoke? We ask him farther, Who makes these passages clash? Only himself and those who like him would fain represent us as the worshippers of three separate Gods, which we deny as a flagrant falsehood. To us there is no contradiction; for we know that the Son and the Father are ONE *in nature* as well as in will and design. Our author’s *begging* us to understand that passage merely in the latter sense, avails nothing. We can grant nothing but on proof, of which in this case we have not seen the last vestige.

§408

Dt 32:39

As to our “being forced by believing the abundant testimonies which God has given of his Son, [to view the Godhead in the same light as we consider mankind and other genera,](#)”<sup>1</sup> we leave that with Him. He knows his own Godhead infinitely better than our author; and while we most firmly believe all he has revealed concerning himself, we leave what he has not revealed, entirely with Him whose language is, “To whom will ye liken me, saith Jehovah?” Respecting the dreams and fables of Hindoo Polytheism, while we triumph in that pure and holy Revelation given by the Triune Jehovah, we add in his own language, “He that hath a dream let him tell a dream, and he that hath my word let him tell it faithfully. What is the chaff to

§409

Jr 23:28

<sup>1</sup> §123.

the wheat, saith Jehovah?" Whether their idols are one or ten thousand, we do not stay to enquire; for "the gods who have not made the heavens and the earth, shall perish from the earth and from under these heavens,"—and that they have not, their ignorance /601 how and when they were made, sufficiently testifies. The "*unity of mankind* however," is a curious idea: except in the First and Second Adam, where does it exist? When were all mankind *One* even "in will and design?" Are all those in our author's own city and neighbourhood one in idea, will, and design? If they are, why does his book appear?

§410 That in saying "if I do not the works of my Father, believe me not," John x. 37,

Jr 10:11 our Lord meant "*works prescribed by the Father and tending to his glory*,"<sup>1</sup> no one doubts. But if he did not also mean works *proper to his Father*, he differed nothing from his own disciples. That he manifested his Godhead in sending his disciples to *work miracles in his own Name*, is a fact that will never be disproved. Nor is it true that it was the constant practice of the Saviour to pray to the Father for the *power* of working miracles; for he *never did them in his Father's name*, as was the invariable practice of the ancient prophets. It is indeed worse than trifling to enquire, whether he who had created heaven and earth, and who at that moment upheld all by the word of his power, was able of himself to turn water into wine, or to raise a man from the grave. If as his Father's Mediatorial Servant in human nature, he asked help of him, it was because he laid aside his own glory, and though rich, for our sakes became poor.—When working miracles however, we find him addressing his heavenly Father in two instances alone; at the breaking of bread to the multitude, and at Lazarus's grave,—and even then he calls Lazarus from the dead without the least mention of the Father, a course at the most distant approach to which Moses would have trembled. Had he less piety, less love to his heavenly Father than Moses? "Lazarus, come forth"—"young man, arise"—"peace, be still"—"I will; be thou clean," was the constant language of Jesus; while, "Thus saith Jehovah,—if thou refuse to let my people go, I will bring the locusts into thy coasts.—Thus saith Jehovah, at midnight will /602 I go out, and all the first-born of the land of Egypt shall die. Behold I will rain bread from heaven for you"—"behold, I will stand before thee on the rock in Horeb," &c. was the language which accompanied the miracles even of Ex 10:3f., 11:4f. Moses: and for saying, "Ye rebels, must we fetch you water out of this rock?" both Ex 16:4, 17:6 Moses and Aaron were shut out of the promised land. Yet Jesus who did always the things that pleased the Father, says, "My Father worketh hitherto, *and I WORK*," a declaration which would have been blasphemy in Moses, and which the Jews deemed blasphemy in him—merely because they knew not "the Lord of Glory."

§411 If it be declared in Scripture "*that the Father created all things by and FOR the*

<sup>1</sup> §124.

Son,"<sup>1</sup> it only proves anew that the Son is equal to the Father in Supreme Dominion, as well as in Almighty power, since he FOR *whom* all things are created, is necessarily the Supreme God. This is clear from Rev. iv. 11. "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honor, and power: for thou hast created all things, and FOR *thy pleasure* they are and were created." Our author therefore closes this chapter on the "Natural Inferiority of the Son," by directing us to a passage which places his Equality with the Father beyond dispute, which inevitably proves that it is *He* before whom the blessed in heaven "rest not day and night, saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come." If after this he will still believe the Son to be "*produced among created beings*,"<sup>2</sup> his faith must transcend every thing yet named among those he terms Trinitarians.

Rv 4:8-11

[Rammohun Roy's Objection to the Seven Positions, considered.]

[1. Jesus' ubiquity.]<sup>3</sup> We come to the last, and by far the easiest, part of our work, that of meeting our author's objections to the Seven Positions formerly advanced in support of the Deity of Christ. The first of these is, that *Jesus was possessed of Ubiquity*, grounded on John iii. 13. "No man hath ascended up to heaven but he that came down from heaven, even the Son /603 of Man who is in heaven." This argument he allows "*might perhaps carry some weight with it were not the frequent use of the present tense in a preterite or future sense observed in the sacred writings, and were not a great number of other passages to determine that the term 'is' in this instance must be understood in the past sense.* John viii. 58, "Jesus said unto them, Verily verily I say unto you, Before Abraham was, *I AM.*" Here the same verb though found in the form of the present tense must obviously be taken in a preterite sense,"<sup>4</sup> p. 32. Is it not singular, and does it not seem almost ominous to our author's cause, that he cannot raise an objection to the ubiquity of Christ without adducing a new proof of his Godhead? Why must this declaration, "before Abraham was I AM," be taken in a *preterite* sense? Because if it be not, our author's cause dies. Did the Jews however understand it thus? So far from it that they esteemed it a decided declaration of Jesus's equality with the Father, and took up stones to stone him as a blasphemer, which indeed he would have been, had not this declaration been the truth itself. And Jesus himself, meek and lowly as he was, although he knew precisely in what sense they understood him, rather chose to work a miracle for his own safety, than to deny his own divinity or even to hint that they had mistaken his meaning. Although Christ's ubiquity has been fully established independently of this passage by the body of evidence previously adduced, as "he who searcheth the heart," who "upholdeth all things by the word of his power," must necessarily possess *ubiquity*, we must still intreat our reader's permission to examine the assertion that the term

§412

Jn 3:13

Jn 8:58f.

<sup>1</sup> §125. <sup>2</sup> §125. <sup>3</sup> §§126-127. <sup>4</sup> §126.



“is,” in this instance must mean “was.” It is evident that all the present tenses in the sacred writings cannot be thus understood, nor even the greater part of them; for this would defeat the very design of different tenses, and reduce language to a Babel of confusion. It is then only in particular cases that this can occur. In prophecy the future /604 is often used for the present, because to the great author of prophecy all future things are present. In poetry, and sometimes in lively narrative, the present is with strict propriety used for the past, because the transaction is narrated as though passing before the reader’s eyes. But this is neither a prophecy, nor a lively narration of past events. It is a grave, didactic discourse, on the clearness and accuracy of which depended the salvation of a man who had hazarded much in coming to Jesus for instruction, and who so far from being quick of apprehension, had already mistaken Christ’s meaning relative to that which forms the basis of real religion in the heart. Common humanity therefore, to say nothing of our Lord’s infinite benevolence, demanded that in further discourse with him, no word should be used but in its direct and proper sense. All this is against the alteration proposed by our author, as it proves that *no necessity* exists for it, unless what arises from its being otherwise fatal to his system. Besides, the alteration here would be of no avail unless it were extended to the language of John himself, ch. i. 18. “No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son who *is in* the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.” Nor indeed do we know how many other passages the same necessity would extend, for no one knows the necessities of this system but those who, like our author, have undertaken to minister to them.

Jn 1:18

§413

He “presumes however, that no one will scruple to conclude, that the Son was actually absent from heaven during his locality on earth, who considers diligently John vi. 62, “What, and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he *was* before;” adding, “The verb *was* accompanied with the term *before* in this passage, positively implies the absence of Jesus from heaven during his stay on the earth,”<sup>1</sup>

Jn 6:62

and mentioning several other passages descriptive of his *going away* and among others, John xvi. 28, “I came forth from the father and /605 am come into the world, again I *leave* the world and *go* unto the Father.” We have already remarked something ominous to our author’s cause in his commencing his attack on Christ’s *ubiquity* with a passage which proves him to be, the Eternal I AM; and this seems scarcely less so. Then our author is convinced that before Christ became incarnate, he *was* in heaven. If then he would only tell us how he was regarded in those realms of light and truth, previously to his descent on earth, he would himself settle this point. Here perhaps we can assist him. The Father had given command, “Let all the angels of God worship him:” and that this was meet, appears from the Son’s being Jehovah, the

Jn 16:28

Heb 1:6

<sup>1</sup> §126.



Creator of all. Down to the moment of his *leaving* heaven then, he was worshipped by the highest archangel there. Thus in whatever sense John iii. 13. be taken, our author has fully established the Deity of Christ. To support his cause, he like some of his Unitarian brethren in Britain, should have denied that Christ had any existence before his conception by the virgin. This would it be true, have cost him the labor of altering a few more passages of scripture, and among the rest that which he has now adduced. But he would then have been consistent, whereas he now builds up the doctrine of Christ's Deity in his attempts to pull it down.

Our author having thus established the fact, that Christ was in heaven before his descent on earth, and the scriptures having shewn, that he was worshipped there as Jehovah God, the Creator and Preserver of all, we have now a test by which to try the truth of his assertion, that the verb *was* with the term *before* in the passage just quoted, "[positively implies the absence of Jesus from heaven during his stay on the earth.](#)" And *Jehovah came down* to see the tower which the children of men builded. Gen. xi. 5. And *Jehovah went his way* as soon as he had left communing with Abraham. Gen. xviii. 33. And God *went up from* Jacob in the place /606 where he talked with him. Gen. xxxv. 13. These passages then, on our author's system, *necessarily imply* that while Jehovah was down on earth to view the tower of Babel, to converse with Abraham and with Jacob, there was *no God remaining in heaven*. A little further acquaintance with the scriptures might have convinced him, that Jehovah, who upholdeth all things by the word of his power, can never be absent from any place, and that when he is said to descend to any particular place, it is meant that he there manifests his presence in a more evident manner than in other places. §414

Gn 11:5  
Gn 18:33  
Gn 35:13

The inconsistency of the attribute of omnipresence with "[the human notions of the ascent and descent effected by the Son of Man](#)"<sup>1</sup> we leave with our author who has these notions. We have them not; and to believe that he who upholdeth all things by the word of his power, is every where at the same moment, we not only find easy; but we find it impossible to believe the one without the other. He who upholds all things must necessarily be *present with* all things. With him we also leave the mind which can affirm that "*the Son*" implies "*the created*,"<sup>2</sup> after the only Being he worships has testified, that he is the unchangeable Jehovah, the Creator of heaven and earth. §415

We now come to the Greek criticism given to convince the English reader, that "is" in John iii. 13, must mean, "*was*." In this we are told "[that the present participle](#)" §416

<sup>1</sup> §126.

<sup>2</sup> "For to a being named *the Son*, or *the created*, (the one term implying the other,) and sent from one mansion to another, the attribute of ubiquity can never be justly ascribed", §126.

ὢν “being,” is used in lieu of the third person singular ἐστὶ, “is,” a true translation of which would be “the *ens*” or “being in heaven,” and as the nominative case ὁ ὢν “the being,” requires a verb to complete the sense, it should be connected with the nearest verb ἀναβέβηκεν, “hath ascended,” no other verb in fact existing in the sentence.”<sup>1</sup> Were this criticism perfectly correct, it would not be of the least service to our author, as “he being in heaven,” is precisely the same as “he who is in heaven.” To make this the nominative case to the verb “hath ascended,” therefore, would /607 completely prove the ubiquity of Christ,—or involve perfect absurdity. The state of the agent, “being in heaven,” necessarily precedes the action, and denotes the *present* time in respect of the act implied\* in, “hath ascended into heaven.” As “being in heaven,” and “ascending into heaven,” are *simultaneous* therefore, nothing but the doctrine of Christ’s being in heaven and on earth at the same moment, could prevent the sentence, “He *being in heaven* hath ascended into heaven,” from expressing the grossest absurdity.

§417 The fact is however, that, while in Greek the participle preceded by the article, as in this case, contains within itself the force of an affirmation, ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ “he who is in heaven” is a descriptive phrase in reality belonging to “the Son of man.” A similar instance occurs, John vii. 50. Nicodemus saith unto them, “(he that came to Jesus by night, being one of them.)” This descriptive clause, “he that came to Jesus by night being one of them,” contains ὁ ἐλθὼν “he having come,” a participle preceded by the relative precisely like ὁ ὢν “he being.” This however our translators have rendered as a verb without the least hesitation. Further, in the same manner as Nicodemus is here the nominative case to the verb λέγει “saith,” is οὐδεὶς “no one” the nominative to the verb ἀναβέβηκεν “hath ascended” in the passage under consideration.

§418 Whether the *present* participle with the article, is used by John to express a *past* action which had now ceased and given place to its opposite, as must be the case if “he *being* /608 in heaven” means, “he having been in heaven and now is not,” can be easily seen. The fact is, that John is more accurate in the choice of his participles, than even our English translators. He uses the present participle with the article no less than Sixty-Three times in this gospel alone, and no less than Seven times in this very chapter. These therefore will enable usefully to decide on our author’s

\* Our author’s reference to Bishop Middleton happens to be *directly against* his own assertion. The example which the Bishop gives of the use of the participle is “*accessit amans pretium pollicens*,” respecting which he properly says “surely in *pollicens* there is an adsignification of time, and that too *present* time in respect of the act implied in *accessit*; that act indeed is spoken of as being past, yet as having once been present; and the meaning is, that the two acts, *viz. accedendo* and *pollicendo* were *SIMULTANEOUS*.” See p. 42.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> §127. <sup>2</sup> See Middleton, *Doctrine*, 23, note.

assertion. In this chapter, ver. 4. we have, "How can a man be born when he is old," literally "being old;" on our author's plan "having been old and now not being so." In ver. 15. "That no one believing on him should perish; on his plan, having formerly believed on him and now ceasing to believe." Ver. 18, "He not believing is condemned already," that is, "he formerly not believing and now believing." Ver. 20, "Every one doing evil hateth the light; i. e. every one having formerly done evil and now ceasing to do evil." Ver. 29, "He having the bride is the bridegroom;" i. e. He formerly having the bride and now rejecting her. Ver. 31, "He being of the earth, is earthly," i. e. "He having been formerly of the earth and now ceasing to be so." Jn 3

If we look further, to chapter v. we find the Present Participle used in precisely the same sense, and the same absurdity involved in giving it a *past* sense. Thus ch. v. 3, "In these lay a great multitude of folk, being impotent, blind, halt, withered:" i. e. "In these lay a great multitude having been impotent, blind, halt, withered, and now ceasing to be so."<sup>1</sup> Ver. 5, "and a certain man was there who had an infirmity thirty and eight years," i. e. having had an infirmity thirty and eight years and now ceasing to have it. The consummate absurdity, not to say falsehood of doctrine and fact, which would follow from rendering these present participles in a *PAST sense* as our author wishes to read John iii. 13, must be obvious to all. Moreover when John wishes to describe a past state of action or being, he chuses some past participle. Thus in the phrase, he *who came* to Jesus by night, this being a past action, he selects, not /609 the present participle, but the Second Aorist. So also in ch. v. 7. "He *having made* me whole," John uses the First Aorist. And in ch. viii. 31. "Then said Jesus unto *those who believed on him*" instead of the present, he employs the Perfect Participle. The apostle therefore evidently selects his participles with the nicest discrimination, suiting them exactly to the time he wished to express. §419 Jn 5:3-5 Jn 5:11 Jn 8:31

In his attempt to repel the second proof of the Saviour's Ubiquity, "For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them," our author is scarcely less unhappy. As if his every attempt against Christ's Deity must tend to establish it, he asks, Is it not evident that the Saviour meant here by being in the midst of two or three of his disciples, his guidance to them when joined in searching for the truth, without preferring any claim to ubiquity? But if Christ guided them, must he not have been *with them* for that purpose? and if there were only two such little companies searching for the truth at the same moment, must he not have possessed *ubiquity* to guide them both? And if he was formerly with them, to guide them, has he left them now? How then can he be "the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever?" But "there are certain [expressions in the Scriptures wherein](#) §420 Mt 18:20 Heb 13:8

<sup>1</sup> Marshman takes τυφλῶν, χωλῶν, ξηρῶν as present participles, although they are forms of the adjectives τυφλός, χωλός, ξηρός.

Lk 16:29 the guidance of the prophets of God is also meant by words that would imply this promise.”<sup>1</sup> Are there? Where? “Abraham saith, they have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them.” But does our author need to be told that this meant the *writings* of Moses and the prophets? And not to say that no author either sacred or profane, ever thus expressed his fond hope of his writings being immortal, we ask, Did Jesus mean that they had *his* writings with them? Where were the writings of Jesus at that time? and where are they now? As if to cut off all occasion of mistake, he has not left us a single page penned by himself.

§421 [2. Jesus’ knowledge of God.]<sup>2</sup> Our author has mistaken the meaning of the Second Po-/610sition relative to the infinite comprehension and inscrutable nature of the Son. It was not intended to infer the deity of every thing which appears *to men* incomprehensible, as in that case the human soul must have been elevated to that honor. But we may safely infer, that if the *works* of God be thus incomprehensible to the human intellect, of Him who fully comprehends the infinite perfections of God himself, it must be said, “His understanding is infinite.” It is not however, this alone on which the proof of Christ’s deity here rests. No *created* being can find out the Almighty to perfection; and Jesus declares that *his* nature is equally inscrutable. If he be a *creature* then, a claim to equal inscrutability of nature with God is here preferred by a Creature in whom “*dwelt all truth*.”<sup>3</sup> Indeed if he be a *creature*, the claim of Jesus to inscrutability of nature *is higher* than that of the Father! If he be not God equal with the Father, his capacity for knowledge must be *infinitely below* the Father’s. Mt 11:27 But he declares that *he himself* can comprehend the nature of the Father; hence if he be a creature, he declares that the Father’s nature is comprehensible *by a creature*, while he affirms that his own nature is comprehensible *by no creature*, but by God alone. We here leave our author to his choice. If he says that the Son is equal with the Father, he allows that his nature is *no more* mysterious than the Father’s; but if he says, that the Son is *inferior in nature* to the Father, he makes him “*in whom dwelt all truth*,” exalt his own finite nature above that of the only God whom our author professes to worship. To his claim of deity for “*a leaf, a visible star, or the day of resurrection*”<sup>4</sup> from its precise time being not yet ascertained, it is sufficient to reply, that *these know nothing*, much less do they comprehend the mysterious nature of God.

§422 [3. Jesus forgives sins.]<sup>5</sup> To disprove the Third Position, that Jesus exercised in an independent manner the power of forgiving sins which is peculiar to God alone, our

<sup>1</sup> “We find similar expressions in the Scriptures, wherein the guidance of the Prophets of God is also meant by words that would imply their presence”, §127.

<sup>2</sup> §§128-129. <sup>3</sup> §109. <sup>4</sup> §129. <sup>5</sup> §130.

author quoting, not Mark, but /611 Matt. ix. 8<sup>1</sup> "But when the multitude saw it they marvelled and glorified God *who had given such power to man,*" asks, "Does not this passage convey an express declaration that Jesus was as much dependent on God in exercising the power of forgiving sins and healing the sick, as the prophets who come forth from God before him?"<sup>2</sup> We answer; Only in the opinion of the multitude who knew him not, but took him for a great prophet: not however in the opinion of the scribes who were better acquainted with their own scriptures, and who although they glorified him not as God, could not restrain themselves from acknowledging the display of his Godhead by accusing him of blasphemy on that very account. Had they thought however, that he exercised the power of forgiving sins and healing in as much dependence on God as Elijah or Moses, they could not have accused him of blasphemy, for they did not regard them as blasphemers. Moreover Jesus's refusing to repel the charge of having acted as though equal with God, and his confounding them by two other displays of his Godhead, one of his Omniscience in answering the undeclared thoughts of their hearts, the other of his Almighty power by healing the paralytic without the least previous or subsequent reference to God, (at the most distant thought of which Moses would have shuddered,) fully declared that he then knew himself to be, what he afterwards declared to John that he was, "the Searcher of hearts, the Almighty who was, and is, and is to come."

Whether the Apostles *were* thoroughly impressed with a belief that the Son *did not forgive sins as well as* the Father, which is the real question, (for no one supposes that the Son came to rob the Father of *his* prerogative of forgiving sins, as much the Father's as the Son's,) may be easily seen from their own trusting in Christ for the forgiveness of sins, which is so fully testified in their epistles. §423

Relative to *God's exalting* him to be a Prince and a Savi-/612our to give repentance and forgiveness of sins, it has been already shewn, that his Deity, from whence arises his right to forgive sins, could receive no exaltation, that being "ever the same." Hence when he asks his Father to glorify him even as he had glorified the Father, (no very modest request from a creature, for it was no less than as God over all,) he does not ask for any *new* glory, but only for that which he had with his Father from eternity. While therefore his right to forgive sins was unchangeably the same with the Father's, after he had voluntarily laid aside his own glory, it was meet that his Father should restore it to him as his Mediatorial Servant, and in this capacity publicly exalt him. Indeed this exaltation of his human nature as Mediator was as much his own act as God, as it was the Father's, which necessarily follows from the Father and the Son's being "one in will and design;" and is most fully expressed in our Lord's declaration, John v. 19. "What things so ever the *Father doth*, these *also*" Jn 17:5

<sup>1</sup> Marshman observes Rammohan switching the gospel in §130. <sup>2</sup> §130.

doeth the Son likewise.” Hence he himself of his own will and pleasure forgives every sin which the Father is described as forgiving, the Father himself never forgiving one sin but in accordance with the *will* and intercession of the Son. Still the doctrine of these scribes was accurate; “Who can forgive sins but God only,” although not knowing the Lord of Glory, they charged Him with blasphemy who is God over all blessed for evermore.

Mk 2:7

§425 [4. Jesus is almighty.]<sup>1</sup> To disprove the Fourth Position, that Almighty power is claimed by Jesus in the most unequivocal manner, appeared so important to our author that he as expended thereon nearly six pages. He is however constrained to allow that the passages on which this position is founded “*taken simply as they stand,*” (precisely the way in which scripture testimonies ought to be taken,) might very readily be understood as implying an assertion of equality with the Father.<sup>2</sup> And had the clause “for the Father judgeth no man but *hath committed all judgment* /613 *unto the Son,*” been added, which he groundlessly charges us with having overlooked, the proof would have been still more complete. While the work of judging mankind belongs by nature equally to the Son and to the Father, the Father *judgeth no man*, but committing *all judgment* to the Son, even of the thoughts of men in every age and in every country, hath left on him the whole work in that great day which fixes the character of God, the destinies of all creatures, and the happiness of the universe throughout eternity. And if he be not God equal with the Father, all this is left on a finite creature who cannot search the heart of one individual!

§426 In our author’s declaration, that “*no unprejudiced person can peruse the verses preceding and subsequent to those quoted to support the position, without feeling that a more explicit disavowal of equality with God can hardly be expressed by language that that which they contain,*”<sup>3</sup> we are at complete issue with him; for if this be the case, the credit of “the Precepts of Jesus” is destroyed for ever. We have seen already that in ch. x. Jesus when he solemnly declared, “Before Abraham was I AM,”<sup>4</sup> so convinced the Jews that he meant to claim equality with God, that he escaped death by their hands only by working a miracle to deliver himself; and that in the beginning of this very chapter, he claimed the peculiar prerogative of God in forgiving sins, and supported his claim by a display of his own omniscience and almighty power. If then he afterwards disavowed his equality with God, he “in whom dwelt all truth” was guilty of such prevarication as must for ever destroy his credit. Our author’s own assertion therefore, that “*there is the strictest consistency between all*

Jn 8:58f.

<sup>1</sup> §§131-132. <sup>2</sup> §131. <sup>3</sup> §131.

<sup>4</sup> Also Marshman mixes up the biblical context. The saying about Abraham is not from the discussion about blasphemy in Jn 10, but from Jn 8:31-59, although also a discussion with the “Jews” ending with their attempt to stone Jesus.



the passages of the sacred books"<sup>1</sup> might have convinced him, how much more likely it was that he had mistaken Christ's meaning in the body of this chapter, than that He "in whom dwelt all truth" had prevaricated and contradicted himself. Let us however carefully examine John v. In the 16th verse /614 we find that after our Lord had healed the impotent man and thrice demonstrated his deity, the Jews sought to slay him because he had done this on the sabbath day. To justify his conduct Jesus declares, "My *Father worketh* hitherto, and I *WORK*." This provoked the Jews still more, because he had now said that God was his Father, "*making himself* EQUAL WITH GOD." This observation, which is John's, sufficiently shews us that not only the Jews, but John himself understood Christ's calling God his Father, to be "making himself God." This Jesus neither denies nor corrects; but adds, "the Son can do nothing of himself but what he *seeth* the Father do;" which must necessarily be the case, if, as our author affirms, the Father and the Son are one "in will and design."<sup>2</sup> But Jesus adds further, "For what things soever he doeth, *these also doeth the Son likewise*." A more full declaration of *equality* with the Father cannot be imagined. How *could* the Son do *whatsoever* the Father doeth, if he were not equal to him in power, wisdom, truth, justice, mercy? Can the highest archangel *do whatsoever* the Father doeth? Can he with him sit on the throne of the universe, preserving both man and beast, judging righteously, his eyes running to and fro the whole earth to make himself strong in behalf of them whose hearts are perfect towards him?

Jn 5:17f.

He then adds, "for the Father sheweth the Son *all things* that himself doeth." As he who spoke the was the unchangeable Jehovah, the Almighty Searcher of hearts, who had created all things, and at that moment upheld them by the word of power, we are at no loss for his meaning here. Indeed what finite being could *understand all* that God doeth, if *shewn* him? Who can find out the Almighty to perfection? Only He who alone knoweth the Father. Jesus adds, "For as the Father quickeneth the dead, even so the Son *quickeneth whom* HE WILL." Here then he declares himself equal with the Father in Sovereignty of Will as well as in almighty power. /615 Was this a disavowal of equality with God? This informs us too that the Father does nothing *of himself*, nothing without the Son. Hence in every epistle, grace and mercy are sought equally of the Son as of the Father; and hence it follows also, that whatever the Father does in forgiving sin or in any other way, the Son as God does it with him, otherwise it could not be true, that "*whatsoever things* the Father doeth, *these also doeth the Son likewise*." The Saviour adds, "For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son." To create and govern mankind are undoubtedly the work of the Godhead, but of these the final judgment is the consumation, because it fixes the eternal state of all who have been thus created and governed. This then

§427

Jn 5:19-23

<sup>1</sup> §287. <sup>2</sup> §119.

is the grand work of the Godhead. The Father however, whose it is equally with the Son, *judgeth no man*, but commits all judgment to the Son, and to the Son as the Incarnate Mediator between God and man, *because* he is “the Son of Man.” Is all this a disavowal of Deity?—But why has the Father done this? “That all men should honor the Son *even as* they honor the Father,” although he was once despised as a man of sorrows and acquainted with griefs. To this glorious declaration of the Son’s Godhead, our author merely objects, p. 46, that this means “*likeness in nature and quality, and not in exact degree of honor.*”<sup>1</sup> But what are the *nature* and *quality* of the honor paid to God the Father? *Divine honor* of the highest kind, and such as can be given to no creature! This alone then completely establishes the Deity of Christ. But the fact is, that this phrase as really refers to *degree* as to nature; see Matt. xx. 14. “I will give unto this last *even as* unto thee;” that is *precisely as much*, one penny.<sup>2</sup> Instead of disavowing his claim to Deity then, it is evident that our Lord here carried it to the highest pitch, and so confounded his adversaries, that they were unable to answer him a word.

§428 In what sense the Prophet to be sent was like unto Moses, /616 sufficiently appears from Heb. iii. where the apostle, telling us that in his nature Christ was in all things like *unto us*, as well as to Moses, yet without sin, adds, that he “was worthy of as much more honor than Moses, as he who builds the house is of more honor than the house;” that is, as much as the Maker or Creator is worthy of beyond the *thing made*, adding even here, that he who made all things, is God, which in Col. i. he declares to be Jesus Christ, as we have already seen. That the Messenger or Angel of God, as our author terms the Saviour, is the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, has been already shewn from Judges ii. 3. “And the Angel said unto them, *I made you* to go out of Egypt and have brought you into the land which *I swear* unto your Fathers;” and from Malachi iii. 1. “And Jehovah whom ye seek, shall suddenly come into his temple, even the Messenger of the Covenant whom ye delight in.” Why should it offend our author that when the Son for the suffering of death took upon him the form of a servant, he was *really* made in all things like unto us though without sin, and hence that like man he was once an infant of days and increased in strength and knowledge? Had his human body been omnipotent, and his human soul omniscient and omnipresent, how could he have been made in all things like unto his brethren? how could he have been “*crucified in weakness?*” how could he have “*suffered* the just for the unjust to bring us to God?” It is quite enough that he who united the human nature to his own, was from eternity the unchangeable Jehovah, “the Creator of the ends of the earth, who fainteth not, neither is weary.”

§429 [5. Jesus is omniscient judge.]<sup>3</sup> Our author’s objections to the Fifth Position, that Je-

<sup>1</sup> §132. <sup>2</sup> Rammohan’s counter-example has been Mt 5:48. <sup>3</sup> §133.



sus's having all judgment committed to him, proves his omniscience, have been so fully met already, that scarcely any thing remains to be added. An Omniscient Creature however, is a monster of which not the least trace is formed in the scriptures. And that omniscience is essential to the act of judging mankind, /617 is almost self-evident were the scriptures silent here. But this God declares Jer. xvii. 10, "I Jehovah Jr 17:10 search the heart I try the reins, *even to give* every man according to his ways and according as his work shall be." To say however that the Father searches the heart *for the Son*, and having accurately judged of every man's ways and doings by examining his *heart*, communicates the *result* of the process to the Son, that he may *appear* the judge, though naturally incapable of making the previous examination, is directly to contradict our Lord's declaration, that the *Father judgeth no man*, as in this case the fact would really be, that the *the Son judgeth no man*, but merely receives from the Father the *result* of his judging men's hearts. Did the Father really search the hearts of men and decide on their works *for* the Son, however, such a course were needless. That *his own* omniscience is fully equal to the work, he himself tells us, Rev. ii. 23. "And all the churches shall know that I am he which searcheth the hearts and Jr 5:22 reins; and I will give unto every one of you according to your works." Of the Father's having given the Son authority to judge we have already spoken. His giving him "to have life in himself," refers wholly to his being the Mediator in human flesh; for of his Divine Nature's being the fountain of life we have the fullest proof: John i. In him *was life* and the life was the light of men. John xi. "I am the resurrection and the life." 1 John v. This is the true God, and *eternal life*. Jn 1:4; 11:25  
 1 Jn 5:20  
 §430

[6. Jesus accepts worship.]<sup>1</sup> To the Sixth Position, that Jesus accepted worship due to God alone, our author objects, "that the word 'worship' both in common acceptation, and in the Scriptural writings, is used sometimes as implying an external mark of religious reverence paid to God, and at other times as signifying merely the token of civil respect due to superiors;<sup>2</sup> that those who worshipped Jesus did not believe him to be God, or one of the three persons of the Godhead and equal to God, and that Jesus in his acknowledged human capacity never pray-/618ed to himself or directed his followers to worship or pray to him,"<sup>3</sup> Granting that "worship" in English and προσκυνέω in Greek are sometimes used to denote civil respect, and that the worship paid by the servant to his master, Matt. xviii. 26, and by the people to David, meant merely civil respect, still the position is not touched in the least degree. Whether the blind men, the lepers, the mariners, and others, knew what they did in worshipping Jesus, is not so much the question as whether *Jesus knew*; for if he suffered them even through ignorance to yield him Divine worship, when Peter did not suffer it in Cornelius for a moment, unless he were God he must have had less discernment, Mt 18:26  
 Ac 10:25f.

<sup>1</sup> §§134-135. <sup>2</sup> §134. <sup>3</sup> §135.

or less piety and concern for the Divine honor, than his own disciple. But were *all* who ever worshipped the Son, ignorant of his Deity? Were the apostles when they worshipped him after his resurrection? Was Thomas when he addressed him as his Lord and his God? Was Stephen when he committed to him his departing soul in language similar to that in which Christ on the cross had committed his to the Father? Was Paul when he besought him thrice that the messenger of Satan might depart from him? Were those who first trusted in Christ, and those who in every place called on the Lord Jesus? Were Paul, Peter and John, when they sought grace and peace for the churches from the Lord precisely as from God the Father? Above all was the Father when he, addressing the Son as Jehovah God, ever the same, commanded all the angels to worship him? If these were not ignorant of his Deity, whatever might have been the case with the lepers, mariners, &c. he is God, infinitely worthy of worship;—or the apostles, the primitive saints, and the angels in heaven, were guilty of idolatry, and with reverence be it spoken, its grand encourager is the Eternal Father, “who will not give his glory to another.”

Jn 20:28  
Ac 7:59; Lk 23:46  
2 Co 12:8  
Is 42:8

§431

Jn 8:54

That in the state of humiliation in which his infinite love to sinners had placed him, and in which he declared, “If I /619 honor myself, my honor is nothing,” he should pray to himself, or formally prescribe this to his disciples, was scarcely to be expected. To glorify him was the proper work of the Holy Spirit, who after his ascension was pleased to be known as “the Spirit of Christ,” and respecting whom Jesus declared, that he should lead his apostles into all truth. But he immediately led them to deem Christ “God the Saviour;”—“God over all blessed for ever more.”—“The only wise God our Saviour;” to pray to him, to trust in him, and to seek from him grace and peace, and all those blessings which God alone can bestow. If therefore Christ be not God equal with the Father, the Spirit of Christ, instead of leading his disciples into all truth, led them into the most extensive system of falsehood and idolatry the world has ever beheld.

§432

[7. The trinitarian formula.]<sup>1</sup> To the Seventh and last Position, that Jesus associated his own name with that of God in the rite of Baptism intended to remain in force to the end of the world, our author merely objects, that while a profession of faith in God is common to all religions supposed to be founded on the Old Testament, they are distinguished from each other “by a public profession of faith in their respective founders, expressing such profession in language that may clearly exhibit the inferior nature of these founders to the Divine Being,”<sup>2</sup>—and hence that the Jews “believed the Lord and his servant Moses,”<sup>3</sup> and the Mohumudans profess faith in God and also in Mohumud his messenger—and Christians are baptized in the name of the Father and the Son, which epithet Son “ought to be understood and

<sup>1</sup> §§136-139. <sup>2</sup> §136. <sup>3</sup> §136.

admitted by every one as expressing the created nature of Christ though the most highly exalted among all creatures.”<sup>1</sup> This abject begging of the question in dispute, we will afterwards examine. We shall first strike Mohummud however quite out of the question: as the Koran’s pretending to be a Divine Revelation when /620 it is not, stamps falsehood on its forehead; nothing it contains can prove or disprove any doctrine whatever. To its dreams, as well as those of the Hindoo writers, our answer is, “He that hath a dream let him tell a dream, and he that hath God’s word let him tell it faithfully. What is the chaff to the wheat saith Jehovah?” The Jews, who alone remain, had no formulary by which each person devoted himself to the worship and service of God as do Christians in baptism. But had the passage quoted from Exod. xiv. 31, been that formulary, instead of being a part of a narrative describing their feelings when they saw their enemies lying dead on the shore of the Red Sea, the omission in the baptismal rite of the clause “his servant” would have been fatal to his objection. If it were necessary to add the phrase “his servant” to Moses, the proper name of a man who had never urged the most distant claim to Deity, for the sake of guarding against the appearance of placing a creature on an equality with God, how much more necessary was it here, when the Son had permitted the worship of his disciples, and pointed them to those Scriptures which described him as the Creator of all, Jehovah God, ever the same; and when He, acknowledged by our author himself to be the Supreme Being, is mentioned merely by the correlative term “the Father.” If then the phrase “his servant” marks the *inferior nature* of this Messenger of God, the omission of it in the circumstances just mentioned, unavoidably proves the *Equality* of the Father and the Son, and their equal right to the service, the worship, the hearts of all commanded thus to be baptized to the end of time. The fact is, that Jesus’s having prescribed this solemn declaration himself, and his adding, “Lo I am with you always even unto the end of the world,” would alone prove that he deemed himself equal with the Father. If being a mere creature, he left this baptismal declaration ambiguous for want of thought, never was there so fatal an ambiguity, as it involves /621 not only the ruin to the end of time of the sincerest of mankind, who, if Christ be a mere creature, must have renounced the worship of those by nature no Gods, for that of one *also by nature no God*; but the corruption of the only system of religion which professes to deliver mankind from idolatry. But if he left this ambiguous with a perfect knowledge of all circumstances, in thus associating his name with that of the Father, the meek and lowly Jesus, in whom dwells all truth, if a mere creature, has exhibited an instance of falsehood, arrogance, and blasphemy unparalleled in the history of men.

Jr 23:28

Ex 14:31

Mt 28:16–20

But we may as well examine the only initiatory we found in the Old Testament:

§433

<sup>1</sup> §136.

Circumcision, while it varies from Baptism in other circumstances, differs from it in this, that it was performed *in no name*. Had it indeed, Jesus himself assures us, that it would not have been in that of Moses, when he says John vii. 22. “Not that it is of Moses, but of the fathers.” But by whom was it instituted? We find in Gen. xvii. that after God had promised to give to Abraham and to his seed, the land wherein he was a stranger, and to be their God, he added, “And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskins, and it shall be a token of the covenant between me and you.” This rite then was a token to every Israelite that the God of Abraham was his God. We have already seen however from Gen. xxviii. 13, that the God of Abraham was He who appeared to Jacob at Bethel, “the Angel who redeemed him from all evil” and whom he intreated on his death-bed “to bless the lads;” and from Judges ii. 1. that it was the “Angel who rebuked the people at Bochim” after having brought them out of Egypt into the land he had sworn to give their fathers, even Jehovah “the Angel of the Covenant” whose way John Baptist was to prepare. Thus a due examination of ancient but infallible records, decidedly proves, that He who in baptism associated his own name with that of the Father and the Holy Spirit, was Jehovah who /622 instituted the covenant of circumcision, and was solemnly chosen for their God by the patriarchs, the prophets, and all the good in Israel down to that day. Hence, as he changes not, it is self-evident that he “*in whom dwells all truth*,”<sup>1</sup> could have inserted his name in this solemn commission with no other view than that of being adored as Jehovah, to the end of time.

§434 But never was there a more humble begging of the question than the assertion “that the epithet Son *ought to be understood and admitted by every one as expressing the created nature of Christ?*”<sup>2</sup> Why ought it thus to be understood and admitted? Because our author has adduced proof that this is its real meaning? Of this not the least has appeared: can he even prove that among men a Son *must be* of a nature inferior to his Father’s? Why then must it be thus understood? Because otherwise the whole of his system dies. Its admission however is impossible: we dare not make thus free with the truth of God, the object of the present request. How can we say that God Almighty, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the Eternal Jehovah who changeth not,—the Creator of heaven and earth, upholding all things by the word of his power, and adored and worshipped, not merely by patriarchs and prophets, but by the highest archangel,—He who searcheth the reins and hearts, and who will give to every man according as his work shall be,—is a “created being,” without having, not only the angels and the saints of God, but “every creature which is in heaven and earth and under the earth,” whose constant language is “blessing, and honor, and glory, and power be unto Him that sitteth on the throne, and unto the Lamb for

<sup>1</sup> §109. <sup>2</sup> §136.

ever and ever,”—rise up against us as false witnesses in the great and last day?

As our author declines renewing the subject relative to Christ’s declaration, “Lo I am with you always even to the end of the world,” which however we are not aware he has /623 ever yet discussed, we beg leave to remind him that this declaration rests on precisely the same authority with “the Precepts of Jesus;” while the declarations of Mohummuad adduced by him, rest wholly on a counterfeit revelation.<sup>1</sup> That unrighteous man, although he ventured to affirm many things respecting *past* events, in which no one could contradict him, yet never dared to declare to his followers; “Lo I am with you always even to the end of the world.” Such however was the declaration of Jesus in whom dwelt all truth,—and among the myriads of his followers in every age who have prayed to him in every time of trouble whether of body and mind, who can stand forth and say that he has sought him in vain?—or that Jesus has ever failed or forsaken on any who have committed to him their all for time and eternity?

§435

[Concluding Observations]

[Personality of the Holy Spirit.]

This baptismal commission also completely establishes the Personality of the Holy Ghost. If he in whom dwelt all truth has declared Him to be as distinct in person and as worthy of worship and adoration, as the Father and Himself, no farther evidence is needed either to his Personality or his Godhead. Were it needful indeed, a rich fulness of Scripture proof could be adduced respecting the Holy Spirit, as well as the Son; but the selection of a few passages will be quite sufficient. John xiv. contains the following testimonies to the *Personality* of the Spirit. Ver. 13, “And I will pray the Father, and *he will send you another Comforter.*” Ver. 26, “The Comforter, the Holy Ghost, whom *the Father will send* in my name, *He shall teach you all things.*” Ch. xvi. ver. 8. “And when he is come, *he will reprove the world* of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment.” Ver. 14. “*He shall glorify me*, for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you.” In the Acts we have these testimonies among others, ch. v. 3, 4. “Why hath Satan filled thine heart *to lie to the Holy Ghost?*—Thou hast not lied unto men *but unto God;*” ch. x. “While Peter thought on the vision, *the Spirit said unto him*, /624 Behold three men seek thee. Arise therefore and get thee down, and go with them doubting nothing; for *I have sent them.*” Acts xiii. 2,—“As they ministered to the Lord and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, *Separate me* Barnabas and Saul for the work *whereunto I have called them.*” These testimonies drawn from passages void of all figurative language, of themselves completely establish both the Personality and the Deity of the Holy Spirit.

§436

Jn 14:13; 26

Jn 16:8; 14

Ac 5:3f.

Ac 10:17–20

Ac 13:2

<sup>1</sup> §138.

[Doctrine of the Trinity.]

§437

The Deity and the Personality of the Son and the Holy Spirit being thus established, the doctrine of the Ever-blessed Trinity needs no further confirmation: it follows of course. We shall therefore close our testimonies from Scripture, by laying before our readers three passages which bring the Sacred Three fully into view. The first we select from Isaiah xlvi. in which One is introduced who previously declares, “My hand also hath laid the foundation of the earth, and my right hand hath spanned the heavens, when I call unto them they all stand up together;” and whom therefore we are at no loss to recognize. He however declares, ver. 16th, “And now *Jehovah God*, and *his Spirit* hath sent *me*.” The second is the passage already discussed, “Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;” and the third is the apostolic benediction, 2 Cor. xiii. 14. “The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all. Amen.” This last passage would alone confirm all the doctrines impugned by our author. Had the Lord Jesus been a Creature, *his grace*, his free favor, sought for the churches by the apostles equally with the Father’s, could have been of no value to them. Of what value to any one on earth is the grace or favor of any one in heaven who is not omniscient and omnipresent?—the grace of Moses? of Abraham? or of the highest archangel? *Communion* includes intercourse and fellowship. But how can we have fellowship and intercourse with one who has no being, no existence?—/625or with one who is not omniscient and omnipresent?—With this testimony we are constrained to close; for were we to bring forth and duly unfold all the testimonies to the Deity of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit contained in the New Testament alone, instead of a hundred pages, we should fill a large volume.

Is 48:13

Is 48:16

Mt 28:16–20

2 Co 13:13f.

[Opinions of Men.]

§438

Respecting the opinions of men relative to the Deity of Christ and the Sacred Three during the first three centuries, we do not even enquire. Paul tells us that even in his time “the mystery of iniquity,” had already begun to work, and John adds, that “many antichrists had already gone out into the world.” In doctrine and practice therefore, men in the first three centuries may have adhered to the Scriptures, or they may have swerved from them; but as this can be known only by bringing these to the Scriptures as the test, they are of no value while we have the Scriptures themselves. Nothing however can be more incorrect than what our author asserts respecting the doctrine of the churches in the three first centuries. Even Mosheim, suspected as he is of being unfavorable to the truth, establishes their faith in Christ’s Deity in the very passage quoted p. 103. by our author against this doctrine.<sup>1</sup> If those who were baptized “made solemn profession of their confidence in Christ,” this was no

2 Th 2:7

1 Jn 2:18

<sup>1</sup> §171.

less than strong trust in him; and this, as they knew the scriptures, they were well aware, would have rendered them accursed, had Christ been a *Creature*. All indeed that can be fairly deduced from Mosheim is, that in the first three centuries they had formed *no specific creed*, but simply believed what the Scriptures revealed respecting the Sacred Three,—precisely like the Editors of this article. But would our author, who knows them well, be willing to rank them on his side of the question?

Respecting Locke and Newton our reply is precisely the same. Their opinions in divinity are nothing to us. If these agreed with the Scriptures, they were right; if not, they were /626 erroneous; and that men eminent for science and philosophy, should yet err respecting scripture doctrines, is nothing new. Not that we think this the case with either Newton or Locke. If Locke, as our author affirms, p. 161,<sup>1</sup> really thought that the faith which make men Christians includes their “receiving Christ for their Lord and King,” Locke knew that this included the belief of his omniscience and omnipresence, as without this, his being their King was only a solemn mockery: a *Creature King in heaven*, must have been more ignorant of his *earthly* subjects than the most stupid earthly despot.—Newton’s belief of Christ’s Deity appears as clear as the light from our author’s own quotation.<sup>2</sup> When he said that Christians of all ages are represented as “*worshipping God and the Lamb*,” he was too well acquainted with the Scriptures to be ignorant, that to equalize a *creature* with God in worship, is the height of blasphemy. §439

As to those modes of defending the doctrine of the Trinity with which our author so amuses himself, we leave them with their respective authors. We need them not. To us the Scriptures are sufficient; and respecting every religious doctrine and practice, our language is, “To the law and the testimony; if they speak not according to this, it is because there is no light in them.” §440

[Parting Reflection.]

We now intreat our author’s permission to address to him a parting reflection. While we have endeavored to meet his opinions as fully as our confined limits would permit, we have endeavored to avoid every expression which might justly give him pain; and we now earnestly intreat him to consider in what a state these opinions have left him. He has forsaken idolatry, and has not wholly escaped reproach; but has he found the religion of the Apostles and primitive believers? Did they not trust in Christ, pray to him in all their sorrows, and through him continually seek access to the Father? Did they not adore him as the Omniscient Search-/627er of hearts, and as their Intercessor presenting their supplications to the Father united with his own all-prevalled intercession? And did not the consciousness of his being ever present with them, support them under every trial, and continually purify their hearts? In §441

<sup>1</sup> §257. <sup>2</sup> §258.

like manner, the humble christian at the present day, who has perhaps never heard a single argument formally advanced in support of his Deity, lives almost intuitively on his Saviour as God over all blessed for evermore. His omniscience, his omnipresence, and almighty power, his infinite love, his boundless mercy and pity, are ever present to his mind. He realizes his Great Intercessor with the Father as acquainted with his inmost thoughts, his most secret desires, as sending him help in every time of trouble, as strengthening his faith, his hope, his love, his godly fear, and forming him after his own image. To all this he who rejects the Deity of Christ is an entire stranger. How can he pour out his soul to him in secret, when he does not believe him Omniscient? How can he come to him daily for help in time of need, when he does not believe him to be Almighty? How can he fear to displease him even in thought, when he does not believe him Omnipresent? Thus from all that communion with the Lord Jesus, which tranquilizes, rejoices, and purifies the soul, he is entirely cut off.—Moreover he can hold no communion with the Holy Spirit. How can a person who disbelieves his very existence, either hold communion with the Holy Spirit, or fear to grieve him? And without Christ, without the Holy Spirit, can he have communion with God the Father? How can he, when John declares 1 John ii. 23, “He that denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father,”—and 2 John ver. 9. “He that abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, the same hath not God;”—nay when our Lord himself declares, “no man knoweth the Father, but—he to whom the Son will reveal him;”—and “No man cometh to the Father but by me?” How dread-ful then, even in this world, the state of a man in these circumstances! He is without Saviour—without a Sanctifier—without God—and without hope in the world, unless it be hope founded on delusion. And what are his prospects for the eternal world? There, in the only heaven the scripture reveals, Christ is worshipped by the highest archangel; and the eternal song of the blessed is, “Thou art worthy,—for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood.” Yea, every creature in heaven—unites in ascribing “Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, unto him that sitteth upon the throne and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.” In this song how can our author with his present views ever join? How can he unite in these adorations? Let us then affectionately intreat him to re-consider the subject, and peruse the Scriptures anew: and may the God of all grace enable him to discern the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, that he may in future determine “to know nothing but Jesus Christ, and him crucified”—in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.

1 Jn 2:23

2 Jn 9

Mt 11:27

Jn 14:6

Rv 5:6-14

2 Co 2:2



# 8 Rammohan Roy: The Final Appeal to the Christian Public

## Editorial Introduction

Rammohan Roy's *Final Appeal to the Christian Public* is his most extensive writing about Christianity and the understanding of the Bible. He started writing in January or February 1822 and signed the preface in January 1823. Compared to the *Second Appeal*, this new work has a clearer structure and is much more restrained. There is less polemics and satire in his style.

The *Final Appeal* is also the first big publication in Rammohan's own printing press. Within the *Calcutta Unitarian Committee* he had established the so-called *Unitarian Press* at his own expense. After the *Second Appeal*, William Yates had explained to him that further publications of this kind were not possible any more in the *Baptist Mission Press* (§442).

There are traces and citations of new literature:

- John Parkhurst (1728-1797), *An Hebrew and English Lexicon* and *A Greek and English Lexicon to the New Testament*.
- George Sale (1697-1736), *The Koran; commonly called The Alcoran of Mohammed. Translated from the original Arabic*.
- a Jewish prayer book, probably the English translation of the *Siddur* by Solomon Hirschell (1761-1842)
- James Macknight (1721-1800), *A New Literal Translation From the Original Greek, of All the Apostolical Epistles*.
- George Campbell (1719-1796), *The Four Gospels*.

The most important source for his understanding of the Pauline letters are now John Locke's paraphrases and comments on Galatians, Ephesians and Corinthians. There are extensive quotations from this source to be found.

Another factor is the introduction of Unitarian theology and thinking in the *Final Appeal*. Since the publication of the *Second Appeal* and the foundation of the *Calcutta Unitarian Committee*, Rammohan's activities had drawn attention in the Western world, especially among British and American Unitarians. The British Baptists had reprinted Marshman's contributions to the debate and the Unitarian societies had done the same to Rammohan's *Precepts* and *Appeals*. Letters and literature had been exchanged, and Rammohan was fully aware that he was writing for a bigger audience now.

The *Second Appeal* had presented an Arian Christology. This understanding of Christ receives several changes. Especially some concepts which were still unclear become now settled by using Unitarian terminology and explanations. One main source for genuine Unitarian understanding of the New Testament was *The New Testament, in an Improved Version*, published by Thomas Belsham et al. in 1808. This *Improved Version* reached Rammohan while he was working on the *Final Appeal*. Step by step he incorporated quotations from this source into his text, first as subsequently inserted footnotes (§554), later they become the dominant main text (§§703-709).

In this incorporation process, Christ loses the attribute of being a mediator of creation (§667), he becomes a common man during his time on earth (§569). He was not existent before the creation of the world, but still—reflecting Arian Christology—he lived with God after the creation of the world, before his incarnation (§673).<sup>1</sup>

The main points of controversy, the Trinity, the subordination of Christ, the vicarious suffering and the “seven positions” are repeated. Occasionally, some arguments are withdrawn, but Rammohan's positions stay firm against Marshman's orthodox opinions.

The expression “Final Appeal” does not mean that he wants to end the debate. Actually he suggests a “new mode of controversy”, a monthly publication with the aim to work through the whole bible book by book (§§451-452). Marshman will reject this idea in his answer on the grounds of impracticability (§803). Only because of this rejection, the *Final Appeal* became literally Rammohan's final publication on Christianity and Christian theology.

The text basis for this edition is Rammohan Roy, *Final Appeal to the Christian Public, in Defence of the “Precepts of Jesus”*, published by the Unitarian Society, London 1823, pp. 327–672. The table of contents has been omitted.

---

<sup>1</sup> This new shaping of Rammohan's Christology is explained in all aspects and in detail in Chapter 4. 4. of my thesis *Die Debatte zwischen Rammohan Roy und Joshua Marshman*, Berlin 2022.

/[323]

FINAL APPEAL  
TO  
THE CHRISTIAN PUBLIC,  
IN DEFENCE OF THE  
“*PRECEPTS OF JESUS.*”

BY  
RAMMOHUN ROY.

CALCUTTA:  
PRINTED AT THE UNITARIAN PRESS, DHURMTOLLAH.  
1823.

LONDON, REPRINTED BY THE UNITARIAN SOCIETY, AND SOLD BY R. HUNTER, 72, ST. PAUL'S CHURCHYARD; DAVID EATON, 187, HIGH HOLBORN; AND C. FOX AND CO. 33, THREADNEEDLE STREET.  
1823.

/[325]

## NOTICE.

ALL the preceding works of the Author, on the subject of Christianity, were printed at the Baptist Mission Press, Calcutta; but the acting proprietor of that Press, having, since the publication of the Second Appeal, declined, although in the politest manner possible, printing any other work that the Author might publish on the same subject,<sup>1</sup> he was under the necessity of purchasing a few types for his own use, and of depending principally upon native superintendance for the completion of the greater part of this work. This must form an Apology to the Public for the imperfections that may appear in its typographical execution. §442

---

<sup>1</sup> Rammohan is referring to his friend William Yates. After the publication of the *Second Appeal* and the conversion of William Adam to an Arian form of Unitarianism, Yates and the *Baptist Mission Press* were put under pressure to distance themselves from Rammohan's teachings. A further support of Rammohan's writings was therefore not possible anymore.

/[327]

PREFACE.

§443 NOTWITHSTANDING the apprehension of exciting displeasure in the breasts of many worthy men, I feel myself obliged to lay before the public at large this my self-defence, entitled “A FINAL APPEAL to the Christian Public.” I, however, confidently hope that the liberal among them will be convinced, by a reference to the first part of this Essay, and to my two former Appeals, that the necessity of self-vindication against the charge of being an “injurer of the cause of truth,”<sup>1</sup> has compelled me, as a warm friend of that cause, to bring forward my reasons for opposing the opinions maintained by so large a body of men highly celebrated for learning and piety—a consideration which, I trust, will induce them to regard my present labours with an eye of indulgence.

§444 I am well aware that this difference of sentiment has already occasioned much coolness towards me in the demeanour of some whose friendship I hold very dear, and that this protracted controversy has not only prevented me from rendering my humble services to my countrymen by various publications which I had projected in the native languages, but has also diverted my attention from all other literary /328 pursuits for three years past. Notwithstanding these sacrifices, I feel well satisfied with my present engagements, and cannot wish that I had pursued a different course, since, whatever may be the opinion of the world, my own conscience fully approves of my past endeavours to defend what I esteem the cause of truth.

§445 In my present vindication of the unity of the Deity, as revealed through the writings of the Old and New Testament, I appeal not only to those who sincerely believe in the books of revelation, and make them the standard of their faith and practice, and who must, therefore, deeply feel the great importance of the divine oracles being truly interpreted; but I also appeal to those who, although indifferent about religion, yet devote their minds to the investigation and discovery of truth, and who will, therefore, not think it unworthy of their attention to ascertain what are the genuine doctrines of Christianity as taught by Christ and his apostles, and how much it has been corrupted by the subsequent intermixture of the polytheistical ideas that were familiar to its Greek and Roman converts, and which have continued to disfigure it in succeeding ages. I extend my appeal yet further; I solicit the patient attention of such individuals as are rather unfavourable to the doctrines of Christianity as generally promulgated, from finding them at variance with common sense, that they may

---

<sup>1</sup> Reference to Marshman’s attack in 1820: “the manner in which this is done, as is justly observed by our highly esteemed correspondent, may greatly injure the cause of truth”, §20.

examine and judge /329 whether its doctrines are really such as they are understood to be by the popular opinion which now prevails.

I feel assured that if religious controversy be carried on with that temper and language which are considered by wise and pious men as most consistent with the solemn and sacred nature of religion, and more especially with the mild spirit of Christianity, the truths of it cannot, for any length of time, be kept concealed under the imposing veil of high sounding expressions,<sup>1</sup> calculated to astonish the imagination and rouse the passions of the people, and thereby keep alive and strengthen the preconceived notions with which such language has in their minds been, from infancy, associated. But I regret that the method which has hitherto been observed in inquiry after religious truth, by means of large publications, necessarily issued at considerable intervals of time, is not, for several reasons, so well adapted to the speedy attainment of the proposed object, as I, and other friends of true religion, could wish. These reasons are as follows: §446

1st. Many readers have not sufficient leisure or perseverance to go through a voluminous essay, that they may make up their minds and come to a settled opinion on the subject. §447

2ndly. Those who have time at their command, /330 and interest themselves in religious researches, finding the real point under discussion mixed up with injurious insinuations and personalities, soon feel discouraged from proceeding further, long before they can come to a determination. §448

3rdly. The multiplicity of arguments and various interpretations of numerous scriptural passages, that bear often no immediate relation to the subject, or to each other, introduced in succession, distract and dishearten such readers as are not accustomed to Biblical studies, and interrupt their further progress. §449

As Christianity is happily not a subject resting on vague metaphysical speculations, but is founded upon the authority of books written in languages which are understood and explained according to known and standing rules, I therefore propose, with a view to the more speedy and certain attainment of religious truth, to establish a monthly periodical publication, commencing from the month of April next, to be devoted to Biblical Criticism, and to subject Unitarian as well as Trinitarian doctrines to the test of fair argument, if those of the latter persuasion will consent thus to submit the scriptural grounds on which their tenets concerning the Trinity are built. §450

For the sake of method and convenience, I propose that, beginning with the Book of Genesis, and taking all the passages in that portion of Scripture, /331 which are §451

<sup>1</sup> In the introduction of the *Abridgment*, Rammohan wrote about the “dark curtain of Sanskrit language” which has to be lifted, see Rammohan, *Abridgment*, 3.

thought to countenance the doctrine of the Trinity, we should examine them one by one, and publish our observations upon them; and that next month we proceed in the same manner with the Book of Exodus, and so on with all the Books of the Old and New Testament, in their regular order.

§452 If any one of the Missionary Gentlemen, for himself, and in behalf of his fellow-labourers, choose to profit by the opportunity thus afforded them, of defending and diffusing the doctrines they have undertaken to preach, I request, that an Essay on the Book of Genesis, of the kind above-intimated, may be sent me by the middle of the month, and if confined within reasonable limits, not exceeding a dozen or sixteen pages, I hereby engage to cause it to be printed and circulated at my own charge, should the Missionary Gentlemen refuse to bestow any part of the funds, intended for the spread of Christianity, towards this object; and also, that a reply (not exceeding the same number of pages) to the arguments adduced, shall be published along with it by the beginning of the ensuing month. That this new mode of controversy, by short monthly publications, may be attended with all the advantages which I, in common with other searchers after truth, expect, and of which it is capable, it will be absolutely necessary that nothing be introduced of a personal nature, or calculated to hurt the feelings of individuals—that we avoid all offensive expressions, and such arguments as have no immediate connexion with the subject, and can only serve to retard the progress of discovery; and that we never allow ourselves for a moment to forget that we are engaged in a solemn religious disputation.

§453 Ac 10:34f. Ep 4:6 As religion consists in a code of duties which the creature believes he owes to his Creator, and as “God has no respect for persons; but in *every nation*, he that fears him and *works righteousness*, is accepted with him;” it must be considered presumptuous and unjust for one man to attempt to interfere with the religious observances of others, for which he well knows, he is not held responsible by any law, either human or divine. Notwithstanding, if mankind are brought into existence, and by nature formed to enjoy the comforts of society and the pleasures of an improved mind, they may be justified in opposing to any system, religious, domestic, or political, which is inimical to the happiness of society, or calculated to debase the human intellect; bearing always in mind that we are children of ONE Father, “who is above *all*, and through *all*, and in us *all*.”<sup>1</sup>

*Calcutta, January 30, 1823.*

---

<sup>1</sup> The same point, using the same verse from Acts, has been taken by Rammohan in February 1824 in his answer to Henry Ware about Christian mission in India, see Ware/Adam/Rammohan, *Correspondence*, 123.

/[347]

FINAL APPEAL.

## CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

NEARLY a month having elapsed after the publication of the fourth number of the Quarterly Series of the "Friend of India"<sup>1</sup> before it happened to reach me, and other avocations and objects having subsequently engaged my attention, I have not, till lately, had leisure to examine the laborious Essay on the doctrines of the Trinity and Atonement at the conclusion of that Magazine, offered in refutation of my "Second Appeal to the Christian Public." For the able and condensed view of the arguments in support of those doctrines, which that publication presents, I have to offer the Reviewer my best thanks, though the benefit I have derived from their perusal is limited to a corroboration of my former sentiments. I must, at the same time, beg permission to notice a few unjust insinuations in some parts of his Essay; but in so doing I trust no painful emotions, neither of that salutary kind alluded to by the Editor, nor of any other, will make their appearance in my remarks. §454

The Reverend Editor charges me with the arrogance of taking upon myself "to teach doctrines /350 directly opposed to those held by the mass of real Christians in every age."<sup>2</sup> To vindicate myself from the presumption with which I am here charged, and to shew by what necessity I have been driven to the publication of opinions, unacceptable to many esteemed characters, I beg to call the attention of the public to the language of the Introduction to "The Precepts of Jesus," compiled by me, and which was my first publication connected with Christianity. They may observe therein, that so far from teaching any "opposite doctrines," or "rejecting the prevailing opinion held by the great body of Christians," I took every precaution against giving the least offence to the prejudices of any one, and consequently limited my labour to what I supposed best calculated for the improvement of those whose received opinions are widely different from those of Christians. My words are, "I decline entering into any discussion on those points, (the dogmas of Christianity,) and confine my attention at present to the task of laying before my fellow-creatures the words of Christ, with a translation from the English into Sungscrit, and the language of Bengal. I feel persuaded that, by separating from the other matters contained in the New Testament, the moral precepts found in that book, these will be likely to produce the desirable effects of improving the hearts and minds of men of different persuasions and degrees of understanding."<sup>3</sup> (Introduction, p. xxvii.) The Precepts of Jesus, which I was desirous of /351 teaching, were not, I hoped "opposed

<sup>1</sup> The referred number was published in December 1821.   <sup>2</sup> §284.   <sup>3</sup> §2.

to the doctrines held by the mass of real Christians,” nor did my language in the Introduction imply the “rejection of those truths which the great body of the learned and pious have concurred in deeming fully contained in the Sacred Scriptures.”<sup>1</sup>

§456

Notwithstanding all this precaution, however, I could not evade the reproach and censure of the Editor, who not only expressed, in the “Friend of India,” No. 20, his extreme disapprobation of the compilation, in a manner calculated more to provoke than lead to search after truth, but also indulged himself in calling me an injurer of the cause of truth. Disappointed as I was, I took refuge in the liberal protection of the public, by appealing to them against the unexpected attacks of the Editor. In that Appeal I carefully avoided entering into any discussion as to the doctrines held up as fundamental principles of Christianity by the Editor. The language of my First Appeal is this: “Humble as he (the Compiler) is, he has therefore adopted those measures which he thought most judicious to spread the truth in an acceptable manner; but I am sorry to observe, that he (the Compiler) has unfortunately and unexpectedly met with opposition from those whom he considered the last persons likely to oppose him on this subject.”<sup>2</sup> (Page 120.) “Whether or not he (the Compiler) has erred in his judgment, that point must be determined by those who will candidly peruse and consider the arguments already /352 advanced on this subject, bearing in mind the lesson particularly taught by the Saviour himself, and of adapting his instructions to the susceptibility and capacity of his hearers; *John* xvi. 12, ‘I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now.’”<sup>3</sup> (P. 122.) “What benefit or peace of mind can we bestow upon a Mussulman, who is an entire stranger to the Christian world, by communicating to him, without preparatory instruction, all the peculiar dogmas of Christianity?”<sup>4</sup> (Page 123.) “The Compiler, obviously having in view at least one object in common with the Reviewer and Editor, that of procuring respect for the precepts of Christ, might have reasonably expected more charity from professed teachers of his doctrine.”<sup>5</sup> (P. 105.) In reviewing the First Appeal, the Reverend Editor fully introduced the doctrines of the godhead of Jesus and the Holy Ghost, and of the Atonement, as the only foundation of Christianity; whereby he compelled me, as a professed believer of one God, to deny, for the first time publicly, those doctrines; and now he takes occasion to accuse me of presumption in teaching doctrines which he has himself compelled me to avow.

Jn 16:12

§457

The Editor assigns, as a reason for entering on this controversy, that after a review of “The Precepts of Jesus, and the First Appeal,” he “felt some doubt whether their author fully believed the deity of Christ,” and, consequently, he “adduced a few passages from the Scriptures to confirm this doctrine.”<sup>6</sup> /353 He then adds, that this Second Appeal to the Christian Public confirms all that he before only feared. (Page

<sup>1</sup> §284. <sup>2</sup> §32. <sup>3</sup> §34. <sup>4</sup> §35. <sup>5</sup> §24. <sup>6</sup> §281.



1.) I could have scarcely credited this assertion of the Reviewer's unacquaintance with my religious opinions, if the allegation had come from any other quarter; for both in my conversation and correspondence with as many missionary gentlemen, old and young, as I have had the honour to know, I have never hesitated, when required, to offer my sentiments candidly, as to the unscripturality and unreasonableness of the doctrine of the Trinity. On one occasion particularly, when on a visit to one of the reverend colleagues of the Editor, at Serampore, long before the time of these publications, I discussed the subject, with that gentleman, at his invitation; and then fully manifested my disbelief of this doctrine, taking the liberty of examining successively all the arguments he, from friendly motives, urged upon me in support of it.<sup>1</sup> Notwithstanding these circumstances, I am inclined to believe, from my confidence in the character of the Editor, that either those missionary gentlemen that were acquainted with my religious sentiments have happened to omit the mention of them to him, or he has forgotten what they had communicated on this subject, when he entered on the review of my publications on Christianity.

In page 503 the Editor insinuates, that vanity has led me to presume “freedom from the powerful effects of early religious impressions has enabled me to discover the truths of scripture, in its /354 most important doctrines, more fully in three or four years, than others have done by most unremitting study in thirty or forty.”<sup>2</sup> The doctrine of the Trinity appears to me so obviously unscriptural, that I am pretty sure, from my own experience and that of others, that no one possessed of merely common sense will fail to find its unscripturality after a methodical study of the Old and New Testaments, unless previously impressed in the early part of his life with creeds and forms of speech preparing the way to that doctrine. No pride, therefore, can be supposed for a moment to have arisen from commonly attainable success. The Editor might be fully convinced of this fact, were he to engage a few independent and diligent natives to study attentively both the Old and New Testaments in their original languages, and then to offer their sentiments as to the doctrine of the Trinity being scriptural, or a mere human invention.

To hold up to ridicule my suggestions in the Second Appeal, to study first the books of the Old Testament, unbiassed by ecclesiastic opinions imbibed in early life, and then to study the New Testament, the Reverend Editor states, that “could it be relied on indeed,” my compendious method “would deserve notice with a view to Christian education, as,” on my plan, “the most certain way of enabling any one to discover, in a superior manner, the truths and doctrines of Christianity, is to leave

§458

§459

<sup>1</sup> Rammohan is probably referring to his visit at Serampore in 1816, when he was invited by Eustace Carey, see BMS, *Periodical No. XXXII*, 118-119.

<sup>2</sup> §283.

him till the age of thirty or forty without any religious impres-<sup>/355</sup>sions.”<sup>1</sup> (Page 503.) I do not in the least wonder at his disapprobation of my suggestion, as the Editor, in common with other professors of traditional opinions, is sure of supporters of his favourite doctrine so long as it is inculcated on the minds of youths and even infants, who, being once thoroughly impressed with the name of the Trinity in Unity and Unity in Trinity, long before they can think for themselves, must be always inclined, even after their reason has become matured, to interpret the sacred books, even those texts which are evidently inconsistent with this doctrine, in a manner favourable to their prepossessed opinion, whether their study be continued for three, or thirty, or twice thirty years. Could Hindooism continue after the present generation, or bear the studious examination of a single year, if the belief of their idols being endued with animation were not carefully impressed on the young before they come to years of understanding?

§460 Let me here suggest, that, in my humble opinion, no truly liberal and wise parent can ever take advantage of the unsuspecting and confiding credulity of his children, to impress them with an implicit belief in any set of abstruse doctrines, and intolerance of all other opinions, the truth or reasonableness of which they are incapable of estimating. Still less would he urge by threats the danger of present and eternal punishment for withholding a blind assent to opinions they are unable to comprehend. Parents are bound by every moral tie to give their children such an <sup>/356</sup> education as may be sufficient to render them capable of exercising their reason as rational and social beings, and of forming their opinion on religious points, without ill-will towards others, from a thorough investigation of the Scriptures, and of the evidence and arguments adduced by teachers of different persuasions. Judgments thus formed have a real claim to respect from those who have not the means of judging for themselves. But of what consequence is it, in a question of truth or error, to know how the matter at issue has been considered, even for a hundred generations, by those who have blindly adopted the creed of their fathers? Surely the unbiassed judgment of a person who has proceeded to the study of the Sacred Scriptures with an anxious desire to discover the truth they contain, even if his researches were to be continued but for a single twelvemonth, ought, as far as authority goes in such matters, to outweigh the opinions of any number who have either not thought at all for themselves, or have studied after prejudice had laid hold of their minds. What fair inquiry respecting the doctrine of the Trinity can be expected from one who has been on the bosom of his mother constantly taught to ask the blessing of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, and to hear the very name of Unitarian with horror? Have the doctrines of the Vedant ever succeeded in suppressing polytheism

---

<sup>1</sup> §283.

amongst the generality of Hindoos brought up with the notion of the godhead of the sun, of fire, /357 and of water, and of the separate and independent existence of the allegorical representations of the attributes of God?<sup>1</sup> Were the sublime works written by the learned among the Greeks ever able to shake the early acquired superstitious notions and polytheistical faith of the generality of their countrymen? Nay, even when Christian converts became numerous, did not those who were brought up in the ancient superstition introduce some vestiges of their idolatry into their new persuasion? In fact, nothing can more surely impede the progress of truth than prejudice instilled into minds blank to receive impressions; and the more unreasonable are the doctrines of a religion, the greater pains are taken by the supporters of them to plant them in the readily susceptible minds of youth.

The Editor has filled a complete page in proving that besides early impressed prejudices, there are also other causes of error in judgment<sup>2</sup>—an attempt which might have been dispensed with, for I never limited the sources of mistake in examining religious matters to early impression alone. I attributed only the prevailing errors in Christianity to traditional instructions inculcated in childhood, as the language of my Second Appeal will shew. “Having derived my own opinion on this subject entirely from the Scriptures themselves, I may perhaps be excused for the confidence with which I maintain them against those of so great a majority who appeal to the same authority for theirs, inasmuch as I attribute the different /358 views, not to any inferiority of judgment compared with my own limited ability, but to the powerful effects of early religious impressions; for when these are deep, reason is seldom allowed its natural scope in examining them to the bottom.”<sup>3</sup> (Pp. 304–305.) If the Editor doubt the accuracy of this remark, he might soon satisfy himself of its justice, were he to listen to the suggestion offered in the preceding paragraph with a view to ascertain whether the doctrine of the Trinity rests for its belief on scriptural authorities or on early religious impressions. §461

The Editor mentions ironically, (in page 3,) that my success in scriptural studies was such “as to prove that the most learned and pious in every age of the church have been so completely mistaken as to transform the pure religion of Jesus into the most horrible idolatry.”<sup>4</sup> In answer to this, I only beg to ask the Reverend Editor to let me know first what a Protestant in the fifteenth century could have answered, if he had been thus questioned by a Roman Catholic: “Is your success in examining the truths of scripture such as to prove that the most learned and pious in every age of the church have been so completely mistaken as to transform the pure religion §462

<sup>1</sup> Rammohan’s understanding of the allegorical representations of the Godhead in Hinduism had been explained by him in Rammohan, *Abridgment*, 8–10.

<sup>2</sup> §284. <sup>3</sup> §255. <sup>4</sup> §283.

of Jesus into the most horrible idolatry, by introducing the worship of Mary the mother of God, and instituting images in churches, as well as by acknowledging the pope as the head of the church, vested with the power of forgiving sins?" Would not his answer be this? "My success is indeed so as to prove these /359 doctrines to be unscriptural. As to your inferences, they are no more divine than mine; and though I do not doubt the piety and learning of many Christians of your church in every age, I am persuaded that many corruptions, introduced into the Christian religion by the Roman heathens converted in the fourth and fifth centuries, have been handed down through successive generations by impressions made in the early part of life, and have taken such root in the minds of men, that piety and learning have fallen short of eradicating prejudices nourished by church and state, as well as by the vulgar superstition and enthusiasm." Were this reply justifiable, I also might be allowed to offer the following answer: "I find not the doctrine of the Trinity in the Scriptures; I cannot receive any human creed for divine truth; but, without charging the supporters of this doctrine with impiety or fraud, humbly attribute their misinterpretation of the Scriptures to 'early religious impressions.'"

§463 The Editor assigns as a reason for his omission of several arguments in the Second Appeal, that "we have before us a work of a hundred and seventy-three pages, to an examination of which we can scarcely devote half that number: and while to leave a single page unnoticed, might by some be deemed equivalent to leaving it unanswered, the mere transcription of the passages to be answered, were it done in every instance, would occupy nearly all the room we can give the reply itself. We shall there-/360fore, adduce such evidence for these doctrines as, if sound, will render every thing urged against them nugatory, though not particularly noticed."<sup>1</sup> To enable the public to compare the extent of the Second Appeal with that of the Review, I beg to observe, that the former contains 173 widely-printed, and the latter 128 closely-printed, pages, and that, if any one will take the trouble of comparing the number of words per page in the two Essays, he will soon satisfy himself that the one is as long as the other.<sup>2</sup> I will afterwards notice, in the course of the present reply, whether or not "the evidence of these doctrines," adduced by the Editor in the Review, has still left a great many arguments in the Appeal quite unanswered.

§464 In his attempt to prove the insufficiency of the precepts of Jesus to procure men peace and happiness, the Reverent Editor advanced the following position, "that the most excellent precepts, the most perfect law, can never lead to happiness and peace, unless by causing men to take refuge in the doctrine of the cross,"<sup>3</sup> (No. I. Quarterly Series of the Friend of India, page 111,) without adducing any arguments having reference to the position. I therefore brought to his recollection (in my First and Second

---

<sup>1</sup> §282. <sup>2</sup> In fact, the *Second Appeal* is about 10,000 words longer. <sup>3</sup> §91.

Appeals) such authorities of the gracious author of Christianity, as, I conceived, established the sufficiency of these precepts for leading to comfort, and solicited the Editor “to point out, in order to establish his position, even a single passage pronounced /361 by Jesus, enjoining refuge in the doctrine of the cross, as all-sufficient or indispensable for salvation.”<sup>1</sup> (P. 153. of the Second Appeal.) The Editor, instead of endeavouring to demonstrate the truth of his assertion as to the insufficiency of the precepts to conduct men to happiness, or shewing a single passage of the nature applied for, introduces a great number of other passages of scripture which he thinks well calculated to prove, that the death of Jesus was an atonement for the sins of mankind. I regret that the Editor should have adopted such an irregular mode of arguing in solemn religious discussion; and I still more regret to find that some readers should overlook the want of connexion between the position advanced and the authorities adduced by the Editor. Were we both to adopt such a mode of controversy as to cite passages apparently favourable to our respective opinions, without adhering to the main ground, the number of his Reviews and of my Appeals would increase at least in proportion to the number of the years of our lives; for verses and quotations of scripture, if unconnected with their context, and interpreted without regard to the idiom of the languages in which they were written, may, as experience has shewn, be adduced to support any doctrine whatever: and the Editor may always find a majority of readers, of the same religious sentiments with himself, satisfied with any thing that he may offer either in behalf of the Trinity or in support of the Atonement. /362

Whether Jesus died actually as a sacrifice for the sins of men, or merely in fulfilment of the duties of his office as the Messiah, as it was predicted, is merely a matter of opinion, the truth of which can only be ascertained from a diligent examination of the terms used and doctrines set forth in the evangelical writings. This, however, has no relation to a proof or disproof of the sufficiency of his precepts for salvation. In order to come to a conclusion as to the value of the precepts of Jesus being either really effectual or merely nominal, I deem it necessary to repeat a few passages already quoted in my Appeals, to ask the Editor, whether they demand explicit belief, or are unworthy of credit;—and, in case he admit the former alternative, I should beg to ask him, whether they confirm the opinion that the precepts preached by Jesus are sufficient to lead men to eternal peace and happiness, or are a set of sentences delivered by him conformably to the principles of his hearers, similar to other codes of moral law written by the ancient philosophers of Greece, Egypt, and India? The passages in question are as follow:

*Mark* xii. 29: “And Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments is,

<sup>1</sup> §111.

§465

§466

Mk 12:29-31 Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment. And the second is like unto it, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. /363 There is none other commandment greater than these." Is there another commandment absolutely enjoining refuge in the doctrine of the cross, so as to shew that these two commandments are insufficient for salvation, and comparatively insignificant?

§467 *Matt.* vii. 24: "Therefore, whosoever heareth these sayings of mine," (alluding to the precepts contained in ch. v., vi., and vii.,) "and doth them, I will liken him unto a wise man who built his house upon a rock," &c. Are not these sayings declared by Jesus to afford a stable foundation, on which may be raised the indestructible edifice of eternal life? *John* xv. 10: "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love." Ver. 14: "Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you." I therefore ask the Reverend Editor to shew a commandment of Jesus directing refuge in the doctrine of the cross, in the same explicit way as he has enjoined love to God and to neighbours, and obedience to his precepts as sufficient means for attaining eternal happiness. Did not Jesus, in *Matt.* xxv. 31, et seq., by means of a parable in the description of the day of judgment, declare that acts of charity and beneficence toward fellow-creatures will be accepted as the manifestation of love towards God, and be the sufficient cause of eternal life?

§468 With a view to depreciate the weight of the following explicit promise of Jesus, "Do this, and thou shalt live," the Editor interprets, (page 509,) that "Jesus, taking him" (the lawyer) "on his own /364 principles, as though he had been what he vainly imagined himself, a sinless man who needed no Saviour, directed him to the whole of the divine law, adding, 'This do, and thou shalt live,' though he knew that it was utterly impossible for that lawyer to observe his instructions."<sup>1</sup> The Editor, however, quite forgot, that by his attempt to undervalue the precepts of Jesus, he was actually degrading the dignity of the author of them; for, according to his interpretation, it appears, that as the lawyer tempted Jesus by putting to him a question which he thought the Saviour could not answer, so Jesus, in return, tempted him by directing him to do what he knew to be impossible for a man to perform, though this very teacher forbids others to shew revenge even to enemies. Did Jesus take also the scribe "upon his own principles" by instructing him in these two commandments?\* — a man who was never inclined to tempt Jesus, but "having heard him reasoning, and perceiving that he had answered well, asked him, Which is the first commandment of all?"<sup>†</sup> and when he heard the reply of Jesus, he said, "Well Master, thou hast said

\* Mark xii. 29. † Mark xii. 28-34.

<sup>1</sup> §291; this quotation is not exact, but renders the meaning.

the truth,”—a man whom Jesus declared to be at least out of danger of hell from his acknowledgment of the truth of his precepts as the means of salvation, telling him, “*Thou art not far from the kingdom of heaven*”? Did Jesus on the Mount take also his disciples “upon their /365 own principle,” as though they had been what they vainly imagined themselves, sinless men, who needed no Saviour, in directing them to his precepts, the observance of which he knew utterly impossible, and in holding out promises\* of eternal salvation as the necessary consequence of their obedience to those sayings? Were we to follow the mode of interpretation adopted in this instance by the Editor, the Bible would serve only to suit our convenience, and would not be esteemed any longer as a guide to mankind; for, according to the same mode of interpretation, would it not be justifiable to explain *Matt.* xxviii. 19, “Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them,” &c., that Jesus took his apostles “upon their own principle,” as firmly persuaded to believe in the sanctification attainable by the baptism introduced by John the Baptist, although he was aware that immersion in water could produce no effect in changing the state of the heart?

Mt 7:24–27

Mt 28:19

In reply to his question, “[Did Jesus, who knew the hearts of all, regard this lawyer as perfectly sinless, an exception to all mankind?](#)”<sup>1</sup> (page 9,) I must say, that the context seems to me to shew that neither Jesus considered the lawyer to be a sinless, perfect man, (as is evident from his directing him to the Scriptures for a guide to salvation—“Do this, and thou shalt live,” and “Go and do thou likewise,”) nor did the lawyer vainly imagine himself /366 “[a sinless man who needed no Saviour,](#)” though he endeavoured to put the claim of Jesus to that title to the proof, in these words, “Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?”

§469

Although I declared in the Second Appeal, (page 150,) that by the term “law,” in the verse “If righteousness came by the law, Christ is dead in vain,” all the commandments found in the books of Moses are understood,<sup>2</sup> yet the Reverend Editor charges me with an unintelligible expression, and intimates his inability to ascertain whether I meant by “law,” the ceremonial or the moral part of the books of Moses.<sup>3</sup> (Page 507.) I therefore beg to explain the verse more fully, that the Reverend Editor may have an opportunity of commenting upon it at large. St. Paul, knowing the efficacy of the perfection introduced by Jesus into the law given by Moses, declares, that had the system of the Mosaical law been sufficient to produce light among the Jews and Gentiles, without being perfected by Jesus, this attempt made by Christ to perfect it would have been superfluous, and his death, which was the consequence of his candid instructions, would have been to no purpose.

§470

Ga 2:21

The Editor notices frequently my expression of the neglect of duty on the part

§471

\* *Matt.* vii. 24, 25.

<sup>1</sup> §291. <sup>2</sup> §109. <sup>3</sup> §288.



of man to the Creator and to his fellow-creatures; nevertheless, he fills up more than two pages in proving this point. He has not, however, attempted to counteract the force of the passages I quoted in both of my Appeals, /367 shewing that the guilt occasioned by the want of due obedience to the precepts in question may be pardoned through repentance, prescribed by the author of those precepts as the sure and only remedy for human failure. I therefore beg to ask the Editor to give a plain explanation of the following passage, selected from my Appeals, that the reader may be able to judge whether or not repentance can procure us the blessings of pardon for our constant omissions in the discharge of the duties laid down in the precepts of Jesus. *Luke* v. 32: "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." Does not Jesus here declare a chief object of his mission to be the calling of sinners to repentance? *Luke* xxiv. 47: "That repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations." Did not Jesus by this commandment to his disciples declare the remission of sins as an immediate and necessary consequence of repentance? In *Luke* xiii. 3, "Except you repent, you shall all likewise perish," the indispensability of repentance for the forgiveness of sins is explicitly declared. Is not also the mercy of God illustrated by the example of a father forgiving the transgressions of his son through his sincere repentance alone, in the parable of the Prodigal Son? Those who place confidence in the divine mission of Jesus, or even in his veracity, will not hesitate, I trust, for a moment, to admit that Jesus has directed us to sincere repentance as the only means of procuring pardon, knowing the inability of /368 men to give entire obedience to his precepts; and that Jesus would have recommended the lawyer, whom he directed to righteousness, to have recourse to repentance "had he gone and sincerely attempted" to obey his precepts, "watching his own heart to discern those constant neglects of duty he owed to the Creator and to his fellow-creatures," and then applied to Jesus for the remedy of his discerned imperfections.<sup>1</sup>

§472 I find abundant passages in the Old Testament also representing other sources than sacrifices, as sufficient means of procuring pardon for sin. *Psalms* li. 17: "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit: a broken and contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise." *Ezekiel* xviii. 30: "Repent, and turn yourselves from all your transgressions; so iniquity shall not be your ruin." *Prov.* xvi. 6: "By mercy and truth iniquity is purged, and by the fear of the Lord men depart from evil." *Isaiah* i. 18: "Come now,

<sup>1</sup> Marshman included Rammohan's words about the "constant neglects of the duty he owed to the Creator and to his fellow-creatures" (§112) in §291: "And had he gone and sincerely attempted this, watching his own heart to discern those 'constant neglects of the duty he owed to the Creator and to his fellow-creatures' found according to our author in the best and wisest of men, he might in one hour have detected his own guilt, and have come to Jesus as one of those sinners whom he came to seek and to save."



and let us reason together, saith the Lord. Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool.”

To shew the inefficacy of repentance to procure pardon, the Editor appeals to human justice, which, as he says, “[inquires not about the repentance of the robber and murderer, but respecting his guilt. The law, indeed, knows no repentance.](#)”<sup>1</sup> (Page 506.) I therefore wish to know whether or nor human justice suffers an innocent man to be killed to atone for /369 the guilt of theft or murder committed by another? It is, at all events, more consistent with justice, that a judge who has the privilege of shewing mercy, should forgive the crimes of those that truly feel the pain and distress of mind inseparable from sincere repentance, than that he should put an innocent man to death, or destroy his own life, to atone for the guilt of some of his condemned culprits.

§473

/370

CHAPTER II. INQUIRY INTO THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT.

In his first Review, the Editor began with what he considered “[the most abstruse and yet the most important of Christian doctrines, the Deity of Jesus Christ,](#)”<sup>2</sup> and then proceeded to substantiate the doctrine of his atonement. I therefore followed this course of arrangement in my Second Appeal; but as the Editor has introduced the doctrine of the atonement of Jesus first in the present Review, I will also arrange my reply accordingly.

§474

The Editor quotes first, *Gen.* iii. 15: “I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.” From this passage he attempts to deduce the atonement of Jesus for the sins of men, demanding, “[What could a reptile feel relative to the fate of its offspring through future ages? Or what individual serpent did the seed of the woman break the head so as for it to bruise his heel?](#)” “Jesus, then,” he affirms, “[is the seed of the woman, who suffered from the malice of Satan, while he on the cross destroyed his power by atoning for sin and reconciling man to God.](#)”<sup>3</sup> (Page 517.) I admit that a reptile, as far as human experience goes, is incapable of feeling “relative to the fate of its offspring through future ages;” but I wish to /371 know if a mere reptile could not have the power of conversation so as to persuade a woman to adhere to its advice? Whether the ass of Balaam could be possessed of the power of seeing exclusively the angel of God, and conversing with its own master, Balaam? And whether ravens could diligently supply the wants of Elijah, by bringing him bread and flesh morning and evening? Are not these occurrences equally difficult to

§475

Gn 3:14–19

Nb 22:21–35

1 K 17:1–7

---

<sup>1</sup> §286. <sup>2</sup> §64. <sup>3</sup> §300.

reconcile to “common sense” as the case of the serpent is, according to the Editor? Yet we find these stated in the sacred books, and we are taught to believe them as they stand. Can we justly attempt to represent the ass and those ravens also as either angelical or demoniacal spirits, in the same way as the reptile is represented by the Editor to have been no other than Satan? We might, in that case, be permitted to give still greater latitude to metaphor, so as to take all the facts found in the Bible as merely allegorical representations; but would not the consequence of such interpretations be most dangerous to the cause of truth? The verse in question, with its context, thus runs: “And the Lord God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above\* all cattle and above every beast of the field: upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life. And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise /372 thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.” Do not the phrases, “Thou art cursed above *all cattle*,” and “above *every beast* of the field,” shew clearly that the serpent thus addressed was really no spirit in borrowed form, but the animal so denominated? Does not the circumstance of the serpent being condemned to move upon its belly, and to eat dust all the days of its life, evidently imply that the serpent thus cursed was of the same class that we now see subject to that very malediction to the present day? The sins of fathers are declared in the Scriptures to have been visited by God on their posterity; would it not be, therefore, more consistent with scriptural authorities to attribute the misery of serpents to the heinous conduct of their first origin, than to Satan, of whom no mention is made throughout the chapter in question?

§476 But, in fact, has the power of Satan over the seed of the woman been destroyed? The consequences of the sin which our first parents committed by the ill advice of the reptile, and which they implanted in the nature of their posterity, have been, that women bring forth children in sorrow, and are ruled by their husbands, and that the earth brings forth thorns also and thistles to men, who eat the herb of the field with labour, and return at last to dust. (*Gen.* iii. 16-19.) If Jesus actually atoned for sin, and delivered men from its consequences, how can those men and women who believe in his atonement be still, equally with others, liable to the evil /373 effects of the sins already remitted by the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus?

§477 If, notwithstanding all the above-stated facts and arguments, the Editor still insists that Satan should be understood by the reptile mentioned in the verse, and Jesus be the seed of the woman, yet his interpretation cannot apply in the least to the doctrine of the atonement. It would imply only, that, as Satan opposed the power of Jesus to procure salvation for all men, as he intended, so Jesus diminished his power and

\* מכל, composed of two words, מן and כל; i. e. *out of all*.

disappointed him by leading many to salvation through his divine precepts. I know not how to answer the question of the Editor, “Of what individual serpent did the seed of the woman break the head, so as for it to bruise his heel?”<sup>1</sup> unless by referring him to the reciprocal injuries which man and serpents inflict on each other.

The Editor refers to the circumstance of the sacrifice offered by Abel, and approved of God in preference to his brother Cain’s, (*Gen.* iv. 4,) esteeming it as an illustration of the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus for the remission of sin.<sup>2</sup> (Page 518.) But I am unable to find out what relation there could exist between the acceptance of the offering of Abel by Jehovah, and the death of Jesus, whether sacrificial or not. The Editor, however, founds his assertion, that Abel having looked forward to the atonement of Jesus, his offerings were accepted by God, upon the circumstance of Abraham’s seeing the day of Christ by prophetic anticipation, (*John* viii. 56,) and /374 of Moses having esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt, (*Heb.* xi. 26,) they all having been “of the same catalogue.”<sup>3</sup> I therefore should hope to be informed whether there be any authority justifying this inference. On the contrary, we find the fourth verse of the same chapter of Genesis points out, that Abel having been accustomed to do well, in obedience to the will of God, contrary to the practice of his brother, righteous Jehovah accepted his offering, and rejected that of Cain; to which Paul thus alludes, “By faith Abel offered a more excellent sacrifice than Cain,” (*Hebrews* xi. 4,) without leaving us doubtful as to the sense in which that apostle used the word “faith” in the above verse.

“By faith Abel offered unto God,” &c. “By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death,” &c. “But without faith it is impossible to please him; for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them who diligently seek him.” Here St. Paul gives us /375 to understand that the “faith” which procured for Abel, Enoch, Noah, and all the other patriarchs, the grace of God, was their belief in the *existence* of God, and in his being their *rewarder*, and not in any sacrifice, personal or vicarious. What could prophetic anticipation by Abraham,

§478

Gn 4:4

Jn 8:56

Heb 11:26

Heb 11:4

§479

Heb 11:6

\* (Improved Version of the New Testament,) Gr., “The reproach of Christ,” or, “of the anointed.” The Israelites are called Christ’s, or anointed, i. e. a chosen and favoured people, Psalm cv. 15, Heb. iii. 13. “The meaning is,” says Dr. Sykes, in loc., “that Moses looked upon the contempt and indignity which he underwent on account of his professing himself a Jew, as much preferable to all the riches and honours of Egypt.” See also Whitby, in loc. Dr. Newcome’s Version is, “such reproach as Christ endured,” which is also the interpretation of Photius, Crellius, and Mr. Lindsey, Sequel, page 278.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> §300. <sup>2</sup> §301. <sup>3</sup> §303.

<sup>4</sup> Rammohan copied the footnote from NTIV, *Ed.* 5, 473, word by word. As in other instances, the Editors of the *Improved Version* assemble various opinions contradicting the traditional view, but also each other. In this case even the sources are partly quoted against their original meaning. Rammohan, merely copying it, is of course not responsible for this problematic approach.

of the divine commission of Jesus, have to do with Abel's conduct, in rendering his sacrifices acceptable to God, that any one can esteem the one as the necessary consequence of the other? Moses having called himself a Jew, gave preference to the term "anointed," or "Israelite," a term of reproach among the Egyptians in those days, over all the riches and honour of Egypt, which he might have obtained by declaring himself an Egyptian instead of a Jew; or Moses esteemed (according to the English version) in his prophetic power, the reproach to which Christ would be made liable by the Jews in the fulfilment of his divine commission, greater riches than all the grandeur of Egyptian unbelievers. But neither explanation can support the idea that Abel, or any other patriarch, had in view the sacrificial death of Jesus in rendering their offering acceptable to God.

§480

It is true, as the Editor observes, that sacrifices are divine institutions as a manifestation of obedience to God, through the oblation of any thing that may be dear to man, whether common, as an animal, or dearly valuable, as one's own son. But they are not represented in any of the sacred books as means having intrinsically the power of procuring men /376 pardon and eternal salvation. They seem, in fact, intended for men unaccustomed to the worship of God in truth and spirit. The following passages suffice to illustrate this beyond doubt.

Mi 6:7f.

*Micah* vi. 7, 8: "Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my first born for many transgression; the fruit of my body for the sin of the soul? He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good, and what doth the Lord *require* of thee *but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly* with thy God?" Here Jehovah, while shewing his displeasure at mere animal sacrifices, enjoins just actions and humility in lieu of them, as worthy to be accepted by God, without substituting human sacrifices in their stead.

Ho 6:6

*Hosea* vi. 6: "For I desired mercy, *and not sacrifice*, and the knowledge of God more than burnt-offerings." *Isaiah* 1–11, [i. 11, 16–18], "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord. I am full of the burnt-offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he-goats.—Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow. Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord; though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be *as white as snow*," &c. Does not Jehovah here substitute good works alone for sacrifices, as real /377 means of taking away sin?

Is 1:11, 16–18

Ps 50:8–15

*Psalms* l. 8 [8–15]: "I will not reprove thee for thy sacrifices or thy burnt-offerings, to have been continually before me. I will take no bullock out of thy house, nor he-goats out of thy folds. For every beast of the forest is mine, and the cattle upon a thousand hills. I know all the fowls of the mountains: and the wild beasts of the field are mine. If I were hungry, I would not tell thee; for the world is mine, and the fulness thereof. Will I eat the flesh of bulls,

or drink the blood of goats? Offer unto God thanksgiving; and pay thy vows unto the Most High; and call upon me in the day of trouble: I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me." Jehovah, who protests against the idea of the flesh of bulls being supposed his food, and the blood of goats his drink, cannot be supposed to have had delight in human blood, the blood of his beloved Son. *Sam.* xv. 22: "And Samuel said, Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." *Prov.* xxi. 3: "To do justice and judgment is more acceptable to the Lord than sacrifice." *Eccles.* v. 1: "Keep thy foot when thou goest to the house of God, and be more ready to hear than to give the *sacrifice of fools*. For they consider not that they *do evil*."

1 S 15:22

Pr 21:3

Qo 5:1

It is now left for us to ascertain in what sense we should take such phrases as, "This man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins;" "Christ hath once /378 appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself;" "Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate;" "I am the living bread;" "If any man eat of this," &c. Whether do these passages imply that Jesus, though he preferred mercy to sacrifice, (*Matt.* ix. 13, xii. 7,) did actually sacrifice himself, and offer his own blood to God as an atonement for the sins of others, or do they mean that Jesus, knowing already that the fulfilment of his divine commission would endanger his life, never hesitated to execute it, and suffered his blood to be shed in saving men from sin through his divine precepts and pure example, which were both opposed to the religious system adopted by his contemporary Jews? Were we to follow the former mode of interpretation, and take all these phrases in their strictly literal sense, we must be persuaded to believe that God, not being contented with the blood of bulls and goats and other animal sacrifices, offered to him by the Israelites, insisted upon the offer of the blood and life of his Son, as the condition of his forgiving sins of men; and that Jesus accordingly offered his blood to propitiate God, and also proposed to men actually to eat his flesh! Would not the doctrines of Christianity, in this case representing God as delighted with human victims, and directing men to cannibalism, appear monstrous to every civilized being? No one, unless biassed by prejudices, can justify such inconsistency as to interpret literally some of the above-mentioned phrases /379 in support of the doctrine of the atonement, and explain the last-quoted figuratively, as they are all confessedly alike subversive of every rational idea of the nature of the Divine justice and mercy.

§481

Heb 10:12; 9:26;  
13:12

Jn 6:51

Mt 9:13; 12:7

To avoid such a stigma upon the pure religion of Jesus, it is incumbent, I think, upon us to follow the latter mode of interpretation, and to understand from the passages referred to, that Jesus, the spiritual Lord and King of Jews and Gentiles, in fulfilment of the duties of his mission, exposed his own life for the benefit of his subjects, purged their sins by his doctrines, and persevered in executing the com-

§482

mands of God even to the undergoing of bodily suffering in the miserable death of the cross—a self-devotion or sacrifice of which no Jewish high-priest had ever offered an example.

§483 Ought not this belief in the unbounded beneficence of Jesus to excite superior gratitude, love, and reverence towards our Saviour and King, than the idea that he, as God above mortal afflictions, borrowed human nature for a season<sup>1</sup>, and offered this fictitious man as a sacrifice for the remission of sin, while he himself was no more afflicted with that sacrificial death than with the sufferings of other human individuals! If there be in this latter case any gratitude felt for the afflictions which attached to the death of the cross, it should be manifested to that temporary man Jesus, and not to Jesus the Christ, whom the Editor and other Trinitarians esteem as God above pain and death. /380

§484 If it be urged that it is inconsistent with common justice to pardon sin that requires the capital punishment of death without an atonement for it, it may be replied, that the perfection of divine justice, as well as other attributes of God, should not be measured by what are found in, and adopted by the human race. Is it consistent with our common notions of justice to visit the sins of fathers on their descendants, as Ex 20:5 God ascribed to himself, *Exodus* xx. 5.? Is it consistent with our common notions of justice to afflict men with infinite punishment for their finite guilt, as Jesus declares Mt 18:8 in *Matthew* xviii. 8.? Even in the present case, would it be consistent with common notions of justice to afflict an innocent man with the death of the cross, for sins committed by others, even supposing the innocent man should voluntarily offer his life in behalf of those others? We can have no idea of the perfection of divine justice, mercy, and wrath, unless from what is revealed to us; and as we find in the sacred books, that sins have been pardoned in consequence of the intercession of righteous men, without any sacrificial atonement, we should, therefore, be contented with those authorities, and should not entertain doubt as to pardon being bestowed upon those who have had the advantage of the intercession of Jesus, exalted as he was by God over all prophets and righteous men that ever lived.

§485 *Numb.* xiv. 19, 20, Moses prayed to the Lord, “Pardon, I beseech thee, the iniquity of this peo-/381ple according unto the greatness of thy mercy, and as thou hast forgiven this people, from Egypt even until now; and the Lord said, I have pardoned Nb 14:19f. according to thy word.” 2 *Chron.* xxx. 18—20: “For a multitude of the people, even 2 Ch 30:18–20 many of Ephraim, and Manasseh, Issachar and Zebulun, had not cleansed themselves, yet did they eat the passover otherwise than it was written. But Hezekiah prayed for them, saying, The good Lord pardon every one that prepareth his heart to seek God, the Lord God of his fathers, though he be not cleansed according to

<sup>1</sup> “His glory he may for a season lay aside, but his Divine Nature he can never change”, §376.

the purification of the sanctuary. And the Lord hearkened to Hezekiah, and healed the people." *Psalm* cvi. 23: "Therefore he said that he would destroy them, had not Ps 106:23  
Moses, his chosen, stood before him in the breach, to turn away his wrath, lest he should destroy them." Did not Jehovah here forgive the sins of Israel from the intercession of Moses, without having the least reference to the offer of animal or human blood? *Psalm* xxxii. 5: "I acknowledged my sin unto thee, and mine iniquity have I Ps 32:5  
not hid; I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord, and thou *forgavest* the iniquity of my sin." Were not sins forgiven in this instance also, through confession and humility, without blood-offerings? *Psalm* cxli. 2: "Let *my prayer be set forth* Ps 141:2  
before thee as incense; and the *lifting up of my hands* as the evening sacrifice." *Isaiah* lv. 7: "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let Is 55:7  
him return unto the Lord, /382 and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon." *Jer.* vii. 21–23: "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God Jr 7:21–23  
of Israel; Put your *burnt-offerings unto your sacrifices, and eat flesh*. For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning *burnt-offerings* or sacrifices. But this thing commanded I them, saying, *Obey my voice*, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people," &c. Here we find prayers and obedience preferred to animal sacrifices, as means of pardon, and no reference, direct or figurative, to propitiation, to be made by human blood. Such an attempt, therefore, as to represent human blood, or that of God in human form, in lieu of animal blood, as an indispensable atonement for sins, is, I think, unscriptural.

The Editor quotes, (p. 519,) *Heb.* x., "It is not possible that the blood of bulls §486  
and [of] goats should take away sins. Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but Heb 10:4–6  
a body hast thou prepared me. In burnt-offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure." And he attempts thereby to prove that "*sacrifices, considered in themselves, then, were never desired by God; they are approved merely with a view to his making atonement for whom God had prepared a body,*" and that "*they ceased after he had offered himself a sacrifice for sin.*"<sup>1</sup> How strange is the idea, that "God, who preserves man and beast, nor suffers a sparrow to fall to the ground without his /383 permission,"<sup>2</sup> and by whom sacrifices "*were never desired for their own sake,*" should have caused millions of animals to be slaughtered, at different times, by men, under the mistaken notion of their being an atonement for sins, while he has been

<sup>1</sup> §304.

<sup>2</sup> Marshman: "But what does a man say who brings a living victim and offers it in sacrifice? That he deserved death for his transgressions and offers this victim instead of himself. Indeed it is difficult to say on what other principle God, who preserveth man and beast, nor suffers a sparrow to fall to the ground without his permission, should approve the slaughter of an innocent animal, otherwise than for food", §301.

remitting iniquity from eternity, referring only to the real and sufficient atonement made by Jesus for the sins of all men that ever lived from the beginning of the world!

§487 How inconsistent is such an idea with the known mercy of that Providence, whose unwillingness to receive human sacrifices was such, that when Abraham had proved his fidelity by binding his son on the altar, God stayed his hand from the sacrifice, and produced a ram, unexpectedly, before him, which he was graciously pleased to accept as an offering in *the stead of Isaac!* (*Genesis xxii. 13.*) How can we imagine that God should have received the offering which he himself had thus prepared, with reference solely to the future sacrifice of a being far superior in excellence to Isaac, whose life he mercifully preserved?

Gn 22:9-13

§488 As to the above-cited verses, they rather corroborate the second mode of interpretation, noticed in the preceding paragraphs, than the doctrine of a real human sacrifice in the Christian dispensation; for, in verses fifth and sixth, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews declares the dissatisfaction of God with sacrifices and offerings, in general terms, without limiting them to any particular species, /384 whether man or of animal. The language of the fifth verse, "Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me," confirms the idea that the divine disregard of mere sacrifice led to the preparation of a body for Jesus, through which he could impart to mankind the perfection of the will and laws of God in a manner consistent with the divine nature, teaching them to yield to God a heartfelt, instead of a ceremonial and outward obedience, and thereby putting an end to the further effusion of blood, as a testimony of humility, gratitude, and devotion.

§489 Hence, it appears more consistent with the context and the general tenor of scripture, to understand by the phrase, "The offering of the body of Jesus Christ," (quoted often by the Editor,) the death of Jesus as a spiritual and virtual sacrifice for the sins of all those for whom he became a mediator; inasmuch as by that death the blessed Saviour testified his perfect obedience and devotion to the will of his heavenly Father, and thereby vindicated to himself the unlimited favour of God. During his life he instructed mankind how they might render themselves worthy of the Divine mercy; by his death he qualified himself to be their intercessor at the heavenly throne, when sincere repentance was to be offered by them instead of perfect duty. We may easily account for the adoption by the apostles, with respect to him, of such terms as sacrifice and atonement for sin, and their repre- /385sented Jesus as the high-priest, engaged to take away the sins of the world by means of his blood. These were modes of speech made use of in allusion to the sacrifices and blood-offerings which the Jews and their high-priest used to make for the remission of sins; and the apostles wisely accommodated their instructions to the ideas and forms of language familiar to those whom they addressed.

§490 How inconsistent would it be in the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews to de-



clare, in one place, that God would not have sacrifice and offering; and again to announce, almost at the same moment, that he was so pleased with sacrifice, even with a human sacrifice, that for its sake he would forgive the sins of the world! Besides, in the Christian dispensation, sacrifice implies a spiritual offering required by God, not only from the author of this religion, but also from his disciples and followers; a fact which may be illustrated by sacred authority. 1 Peter ii. 4, 5: “To whom coming, as unto a *living stone*, disallowed indeed of men, but *chosen of God, and precious*, ye also, as *lively stones*, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up *spiritual sacrifices*, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ.” 1 P 2:4f.

I am not at all disposed to dispute the assertion of the Editor, (page 532,) that “a priest without atonement, however, had no existence in the Old Testament;”<sup>1</sup> but I must say, that a priest without atonement, has existence in the New Testament, and refer the Editor to the following verses, excluding /386 those that are applied to Jesus. Rev. i. 6, “And hath made kings and priests unto God;” xx. 6, “But they shall reign with him a thousand years;” 1 Peter ii. 5, “Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood.” Moreover, in explaining such phrases as, “I am the living bread,”—“If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever,”—“The bread that I will give is my flesh,”—“Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man,” and “Unless ye eat his flesh, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you,”—“My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed;” Protestant commentators take upon themselves to interpret, that these phrases are in allusion to the manner of sacrifice, and that the eating of the flesh of Jesus, and drinking his blood, must be understood in a spiritual, not in a carnal sense.<sup>2</sup> If these writers make so direct an encroachment upon the literal sense of those phrases, in order to avoid the idea of cannibalism being a tenet of Christianity, why should I not be justified upon the same principles, and on the authority of the apostle, in understanding by sacrifice, in the language of the apostle, a virtual oblation—that Christianity may not be represented as a religion founded upon the horrible system of human victims? Rv 1:6; 20:6  
1 P 2:5  
Jn 6:51–58

The Editor first refers (page 520) to “Noah’s sacrifice on his coming out of the ark;”<sup>3</sup> whence he concludes, that all the genuine religion of the new world was founded on the future atonement made by /387 Christ. He again mentions God having made a promise to Abraham, that in him “shall all the families of the earth be blessed;”<sup>4</sup> a blessing which came to the Gentiles through Jesus. He considers this circumstance of the communication of blessing, as fully foretelling the atonement of Jesus. The Editor has also quoted the passage in Job, “I know that my Redeemer liveth and that he shall stand in the latter day on the earth;” being of opinion, that Jn 492  
Gn 12:1–3  
Jb 19:25f.

<sup>1</sup> §322. <sup>2</sup> Rammohan is referring to the Reformed (not Lutheran) understanding of the Lord’s supper.

<sup>3</sup> §305. <sup>4</sup> §307.

the term redeemer being applied to Christ, proves either his atonement or his deity.<sup>1</sup> I must confess my inability to find out the connexion between these authorities and the conclusion drawn by the Editor from them. Did God, who, according to the Reverend Editor, had no delight even in animal sacrifice, anticipate great delight in human sacrifice, when Noah made an offering to him?

§493 May we not admit, that the divine promise to Abraham has been fulfilled in the blessings we enjoy, derived from the sacred instructions of Jesus, without assuming that other advantages have been reaped by us from the circumstance of his having shed his blood for us, exclusively considered? If not, how can Jesus assure us of the divine blessing merely through the observance of his instructions? *Matt.* v. 3–11, *Luke* xi. 28, “But, said he, (Jesus,) Yea, rather blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it.”

Mt 5:3–11; Lk  
11:27f.

§494 Could not Job, or any one, call another his redeemer or deliverer, without having allusion to his /388 blood? Cannot one being redeemed another without sacrificing his own blood? How is it, then, we find Jehovah, the Father of all, called redeemer, though in that capacity not considered even by Trinitarians to have had his blood shed as an atonement? *Isaiah* lxiii. 16: “Thou, O Lord, art our Father, our Redeemer.” *Isaiah* lx. 16: “Shalt know that I, Jehovah, am thy Saviour and thy Redeemer.”

Is 63:16; Is 60:16

§495 I wonder at the assertion of the Editor, that “the Messiah is not termed a redeemer merely on account of his teaching or his example. These,” he says, “could be of no value to Job, who lived so long before the appearance of Christ in the earth.”<sup>2</sup> I wish to know whether Job, an inspired writer, is to be considered as possessed of a knowledge of future events or not? as, in the former case, the circumstances of Christ’s atoning for sin, according to the Editor, and the nature and import of his divine instructions, were equally known to him, and he could call the Messiah redeemer in either view. In the latter case, (i. e. if he was unacquainted with future events while writing this passage,) then the doctrine of the atonement, and the saving truths inculcated by Christ, were, of course, equally hidden from him, and neither, consequently, could be of any value to Job, “who lived so long before Christ’s appearance in the earth.” The fact is, the verse of Job quoted by the Editor has no such obvious reference to the Messiah, that any one can be justified in applying to Jesus the term “Redeemer,” found in the same /389 verse. I therefore quote it with its context, that my readers may have a better opportunity of considering the subject in question. *Job* xix. 24–26: “That they (my words) were graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock for ever! For I know that my redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day\* upon the earth. And though after my *skin worms destroy* this body, yet

Jb 19:24–26

\* אחרון signifies properly *afterwards*, without any references to a particular day.

<sup>1</sup> §306. <sup>2</sup> §306.

in my flesh shall I see God.”

The Editor having urged in his first Review, (p. 101,) that the circumstance of the term “lamb” being twice applied to Jesus by John the Baptist, shewed that Jesus came into the world to sacrifice his life as an atonement for sin;<sup>1</sup> I observed to the Editor in my Second Appeal, (page 212,) that such terms as “lamb” and “sheep” were applied in scripture to the disciples of Jesus also; many of whom likewise suffered death in their attempt to withdraw men from sin; yet in their cases no allusion to the sacrificial lamb has ever been made; and that it might be, therefore, safely inferred, that the epithets “lamb” and “sheep” are merely figurative terms for innocence subjected to persecution.<sup>2</sup> The Editor, however, without noticing this observation, quotes in his present Review (page 522) some verses of the Epistles of Peter and John, in which the apostles use the same epithet “lamb,” applied to /390 their gracious Master.<sup>3</sup> It is obvious, from what I stated in my Second Appeal, that I did not dispute the application of that term to Jesus in the scriptural books. I only maintained, that no Christian, whether primitive or modern, could ever apply the word “lamb,” in its literal sense, to Jesus, who, as being above the angels of God, is of course far above the nature of a “lamb;” and that, under this consideration, it must have been used for innocence subjected to persecution, as we find the use of the word “lamb” very frequent elsewhere when applied to man. *John* xxi. 15, (already quoted in the Second Appeal,<sup>4</sup>) “Feed my lambs.” *Luke* x. 3, “Behold, I send you forth as lambs among wolves.” *Gen.* xxii. 7, 8, “And he (Isaac) said, Behold the fire and the wood; but where is the lamb for a burnt-offering? And Abraham said, My son, God will provide himself a lamb for a burnt-offering.” Wherein, Abraham doubtless meant his innocent son about to be subjected to a violent death, hiding the commandment of God from him, as appears from the following verses: “And they came to the place which God had told him of; and Abraham built an altar there, and laid the wood in order, and bound Isaac his son, and laid him on the altar upon the wood: and Abraham stretched forth his hand, and took the knife to slay his son.” *Jer.* xi. 19, “But I was like a lamb or an ox that is brought to the slaughter.”

§496

Jn 21:15; Lk 10:3

Gn 22:7f.

Jr 11:19

Upon the same principle, the apostles generally used “blood” for condescension to death, and “sa-/391crifice” for a virtual one, as I noticed fully in the preceding paragraphs.

§497

The Editor relates, (page 524,) that the priest used to lay his hands on the head of a living goat, “and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, putting them on the head of the goat, and by the hand of a fit person to send it away into the wilderness as an atonement for all their sins in every year.”<sup>5</sup> He then infers from this circumstance, that “commandments like these did more than merely

§498

Lv 16:1–30

<sup>1</sup> §76. <sup>2</sup> §147. <sup>3</sup> §308. <sup>4</sup> §147. <sup>5</sup> §310.

foretel the atonement of Christ.” Were we to consider at all the annual scape-goat as an indication of some other atonement for sin, we must esteem it as a sign of Aaron’s bearing the iniquities of Israel, both the scape-goat and Aaron having alike borne the sins of others without sacrificing their lives: but by no means can it be supposed a sign of the atonement of Christ, who, according to the author, bore the sins of men by the sacrifice of his own life, and had therefore no resemblance to the scape-goat or Aaron. *Exod.* xxviii. 38: “And it shall be upon Aaron’s forehead, that Aaron may bear the iniquity of the holy things which the children of Israel shall hallow in all their holy gifts; and it shall be always upon his forehead, that they may be accepted before the Lord.” I wonder that the Reverend Editor himself notices here that the iniquities of Israel were forgiven by confession over the scape-goat, without animal or human victims, and yet represents the circumstance of the *scape-goat* as a prediction of the /392 sacrificial *death* of Christ, and insists upon the forgiveness of sins being founded upon the effusion of blood.

Ex 28:38

§499 The Reverend Editor now begins with *Psalm* ii. 1, (page 527,) stating that in *Acts* iv., the apostles lifted up “their voices with one accord to God in the very words of the Psalms;”<sup>1</sup> adding verse 27, “For a truth, against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate with the Gentiles and the people of Israel were gathered together.” Secondly, he quotes *Psalm* xvi. 8–11, comparing them with *Acts* ii. 25–27;<sup>2</sup> 3rdly, *Psalm* xxii. 1, comparing it with *Heb.* ii. 10–12;<sup>3</sup> 4thly, *Psalm* xxxi. 5, while he repeats *Psalm* xl. 6–8, comparing them to *Heb.* x. 4;<sup>4</sup> 5thly, *Psalm* xlv. 6, 7, comparing it [them] with *Heb.* i. 8–12;<sup>5</sup> 6thly, *Psalm* lxviii. 18, applying it to *Ephes.* iv. 8–11;<sup>6</sup> 7thly, *Psalm* lxix. 1, 2, comparing them with *John* ii. 17, “The zeal of thy house hath eaten me up,” and with *Rom.* xv. 3, “Even Christ pleased not himself; but, as it is written, The reproaches of them that reproached thee fell on me;”<sup>7</sup> 8thly, *Psalm* lxxii. 7–11, 17;<sup>8</sup> 9thly, *Psalm* lxxxix. 19–37;<sup>9</sup> 10thly, *Psalm* cii. 4, 5, 10, quoting immediately after this, *Heb.* i. 7, without comparing one with the other;<sup>10</sup> 11thly, *Psalm* cxviii. 22;<sup>11</sup> 12thly, *Psalm* cx. 1, 4.<sup>12</sup> After having filled up more than six pages (527–533) with the quotations of the above Psalms, the Editor observes, that, “notwithstanding the abundant evidence of the atonement, and even the deity /393 of Christ, already adduced from the Pentateuch and the Psalms,” &c.<sup>13</sup> But I regret that none of these Psalms appear to me to bear the least reference to the principle of vicarious sacrifice as an atonement for sin, except *Psalm* fourteenth<sup>14</sup>, in which a declaration of the displeasure of Jehovah at sacrifice in general is made, and which I have fully examined in the preceding paragraphs. I therefore beg my

<sup>1</sup> §314. <sup>2</sup> §315. <sup>3</sup> §316. <sup>4</sup> §317. <sup>5</sup> §318. <sup>6</sup> §319. <sup>7</sup> §320. <sup>8</sup> §320. <sup>9</sup> §321. <sup>10</sup> §321.

<sup>11</sup> §322. <sup>12</sup> §323. <sup>13</sup> §323.

<sup>14</sup> Ps 14 was not quoted, surely Ps 40:6 is meant. (“Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire; mine ears hast thou opened: burnt offering and sin offering hast thou not required.”)

readers to look over all the Psalms introduced here by the Editor, and to form their opinion whether these are properly applied to the discussion of the doctrine of the atonement; and should they find them having little or no relation to a proof of the atonement, they may then judge whether the frequent complaint of the Editor of *the want of room*<sup>1</sup>, is or is not well founded.

I will examine his attempt to prove the deity of Jesus from these Psalms, in a subsequent chapter on the Trinity, but cannot omit to notice here two or three remarks made by the Editor, in the course of quoting these Psalms, on some of my assertions in the Second Appeal, leaving a decision on them to the free judgment of the public. The Editor having quoted *Psalm* xl. 6–8, and compared these verses with *Heb.* x. 4–7, 9, thus concludes (page 528): “By these declarations various facts are established. They inform us, that the grand design of the Son in becoming man was that of being a sacrifice; which fully refutes our author’s assertion, (page 202,) that the sole object of his mission was to preach and impart divine instructions.”<sup>2</sup> The Editor, I am sorry to say, following a frequent practice of his other orthodox brethren, omits the immediately following verses, which thoroughly explain whether “the will of God,” mentioned in verse 8 of the Psalm quoted by the Editor, implies sacrifice or divine instructions: “I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea, thy law is within my heart. *I have preached* righteousness in the great congregation: lo, I have not refrained my lips, O Lord, thou knowest. *I have not hid* thy righteousness within my heart; *I have declared thy faithfulness and thy salvation: I have not concealed thy loving-kindness and thy truth* from the great congregation.” It is now left to the public to judge whether *Psalm* fortieth, quoted by the Editor, establishes that “the grand design of the Son in becoming man was that of being a sacrifice,” or of preaching the righteousness of God to the world, and declaring his truth and salvation to them. The preparing of the body for the Son, as found in *Heb.* x. 5, implies, of course, the necessity of his being furnished with a body in preaching the will of God to mortal men; a body which, in the fulfilment of his commission, Jesus never valued, but exposed to danger, and virtually offered as a sacrifice.

It is worth observing, that the Editor, though he affirms positively that the grand object of the Son’s appearing in this world was to be a sacrifice, and not to inculcate divine instructions, and thinks it proper to rest his position upon a comparison of the above *Psalm* with *Hebrews*, yet never attempts to reconcile to this notion the verses pointed out in page 202 of my Second Appeal, proving that the object of his mission was to preach and impart divine instructions.<sup>3</sup> Are we to place greater reliance on his bare affirmation, or on the authority of Jesus himself, the Lord and

§500

Heb 10:4–7

Ps 40:8–10

Heb 10:5

§501

<sup>1</sup> §322. <sup>2</sup> §317, Marshman quoting Rammohan’s §140.

<sup>3</sup> §140, Rammohan used Lk 4:43; 2:47–49 and Jn 17:4–8.

King of Jews and Gentiles?

- §502 Not finding a single assertion in the Scriptures that can support his above notion, the Editor lays stress upon *John* x. 17, “Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it again.” Do these words imply any thing more than his attributing the love of the Father towards the Son to his implicit obedience, even to the loss of his own life, taken by the rebellious Jews? Should a general inform his fellow-soldiers, that his king is attached to him in consequence of his being ready to give up his life in the discharge of his duty, can we thence infer that the grand design of the king in appointing him general is death, and not his reconciling rebels to their merciful king through friendly entreaty and offers of amnesty, which we know he has employed?
- §503 The second conclusion of the Editor from the above-quoted *Psalms* and *Hebrews*, is, that “they also demonstrate that the Son delighted in offering himself a sacrifice, which refutes that dreadful assertion, that Jesus declared great aversion to the death of the cross, and merely yielded to it as knowing /396 that the will of his Father rendered such death unavoidable.”<sup>1</sup> I find no mention made in *Heb.* x., much less in *Psalms* xl., of the Son’s “delighting in offering himself as a sacrifice;” on the contrary, it is evidently found in *Heb.* x., that whatever the Son performed with the body prepared to him, was entirely through his implicit obedience to the will of the Father.—Ver. 7: “Then said I,” (the Son,) “Lo, I come to do thy will, O God.”—“Then said he,” (the Son,) “Lo, I come to do thy will, O God,” ver. 9;—an assertion which is thoroughly confirmed by what I quoted in my Second Appeal, (pp. 206, 207,) part of which I am necessitated to repeat here, to shew that Jesus (whether as a man or God let the Editor decide) declared great aversion to death, yet yielded to it in common with many other prophets, knowing that the will of his Father rendered such death unavoidable *Matt.* xxvi. 37–39, 42: “And he took with him Peter and the two sons of Zebedee, and began to be sorrowful and very heavy. Then saith he unto them, My soul is *exceeding sorrowful, even unto death.*—And prayed, saying, O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup” (meaning death) “pass from me; nevertheless *not as I will, but as thou wilt.*—He went away again the second time, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if this cup may not pass away from me, except I drink it, thy will be done.”
- Mt 26:37–42 *Mark* xiv. 36: “And he said, Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee; *take away this cup from me: nevertheless not what I will, but /397 what thou wilt.*” *Luke* xxii. 42, 44: “Saying, Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless not my will, but thine be done. And being in an agony, he prayed more earnestly; and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood, falling down to the ground.”
- Mk 14:36  
Lk 22:42–44
- §504 Now, let the Editor find out a set of verses, or even a single passage, which may

<sup>1</sup> §317, Marshman quoting Rammohan’s §142.



evinced that Jesus, so far from feeling aversion to death, delighted in it, as he has attempted to prove; and let him take upon himself to reconcile such gross contradictions between those two sets of passages, (if there are any such,) or reject one set of them.

The third conclusion of the Editor, from the above *Psalms* and the compared passage of *Hebrews*, is, that “they furnish a complete answer to the declaration, (page 206,) that it would be a piece of gross iniquity to afflict one innocent being who had all the human feelings, and who had never transgressed the will of God, with the death of the cross for the crimes committed by others, and (page 207) that the iniquity of one’s being sentenced to death as an atonement for the fault committed by another, is such, that every just man would shudder at the idea of one’s being put to death for a crime committed by another, even if the innocent man should willingly offer his life in behalf of that other.”<sup>1</sup> The Editor, then, maintains, that the texts quoted (*Psalms* and *Hebrews*) refute the above positions, stating, that “this iniquity, if it be such, the Father willed, since he prepared the /398 Son a body, in which to suffer this palpable injustice.”<sup>2</sup> In this I perfectly coincide with the Editor, that the death of the innocent Jesus took place, like that of many preceding prophets, by the unsearchable will of God, who hath ordained that all the sons of men shall die, some by a violent and painful death, others by an easy and natural extinction; nor do I require the evidence of the text quoted, (“Thou hast prepared me a body;”) to convince me of the fact, declared by Jesus in his agony in the garden, that his sufferings, in particular, were, like those of mankind in general, conformable to the will of God. But I cannot find any thing in these words that warrants an inference so contrary to our ideas of justice, as, that the pain thus suffered by Jesus was inflicted on him, though innocent, by God, as an atonement to himself for withholding merited punishment from the truly guilty. And this is the real point in discussion. The Editor will admit that the ways of God, in bestowing happiness on some and leaving others, in our eyes more worthy of divine favour, to wretchedness and misery, are inscrutable; yet, on the bare fact, that the innocent Jesus was ordained to die on the cross, he pretends to rest the conclusion, as the only possible one, that this death he suffered to satisfy the justice of his Maker. Was it for this that John the Baptist was beheaded? Was it for this that Zechariah was slain? Was it as an atonement for the sins of the rest of mankind, that Jerusalem was suffered to /399 “stone the prophets and kill those who were sent to her”? The Editor will not admit that it was; yet the proposed inference from the bare fact would be as legitimate in these cases as that of Jesus. The plain and obvious conclusion to be drawn from the text is, that God prepared for Christ a body, that he might communicate a perfect code of divine law

§505

Mt 23:37

<sup>1</sup> §317, Marshman quoting Rammohan’s §142.   <sup>2</sup> §317.

to mankind, and that he loved him for the devotion with which he fulfilled his divine commission, regardless of the comfort or safety of that body, and his readiness to lay it down when it suited the purpose of the Maker.

§506 The Reverend Editor expresses his indignation at the mode of reasoning adopted by me, in the passages above quoted; saying, “Should not a creature, a worm of the dust, who cannot fully comprehend the mysteries of his own being, pause before he arraign his Maker of gross injustice, and charge him with having founded all religion on an act of palpable iniquity?”<sup>1</sup> (Page 529.)

§507 There appears here a most strange mistake on the part of the Editor. It is he who seems to me to be labouring to prove the absurdity that God, the almighty and all-merciful, is capable of a palpable iniquity—determined to have punishment, though he leave quite unpunished; inflicting the marks of his wrath on the innocent *for the purpose* of sparing those who justly deserve the weight of its terrors. If he mean to object to the rashness of applying the limited capacity of the human understanding to /400 judge the unsearchable things of the wisdom of God, and therefore denies my right, as a worm of the dust, to deduce any thing from human ideas inimical to his view of the divine will, I can only say, that I have for my example that of a fellow-worm in his own argument, to shew the necessity that the Almighty laboured under to have his justice satisfied. For I find this very Editor, in his endeavour to prove the doctrine of the atonement, arguing (p. 506) thus: “He who has kept the law has not broken it, and he who has broken it cannot have kept it: that the same man, therefore, should incur its penalty for violating it, and also deserve its reward for keeping it, is an *outrage on common sense*.” “This will clearly appear, if we refer to *human laws*, imperfect as they are.” “Apply this to the divine law.” “For him, therefore, to be rewarded as one who had kept the divine law, would be directly contrary to righteousness.” “Human judges inquire not [about the] repentance of the robber or murderer, but respecting his guilt.”<sup>2</sup>

§508 From these passages does it not appear as if the Editor were of opinion that it is quite right and proper to apply human reason as standard, by which to judge what must be the will of God, when he thinks it supports his views of the ways of Providence; but that, on the contrary, it is blasphemous and rebellious against the Divine Majesty, to deduce from human reason conclusions from the Scriptures contrary to his interpretations of them? The Editor /401 has not attempted to dispute that, applied to human affairs, the motive to which he assigns the will of God, in ordaining the death of Jesus on the cross, would be palpably iniquitous. Should not this induce him to pause, and permit nothing but the most express and positive declaration, couched in language not capable of being explained in a metaphorical

---

<sup>1</sup> §317. <sup>2</sup> §286.



sense, to sway him to belief so irreconcilable to common sense? Yet he is willing to assume, at once, this conclusion, on the bare fact that Jesus was provided with a body.

Do not orthodox divines often offer it as a reason for the necessity of an atonement being made for the crimes of men, that it would be inequitable, in the perfect nature of the just God, to remit sin without some sort of punishment being inflicted for it as a satisfaction to his justice? Do they not, in consequence, represent the death of Jesus as an atonement for the sins of mankind? If they do, and are allowed to do so, I think myself also authorized to urge, in reference to human notions of justice, that “it would be a piece of gross iniquity to afflict one innocent being, who had all the human feelings, and who had never transgressed the will of God, with the death of the cross, for crimes committed by others, especially when he declares such great aversion to it.”<sup>1</sup> But if the Editor abandon this mode of reasoning, and confess the unsearchable, inscrutable nature both of divine justice and of divine mercy, I am perfectly ready and willing to do the same. /402 §509

The Editor now refers to the prophets, (page 533,) saying, that *Isaiah*, in ch. vii., “predicting the birth of Christ, identifies his divine and his human nature.”<sup>2</sup> As *Isaiah* vii. 14, and ix. 6, have no relation whatever to the doctrine of atonement, I deem it proper to defer the notice of them to the subsequent chapter on the Trinity. §510

The Editor, in his next quotation from *Isaiah*, first introduces ch. xi. [3], “And he shall make him (Jesus) of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord;”<sup>3</sup> but my limited capacity has failed to enable me to ascertain what he really means to establish by the quotation of this passage (page 536). The Editor was in the course of an attempt to prove the deity and the atonement of Jesus Christ, but the force of truth would appear to have induced him here to cite a verse, which, containing such phrases as—“making him of quick understanding,” and “in the fear of the Lord,” go to prove his created nature. In like manner I must confess my inability to discover any allusion whatever to the atonement in his next quotation from *Isaiah* xix. 19, 20. Is 11:1-9 §511

The Editor having endeavoured, in his former review, to prove the doctrine of the atonement from the application of the term “Saviour” to Jesus, I noticed, in my Second Appeal, that “we find the title Saviour applied frequently in the divine writings to those who have been endued with the power of saving nations, whether in the spiritual sense, by the imparting of the Divine will, or by affording tempo-/403rary protection to them; although none of those saving prophets or princes atoned for the sins of their fellow-creatures by their death;”<sup>4</sup> (page 208;) and, that “all those who have been instrumental in effecting the deliverance of their fellow-creatures, from evils of whatever nature, were dependent themselves upon God, and only instru- Is 19:19f. §512

<sup>1</sup> §142. <sup>2</sup> §324. <sup>3</sup> §326. <sup>4</sup> §143, Rammohan has heavily improved his text while quoting it.

ments in his hand.”<sup>1</sup> The Editor, though unable to deny this fact, thus turns away the subject; saying, “It surely required but little knowledge to discern, that a man’s delivering his country does not elevate him to an equality with God, or, that to overcome an invading enemy is an act totally different from saving sinners from their sins.”<sup>2</sup> But the force of truth again makes the Reverend Editor quote here the follow-

Is 19:19f.

ing passage, (“and he *shall send them* a Saviour, and a great one, and he shall deliver them,”) which does not only refute his own position, but proves what I advanced in my Second Appeal; that is, as Christ and others, who saved people at different times in their capacities, were dependent themselves upon God, and only instruments in his hands; is it not possible for God, who could raise, as the Editor confesses, personages to save men, by their miraculous strength, from the grasp of their enemies, to raise one to save mankind from sin through his divine instructions? If not, how should we reconcile such disavowal of the power of God to the following assertion of the Evangelist Matthew, that the people “glorified God, who had given such power to men”? (ix. 8.) And if Jesus was not entitled to the appellation of a Saviour from the saving power of his divine instructions, in what sense should we understand those declarations of Jesus himself, to be found even in a single gospel?—*John* v. 24, vi. 63, xv. 3.

Mt 9:8

Jn 5:24; 6:63; 15:3

§513

To his question, “When, previously to Christ’s coming, did the Egyptians cry to Jehovah for deliverance, and when, previously, was Israel the third with Egypt and the Assyrians?”<sup>3</sup> my answer must be in the negative; that is, neither previous to Christ’s coming did the Egyptians cry to Jehovah and join the Assyrians and Israel, a blessing in the midst of the land, nor have the subsequently to the coming of Jesus, up to this day, cried to the God of Israel, or joined Israel and the Assyrians in asking a divine blessing.

§514

The Editor says, (page 537,) that “in chap. xxxv. the blessings of Christ’s kingdom are declared in the most glowing language.”<sup>4</sup> I do not dispute it in the least. If verse 10 (“the ransomed of the Lord shall return,” &c.) have any allusion to Jesus, it must have reference to his implicit obedience to the will of Jehovah, even to the laying down of his own life for the safety of mankind; as explained in my Second Appeal, pp. 201, 202. Any one who has a tolerable knowledge of the idiom of Hebrew or Arabic, or even of Persian, must be aware that the word “ransom” פְּדִיּוֹם or فِراء is often used to express extreme attachment or obedience, without implying an actual sacrifice as an atonement for sins. /405

Is 35:10

§515

Is 42:2, 21

He again quotes *Isaiah* xlii. [2] 21, “He shall not cry,” &c. “The Lord is well pleased for his righteousness’ sake,”<sup>5</sup> but I am unable, also, to discover what these quotations have to do with Christ’s atoning for sin as a sacrifice in lieu of goats and bullocks.

<sup>1</sup> §235. <sup>2</sup> §327. <sup>3</sup> §327. <sup>4</sup> §328. <sup>5</sup> §329.

So, 2 Cor. v. 21, “For he hath made him to be sin,” &c., has no reference to the atonement, which the Editor insists upon: it implies no more than that “God hath made him subject to sufferings and death, the usual punishment and consequence of sin, as if he had been a sinner, though he were guilty of no sin; that we, in and by him, might be made righteous, by a righteousness imputed to us by God.” See Locke’s Works, Vol. VIII. page 232.<sup>1</sup> 2 Co 5:21

The Reverend Editor now refers to ch. liii. of *Isaiah*, laying great stress upon such phrases as the following, found in that chapter: “Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows;” “He was wounded for our transgressions;” “The Lord hath laid on him the iniquities of us all;” “He shall bear their iniquities.”<sup>2</sup> Do these sentences prove that he, like a sacrificial “lamb” or “sheep,” atoned for the sins of others? Did ever a sacrificial lamb or goat bear the iniquities of men? The scape-goats are stated to have borne the iniquities of Israel—a circumstance far from being applicable to Christ, even typically; for he, as was predicted, made no escape from the hand of his enemies. My readers may peruse the whole of ch. liii., and may find that /406 it conveys but the idea that Jesus, as a prince, though innocent himself, was to suffer afflictions, or rather death, for the transgressions of his guilty people, while interceding for them with a King mightier than himself. §516

To this question of the Editor, “Is not our repentance sufficient to make atonement with the All-merciful?”<sup>3</sup> my answer must be in the affirmative, since we find the direct authority of the author of this religion, and his forerunner, John the Baptist, requiring us to have recourse to repentance as the means of procuring pardon for sin. (Vide p. 367.<sup>4</sup>) Had the human race never transgressed, or had they repented sincerely of their transgressions, the Son of God need not have been sent to teach them repentance for the pardon of their sins, to lay before them the divine law, calculated to prevent their further transgressions, the fulfilment of which commission was at the cost of his life. §517

As I have already noticed (in page 399, et seq.) the Editor’s reference to human ideas of justice in support of the doctrine of atonement, and his censuring me for the same mode of reference to natural equity, I will not renew the subject here. §518

The Editor seems contented with the quotation of only two passages of *Jeremiah*, viz. ch. xxiii. [5], “Behold, the days come, saith Jehovah, that I will raise unto David a righteous branch,” &c., and ch. xxxi. [31, 33], as being quoted in *Heb.* viii. [8, 10], “Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I /407 will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the land of Judah. I will put my law in their inward parts,” &c. The Editor then quotes (page 539) 1 Cor. i. 30, “Christ is made unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption.”<sup>5</sup> But what these quotations have to Jr 23:5f. Jr 31:31–34; Heb 8:8–12 1 Co 1:30

<sup>1</sup> Locke, *Works III*, II *Corinthians*, 229. <sup>2</sup> §330. <sup>3</sup> §330. <sup>4</sup> §471. <sup>5</sup> §331.

do with the vicarious sacrifice of Christ, I am again at a loss to perceive, being able to discover in them nothing more than a prophecy, and its fulfilment, that Christ was to be sent to direct mankind to sincerity in worship, righteousness in conduct, sanctification in purity of mind, and salvation by repentance.

§520 The Editor then advances, that “Ezekiel also predicts the promised redeemer in ch. xxxiv. 23. He says ‘I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; and he shall be their shepherd.’”<sup>1</sup> I never denied, in any of

Ezk 34:23

my publications, that Jesus was sent as the promised Messiah, nor did I ever interpret the above passages, as some Jewish writers, that the Messiah would be not only of the race of David, but also of his spirit. How is it, then, that the Editor thinks is necessary to attempt so often to prove the kingdom and redemption of Jesus as the promised Messiah in the course of his arguments in favour of the atonement? He afterwards quotes *Dan.* ix. 26, “Shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself.” There is no term in the original Hebrew passage answering to the words “but” or “himself,” found in the English version. We find in the He-/408brew, **וְאִין לוֹ**, “no person or nothing for him;” that is, “Shall Messiah be cut off, and no one be for him.”<sup>2</sup> The translators used the term “but,” instead of “and,” as in the Hebrew, and the term “himself,” in lieu of “him.” In illustration, I shall here cite the same phrase found in other instances, both in the original Hebrew Scriptures and their translation also, in the English version. *Exodus* xxii. 2, **אִין לוֹ דָּמִים**, “No blood be shed for him.” *Numb.* xxvii. 4, **אִין לוֹ בֵן**,<sup>3</sup> “He hath no son.” *Psalms* lxxii. 12, **וְאִין עֹזֵר לוֹ**, “And him that hath no helper.” *Dan.* xi. 45, **וְאִין עֹזֵר לוֹ**, “And none shall help him.” But, even were we to admit this mistranslation or perversion of the original Scriptures, the words, “Shall the Messiah be cut off, but not for himself,” would, to my mind, convey nothing more than that the Messiah should be cut off, not for any guilt he committed himself, but by the fault of his subjects, who continued to rebel against the divine law, though instructed by their intercessor even at the hazard of his own life.

Dn 9:24–27

Ex 22:2; Nb 27:4

Ps 72:12; Dn 11:45

§521 The Editor quotes *Hosea* iii. [5], “After that [afterward shall] the children of Israel return and seek the Lord their God, and David their king,” &c.;<sup>4</sup> and *Joel* ii. 28, “And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy,” &c.;<sup>5</sup> and also *Amos* ix. [11], “In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David which is fallen,” &c.<sup>6</sup> Had he been pleased to shew the tendency of these quo-/409tations to the proof of the vicarious sacrifice

Ho 3:5

Jl 2:28

Am 9:11

<sup>1</sup> §332.

<sup>2</sup> NRSV translates: “An anointed one shall be cut off and shall have nothing.” Luther2017 translates: “Und nach den zweiundsiebzig Wochen wird ein Gesalbter ausgerottet werden, und niemand wird ihm helfen”, which is exactly like Rammohan’s translation.

<sup>3</sup> Read: **אִין לוֹ בֵן**. This is misprinted in all editions (London1823, London1824, Ghose).

<sup>4</sup> §334. <sup>5</sup> §335. <sup>6</sup> §336.

of Jesus, I would endeavour to examine the connexion between them: as he has omitted to do so, and their relation to the question is certainly not obvious, I must spare myself the trouble.

The Reverend Editor says, (page 541,) “Nor does Obadiah, in his short prophecy, wholly omit the Reemer’s kingdom. He alludes thereto in verse 21: ‘And saviours shall come up on Mount Zion to judge the Mount of Esau: and the kingdom shall be Jehovah’s.’”<sup>1</sup> To justify the application to Jesus of the noun “saviours,” though found in the plural form, he thus argues: “Should he” (the author of the Appeals) “reply, that as the plural number ‘saviours’ is used, this cannot refer to Christ; we ask him whether he has not (page 242) affirmed, that ‘the plural form is often used in a singular sense, as of his masters, meaning, his master has given him a wife’”?<sup>2</sup> The Editor, as a diligent student of the Scriptures, should have known that the noun in question, “saviours,” being accompanied with the plural verb ועלו, “they shall come up,” is by no means an analogous case to that of the term “masters,” as found in *Exod.* xxi. 4, which is connected with the verb singular יתן, whereas, in *Neh.* ix. 27, the term “saviours” is associated with the verb in the plural form and the past tense, as well as with the pronoun plural.

I must, therefore, maintain the correctness of reading “saviours” in *Obadiah* as required in the former /410 alternative of the question put by the Editor, (page 541, line 34,) finding myself unable to “acknowledge the triune God,”<sup>3</sup> as proposed by him in the latter alternative: for having relinquished the notion of the triune, quadrune, and decimune gods, which I once professed, when immersed in the grosser polytheism prevailing among modern Hindoos, I cannot reconcile it to my understanding to find plausibility in one case, while the same notion is of acknowledged absurdity in another. The Editor admits (p. 536) the application of the term Saviour to human individuals, as pointed out by me, (Second Appeal, pp. 289, 290,)<sup>4</sup> yet he is anxious to prove the doctrine of the atonement by the application of that very term to Jesus.

The Editor says, (page 542,) that “Micah, in ch. iv., describes Christ’s kingdom nearly in the same terms with Isaiah, and in ch. v. he predicts the place of his birth: ‘Thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, out of thee shall he come forth unto me—whose goings forth have been of old, from everlasting.’ The testimony to the eternal deity of Christ

<sup>1</sup> §337. <sup>2</sup> Marshman quoting Rammohan’s §165.

<sup>3</sup> §337: “Will he read this ‘and Saviours, that is, a Saviour, shall come upon mount Zion,’ and thus declare himself so unacquainted with the Scriptures, that of the four instances he has adduced *against* the Saviour, two of them relate *to him?* or—acknowledge the Triune God?”

<sup>4</sup> §327: “It surely required but little knowledge to discern, that a man’s delivering his country does not elevate him to an equality with God, or that to overcome an invading enemy, is an act totally different from ‘saving sinners from their sins.’”, referring to Rammohan’s §235.

given in connexion with his birth as man, it is wrong to overlook.”<sup>1</sup> Any testimony relating to the birth of Jesus, having nothing to do with his atonement, is not in place here; but I will examine the verse here cited in the subsequent part of this discussion, when we come to the subject of the Trinity.

§525 He quotes again *Nahum* i. 15, for the purpose of proving Christ’s kingdom, which

Na 1:15

is a subject totally /411 foreign to that of the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus. “Habakkuk” (says the Editor, page 542) “was evidently no stranger to the doctrine founded on the atonement;”<sup>2</sup> and he then quotes the passage, “The just shall live by faith,” as corroborated by Paul, *Rom.* i. [17], and *Gal.* iii. 2 [11?]; and “the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of Jehovah,” &c. But what faith in, and knowledge of God, as well as faith in the perfection of his attributes, and in the prophets sent by him, has to do with the atonement, I am at a loss to discover. Does the bare mention of faith by Habakkuk, or other prophets, prove his or their familiarity with the sacrificial death of Jesus?

Hab 2:4; Rm  
1:17; Ga 3:11

§526 He quotes the passage of *Haggai* ii. [6, 7, 9], “Thus saith Jehovah;—The desire

Hg 2:6–9

of all nations shall come, and [I] will fill this house with glory.—The glory of this latter house shall be greater than that of the former, saith Jehovah of hosts,”—which the Editor thinks affords decides proof respecting both the atonement and the deity of Christ.<sup>3</sup> It is, however, too deep for my shallow understanding to discover from this passage an allusion to either of these doctrines, much less that it is a decided proof of them. Were we to understand by the word “temple,” in both instances in the verse, a *material* one, which is evident, from its context in the prophecy, was alone in the contemplation of Haggai, we must be persuaded to believe that the latter temple was more magnificently built by Zerubbabel and Joshua, in the reign of Darius, than the former built /412 by Solomon. Should the *spiritual* temple be understood by the latter term in the above, it would be regarded naturally superior to a material one, without the necessity of “Jehovah’s coming into it clothed in our nature.”<sup>4</sup>

§527 He quotes *Zech.* iii. 8, 9, and vi. 12, 13, wherein there is not the slightest mention

Zc 3:8f.; Zc 6:12f.

of the atonement. As to his attempt to prove the deity of Jesus from these passages, I will notice it in a subsequent chapter. The phrase found in the verse (“I will remove the iniquity of that land in one day”) does not attribute to the removal of the iniquities of the land of Israel to the sacrificial death of Jesus, so as to justify the Editor in quoting it as a proof of the doctrine of the atonement. Besides, the verse can by no means be applied to the death of Jesus, whether vicarious or accidental, since, after the day of his crucifixion, the Israelites, so far from being freed from sins, continued, more vehemently than ever, to pursue sinful conduct in their violent persecution of Christians. So the Jews have been punished to this day, as Christians believe, on

---

<sup>1</sup> §338. <sup>2</sup> §339. <sup>3</sup> §341. <sup>4</sup> §341.

account of their outrages upon the body of Jesus, and their disobedience to him. The remaining passage of *Zechariah*, (pages 543–548,) and verse 1st of ch. iii. of *Malachi*, (page 548,) quoted by the Editor in support of the deity of Jesus, I will notice afterwards.

I am sorry I cannot agree with the Editor in his assertion, (page 549,) that “had our Lord himself made no direct declaration respecting the design of /413 his death, his referring his disciples to those predictions already named, would have been sufficient, particularly in their circumstances;”<sup>1</sup> for it would be strange to suppose that Jesus should have omitted to inculcate so important a doctrine, and so fundamental for salvation, (according to the Editor,) both before and after his resurrection, while he was constantly enjoining love to God, to neighbours, and to each other, and also repentance, in case of failure in obedience. How is it possible to think, unless biassed by early prejudices, that a teacher, a truly divine teacher, who, by declaring himself publicly the Son of God\* and the King of the Jews,\* as predicted, brought death upon himself, should have kept concealed the doctrine of the atonement, if such were the main source of salvation, from his own apostles, even after his resurrection, and have left them to deduce so material a point from the obscure predictions of the prophets, which are susceptible of so many different interpretations?

§528

The Editor then affirms, that “it is evident that direct intimations of his nature were not withheld: such were, his declaring to them” (his apostles) “that he came to give his life a ransom for many—his conversing with Moses and Elias, (*Luke ix. 31*),—his declaring that the Son of Man should be betrayed into the hands of men, and be killed, and rise again the third day—that he was about to give /414 his flesh for the life of the world, and to lay down his life for his sheep—and his discourse with them, ‘This is my body, which is broken for you;’ ‘This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins;’ ‘Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day.’”<sup>2</sup> As the Reverend Editor quoted some of these verses in his former Review, I noticed them in the Second Appeal (pp. 201-203). Entirely overlooking my observations, however, he has thought proper to repeat them here, with some additions. This is indeed a strange mode of conducting a controversy; but it lays me under the necessity of again adducing my remarks in the Second Appeal on those passages. They are as follow:—“Do these passages reasonably convey anything more than the idea that Jesus was invested with a divine commission to deliver instructions leading to eternal beatitude, which whosoever should receive should live for ever? And that the Saviour, foreseeing that the imparting of those instructions would, by exciting the anger and enmity

§529

Mt 20:28; Lk 9:31; Mt 17:22; Jn 6:51; 10:11

1 Co 11:24; Mt 26:28; Lk 24:44–47

\* John xix. 7, 12.

<sup>1</sup> §349. <sup>2</sup> §349.



of the superstitious Jews, cause his life to be destroyed, yet hesitated not to persevere in their promulgation; as if a king, who hazards his life to procure freedom and peace for his subjects, were to address himself to them saying, 'I lay down my life for you.' This interpretation is fully confirmed by the following [passages].—*Luke* iv. 43: 'And he said unto them, I must preach the kingdom of God to other cities /415 also; for therefore am I sent.' Ch. ii. 47—49: 'And all that heard him were astonished at his understanding and answers. And when they (his parents) saw him, they were amazed: and his mother said unto him, Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us? Behold, thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing. And he said unto them, How is it that ye sought me? wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?' Wherein Jesus declares, that the sole object of his mission was to preach and impart divine instructions. Again, after having instructed his disciples in the divine law and will, as appears from the following text: '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.) Jesus, in his communing with God, manifests that he had completed the object of his commission by imparting divine commandments to mankind: 'I have glorified thee in [on] the earth, *I have finished* the work which thou gavest me to do.' Had his death on the cross been the work, or part of the work, for the performance of which Jesus came into this world, he, as the founder of truth, would not have declared himself *to have finished that work prior to his death.*"<sup>1</sup>—I now beg that the Editor will be pleased to reconcile all the above passages to his position that the death of Jesus on the cross was the sole object of his appearance in this world, and that his precepts /416 was a mere code of morality inadequate to procure salvation. Had not Jesus disregarded his life, and suffered his blood to be shed, as predicted, in the delivery of the will of the Father, the whole of the Jews would have still remained sunk in superstition, and the Gentiles in idolatry, and there would have been no perfect security for the remission of sins and the attainment of eternal comfort in those sayings. Hence the gracious benefactor alludes to this act of delivery from sins through divine instructions even at the expense of his own life, and not to an actual sacrificial death as an equal value or compensation for the sin pardoned, since the New Testament declares that God forgives mankind *freely*, without any equivalent. *Romans* iii. 24, "Being justified *freely* (δωρεαν, *gratis*) by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus."<sup>2</sup> So *Rom.* viii. 32, 15, 16, 18, confirms the idea of justification by the free grace of God. For the further illustration of this subject, I quote the paraphrase on the abovesited verse, (*Rom.* iii. 24,) by Locke, one of the greatest men that ever lived, and his notes on its different expressions. Locke's Works, Vol. VIII. p. 304,

<sup>1</sup> §140. <sup>2</sup> Quoted by Marshman §350.



paraphrase on verses 24 and 25: "Being made righteous gratis, by the favour of God, through the redemption which is by Jesus Christ; whom God hath set forth to the propitiatory, or mercy-seat, in his own blood, for the manifestation of his (God's) righteousness, by passing over their transgressions, formerly committed, which he hath bore /417 with hitherto, so as to withhold his hand from casting off the nation of the Jews, as their past sins deserved."<sup>1</sup>

Note on the word Redemption, verse 24: "Redemption signifies deliverance, but not deliverance from every thing, but deliverance from that to which a man is in subjection or bondage. Nor does redemption by Jesus Christ import there was any compensation made to God, by paying what was of equal value, in consideration whereof they were delivered; for that is inconsistent with what St. Paul expressly says here, viz. that sinners are justified by God gratis, and of his free bounty. What this redemption is, St. Paul tells us, *Eph.* i. 7, *Col.* i. 14, 'even the forgiveness of sins.' But if St. Paul had not been so express in defining what he means by redemption, they yet would be thought to lay too much stress upon the criticism of a word, in the translation, who would thereby force from the word, in the original, a necessary sense which it is plain it hath not. That redeeming, in the sacred scripture language, signifies not precisely paying an equivalent, is so clear that nothing can be more. I shall refer my reader to three or four places amongst a great number: *Exod.* vi. 6, *Deut.* vii. 8, and xv. 12, and xxiv. 18. But if any one will, from the literal signification of the word in English, persist in it, against Paul's declarations, that it necessarily implies an equivalent price paid, I desire him to consider to whom; and that, if we strictly adhere to the meta-/418phor, it must be to those whom the redeemed are in bondage to, and from whom we are redeemed, viz. Sin and Satan. If he will not believe his own system for this, let him believe St. Paul's words, *Titus* ii. 14: 'Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity.' Nor could the price be paid to God, in strictness of justice, (for that is made the argument here,) unless the same person ought, by that strict justice, to have both the thing redeemed, and the price paid for its redemption; for it is to God we are redeemed, by the death of Christ. *Rev.* v. 9: 'Thou was slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood.'"<sup>2</sup>

§530

Ep 1:7; Col 1:14

Ex 6:6; Dt 7:8;  
15:12; 24:18

Tt 2:14

Rv 5:9

Note upon the word mercy-seat, verse 25: "Ἰλασθηριον signifies propitiatory, or mercy-seat, and not propitiation, as Mr. Mede has rightly observed upon this place, in his discourse on God's house."<sup>3</sup>

§531

Rm 3:24-26

The Editor fills about a page and a half (a part of 550 and the whole of 551) with quotations from the writings of the apostles, to substantiate the doctrine of the atonement, beginning with *Rom.* iii. 24, already quoted by me;<sup>4</sup> but as those teachers merely illustrated the sayings of their gracious Master, their writings must be un-

§532

<sup>1</sup> Locke, *Works III, Romans*, 269-271. <sup>2</sup> Locke, *Works III*, 270. <sup>3</sup> Locke, *Works III*, 270. <sup>4</sup> §350.

derstood with reference only to what had been taught by him. I will, therefore, not prolong the present subject of discussion by examining those passages separately, especially as I have already noticed some of them in the course of the examination of the Psalms and Prophets. Being desirous to shew that my interpretation of these is /419 fully supported by scriptural authorities, I will only refer to a few texts explanatory of the terms sacrifice, ransom, offering, and the taking away the sins of the world, as ascribed to Jesus. *Rom.* v. 10; *Heb.* ii. 17; *Eph.* v. 2; *Heb.* v. 1, viii. 3, ix. 14, 23, 26; *Titus* ii. 12–14; *Heb.* xiii. 12; *Rev.* i. 5; *Eph.* i. 7; *Luke* i. 77; *Matt.* xx. 28; *Mark* x. 45; 1 *Tim.* ii. 6.<sup>1</sup>

Rm 5:10; Heb  
2:17; 5:1; 8:3;  
9:23f.; 13:12; Ep  
1:7; 5:2; Tt  
2:12–14  
Rv 1:5f.; Lk 1:77;  
Mt 20:28; Mk  
10:45; 1 Tm 2:6

§533 Now I beg that my reader will be pleased to determine whether it would be more consistent with the context, and with the benevolent spirit of the Christian dispensation, to understand such words literally, and thus found the salvation attainable by Christianity upon flesh and blood, human or divine; or whether it would not rather be thoroughly reasonable and scriptural, as well as consistent with the religion of Jesus, to take them in a spiritual sense as explained by the apostles themselves.

§534 As the Editor's illustrative remarks upon the atonement (pages 552 and 553) rest entirely on the arguments previously adduced, I will leave them unnoticed, having already examined those in the preceding chapters, except only his queries, "What shall we say to his impugning" (page 253) "the doctrine of Christ's divine and human nature, even after having acknowledged it in chapter the second; and to his ridiculing his intercession?"<sup>2</sup> &c. to which I must reply. It is perfectly optional with the Editor to say for or against any one whatever his conscience may permit; nevertheless I shall from the dictates of /420 my own conscience reject absolutely such unaccountable ideas as a mixed nature of God and man, as maintained by the Editor, as I have previously rejected the idea of a mixed nature of God, man and lion, *নৃসিংহাবতার*<sup>3</sup> in which Hindoos profess their faith. I have not the most distant recollection of acknowledging Christ's divine and human nature, and shall therefore feel obliged if the Editor will have the goodness to point out in what passage of chapter second of my Appeal I acknowledged this mystery.<sup>4</sup> I have never, so far as I am aware, ridiculed, even in thought, the intercession of Jesus for mankind: I therefore hope that Christian charity will restrain the Editor from imputing to me in future such a charge. I only intended to refute the argument adduced by Trinitarians, that no being can intercede with another being for a third one, unless the mediator be possessed of the nature of the being with whom, as well as of those for whom he

<sup>1</sup> Marshman looks in detail at every verse of this list in §933. It is difficult to explain what Rammohan meant by listing all these verses and wiping them all off again as "spiritual" language in the next paragraph.

<sup>2</sup> §352. <sup>3</sup> *Nṛsiṃhābatār*, fierce avatar of the Vishnu, who incarnates in the form of part lion and part man. <sup>4</sup> See the note to §352 about this.

intercedes.

To this assertion of the Editor, “the blood of no mere creature could take away sin,”<sup>1</sup> §535 I add the assertion also maintained by the Editor, that “the Creator is not composed of blood and flesh,”<sup>2</sup> and leave to him to say, if the blood of Jesus was not that of a creature whose blood it was. It is evident from the circumstance of the blood of a creature being unable to take away sin, and the Creator having no blood, that the taking away of sin can have no connexion with blood or a bloody sacrifice.

The Editor declares, (page 554,) that “no one but /421 Jehovah, the unchangeable God, could atone for sin, justify the sinner, and change his heart: the Father himself witnesses that it is Jehovah whom he hath appointed to this glorious work.” “He humbled himself by becoming in our nature the Mediator between God and men.”<sup>3</sup> §536 Nothing that I can conceive, but prejudice in favour of the Trinity, can prevent the Editor from perceiving gross inconsistency between his declaring Jesus to be the unchangeable Jehovah, and also to have been appointed by Jehovah, according to whose will the former Jehovah humbled himself in becoming in our nature a Mediator. How could the unchangeable Jehovah be endued with a new honour which he had not prior to his appointment by the latter Jehovah? How could the unchangeable God change his condition by assuming a new nature? If the acceptance of a new state of honour, the assuming of a new nature, or the alteration of properties, such as magnitude and other conditions, be not considered as changes in an object, all phenomena may safely, according to the Editor’s maxim, be called unchangeable; and consequently the application of the term “unchangeable” being common to Jehovah, and those who are not Jehovah, can imply no peculiar ground of distinction or reverence for Jehovah. The Editor says, (page 555,) “Nor does it” (the scripture) “give us the least hint that God ever has imparted any one infinite perfection to a finite crea-/422ture. This, indeed, is impossible in its own nature.”<sup>4</sup> I therefore beg to ask, whether or not, on the same ground, it is not impossible in its own nature that the whole of the omnipresent God should be brought into a circumference of a small space, subjected to all human feelings, and clothed at one time with two opposite natures, human and divine?

The Reverend Editor, in the concluding part of the subject of the atonement, at- §537 tempts to prove the infinite perfection of Jesus, forgetting, perhaps, the denial made by Jesus himself of omniscience, as well of omnipotence, as narrated by the evangelical writings. He entirely avoids here noticing what I stated in proof of the finite effects of Christ’s appearance in the world, which I now repeat, and beg that the Editor will favour me with a reply thereto. My argument is, “that the effects of Christ’s appearance on earth, whether with respect to the salvation or condemna-

<sup>1</sup> §353. <sup>2</sup> This is not to be found as a literal quote in Marshman’s text. <sup>3</sup> §353. <sup>4</sup> §353.

tion of mankind, were *finite*, and therefore suitable to the nature of a finite being to accomplish, is evident from the fact, that to the present time millions of human beings are daily passing through the world, whom the doctrines he taught have never reached, and who, of course, must be considered as excluded from the benefit of his having died for the remission of their sins.”<sup>1</sup> (Second Appeal, pp. 205, 206.) Besides, it is worth observing, that an avowal of the beginning of creation, and of its end, amounts to a proof of the finite number of creatures, however /423 numerous they may be; therefore an atonement even for the remission of the sins of all of them must be of a finite nature.

§538 Should it be alleged that the sins committed by a single individual, in the limited period of his life, though they are finite in themselves, yet are committed against the infinite God, and thereby they are infinite, and that an atonement on the part of an infinite being is therefore necessary for their remission; I shall reply—In the first place, the assertion that the guilt committed against an infinite being is infinite in its consequences, is entirely unsupported by reason or proof, and is contrary to scriptural authorities; for we find that the Israelites were, from time to time, afflicted with finite punishment for the sins they committed against the infinite God. 1 Chron. xxi. 11, [12]: “So Gad came to David, and said unto him, Thus saith the Lord, Choose thee either *three years’ famine, or three months* to be destroyed before thy foes, while that the sword of thine enemies overtaketh thee; ore *else three days* the sword of the Lord, even the pestilence, in the land, and the angel of the Lord destroying throughout all the coasts of Israel,” &c. Ver. 15: “And God sent an angel unto Jerusalem, to destroy it; and as he was destroying, the Lord *beheld, and he repented him of the evil*, and said to the angel that destroyed, It is enough, stay now thine hand,” &c. Judges xiii. 1: “And the children of Israel did evil in the sight of the /424 Lord; and the Lord delivered them into the hand of the Philistines *forty years*.”

1 Ch 21:11–15

Jg 13:1

§539 In the second place, were we to admit the truth of this argument, we must, upon the same ground, as far as reason suggests, esteem a good act, done for the honour of the commandment of the infinite God, or a prayer offered to propitiate the Divine Majesty, to be also worthy of infinite reward as its effect. Under these circumstances we cannot help observing, that among those that believe in any revelation, either true or received as true, there is, probably, no man that has not performed, at least, one single righteous act during the whole period of his life; but as he is a mortal and imperfect being, he cannot be supposed to have escaped every sin in this tempting world: every man, then, must be both guilty of infinite sin and an agent of infinite virtue. If we suppose that this very person is to be punished for eternity, according to the Editor, for the infinite sin he has committed, there will be no opportunity of

---

<sup>1</sup> §142.

his enjoying an infinite reward for his good work; but according to the position, he must be either rewarded for his good or punished for his evil actions for eternity, while justice requires that he should experience the consequences of both. Would it be consistent with the perfect nature of the just God, to afflict one with eternal punishment for his guilt, leaving, at the same time, his good deeds unnoticed entirely, though performed with a view to the glory /425 of God? Is it not, therefore, scriptural as well as reasonable, that all men should be judged, after death, according to their good and evil works; and, then, that through the intercession of one who stands as a mediator between God and man, those who have, through Christ, truly repented, shall be admitted to enjoy infinite beatitude by the free bounty of the Father of the universe, to which they are not entitled by their own merit?<sup>1</sup>

As to such phrases as *everlasting fire*, or *everlasting punishments*, found in the English version, I beg to refer my readers to the original Greek, in which the term αἰωνιος, being derived from αἰων, denotes, frequently, *duration* or *ages*; that is, “durable fire,” or “durable punishments.” Besides, they may find the term “everlasting,” when applied to an object *not divine*, implies long duration. *Gen.* xvii. 8: “And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession,” &c. xlix. 26: “The blessings of thy father have prevailed above the blessings of my progenitors, unto the utmost bound of the everlasting hills,” &c. *Hab.* iii. 6: “He stood and measured the earth: He beheld and drove asunder the nations; and the everlasting mountains were scattered, and the perpetual hills did bow.” Vide Note in the Second Appeal, page 277.<sup>2</sup> /426

§540

Gn 17:8; 49:26

Hab 3:6

### CHAPTER III. INQUIRY INTO THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.

#### Section I. *The Pentateuch and Psalms.*

I NOW proceed to examine the doctrine of the Trinity, a term which, although it is frequently introduced both in orthodox writings and conversation, as the fundamental doctrine of Christianity, yet is not once found in any part of the sacred books.

§541

The first position of the Editor advances, in support of the deity of Jesus, (page 556,) is, that the angel, who is said, in *Gen.* xlvi. 16, to have redeemed Jacob, was Jesus himself, as he appears, “in the Scripture, distinct from the Father and able to redeem,”<sup>3</sup> and that the same redeeming being was the angel who spoke to Jacob in a dream, “I am the God of Bethel,” (*Gen.* xxxi. 13,) and appeared to Moses “in a flame of fire, out of the midst of an unconsumed bush,”<sup>4</sup> (*Exod.* iii. 2,) and who came up

§542

Gn 48:15f.

Gn 31:11–13

Ex 3:1–6

<sup>1</sup> In this paragraph, Rammohan is reasoning with the help of the logic of *karma*. Marshman will observe this in §§937-940 of his review.

<sup>2</sup> §215, note. <sup>3</sup> §355. <sup>4</sup> §356.

Jg 2:1f. Gn 22:9-13 from Gilgal to Bochim, and said, "I made you go up out of Egypt," &c., (*Judges* ii. 1,) and called unto Abraham, out of the heaven, and said, "Thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from me," (*Gen.* xxii. 12,) whence the Editor concludes, that Christ being the redeeming angel, and that redeem-/427ing angel being the angel that spoke of himself as God in other instances, Christ is God. The Editor, although he fills more than two pages with this argument,<sup>1</sup> yet never thinks of producing a single authority for his inference, that the angel who redeemed Jacob, was Christ, or for his identifying that angel with those angels whom the Editor considers as Jehovah, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. The only reason he assigns for his first supposition is, that the angel appeared "distinct from the Father and able to redeem;" hence he was Christ who is represented as the redeemer of his people. Can the circumstance of the performance of similar acts, by two persons, identify one with the other? If so, we must, on the same ground, identify God with the human race, the Scriptures having ascribed to them both, such attributes as mercy, wrath, reward, and punishment; and we also, on the same principle, must maintain the identity of Jesus with all those that are said in the sacred books to have redeemed people at different times. *Isaiah* lxiii. 9: "In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence saved them; in his love and in his pity he redeemed them, and he bare them, and carried them all the days of old." *Ruth* iv. 14: "And the woman said unto Naomi, Blessed be the Lord who hath not left thee this day without a redeemer,\* נָסִיחַ, /428 that his name may be famous in Israel." *Neh.* v. 8: "We, after our ability, have redeemed our brethren the Jews, who were sold unto the heathen."

§543 Were we to admit for a moment, that the angel who redeemed Jacob was indeed Jesus, it would necessarily follow, according to the Editor, that there was Christ-man-Jesus, God-Jesus, and Angel-Jesus; that is, that Christ is possessed of a three-fold nature, and that he is to be esteemed as an obedient servant in his human capacity, as a faithful messenger in his angelical nature, and as an independent master and employer in his divine essence!

§544 If it be alleged that the term angel is here only figuratively applied to Jesus, I shall reply, that we find nothing in the verse that can prevent the application of the term "angel" to the angel of God, in its literal sense; no one, under such a circumstance, can be justified in adopting a metaphorical meaning; nevertheless we will, in con-

---

\* In the English Bible the term kinsman is here employed. This, however, is inaccurate, which will appear by referring to the context. It is thereby made evident, that, before the birth of this son, Ruth and Naomi had Boaz and others as their kinsmen, and therefore the expression, "who hath not left thee this day without kinsman," cannot have reference to the child then born. Besides, the synonymous term, "restorer of life," used in verse 15th for the child, sufficiently determines the meaning.

<sup>1</sup> §§355-358.

formity to the spirit of the sacred writings, maintain the opinion that God is the only true redeemer, and that his Christ, his angels, and his prophets, are redeemers in a secondary sense; that is, they are the instruments in the hand of God in his works of redemption. If the Scriptures do not scruple to call angels, like Jesus, /429 “gods,” and “sons of God,” in a metaphorical sense, we should not wonder if we find the term “redeemer” applied to any angel of God, in an inferior sense. *Psalm* xcvi. 7: “Worship him, ye gods.” *Jugdes* xiii. 21, 22: “Then Manoah knew that he was an angel of the Lord, and Manoah said to his wife, We shall surely die, because we have seen God.” *Job* i. 6: “The sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord.” As to his latter supposition, that the angel who redeemed Jacob was the same that appeared to him in a dream, and to Abraham and to others, on different occasions, the Editor neither attempts to assign reasons, nor does he endeavour to shew any authority for his assertion. He might, perhaps, lay stress on the definite article prefixed in the word “angel,” in several of these instances, in the English version, (which he cannot do without total disregard to the idiom and use of the Hebrew language,) and thereby might attempt to substantiate the identity of one angel with the other. He would, however, in this case, soon perceive his own error, if he should refer to *Jugdes* xiii. 16, where *the* angel (with the definite article in the common version) says to Manoah, “Though thou detain me, I will not eat of thy bread: and if thou wilt offer a burnt-offering, thou must offer it unto the Lord,” declaring himself unworthy of the worship due to God alone; or if he should turn to 2 *Samuel* xxiv. 16, where the angel is represented as an obedient messenger of God, a destroying instrument in the /430 hands of Jehovah. Many other instances might be cited of a similar nature. How, then, can Jesus, if he be the being termed *the* angel, speak of himself, (as the Editor supposes,) as God in one instance, while in others he renounces his own deity, and even declares, that he destroys the lives of thousands by the command of a superior being?

Ps 47:7; Jg 13:21f.

Jb 1:6

Jg 13:16

2 S 24:16

Let us now examine whether or not the prophets, as well as the angels of God, in the delivery of his message and his will, did not often speak in behalf of God, as if God himself had spoken. I confine my notice to the prophets; for were I point out any angel speaking in behalf of Jehovah, without distinction of persons, the Editor might attempt to deduce from this very circumstance, that that angel was God the Son.

§545

Instances similar to the following abound in the Old Testament. *Isaiah* x. 4–7: “Without *me* they shall bow down under the prisoners, and they shall fall under the slain. For all *this* his anger is not turned away, but his hand is stretched out still. O Assyrian, the rod of mine anger, and the staff in their hand is my indignation. I will send him against an hypocritical nation, and against the people of my wrath will I give him a charge, to take the spoil, and to take the prey, and to tread them down

§546

Is 10:4–7

like the mire of the streets. Howbeit *he* meaneth not so, neither doth his heart think so; but it is in his heart to destroy and cut off nations not a few.” Ch. xxix. 1, [1–3]: “Woe to Ariel, to Ariel, the city /431 where David dwelt! add ye year to year; let them kill sacrifices; yet I will distress Ariel, and there shall be heaviness and sorrow: and it shall be unto me as Ariel. I will camp against thee round about, and will lay siege against thee with a mount, and I will raise forts against thee.” *Micah* iv. 13: “Arise and thresh, O daughter of Zion, for I will make,” &c. Ch. v. 1: “Now gather thyself in troops, O daughter of troops; he hath laid siege against us: they shall smite the judge of Israel with a rod upon the cheek. But thou, Beth-lehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel,” &c. Now, I presume, the Editor will not propose to identify those prophets with the Deity; yet he must admit that his argument, if it have any weight at all, must force us to submit to that monstrous conclusion.

§547 In the course of this argument the Reverend Editor asserts, that “Christ also, in *John* viii., declares himself to be precisely what Jehovah declares himself in *Exodus* iii. 14. ‘Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, *I am* hath sent me unto you.’ *John* viii. 24. ‘If ye believe not that I am (*he* being supplied) ye shall die in your sins;’ and ver. 58 ‘Verily, verily, I say unto you, before Abraham was, I am.’”<sup>1</sup> How is it possible that the Editor, a diligent student of the Bible for thirty or forty years, can have made such a palpable mistake as to assert, that the declaration of Jehovah, in *Exod.* iii., and that of Jesus, in /432 *John* viii., are *precisely the same*? It is but his zeal to support the doctrine of the Holy Trinity that can have prevented him from examining the phrases found in these two chapters. In *Exod.* God says, “Thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel, אֲדֹנָי אֲשֶׁר אֲדֹנָי ‘the being who *is* being’ hath sent me unto you;” a phrase in Hebrew, which implies Him who alone can be described as only mere being or existence, and which is translated in the Greek Septuagint, though not<sup>†</sup> very correctly, εγω εμμι ο ων, “I am the being.” But in the Gospel of *John* (viii. 24) the words are, “I am,” (*he* or *Christ*), and in the original Greek, εγω εμμι, “I am,” without the addition of ο ων, “the being,” as found in the Septuagint. In the Hebrew translation of *John* viii. 24, אֲנִי הוּא, or “I he,” is found. So, in ver. 58, we find only εγω εμμι, “I am.” In *John* viii. 24, the word Χριστος<sup>2</sup> is of course supplied in comparing with *Matth.* xxiv. 5, “I am Christ,” and with *John* iv. 25, 26. I would

\* אֲדֹנָי is the future tense of הָיָה to be, which literally implies “I shall be,” and is used for “I am,” that is, “I am and shall be;” equivalent to the “eternal being.” The Jews consequently count this term among the names of God, as is evident from its being used in agreement with a verb in the third person, as in the above-cited verse.

† I say not very correctly, because we find in the Septuagint, the term אֲדֹנָי, rendered ο ων, or the being, in one instance, and εγω εμμι in lieu of the same term אֲדֹנָי in the other.

<sup>1</sup> §356. <sup>2</sup> Read: Χριστος. London1824 likewise misprinted, Ghose is correct.



then ask, is אֱדִיָּה אֲשֶׁר אֱדִיָּה, or “the being who is being,” a phrase precisely the same with εγω εμυ, or “I am”? If so, it must /433 require a mode of argument to prove it, equally beyond my comprehension with the mysterious doctrine of the Trinity, which is brought to support.

From the circumstance of Jesus having announced, “Before Abraham was, I am,” §548

(ver. 58,) the Editor concludes, that “the Jews at once understood him to declare himself God, and took up stones to stone him; nor did Jesus hint that they had mistaken him;”<sup>1</sup>—a silence which the Editor thinks amounts to the tacit acknowledgment by

Jesus of his deity. But from the context of ver. 58, it appears clearly that the indignation of the Jews arose from the idea that Jesus declared himself not merely the contemporary of Abraham, but even gave out that before Abraham, he was; and that it was for this they attempted to stone him. It is not the only instance in which Jesus left the Jews to labour under a misconception of his meaning, for we find the same to have been the case in several other instances. Thus, *John* ii. 19—21: “Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. Then said the Jews, Forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou rear it up in three days? But he spake of the temple of his body.” *John* vi. 53, 66, viii. 26, 27: “I have many things to say and to judge of you; but he that sent me is true: and I speak to the world those things which I have heard of him. They understood not that he spake to them of the Father.”

Jn 2:19–21

Jn 6:53, 66; 8:26f.

The Editor mentions, (page 559,) that “*Job* /434 also testifies that the redeemer is God,”<sup>2</sup> and quotes *Job*. xix. 25, 26: “I know that my redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand in the latter day upon the earth. And though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God.” I fully coincide with the Editor in this declaration. Not *Job* alone, but all the other writers of the sacred books, testify that the true redeemer is God; and they all expected him to cast his mercy upon them, both at the last moment of their life, and at the last period of the world. I am at a loss to know what expression in the passage in question has induced the Editor to refer to the other texts cited, “would we know whether by God, *Job* means some inferior deity, neither creature nor creator;”<sup>3</sup> for there can be no doubt that the term redeemer is frequently in the sacred writings applied in its strict sense to the Most High God; and that the phrases, “He shall stand at last,” and “I shall see God,” which are also found in the above passage, are often spoken of the Supreme Being, without implying any necessity of understanding them as applicable to an inferior deity, either creature or creator. *Exod.* xxxiv. 5: “And the Lord descended in the cloud, and stood with him there,” &c. *Zech.* xiv. 3, 4: “Then shall the Lord go forth and fight against those nations, as when he fought in the day of battle. And his feet

§549

Jb 19:25f.

Ex 34:5

Zc 14:3f.

<sup>1</sup> §356. <sup>2</sup> §359. <sup>3</sup> §359.

will stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem.” *Numb.* xiv. 14: “That thou art seen face to face.” *Matt.* v. 8.: “Blessed are the /435 pure in heart, for they shall see God.” The phrase, “at the latter day,” found in verse 25, in incorrectly rendered in the English version as the translation of the Hebrew אחרון, as has been already noticed in page 389. [Note.]<sup>1</sup>

§550 The Editor refers his readers to *Psalms* ii. last verse, “Kiss the son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed

Ps 2:12 are they who trust in him,”—leaving the context carefully out of sight.<sup>2</sup> I therefore deem it proper to cite the preceding verses here, that the public may judge whether the verse referred to by the Editor be directly applicable to Jesus or to David. David thus relates the circumstance of the hostile disposition of the heathen kings against God and against his anointed David himself, in verses 1–3, and the despite of God at their vain boast, in verses 4–6. He then mentions, in verses 7–9, how God afforded him consolation: “I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto *me*, Thou art my Son; THIS DAY HAVE I BEGOTTEN THEE. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt *break* them with a *rod of iron*; thou shalt *dash them in pieces* like a potter’s vessel.” David lastly mentions what God recommended those heathen kings to do for their safety, verses 10–12: “Beware now, therefore, O ye kings; be instructed, ye judges of the earth! Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss /436

Ps 89:27 the son, lest he be angry,” &c. Here Jehovah, in verse 7, calls David, “*my son, this day have I begotten thee*,” corresponding with *Psalms* lxxxix. 27, “Also, I will make him (David) my first-born, higher than the kings of the earth.” I must again say, that nothing except the violent force of early-acquired prejudice can lead any one to the direct application of the term “son” (found again in verse 12 of the same *Psalms*,

relating to the same subject) to another than David. God again assures David, in verses 8, 9, that he would have the heathen for his possession, and that he would break the heathens and dash them to pieces. So we find in [1] *Chron.* xiv. 8: “When the Philistines heard that David was\* anointed king over all Israel, all the Philistines went up to seek David: and David heard of it, and went out against them.” Ver. 16, [17]: “David therefore did as God commanded him: and they smote the host of the Philistines from Gibeon even to Gazer. And the fame of David went out into *all*

1 Ch 14:8–17 *lands*; and the Lord brought the *fear of him upon all nations*.” And ch. xviii. 1–8: “Now after this it came to pass, that David smote the Philistines, and subdued them, and took Gath and her towns out of the hand of the Philistines. And he smote Moab; and the Moabites became David’s servants, and brought gifts. And David

1 Ch 18:1–8

\* Vide *Psalms* ii. 2, “against his anointed.”

<sup>1</sup> §495. <sup>2</sup> §360.

smote Hadarezer, king of Zobah, unto Hamath, as he went /437 to establish his dominion by the river Euphrates. And David took from him a thousand chariots, and seven thousand horsemen, and twenty thousand footmen: David also houghed all the chariot horses, but reserved of them an hundred chariots. And when the Syrians of Damascus came to help Hadarezer, king of Zobah, David slew of the Syrians two-and-twenty thousand men. Then David put garrisons in Syria—damascus, and the Syrians became David’s servants, and brought gifts. Thus the Lord preserved David *whithersoever* he went. And David took the shields of gold that were on the servants of Hadarezer, and brought them to Jerusalem. Likewise from Tibhath, and from Chun, cities of Hadarezer, brought David very much brass, wherewith Solomon made the brazen sea, and the pillars, and the vessels of brass.” And also ch. xx. 2, 3: “And David took the crown of their king from off his head, and found it to weigh a talent of gold; and there were precious stones in it; and it was set upon David’s head: and he brought also exceeding much spoil out of the city. And he brought out the people that were in it, and *cut them with saws, and [with] harrows of iron, and with axes*. Even so dealt David with all the cities of the children of Ammon. And David and all the people returned to Jerusalem.” Do not such denunciations as “Thou shalt break them with a *rod of iron*,” “Thou shalt dash them in pieces,” found in ver. 9 of the above *Psalm*, /438 correspond with 1 *Chron.* xviii. [xx.], “David smote the Philistines;” “he smote Moab;” “David smote Hadarezer;” “David slew of the Syrians tow-and-twenty thousand men;” “David took the crown of their king from off his head;” “and cut them” (the citizens) “with saws, and with harrows of iron”? Are not these directly suitable to the history of David, the conqueror, called by God, his son, rather than to the office and nature of the meek and lowly Jesus, who, though most exalted among the sons of God, was himself the victim of the rage of unbelievers? Even upon the Trinitarian system, do not such sentences as “Ask—I shall give thee the heathen for an inheritance,” corresponding with the passages in *Chronicles*, “The Lord brought the fear of him” (David) “*upon all nations*,” “Thus the Lord preserved David whithersoever he went,”—admit of better application to David, whose glory depended from time to time upon his supplications to God, than to Jesus, who, as God himself, according to the Editor, was possessed of infinite power and glory from eternity, and needed not to ask of another? Does not such address to the heathen kings as “Kiss the son, lest he be angry,” &c., agree with the circumstances mentioned in 1 *Chron.* xviii. [xx.] “The Moabites became David’s servants, and brought gifts;” “the Syrians became David’s servants, and brought gifts;” “and he brought out the people—and cut them with saws, /439 and [with] harrows of iron, and with axes. Even so dealt David with all the cities of the children of Ammon”?

1 Ch 20:2f.

The opponents whom David broke “with a rod of iron,” were his political enemies; consequently the assertion of the Editor, that “[destruction to spiritual enemies is no](#)

§551

where in scripture described as arising from the wrath of a mere creature," has no applicability to the subject in question. As to his assertion, "Prophets denounced on men the wrath of God, and pronounced on them a curse in his name,"<sup>1</sup> I only refer the Reverend Editor to 2 *Kings* v. 26, 27, in which Elisha is said, when displeased at the conduct of his servant, to have miraculously punished him with leprosy, without pronouncing on him verbally any curse in the name of God; and also to *Exod.* xxiii. 21, wherein he will find that the angels of God, if provoked, have the power of keeping away pardon from men.

2 K 5:26f.

Ex 23:21

§552

It may, however, be fairly concluded from the authority and acts of Jesus himself, that both the angels and the prophets of God, in performing miracles, either of punishment or reward, according as they were disposed, applied always to God for power, though they sometimes omitted to express such applications verbally. *John* xi. 41, 42: "And Jesus" (in raising Lazarus from the dead) "lifted up his eyes and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me; and I knew that thou hearest me *always*."

Jn 11:41-43

§553

From the words, "who trust in him," found in /440 the second Psalm, the Editor attempts to prove the deity of the Son on the supposition that the phrase "to trust in" is exclusively applicable to God, and corroborates his opinion by *Jer.* xvii. 5,<sup>2</sup> forgetting that this term, though it is often used with reference to God, yet is applied sometimes to created beings. *Prov.* xxxi. 11: "The heart of her husband doth safely trust in her, so that he shall have no need of spoil." *Isaiah* xiv. 32: "The Lord hath founded Zion, and the poor of his people shall trust in it." As to *Jer.* xvii. 5, quoted by the Editor, "Thus saith Jehovah, Cursed be he that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from Jehovah," it, of course, implies that he who trusts in man, independently of God, should be cursed, as appears from the last sentence of the same verse, "whose heart departeth from Jehovah."

Jr 17:5-8

Pr 31:11

Is 14:32

§554

The Editor quotes *Psalm* xxiv. [1, 2]: "The earth is Jehovah's and the fulness thereof, the world and they that dwell therein; for he hath founded it upon the sea, and established it upon the floods," and compares it with *John* i. 3, "All things were made by him, (the Word,) and without him was not any thing made which was made." The inference which he draws from this comparison is, that "In creating power, Christ is equal to Jehovah."<sup>3</sup> Were we to overlook the mistranslation of this

Ps 24

Jn 1:3

<sup>1</sup> §360.

<sup>2</sup> §360: "Jeremiah however declares, ch. xvii. 5. 'Thus saith Jehovah, *Cursed* be he that *trusteth in man*, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from Jehovah.' If then it be cursed to trust in man, but blessed to trust in the Son, he is God over all blessed for evermore."

<sup>3</sup> §361.

verse\* in the /441 English version, (which is almost impossible not to notice,) and to understand the passage as it stands in the orthodox translation, we should esteem Jesus as the cause of all created beings. But we should be in this case naturally inclined to ascertain whether Jesus was an efficient or an instrumental cause of those things; since the preposition “by,” found in the verse, signifies either a principal agent of an action, or an instrument therein. We find *Heb. i. 2*, (as it stands in the English version,) deciding the question beyond a doubt: “(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 worlds*.” *Eph. iii. 9*: “Who (God) created all things by Jesus Christ.” Here all the worlds are represented as made by Jesus as an instrument in the hands of God. It is hoped that after reflecting upon this decision, by the author of these Epistles, /442 the Editor may, perhaps, retract his assertion, that “**in creating power, Christ is equal to Jehovah,**” and be of opinion that the world was made by the will of one being. Could not Jehovah, to whom the Editor ascribes omnipotence, create this world independently of another omnipotent being, equal to him “in creating power”? If not, the world must be, in this case, the joint production of Jehovah and Christ, as well as of the Holy Ghost, (whom the Editor here omits to notice,) and each of them must depend upon the others in creation, like joint managers of a concern. Can the Editor point out any set of men, or any nation professing a grosser polytheism than this? The only difference that he can shew between his notion and that of avowed polytheists, must consist only in respect of the increase or decrease of the supposed number of creators—a distinction which will amount to nothing intrinsic. I must now leave the subject to the sound judgment of my reader.

Heb 1:2

Ep 3:9

The Editor further proceeds, saying, “**With reference to Christ, Paul adds, (1 Cor. x. 25, 26,) ‘Whatsoever is sold in the shambles, that eat: for the earth is the Lord’s and the fulness thereof.’**”<sup>1</sup> He then concludes, “**If this *Psalm*, (xxiv. 1.) then, speak of Jehovah the Father, the same absolute dominion over the earth is here ascribed**

§555

1 Co 10:21–26;  
Ps 24:1

\* All things were done by him.] “All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made.” Newcome: who explains it of the creation of the visible material world by Christ, as the agent and instrument of God. See his notes on verses 3 and 10. But this is a sense which the word εγενετο will not admit. Γινομαι occurs upwards of seven hundred times in the New Testament, but never in the sense of create. It signifies in this Gospel, where it occurs fifty-three times, to be, to come, to become, to come to pass; also, to be done or transacted. Chapter xv. 7, xix. 36. It has the latter sense Matt. v. 18, vi. 8, xxi. 42, xxiv. 6. All things in the Christian dispensation were done by Christ; i. e. by his authority, and according to his direction; and in the ministry committed to his apostles, nothing has been done without his warrant. See John xv. 4, 5: “Without me ye can do nothing.” Compare vers. 7, 10, 16; John xvii. 8; Col. i. 16, 17; Cappe, *ibid.* (Improved Version.)<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> §361.

<sup>2</sup> Rammohan copied the footnote from NTIV, *Ed. 5*, 185. Obviously in his further explanation he does not follow the opinion given therein.

to the Son as to the Father; if the Son, he is there termed Jehovah.” St. Paul here justifies the eating of whatever is sold in the shambles, referring to *Psalm* /443 xxiv. 1, as his reason for such justification, without the most distant allusion to Jesus: I am, therefore, at a loss to discover the ground upon which the Editor finds his foregoing conclusion. For further illustration I quote the paraphrase by a most eminent personage on the above verses of *Corinthians*: “Eat whatever is sold in the shambles, without any inquiry or scruple, whether it had been offered to any idol or no. For the earth and all therein are the good creatures of the true God, given by him to men for their use.”<sup>1</sup> (Locke, Vol. VIII.) If the Editor still insists, in defiance of St. Paul’s reference, of common sense, and of the above paraphrase, that in 1 *Cor.* x. 26, St. Paul alludes to Jesus, I should take upon myself to refer him to *Heb.* i. 2, (the Son,) “whom he (God) hath appointed heir of all things;” and to *John* iii. 35, “The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand.” These I hope will convince him that all the power and possession of the Son, in heaven and earth, are derived from the gift of the Father of the universe.

Heb 1:2; Jn 3:35

§556

1 Co 10:21f.

The Editor quotes 1 *Cor.* x. 22: “Do we provoke the Lord to jealousy? Are we stronger than he?” whence he infers that “the Lord then is capable of being provoked by the worship of idols equally with God.”<sup>2</sup> Granting that St. Paul means Jesus by the term “Lord,” and by the pronoun “he,” in verse the 22nd, (a position which is unsupported by proof,<sup>3</sup>) we still find nothing in the passage elevating Jesus /444 to equality with his Father. The apostle may, according to the Editor’s interpretation, be supposed to have prohibited Christians from provoking Christ to jealousy, by partaking of the cup and table of devils, instead of those of Christ, of which their Master required them to partake, as appears from the immediately preceding verse—“Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils. Ye cannot be partakers of the Lord’s table, and of the table of devils.” Is it not natural that Jesus, who enjoined the apostles to observe the Lord’s Supper, would be provoked to jealousy by his followers’ partaking both of his table, and of the sacrifice offered to idols, without his thereby equalizing himself with God? I find that the prophets of God are declared in more pointed terms to have been jealous of the dishonour manifested to God; but no one has ever felt disposed to ascribe to them equality with his Divine Majesty.

1 K 19:10

1 *Kings* xix. 10: “And he said, I have been very jealous for the Lord God of hosts; for the children of Israel have forsaken thy covenant, and thrown down thy altars,” &c.

§557

I will repeat *verbatim* the Editor’s quotation of *Psalm* xxiv. 8, and *Eph.* iv. 8, and his inference of the deity of Jesus, from the comparison of the one with the other,

<sup>1</sup> Locke, *Works* III, I *Corinthians*, 183.   <sup>2</sup> §361.

<sup>3</sup> Marshman’s quotation had also included verse 21: “Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils.” This reference to the Lord’s supper and his cup would be proof enough.

that my reader may perceive how violently prejudice can operate upon the human mind. He says, (p. 561,) that “in verse 8th, one is about to enter heaven as the king of glory; who is called ‘Jehovah,’ mighty in battle.” In *Eph.* iv. /445 “Jesus, *elsewhere* styled the Lord of glory, ascends, having led captivity captive, which implies battle and victory.\* Here also, the Son is either described as equal in might to Jehovah, or as Jehovah himself.”<sup>1</sup> There are not in verse eight, nor in the whole *Psalms* xxiv., such phrases as “captivity captive,” or “ascend on high,” as found in *Eph.* iv. 8; nor are there, in the whole chap. iv. of *Ephesians*, the terms “king of glory,” or even “Lord of glory,” or “mighty in battle,” as we find stated in the above *Psalms*. The *Psalms* commences by a declaration of God’s sovereignty over the earth—proceeds to state the virtues that must belong to those who seek his presence and desire his blessing—and concludes with an exhortation to Jerusalem to receive him as the king of glory—the Lord of hosts. But the subject of the above verse of the Epistle to the *Ephesians*, is Jesus, who ascended on high to give divine gifts to men, after he had *descended first into the middle of the grave*, as is evident from the immediately following verse: “Now that he ascended, what is it, but that he also *descended first into the lower parts of the earth*,” and so on; a descent which cannot be ascribed to God. *Eph.* iv. 8, is an obvious reference to *Psalms* lxviii. 18, a fact which is acknowledged /446 even by Mr. Brown and Mr. Jones,<sup>2</sup> and many other Trinitarian writers: “Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive, thou hast received gifts for men; yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them.” But the Editor omits here to compare the passage in *Ephesians* with the last-mentioned *Psalms*, though both contain almost the same words that he dwells upon; perhaps in consideration of the latter phrases of the *Psalms* being inconsistent with his object. “Thou *hast received gifts* for men, that *the Lord God might dwell among them*,” which clearly shews the subordination of the Son to his heavenly Father. In further explanation, I repeat the note of Mr. Locke, on verses 9 and 10 of *Ephesians*, in his paraphrase of this Epistle, page 477. Note on verses 9, 10: “St. Paul’s argumentation, in these two verses, is skillfully adapted to the main design of his Epistle. The converted Gentiles were attacked by the unconverted Jews, who were declared enemies to the thoughts of a Messiah that died. St. Paul, to enervate that objection of theirs, proves, by the passage out of the *Psalms*, (ver. 8,) that he must die and be buried. Besides the unbelieving Jews, several of them that were converted to the gospel, or at least, professed to be so, attacked the Gentile converts on another ground, persuading

Ps 24; Ep 4:8

Ps 68:18

Ep 4:9f.

\* This term, “to lead captivity captive,” is not synonymous to “mighty in battle,” nor equivalent in application. For one may be mighty in battle without leading captives; so one may lead captive, by miraculous or artful means, without being mighty in battle.

<sup>1</sup> §361. <sup>2</sup> See Rammohan’s explanation and quotations of Brown and Jones in §244.



them that they could not be admitted to be the people of God, under the kingdom of the Messiah, nor receive any advantage by him, unless they were circumcised, /447 and put themselves wholly under the Jewish constitution. He had said a great deal, in the three first chapters, to free them from this perplexity, but yet takes occasion here to offer them a new argument, by telling them, that Christ, the same Jesus that died, and was laid in his grave, was exalted to the right hand of God, above all the heavens, in the highest state of dignity and power, that, he himself being filled with the fulness of God, believers, who were all his members, might receive immediately from him, their head, a fulness of gifts and graces, upon no other terms, but barely as they were his members.”<sup>1</sup>

§558

Ps 36:6; Col 1:17;

Heb 1:3

After having compared *Psalm* xxxvi. 6, “O Jehovah, thou preservest man and beast,” with *Col.* i. 17, “By him (by Jesus) all things consist,” and with *Heb.* i. 3, “He upholds all things by the word of his power,” the Editor thus concludes, “**The Son, then, is either equal to Jehovah in preserving power, or Jehovah himself.**”<sup>2</sup> In the first place, in some ancient manuscripts, instead of “by him all things consist,” there is the phrase “all things are united in him,”<sup>3</sup> which of course bears no comparison with the above *Psalm*, “O Jehovah, thou preservest man and beast.” In the second place, he may perceive from the context, that by the term “all things,” the apostle could have meant only the things concerning the Christian dispensation; for we find, in the verse immediately following, Jesus is declared to be “the head of the body, the church,” and in the preceding /448 verse, “the things” are enumerated as orders and ranks in the religious and the moral world, and not natural substances. In the third

---

\* “That the apostle does not here intend the creation of natural substances, is evident; for 1st, He does not say, that by him were created heaven and earth, but things in heaven and things on earth; 2dly, He does not, in descending into detail, specify things themselves, viz. celestial and terrestrial substances, but merely states of things, viz. thrones, dominions, &c., which are only ranks and orders of beings in the rational and moral world; 3dly, It is plain, from comparing ver. 15 and ver. 18, that Christ is called the first-born of the whole creation, because he is the first who was raised from the dead to an immortal life; 4thly, The creation of natural objects, the heaven, the earth, and sea, and all things therein, when they are plainly and unequivocally mentioned, is uniformly and invariably ascribed to the Father, both in the Old Testament and the New. Hence, it follows, that the creation, which the apostle here ascribes to Christ, expresses that great change which was introduced into the moral world, and particularly into the relative situation of Jews and Gentiles, by the dispensation of the gospel. This is often called creation, or the new creation, and is usually ascribed to Jesus Christ, who was the great prophet and messenger of the new covenant. See *Eph.* i. 10, ii. 10–15, iii. 9, iv. 24; *Col.* iii. 10; *2 Cor.* v. 17. This great change the apostle here describes under the symbol of a revolution, introduced by Christ amongst certain ranks and orders of beings, by whom, according to the Jewish demonology, borrowed

<sup>1</sup> Locke, *Works III, Ephesians*, 372.   <sup>2</sup> §361.

<sup>3</sup> Lant Carpenter claims this to be a correcter translation, of *συνέστηκεν*. see L. Carpenter, *Unitarianism*, 165. He does not refer to “ancient manuscripts”, though, and there are no alternative readings of this verse given by Griesbach.



place, admitting even the interpretation of the Editor, that all natural substances consist by Jesus, we cannot help yielding conviction to the repeated avowal of Jesus, /449 manifesting that the support of all things, or the things of the new dispensation of Jesus, is entirely owing to the power vested in him by the Father of all things, without which, he is totally unable to support them. *John* xvii. 2: “Thou hast given him (the son) power over all flesh.” Ch. v. 30: “I can of mine ownself do nothing,” &c. As to the term “all things,” τα παντα, found in *Heb.* i. 3, just quoted by the Editor, it signifies also, all things belonging to the Christian dispensation, as I observed before.<sup>1</sup> But if the Editor again insists upon his mode of interpretation, as meaning all natural objects by that term, he, by referring to *John* xiv. 24, “The word which ye hear is not mine but the Father’s,” and *Matt.* xxviii. 18, “All power is given unto me in heaven and on earth,” must be convinced that the word of power, by which Jesus upholds or rules all things, is, in fact, belonging to the Father.

Jn 17:2; 5:30

Jn 14:24; Mt 28:18

In his attempt to prove the deity of Jesus, the Editor repeats (page 561) *Psalms* xlv. 6, as quoted in *Heb.* i. 8, “Thy throne, O Jehovah, is for ever and ever.” My reader may observe, that to apply to Jesus the term “Jehovah,” the peculiar name of God, the Editor perverts the verse in question by placing the word “Jehovah” instead of “God,” a term which is in the Scriptures commonly used, not only for the Creator, but for other superior existences. He, at the same time, neglects entirely the /450 original *Psalms*, in Hebrew אלהים, “Thy throne, O God,” and also the original Epistle to Hebrews, in Greek Θεος, “The throne of thee, O God.” I now beg to ask the Editor to let me know his authority for this unaccountable change.<sup>2</sup> I should, for my own part, be indeed very sorry and ashamed of my opinions, if I found myself compelled to make perversions of scriptural passages, and to set aside the suggestions of common sense, to support the doctrines that I may have been persuaded to profess. It is again worth observing, that the Editor quotes the above passage of *Psalms* xlv., omitting entirely to notice my remarks on it in the Second Appeal. I am therefore, induced to repeat them, in the hope that he may reply to them, and adopt a regular mode of argumentation. After stating that Moses was also called God in [the] Scriptures, I thus proceed: “On what principle, then, can any stress be laid in defence of the deity of the Son, on the prophetic expression, quoted in *Hebrews* from *Psalms* xlv. 6, ‘Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever’; especially when we find, in the very

§559

Heb 1:8

Heb 1:8f.  
(=Ps 45:6–8)

from the oriental philosophy, the affairs of states and individuals were superintended and governed. See Mr. Lindsey’s Sequel, page 477, and Wetstein in loc.” Improved Version.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> NTIV, Ed. 5, 454, to Heb 1:3: “ruling and directing all things in the new dispensation, by authority derived from the Father.”

<sup>2</sup> Marshman committed this mistake in §343 and §362. Otherwise he quotes this verse correctly.

<sup>3</sup> Rammohan copied this footnote from NTIV, Ed. 5, 419-420.

next verse, words that declare his subordinate nature, ‘Thou lovest righteousness and hatest wickedness, therefore God, *thy God*, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above *thy fellows*?’<sup>1</sup> (Page 170.) “But it deserves particularly to be noticed, in this instance, that the Messiah, in whatever sense he is declared God, is, in the very same sense, described in verse 7, (‘God /451 *thy God*,’) as having a God *superior to him*, and by whom he was appointed to the office of Messiah.”<sup>2</sup> (Page 285.)<sup>3</sup>

§560 In the third place, no scripturalist ever hesitated to apply *Psalms* xlv. directly to Solomon, after his marriage with the daughter of Pharaoh, as is evident from the context: “My heart is inditing a good matter: I speak of the things which I have made touching the king: my tongue *is* the pen of a ready writer. Thou art fairer than the children of men: grace is poured into thy lips: therefore God hath blessed thee for ever. Thy throne, O God, *is* for ever and ever: the sceptre of thy kingdom *is* a right sceptre. Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness: therefore God, *thy God*, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows. Kings’ daughters *were* among thy honourable women: upon thy right hand did stand the queen in gold of Ophir. Hearken, O daughter, and consider, and incline thine ear; forget also thine own people, and thy father’s house: so shall the king greatly desire thy beauty; for he *is* thy Lord; and worship thou him. Instead of thy fathers shall be thy children, whom thou mayest make princes in all the earth.”<sup>4</sup> If the application of the word “God” in an accommodated sense, entitle Jesus to deity, how much more properly should the direct application of the same word, “God,” to Solomon, according to the Editor, exalt him to a participation in the divine nature? /452

§561 The Editor afterwards quotes, in defence of the deity of Jesus, *Psalms* cii. 25–27, referred to by the author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*. (i. 10–12.) “Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thy hand. They shall perish; but thou remainest: and they all shall wax old as doth a garment: and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail.” The construction here admits of two interpretations: one is, that verses 10–12, are in continuation of verses 8, 9, addressed to the Son by God, as supposed by the Editor: the other is, that the author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* invokes his Divine Majesty by quoting *Psalms* cii. 25–27, after he has, in the preceding verse, introduced the name of God, as anointing the

<sup>1</sup> §121. <sup>2</sup> §226.

<sup>3</sup> Actually Marshman has answered to these with his explanation of an innertrinitarian transfer of power, e. g. §377: “Judgment originally belongs to both the Father and the Son. But the Son was pleased of his infinite mercy to *give himself* for our sins, and the Father was pleased to deliver to him *all power* in heaven and earth, and commit to him *all judgment, judging* no man *himself*, thus committing that work *wholly* to the Son, which by nature belongs to him in common with the Father.”

<sup>4</sup> Omitting v. 3-5, 8, 12-15. But those verses rather intensify the impression of a royal marriage.

Son above his fellows, to shew the continual duration of the honour bestowed on the Son, as flowing from the unchangeable and preserving power of the bestower of that honour. To ascertain which of these two interpretations the apostle had in view, let us now refer to the context. One's exaltation above his fellows by another, on account of his merit, as stated in the preceding verse, (9,) is quite inconsistent with the immutable character mentioned in verses 10—12, and, therefore, these two opposite qualities can by no means be ascribed to the same being. Again, in the following verse, (13,) the apostle, to prove the superiority of the Son over angels, asks, "To which of the angels /453 said he, at any time, Sit on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool?" Here common sense dictates, that if such expressions as "Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth," &c.; "As a vesture shalt thou fold them up;" and "Thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail," had been meant by the apostle as applicable to Jesus, he would not, in setting forth the dignity of the Son, have added the words, "Sit on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool;" which imply a much inferior nature to that attributed in the preceding passage, and which, indeed may be paralleled by other expressions found in scripture, applied to mere human beings. *Deut.* xxxii. 10: "He (Jehovah) kept him as the *apple of his eye*." *Isaiah* xlix. 16: "Behold, I have graven thee upon *the palms of my hands*." *Psalms* xlvii. 3: "He (Jehovah) shall subdue the people under *us*, and the nations under *our feet*." In describing the superior courage and strength of a man who is reported to have overpowered a lion, and also a dog, no one endued with common sense would, after stating the former fact, adduce the latter as additional proof of courage and strength, as it is evident that to kill a dog is a feat by no means of so wonderful a nature as that of overcoming a lion. My reader may recollect *Matt.* xxii. 45: "If David then call him (the Messiah) Lord, how is he his son?" which tells us that Jesus disproves the assertion of the Messiah /454 being the son of David, on the ground that no father could consistently call his son "Lord," much less could he apply to his son the term "my Lord." Were we to admit the first interpretation, upheld by the Editor, and to consider the passage, "Thou, Lord, in the beginning," &c., as a part of the address of Jehovah to Jesus, we must, in conformity to the argument used by Jesus himself, in *Matt.* xxii. 45, relinquish the commonly-received doctrine, that Jesus is the Son of God, and actually admit his superiority to the Father of the universe, who, according to the Editor, addresses him as "Lord" in Heb. i. 10. Either, therefore, the Editor must abandon the opinion that God the Father addresses Jesus as Lord, in the passage referred to, or he must cease to consider him as the "Son of God."

Heb 1:13

Dt 32:10; Is 49:16; Ps 47:3

Mt 22:45

Heb 1:10

The Editor again uses the word Jehovah in verse 10, and reads, "**Thou, Jehovah, in the beginning,**" &c., instead of "Thou, Lord, in the beginning," &c., without assigning any reason for his deviating from the English version, as well as the Hebrew

§562

Ps 102:25 and Greek originals.<sup>1</sup> For in the original Hebrew there is no “Jehovah” mentioned in *Psalm* cii. 25, and, consequently, in the Greek passage, *Heb.* i. 10, which is a quotation of the same verse of the above *Psalm*, the term *κυριε* cannot be supposed to be intended as a translation of the word Jehovah. So in the English version in the verse stands thus, “Thou, *Lord*, in the beginning,” &c. I shall, however, feel obliged to the Reverend Editor, if he can point out to me any authority for his substitution of the word “Jehovah” for *Lord*, in the verse in question.

§563 With a view to weaken the strength of the evidence found in 1 *Cor.* xv. 24, as to the changeable nature of Christ, the Editor says, (page 562,) “His original throne as Jehovah God, is for ever and ever; his mediatorial throne remains for a season, and then ceases.”<sup>2</sup> I have already noticed, in pages 170 and 277 of the Second Appeal,<sup>3</sup> and in the foregoing chapter of this work, that the term *for ever*, or similar terms, when used for a creature, or a begotten son, signify, in scriptural idiom, long duration of time. My reader, therefore, by referring to those instances, will be convinced that neither Solomon, to whom *Psalm* cii. 25, is directly applied,<sup>4</sup> nor Jesus, to whom the apostle applies the said verse in the above *Psalm*, in an accommodated sense, can be supposed to be endued with a throne or kingdom that never will cease;—a question which St. Paul decides in the most plain and positive terms, in 1 *Cor.* xv. 24, 25: “Then cometh the end, when he shall have *delivered up the kingdom* to God, even the Father; when he shall have laid down all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet.” (Verse 28): “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.” Here the apostle declares, that Jesus /456 will in the end *deliver up his kingdom* to God *the Father*, and not to God composed (as the Editor maintains) of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and that the Son himself, unlimited to any particular capacity, whether mediatorial, human, or divine, shall be subject to the Father, that God alone may be all in all. Is there in this passage, or in any other part of the Scriptures, any authority for saying that the Son’s mediatorial throne *alone* shall be delivered up to the Father? On the contrary, neither he nor any one, can in a mediatorial capacity exercise a kingdom; but Jesus, as the king of our faith, the anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows, has a kingdom and throne, and that kingdom only can he deliver up in the end of the world, that God may be all in all. Besides, the above verse (28) asserts, that he, as the *Son*, the highest title that Jesus is honoured with, will be subject to him who has exalted him above all creatures. No one, besides, unbiassed by early

1 Co 15:24f.

1 Co 15:28

<sup>1</sup> §362    <sup>2</sup> §362.    <sup>3</sup> §121 and §215.

<sup>4</sup> Is there a mistake? Rammohan cannot in any way apply Ps 102:25 to Solomon (as Marshman points out in §1010), but he applied Ps 45 “directly to Solomon” in §560.

prejudice, can ever venture to pronounce such an opinion as, that a being can lose his kingdom in any capacity whatsoever, and yet be unchangeable.

As some orthodox divines had attempted to prove the deity of Jesus from the circumstance of the term “shepherd” being applied to God, in *Psalm* xxiii. [1], and to Jesus, in *John* x. 16, I pointed out (pp. 290, 291 of the Second Appeal<sup>1</sup>), that the same term “shepherd” is used for Moses, (in *Isaiah* lxiii. 11, “With the shepherd of his flock,”) and for the /457 leaders of Israel, (*Jer.* xxiii. 4, “I will set up shepherds over them,”) yet that none of those persons is supposed to have been united with God. §564  
Ps 23; Jn 10:16  
Is 63:11; Jr 23:4

The Reverend Editor, although he acknowledges the accuracy of my above assertion, yet tries to draw from it an argument against me by means of one or two strange questions. One is, (page 562,) “But did he” (the author) “never read of a chief shepherd, who, when he shall appear, will give the under shepherds a crown of glory?” The other is, “But was our author ignorant that David was also one of Christ’s fold, and Moses, and Abraham?”<sup>2</sup> In answer to which, I must confess that I am ignorant of David, Moses, and Abraham, having been of Christ’s fold: and although Jesus is styled “a chief shepherd,” yet such avowal of his superiority above other messengers of the Deity neither places him on a level with Jehovah, nor does it prove his unity with the Most High God. Can a chief among the generals of a king, be ever supposed equal to, or identified with, the king, his employer? With respect to the argument founded on referring to Jesus Christ *Ezek.* xxxiv. 23, “I will set one shepherd, even my servant David,” I observed in my Second Appeal, (p. 291,) that, even in this case, “they must still attribute his shepherdship over his flock to divine commission, and must relinquish the idea of unity between God the employer, and the Messiah his servant.”<sup>3</sup> To which the Editor makes reply, “We must relinquish a unity of nature between the Divine Father /458 and the Messiah whom he sent, just as much as we do between Cyaxares and Cyrus, employed to lead his armies, between Vespasian and Titus, between George the Third and his Son, now George the Fourth.”<sup>4</sup> In this passage, it must be confessed that we have something like a clear definition or exposition of the nature of the Trinity, in which the Editor professes his belief;—that is, he conceives the Godhead to constitute a genus like angel, man, fowl, fish, &c., God the Son being of the same nature with God the Father, just as the man George the Third is of the same nature with the man George the Fourth, though of a separate will, inclination and passion, and distinct existence—a conception which is certainly compatible with an idea of unity of nature between the Father and the Son, but which is entirely inconsistent with that of coequality between them; and implies, that, as the difference of existence, &c., between man and man is the origin of the 1 P 5:4  
Ezk 34:23f.

<sup>1</sup> §236. <sup>2</sup> §363. <sup>3</sup> §236. <sup>4</sup> §363.

plurality of mankind, so the difference of existence, &c. between God and God, must cause plurality in the Godhead. Can there be any polytheistical creed more clear and more gross than this? Yet the Editor will take it amiss if charged with Polytheism. It is worth observing, that the orthodox, so far from establishing the unity of the Messiah with God by means of the above passage, “I will set one shepherd over them, even my *servant David*,” can at most but prove unity between the Messiah and God’s *servant David*. /459

§566 In the course of this argument, the Editor says, that “he had [adduced many other passages in which the Son is called Jehovah](#).”<sup>1</sup> I wonder at this assertion. I find hitherto only two places in which he applies the word Jehovah to Jesus, “Thy throne, O God!” &c., “And thou, Lord, in the beginning,” &c. The Editor takes upon himself to use the term Jehovah instead of “God” in the former, and instead of “Lord” in the latter instance, as before noticed, and now he gives out his own perversion of those texts as authority!

§567 Mr. Jones having attempted to deduce the deity of Jesus by a comparison of *Ephes.* iv. 18<sup>2</sup>, with *Psalms* lxxviii. 18, “Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive: thou hast received gifts for men; yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them,”—I observed, (page 297, Second Appeal,) that, “[from a view of the whole verse, the sense must, according to this mode of reasoning, be as follows—The person who ascended on high, and who received gifts for men, that the Lord God might dwell among them, is the Lord God;—an interpretation which, as implying that the Lord God ascended, and received gifts from a being of course superior to himself, in order that he might dwell among men, is equally absurd and unscriptural](#).”<sup>3</sup> The Editor entirely omits to notice the foregoing observation, and only refers to the context, inferring thence that different persons of the Godhead are addressed in the course of the Psalm. /460 (Page 564.) “[The Psalm](#),” he observes, (lxxiii.,) “[commences with an address to God in the third person. At verse 7th he is addressed in the second person: the second person is retained till verse 11th, and is resumed again in this, the 18th, verse. If one person be not addressed from the beginning, therefore, it is certain that he who ascended on high, identified by Paul as Christ, is God, who went forth before the people through the wilderness](#).”<sup>4</sup> How is it possible that the Editor, a diligent student of the Bible for thirty or forty years, should not know that, in addressing God, the third person and also the second are constantly used in immediate sequence, and that this variation is considered a rhetorical trope in Hebrew and Arabic, as well as in almost all the Asiatic languages, from being supposed to convey notions of the omnipresence and pervading influence of the Deity? To prove this assertion, I could quote a great many instances even from the single

<sup>1</sup> §363. <sup>2</sup> Read: “8”. <sup>3</sup> §244. <sup>4</sup> §364.

book of *Psalms*, such as *Psalms* iii. 3–5, &c., and in a single ch., 2 *Sam.* xxii. 3, 49, in which God is addressed both in the second and third persons; but as the Editor might, perhaps, allege in those cases, though in defiance both of the idiom of the Hebrew and of common sense, that in all these instances, David in spirit meant the first and the second persons of the Godhead by the variety of persons, I shall quote the translation of some lines of the *Qoran*, by Sale<sup>1</sup>, and of a Jewish prayer, in which the same variety of persons is used, and where it cannot be imagined /461 that different persons of the Godhead are meant to be therein addressed. *Alqoran*, ch. i.: “Praise be to *God the Lord* of all creatures, the most merciful, the King of the day of judgment. *Thee* do we worship, and of thee do we beg assistance. Direct us in the right way, in the way of those to whom thou hast been gracious; not of those against whom thou art incensed, not of those who go astray.”<sup>2</sup> Can Mohummud here be supposed to have alluded in spirit to the first and second persons of God, or has he not rather used those phrases according to the common practice of the language? The following lines are from a Jewish book of prayers, written in Hebrew, and translated into English.\* “*Sabbath morning service.* ‘Therefore, all whom God hath formed, shall glorify and bless him; they shall ascribe praise, honour, and glory, unto the King who hath formed all things, and who, through his holiness, causeth his people Israel to inherit rest on the holy sabbath. *Thy* name, O Lord our God! shall be sanctified.’” “*Morning service.* ‘His words also are living, permanent, faithful, and desirable for ever, even unto all ages; as well those which he hath spoken concerning our ancestors, as those concerning us, our children, our generations, and the generations of the seed of Israel, *thy* servants, both the /462 first and the last.’” A thousand similar instances might be adduced.

Ps 3:3–5; 2 S 22:3, 49

Surah 1

In the *Qoran*, it is further remarkable that the same change of person is adopted when God is represented as speaking of himself. *Alqoran*, ii. 5<sup>3</sup>: “Set not up, therefore, any equals unto *God* against your own knowledge. If ye be in doubt concerning that revelation which we have sent down unto our servant, produce a chapter like unto it, and call upon your witnesses besides *God*, if ye say truth.” Moreover, we find in the Jewish Scriptures, that in speaking of a third party, both the second and the third personal pronouns are sometimes used. *Hosea* ii. 15–17: “And I will give

§568

Surah 2:22f.

Ho 2:15–19

\* Compiled by the Rev. Solomon Hirschell, translated by Messrs. Justins, Barnet, and Joseph, and printed in London by E. Justins, 1803.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> George Sale (1697-1736), British Orientalist. <sup>2</sup> Sale, *Koran*, Vol. I, 1f.

<sup>3</sup> This is from verses 22f. of the second Surah. Rammohan seems to give “ii. 5”, because he quotes from page 5 of Sale’s translation!

<sup>4</sup> This could be *Joseph, Barnet and Justins, editors, The form of daily prayers. According to the custom of the German and Polish Jews, as read in their synagogues, and used in their families, London 1808.* I could not access this book in order to check Rammohan’s quotation.



her her vineyards from thence, and the valley of Achor for a door of hope; and she shall sing there, as in the days of her youth, and as in the day when she came up out of the land of Egypt. And it shall be at that day, saith the Lord, *that* thou shalt call me Ishi; and shalt call me no more Baali. For I will take away the names of Baalim out of her mouth, and they shall no more be remembered by their name.” Ver. 19: “And I will betroth thee unto me for ever; yea, I will betroth thee unto me in righteousness, and in judgment, and in loving-kindness, and in mercies.” The public may now judge what weight the argument of the Editor ought to carry with it, and whether I adduced only a “[Jewish dream](#)” in applying verse 18 originally to Moses,<sup>1</sup> or whether the Editor rather /463 has not founded his position on the ground of mere imagination. To me, as an Asiatic, nothing can appear more strange than an attempt to deduce the deity of Jesus from an address by David to the omnipresent God, couched in both the second and third persons. I will, moreover, confidently appeal to the context, to satisfy any unprejudiced person that the Psalmist, in verse 18th, had Moses alone in view.<sup>2</sup> The Psalm, it will be recollected, was written on the specific occasion of the removal of the ark, which was done according to the instructions delivered to Moses by God on Mount Sinai.<sup>3</sup> David accordingly recapitulates, in the preceding verses of the Psalm, the wonderful mercies of God in delivering Israel from the Egyptians, and leading them towards the promised land. In verses 15–17, Sinai is thus mentioned: “The hill of God is as the hill of Bashan; an high hill, as the hill of Bashan. Why leap ye, ye high hills? This is the hill which God desireth to dwell in; yea, the Lord will dwell in it for ever. The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of angels: the Lord is among them, as in Sinai, in the holy place.” In verse 18, immediately after mention of the word Sinai, the holy place, he goes on, “Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive: thou hast *received gifts* for men; yea, for the rebellious also, *that the Lord God might dwell among them;*”—the very reason to which, in the book of Exodus, the construction of the ark, whose removal /464 was taking place, is assigned. From this it appears evident, that the gifts alluded to were those granted on Mount Sinai; and the only question that remains is, Who was it that received those gifts for men? I leave this to be answered by the candid reader. There are, besides, many other passages in the writings of the Psalmist where David, after addressing the Supreme Father of the

Ps 68

<sup>1</sup> Marshman in §364: “our author, while he adduces the Jewish dream that it was Moses who ascended on high, i. e. to Sinai, and received gifts for men, the ten commands”.

<sup>2</sup> In §244 of the *Second Appeal* Rammohan mentioned this Jewish interpretation only as one possible explanation.

<sup>3</sup> Rammohan got this from Brown, *Self-Interpreting Bible*, 595: “Perhaps this psalm was composed on the same occasion as the 24th and 47th, when David brought up the ark of God to that tabernacle which he had pitched for it in Zion; [2 Sam. vi.]”



universe, abruptly addresses himself to creatures, such as in *Psalm* lxxviii. 28; iv. 1, 2; ix. 5, 6, 10, 11; lxxvi. 15, 16; xci. 13, 14. There is nothing, therefore, unusual or strange in applying the verse in question, though originally relating to Moses, in an accommodated sense to Jesus. Ps 68:28; 4:1f.; 9:5-11; 66:15f.; 16:13f.

To prove the figurative application of the term God to Jesus, and to other superior creatures, from the authority of the Saviour himself, I quoted (Second Appeal, p. 169)<sup>1</sup> *John* x. 34, "Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are Gods?" With a view to invalidate this argument, the Editor puts three questions (page 564). "What creatures of a superior nature are here termed gods? Those that die like men."<sup>2</sup> To this I answer, Yes; the term "God" is here applied to those chiefs of Israel who were men, and who consequently died like men; and from the very circumstance of their having had the appearance of man, an having been endowed with human feelings, as well as their having been, like men, liable to death, we are under the necessity of inferring that the application of the term "God" /465 to them is figurative, and that it is by no means real, though we find them exalted by the terms, "the sons of the Most High" (*Psalm* lxxxii. 6\*); "the first-born of God" (*Exodus* iv. 22); the "peculiar people of God, above all nations" (xix. 5); the "kingdom of priests, and an holy nation" (ver. 6); and even by the most glorifying title of "Gods" (*Psalm* lxxxii. 6). Upon the same ground and the same principle, we must consider (if not biassed by prejudice) the use of the word "God," and "the Son of God," for Jesus, to be figurative, as he himself explained (*John* x. 34); for although Jesus was honoured with abundantly high titles, yet he was in the appearance of man, and possessed of human feelings, and liable to death, like those chiefs of Israel, as is evident from the following, as well as many other facts recorded in the Scriptures: "She brought forth her first-born son" (Jesus). (*Luke* ii. 7) "And when eight days were accomplished for *circumcising* of the child, his name was called Jesus." (Ver. 21.) "And the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom, and the grace of God was upon him." (Ver. 40.) "When he was twelve years' old." "And was subject unto them" (his parents). (Ver. 51.) "Jesus increased in wisdom and stature." (Ver. 52). "The Son of Man came eating and drinking," &c. (*Matt.* xi. 29.) /466 "And when he had looked round about on them with anger, being grieved." (*Mark* iii. 5.) "Jesus, therefore, being weary with his journey." (*John* iv. 6.) "Now is my soul troubled." (xii. 27.) "And began to wash his disciples' feet." (xiii. 5.) "He was troubled in spirit." (Ver. 21.) "And being in an agony, he prayed more earnestly." (*Luke* xxii. 44.) "And (Jesus) said unto them, My soul is exceedingly sorrowful, unto death." (*Mark* xiv. 34.) "Jesus, when he had cried again with a loud voice, yielded §569 Jn 10:33-36 Ps 82:6; Ex 4:22; 19:5f. Lk 2 Mt 11:29; Mk 3:5 Jn 4:6; 12:27; 13:5, 21 Lk 22:24; Mk 14:34

\* In the original Hebrew, the word בני, signifying sons, is found, instead of ילדי, or children, as found in the English version.

<sup>1</sup> §121. <sup>2</sup> §365.

Mt 27:50; Ph 2:8

up the ghost.” (Matt. xxvii. 50.) “And became *obedient unto death*, even the death of the cross.” (Philip. ii. 8.) Ought not the consideration of the forgoing circumstances relating to Jesus Christ, to have prevented the Editor from inquiring, “What creatures of a superior nature are here termed Gods? Those (Israelites) that die like men?” For if the circumstance of being men, and dying like men, must preclude the chiefs of Israel from being supposed to be creatures of a superior nature, notwithstanding they are called *gods*, the highest of all the honorary terms with which any being can be exalted; how can the same argument fail in proving the common humanity of Jesus, who was, like them, in the shape of a man, and died as a man? If the Editor say, that Jesus, though he died like man, yet was raised again from the dead, I shall remind him, that Enoch, one of the sons of men, and Elijah, a Jewish prophet, never tasted death at all, like other /467 men;\* that the dead, who happened to touch the body of Elisha, revived and stood up;† and, that a dead boy also was raised by him;‡ and then ask the Editor, are not these circumstances more wonderful than Christ’s being raised after death? Is not the fact of Elijah’s not having died at all, more conclusive evidence of a superior nature, according to the mode of reasoning employed by the Editor, than the resurrection of Christ after his death on the cross?

Gn 5:24; 2 K  
2:10f.

2 K 13:21; 4:34f.

§570

In case the Editor should have recourse to the generally-adopted argument, that Jesus was possessed of a two-fold nature, the nature of God and the nature of man; the former, because he is termed God in scripture, and the latter, because he was in the shape of man; I would ask, is there any authority in the sacred writings for alleging that Jesus was possessed of such two-fold nature? A question which, indeed, I took upon myself to put to the Editor in the Second Appeal, (page 252,)<sup>1</sup> but which he has avoided to answer. Are not Moses and the chiefs of Israel termed, in like manner, gods<sup>§</sup> as well as men?<sup>¶</sup> Did not they perform wonderful miracles, as raising the dead and commanding wind and water,<sup>||</sup> as well as the sun and moon?<sup>\*\*</sup> Did /468 not some of them talk of themselves in a manner suitable to the nature of God alone?<sup>††</sup> Are we, from these circumstances, to represent them as possessing a two-fold nature, divine and human? If not, let us give up such an unscriptural and irrational idea, as attributing to Jesus, or to any human being, a double nature of God and man, and restrain ourselves from bringing Christianity to a level with the doctrines of heathenish polytheism. Is it not a general rule, adopted to preserve

\* 2 Kings ii. 11. † 2 Kings xiii. 21.

‡ 2 Kings iv. 34, 35

§ Exod. vii. 1. ¶ Deut. xxxiii. 1<sup>2</sup>; Ezek. xxxiv. 31. || 1 Kings xvii. 1, xviii. 44, 45, and 2 Kings ii. 22.

\*\* Joshua x. 12, 13. †† Deut. xxvii. 1, xxxii. 1.

<sup>1</sup> §173.

<sup>2</sup> In Dt 33:1 Moses is called “man of God”, not “God”. “Man of God” is a common biblical term for prophets and holy men.

concordance between all the passages of scripture, and to render them consistent with reason, that when terms, phrases, or circumstances, which are applicable to God alone, are found ascribed to a created being, either man or angel, these are to be interpreted in an inferior sense? Were we to deviate from this general rule and take these terms to be real, Judaism and Christianity would be but systems of Polytheism, and unworthy of adoption by rational beings. Such an attempt as to shew that Moses and the chiefs of Israel having been types and shadows of Jesus, are called gods, is totally inadmissible; for we find no authority in the Scriptures for such an assertion: moreover, had there been any authority declaring Moses and others to have been types of Jesus, it could not depreciate the honour which scripture confers upon them, by the application of the terms “gods” and “sons of God” to them, any more than /469 the fact, that Christ was the Saviour of mankind, in consequence of his having been the seed of Abraham\* and house of David, as well as the rod of the stem of Jesse,† could lower the dignity of the Messiah, or could exalt the rank of Abraham, or of David, above Christ.

Such an apology as ascribes birth, growth, and death, to the material body of Christ, and immortality and divinity to his spirit, is equally applicable to those Israelites that are termed gods. §571

The second question of the Editor is, “To whose nature is their’s (Israel’s) superior? only to that of the brutes!”<sup>1</sup> In answer to which I refer the Editor to the passages already cited, to wit, *Psalm* lxxxii. 6, *Exod.* iv. 22, xix. 5, 6, as well as to *Exod.* xxv. 8, “God was dwelling among them;” *Deut.* vii. 6, “That he has chosen them from all the nations;” x. 15, “He loved them, he chose them only;” xiv. 1, “They are the sons of God;” and to numerous passages of a similar description, whence the Editor may judge whether Israel was superior to the brutes only, or to the rest of mankind. §572

The third question is, “If other gods die like men, must Jehovah, who made heaven and earth, whose throne is for ever?”<sup>2</sup> My answer must be in the negative, because Jehovah is not a man-god that shall die; but he, as the God of all gods, and the Lord of lords, must regulate the death and birth of those who are figuratively called gods, while he himself is immutable. *Deut.* x. 17: “Jehovah your God, is God of gods, and Lord of lords.” *John* xx. 17: “To my God and your God.” *Psalm* xlv. 7: “God, thy God, hath anointed thee.”—Let us now again refer to the context of *John* x. 34. In ver. 33, the Jews assign it as the reason for their attempting to stone Jesus, that he made himself equal to God, by<sup>‡</sup> calling himself the Son of God, as they supposed, in a real sense, which was, according to their law, blasphemy; Jesus, therefore, pointed

Ps 82:6; Ex 4:22; 19:5f.; 10:15; 14:1

Dt 10:17; Jn 20:17; Ps 45:7

Jn 10:33–36

\* Genesis xxii. 18. † Isaiah xi. 1.

‡ As is evident from the reply of Jesus, (ver. 36.) “Thou blasphemest; because I said I am the Son of God.”

<sup>1</sup> §365. <sup>2</sup> §365.

out to them, in ver. 34, that even the term “god” is found figuratively applied to the chiefs of Israel, in scripture, without meaning to imply thereby, their equality with God; in ver. 35, he reminds them of their applying, according to the Scriptures, the same divine term to those chiefs; and lastly, he shews their inconsistency in calling their chiefs gods, and, at the same time, rejecting Christ’s declaration of his being the Son of God, in the same metaphorical sense, as being “sanctified” and “sent” by God. Is not this argument, used by Jesus, an evident disavowal of his own deity, and manifestation of his having called himself “the Son of God,” only in a metaphorical sense? I am sorry to observe, that the Editor seems to have bestowed little or no reflection upon these texts. /471

§573 In answer to my observation on the attempt of orthodox Christians to prove the deity of Jesus from 1 Cor. x. 9, “Neither let us tempt Christ as some of them also tempted,” the Editor quotes first, an observation of my own, to wit, “How far cannot prejudice carry away men of sense! Are we not all, in common with Jesus, liable to be tempted both by men and by Satan? Can the liability to temptation, common to God, to Jesus, to Abraham, and all mankind, be of any avail to prove the divinity and unity of these respective subjects of temptation?”<sup>1</sup> He then declares, that I was not correct in the statement of my opponent’s doctrine on his subject, and denies any one’s “having attempted to prove the deity of Christ merely from his being tempted.”<sup>2</sup> To shew the accuracy of my statement, however, I beg to refer the Editor to Mr. Jones’s work on the nature of Christ.<sup>3</sup> The Editor lastly asserts, that “it is the apostle’s declaring that Christ was he who was tempted in the wilderness, and hence, the Most High God, described by the Psalmist as tempted, which is here adduced.”<sup>4</sup> But I do not find in the verse in question, nor in any preceding or following verse, “the apostle’s declaring that Christ was he who was tempted by Israel in the wilderness.”<sup>5</sup> If the Editor has met with such a declaration elsewhere, he should first point it out, and then build his argument upon it. But unless he first shew, that being tempted by the devil, and being tempted by Israel, mean the /472 same thing, I cannot admit any relation between the declaration of the apostle’s and that of the Psalmist.

§574 Relative to *Psalm cx.*, [1,] “The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou at my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool,” I observed, in my Second Appeal, (p. 266.)

<sup>1</sup> Marshman quoted §237 in §366.

<sup>2</sup> Marshman: “Now we never heard any one to prove the deity of Christ merely from his being tempted”, §366.

<sup>3</sup> See Jones, *Catholic Doctrine*, 6, quoted by Rammohan in §237. <sup>4</sup> §366.

<sup>5</sup> It is difficult to explain, how Rammohan Roy can overlook the second half of the verse: “Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed by serpents.” The “serpents” are a clear reference to Nb 21:5–9, where Israel was attacked by serpents in the wilderness after murmuring against JHWH.

“that this passage is simply applied to the Messiah, manifesting, that the victory gained by him over his enemies, was entirely owing to the influence of God!”<sup>1</sup> To this the Editor replies, “After the Son had humbled himself, so as to assume our nature and be appointed to the combat, it was not to be expected that the Father would forsake him. But that Jesus had no might of his own, which our author would fain prove, is not a fact.”<sup>2</sup> Is it not most strange, that the Son, whom the Editor considers the *immutable, almighty* God, should be supposed by him again to have *humbled* himself, and to have been *appointed* by another to combat, in which that other assisted him to obtain success? Are not these two ideas quite incompatible with each other? If such positive disavowal of his *own* power, by Jesus himself, as “I can of mine ownself do nothing,” “All that the Father giveth shall come to me,” has failed to convince the Editor that Jesus had no power of *his own*, no argument of mine, or of any other human being, can be expected to make any impression upon him.

Jn 5:30; 6:37

The Editor afterwards endeavours to prove the omnipotence of Jesus by quoting *Isaiah* lxiii. 5: /473 “Mine own arm brought salvation unto me,” and *Rev.* i. 8: “I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.”<sup>3</sup> Supposing these two last-mentioned passages to be actually ascribed to Jesus, conveying a manifestation of his own omnipotence, would they not be esteemed as directly contradictory to his positive disavowal of omnipotence, found in the foregoing, and in hundreds of other passages? How, then, are we to reconcile to our understanding the idea that the Author of true religion disavows his almighty power on one occasion, and asserts it on another? But, in fact, we are not reduced by the texts in question to any such dilemma; for the passage quoted from *Isaiah* (lxiii. [5.]) has no more allusion to Jesus than to Moses or Joshua. Whence, and under what plea, the Editor and others apply this passage to Christ, I am quite at a loss to know.<sup>4</sup> The prophet here speaks of the destruction of Edom and Bozrah, under the wrath of God, for their infidelity towards Israel. These places were inhabited by the sons of Esau, (the brother of Jacob,) who was also called Edom. *Gen.* xxv. 30: “And Esau said to Jacob, Feed me, I pray thee, with that same red pottage, for I am faint: therefore was his name called Edom.” So *Jeremiah* prophesies the destruction of Edom and Bozrah (xlix. 7 [8]): “Concerning Edom, thus saith the Lord of hosts, Is wisdom no more in Teman? Is counsel perished from the prudent? Is their /474 wisdom vanished? Flee ye, turn back, dwell deep, O inhabitants of Dedan; for I will bring the calamity of Esau upon him, the time that I will visit him.” *Ver.* 13: “For I have sworn by myself, saith the Lord, that Bozrah shall become a desolation, a reproach, a waste, and a curse, and all the

§575

Is 63:1-6; Rv 1:8

Gn 25:30

Jr 49:7-13

<sup>1</sup> §191. <sup>2</sup> §367. <sup>3</sup> §367. <sup>4</sup> This verse from *Isaiah* is used in the description of Christ in *Rv* 19:13.

cities thereof shall be perpetual wastes." And also the whole of *Obadiah's* Prophecy foretels the slaughter of Edom by the wrath of God. I quote here only one or two verses (8, 9); "Shall I not in that day, saith the Lord, even destroy the wise men out of Edom, and understanding out of the mount of Esau? And thy mighty men, O Teman, shall be dismayed, to the end that every one of the mount of Esau may be cut off by slaughter." Ver. 11: "In the day that thou stoodest on the other side; in the day that the strangers carried away captive his forces, and foreigners entered into his gates, and cast lots upon Jerusalem, even thou wast as one of them." What expression does *Isaiah* make use of in chap. lxiii., that the passage can be interpreted as speaking the language of Jesus? Nothing of the kind that I can perceive. It contains rather such denunciations as are considered totally inconsistent with the office and character of the meek and lowly Jesus, the messenger of peace on earth, and good-will in heaven towards men. Can the following expressions, "I will tread them in my anger," "Their blood shall be upon my garment," (ver. 3,) be ascribed to Jesus, who so far from treading down the inhabitants of /475 Edom and Bozrah, or of any other land, and sprinkling their blood upon his garment, came to reconcile them to God, and laboured in behalf of them, and of all men; even suffering his own blood to be shed, rather than refrain from teaching them the way of salvation? What particular connexion had Jesus with the destruction of the sons of the children of Edom, to justify the Editor in referring chap. lxiii. to the Messiah? I should expect to find such language as is used by *Isaiah* in that chapter referring to God; for in the poetical language of the prophets, similar expressions are abundantly ascribed to the Most High in an allegorical sense. *Isaiah* lix. 15–17: "And the Lord saw it, and it displeased him that there was no judgment. And he saw that there was *no man*, and wondered that there was *no intercessor*: therefore his arm brought salvation unto him, and his righteousness, it sustained him. For he put on righteousness as a breast-plate, and an helmet of salvation upon his head; and he put on the garments of vengeance for clothing, and was clad with zeal as a cloke." *Dan.* vii. 9: "I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow."

Ob 8–11

Is 59:15–17

Dn 7:9

§576

Rv 1:4–8

As to *Rev.* i. 8, let us refer to the contexts, commencing with ver. 4. In this, John addressing the seven churches of Asia, says, "Grace be unto you, and peace from him which is, and which was, and which is to come; *and* from the seven spirits which are before his throne; *and* from Jesus Christ." He /476 proceeds to describe Christ as "faithful witness, the first-begotten of the dead, and the Prince of the kings of the earth," adding, "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen. Behold, he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him: and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him. Even so, Amen." Having thus stated what Christ

had done, and is to do, John reverts to the declaration of the eternity of God, with which he commenced: "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord; which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty." All this appears so very plain; the eternal attributes of the Almighty, in verse 4, are so distinct from the description of the character and office of Christ in verses 5—7; the identity of the definition of God in ver. 4, with that in ver. 8, is so obvious; that I should have thought it impossible for any [one] not to perceive how totally unconnected verse 8 is with that which precedes it, and how far it was from John's intention to declare the Almighty, and his faithful witness, to be one. Moreover, we find the term "Almighty" in the book of *Revelation* mentioned seven times, besides in verse 8, and referring *always* to God; at the same time, notwithstanding the frequent mention of the Lamb or Jesus, throughout the whole book, neither, the /477 term "Almighty," nor the designation "who is, and who was, and is to come," equivalent to the term "Jehovah," is *once* ascribed to the Lamb.<sup>1</sup> Let the candid reader judge from himself.

The Editor again introduces the subject of the angel of Bokim, (page 565,) quoting *Psalm lxxviii.*, [13,] "He divided the sea, and caused them to pass through, and made the waters to stand in a heap," &c.<sup>2</sup> Whence he concludes that the Son was with Israel in the Wilderness as their God. But what allusion this Psalm has to Christ, situated either in the Wilderness, or in an uninhabited land, my limited understanding is unable to discover. As I have already noticed the argument adduced by the Editor respecting angels, in the beginning of this chapter, I will not renew the subject, but beg my reader's attention to that part of my treatise.<sup>3</sup>

The Editor quotes *Psalm xcvi.*, [6, 7,] "For Jehovah is a great God, and a great King above all gods. O come, let us worship and bow down, let us kneel before Jehovah our Maker; for he is our God, and we are the people of his pasture, and the sheep of his hand;" and justifies the application of this passage to Jesus upon the ground that, in *John i. 3*, Jesus is declared equally with the Father to be the Maker of all things.<sup>4</sup> I wonder at the Editor's choosing this passage, as being applicable to Jesus, on such a basis; for should this reason be admitted as well founded, all the passages of the Old Testament in which Jehovah is mentioned, would be inter-/478preted as referring to Jesus without selection. As I noticed this verse of *John i. 3*, and one or two similar

§577

Ps 78:13

§578

Ps 95:3-7

Jn 1:3

<sup>1</sup> "Almighty" is to be found eight times in Rv (KJV): 1:8; 4:8; 11:17; 15:3; 16:7; 16:14; 19:15; 21:22. Seven times it is a description of God. In 19:15 Jesus is treading "the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God."

<sup>2</sup> §368. <sup>3</sup> §§542-544

<sup>4</sup> §370: "Here if the Son himself be not intended, who *made all things*, and without whom *was nothing made* which was made, the same language applied to the Father and the Son, demonstrates their equality".

verses in pages 440, 441,<sup>1</sup> I will not recur to them here.

§579 Having also noticed *Psalms* ii., [12,] (page 435,<sup>2</sup>) “Blessed are all they who trust  
Ps 2:12 in him,” I will abstain from reiterating the same subject, though I find the Editor repeating his arguments here in his usual manner.

§580 To my great surprise I observe that the Editor again quotes *John* x. 30, “I and my Father are one,” to shew that God and Jesus, though they are two beings, yet are one,<sup>3</sup> without any attention to all the illustrations I adduced to explain this passage in the Second Appeal (page 162).<sup>4</sup> I will, however, elucidate this passage still more fully in its proper place. I thank the Reverend Editor for quoting such passages as  
Ps 81:9f.; 83:18 *Psalms* lxxxi. 9, 10, and lxxxiii. 18, which, in common with all other authorities of the sacred books, decidedly prove the unity of the Supreme Being, and that no other being except him, is worthy to be called Jehovah.

§581 In the course of the quotation from the *Psalms*, the Editor cites *Heb.* iii. 3, 4: “For  
Heb 3:3f. this man was counted worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch as he who hath builded the house is worthy of more honour than the house. For every house is built by some man; but he that built all things is God.” Upon which he comments, that it was Christ that built the house understood, (as he supposes,) from /479 the phrase “all things” in the verse in question.<sup>5</sup> I will not prolong the discussion by pointing out the errors appearing in the English version. I only repeat verse 6, explaining what the apostle meant by the house of Christ, which the Editor omitted to mention; to wit, “But Christ as a *son over his own house, whose house are we.*” Hence it is evident, that the house which Christ built by the will of the Father is the Christian church; and that God, the Father of Jesus and of the rest of the universe, is the author of all things whatsoever.

## Section II. *The Prophets.*

§582 In introducing the Prophets, the Reverend Editor commences with Proverbs; saying, “If in this book Christ be represented under the character of wisdom, as divines have thought, and as seems implied in Christ’s saying, *Matt.* xi. 19, ‘But wisdom is justified of her children;’ and *Luke* xi. 49, ‘Therefore said the wisdom of God, I will send them prophets,’ fresh proof is here furnished to the eternal deity of the Son.”<sup>6</sup>  
Mt 11:19; Lk 11:49  
Pr 8:1, 22–36 He then quotes *Prov.* viii. 1, 22, 27, 30: “Doth not wisdom cry? The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. When he prepared the heavens, I was there. I was /480 by him, as one brought up\* with him: I was daily

\* אָמֵן in the original Hebrew does not signify “brought up.” It means “steadied,” stabled, or established,

<sup>1</sup> §553. <sup>2</sup> §550. <sup>3</sup> §369. <sup>4</sup> §119. <sup>5</sup> §368. <sup>6</sup> §371.



his delight, rejoicing always before him.”<sup>1</sup> It is, indeed, astonishing to me how the strong prejudice of other learned divines, as well as of the Editor, in favour of the doctrine of the Trinity, has prevented them from perceiving that the identification attempted to be thus deduced by them from those passages of the book of Proverbs, instead of proving the “eternal deity” of Jesus, or his self-existence, would go to destroy his distinct existence altogether; for Christians of all denominations agree that *wisdom, understanding*, and all other attributes of God, have been from eternity to eternity in the *possession* of the almighty power, without either or any of them having been endowed with a separate existence; and were we to attribute to each of the properties of God self-existence, we must necessarily admit that there are besides God numerous beings, (his attributes,) which possess, like God himself, eternal existence—a doctrine which would amount to gross Polytheism. But the expression, “The Lord *possessed* me in the beginning of his way,” (ver. 22, quoted by the Editor,) proves that the wisdom there alluded to was considered as *in possession* of Jehovah, just as his other attributes are. If Jesus, then, be meant here by wisdom, he must, so far from being esteemed as Jehovah himself, be supposed to have been *possessed* /481 by Jehovah as an attribute. If this doctrine be admitted as orthodox, how then are the primitive Christians to be justified in condemning Sabellius on account of his maintaining the same doctrine?<sup>2</sup> We find that, consistently with the same prophetic language, the inspired writer of *Proverbs* directs us do call wisdom *a sister*, and understanding *kins-woman*, (vii. 4,) instead of bestowing on her such epithets as, Jehovah, the everlasting God, that are insisted upon by the Editor as properly applied to Jesus. In fact, the book of *Proverbs* meant only to urge, in the usual poetical style of expression, the necessity of adhering to wisdom, both in religious and social life, strengthening the exhortation by pointing out that all the works of God are founded upon wisdom. If such poetical personifications as are found in the Prophets, as well as in profane Asiatic works in common circulation, were to be noticed, a separate voluminous work would, I am afraid, fail to contain them. And if the abstract attributes of God, such as wisdom, mercy, truth, benevolence, &c., are to be esteemed as separate deities, on account of their being sometimes personified, and declared

Pr 7:4

as qualities with substances. See Parkhurst’s Hebrew Lexicon.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In §371, Marshman did not quote from v. 1, and Rammohan omits v. 23 from Marshman’s quotation (“I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning or ever the earth was.”)

<sup>2</sup> Rammohan mentioned Sabellius already in §174.

<sup>3</sup> Rammohan refers to Parkhurst, *Hebrew*, 26, Art. אָמֵן, I. “To make steady”, and III. “To be steady, stable, constant, settled, established, confirmed.” However, he does not pay attention to V.: “It is particularly applied to the constant, stated care or attendance of a nurse, or nursing-father, on a child. [...] As a N. אָמֵן A nurse-child, a darling. occ. Prov. viii. 30.” Modern translations understand the word as a noun, and they either translate it as a playing child before JHWH, or as a work master assisting him in the creation.

eternal, and associating with God, this mode of literal interpretation would, I admit, be so far advantageous to the cause of the Editor as respects the refutation of the doctrine of the unity of God, but would not be precisely favourable to the doctrine of the Trinity, as it would certainly extend the number of personified deities much beyond three. Take, for /482 example, the following passages, which personify the attributes of God, and ascribe to them eternity, and association with God. *Psalm* cxxx. 7: "With the Lord there is mercy, and with him is plenteous redemption." Ps 130:7  
 Ps 85:10 lxxxv. 10: "Mercy and truth are *met* together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other." Nb 16:46  
*Numbers* xvi. 46: "There is wrath gone out from the Lord." Here we have mercy, redemption, truth, and wrath, all spoken of as separate existences. Are we, therefore, to consider them as persons of the Godhead? As abstract qualities are often represented in the Scriptures, and in Asiatic writings generally, as persons and agents, to render ideas familiar to the understanding, so real existences are intended sometimes under the appellation of abstract qualities, for the sake of energy of expression. In 1 *John* iv. 8, God is declared to be mere *love*. *John* i. 1, Jesus is called word, or revelation. 1 *Cor.* i. 24, 30, Christ is represented as power and wisdom, &c. 2 *Cor.* v. 21, true Christians are declared to be wisdom<sup>1</sup> in Christ; and Israel is said to be an *astonishment* in *Deut.* xxviii. 37, and *curse* in *Zech.* viii. 13; Abraham to be *blessing* in *Gen.* xii. 2; and Jehovah is declared to be *glory* in *Zech.* ii. 5. But every unprejudiced mind is convinced that these allegorical terms neither can alter the fact, nor can they change the nature of the unity of God, and of the dependence of his attributes.

§583 After this no further remark seems necessary on the passages quoted by the Editor, from *Matthew* /483 and *Luke*, where, as in many other passages in which the word Wisdom is to be found, the sense neither requires, nor even admits, of our understanding Jesus to be meant under that appellation.<sup>2</sup>

§584 The Editor quotes *Isaiah* vi. 1, 10, relating to the Prophet's vision of God; he then comments, "As this glorious vision, wherein the prophet received his commission, represented either the Father or the Son, we might have expected that it should be the Son, who had undertaken to redeem men."<sup>3</sup> The Editor afterwards quotes *John* xii. 41, "These things, said Isaiah, when he saw his glory and spoke of him," and considers these words as decisive testimony of the opinion, that it was the Son who was seen by the Prophet in the vision.

§585 Let us first impartially refer to the context of verse 41 of *John*. We find in the verse a personal pronoun used three times. The first, "he," in the phrase "when he

<sup>1</sup> 2 *Co* 5:21: "we might be made the righteousness of God in him". There seems to be some mistake. "2 *Cor*" is also in the original printed without italics.

<sup>2</sup> Marshman quoted Mt 11:19 and Lk 11:49 in §371. <sup>3</sup> §372.

saw,” though understood in the Greek verb εἶδε; the second, “his,” connected with the word “glory;” and the third, “of him,” after the verb “spoke;” thus—“when *he* saw *his* glory and spoke *of him*.” The first pronoun, “he,” of course refers to Isaiah, mentioned just before it. The second and the third, “his” and “of him,” can have no reference to Isaiah, for the words “when Isaiah saw Isaiah’s glory, and spoke of Isaiah,” could bear no sense whatever. These two last pronouns must, therefore, have reference to some pronoun or noun to be found in the immediately preceding part /484 of the passage. We accordingly find, from the preceding verse, (40,) that these pronouns refer to Jehovah, the God of hosts, mentioned twice in verse 38, whose glory Isaiah saw, and in whose behalf he spoke, without mention of the Son being once made between verses 38 and 41. The passage thus stands, (ver. 38,) He (Isaiah) spoke, “*Lord*, who hath believe our report? and to whom hath the arm of he *Lord* been revealed?” (39,) “Therefore they could not believe [because] that Isaiah said again,” (40,) “*He* hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart;” (41,) “These things, said Isaiah, when he saw *his* glory, and spake *of him*.” Isaiah must have then seen the glory of him in whose behalf he spoke; a fact which neither party can dispute; and, as it is evident from the preceding verse, (40,) and from *Isaiah* vi., [10,] that he spoke of God, who *blinded* the eyes of the Jews and *hardened* their hearts, it necessarily follows, that he saw the glory of that very being spoken of by Isaiah. For further illustration of God’s being often declared to have blinded their eyes and hardened their hearts, I quote *Rom.* xi. 7, 8: “What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for; but the election hath obtained it, and the rest were *blinded*. (According as it is written, God hath given them the spirit of slumber; *eyes* that they should *not see*, and *ears* that they should not hear,) unto this day.” *Isaiah* lxiii. 17: “O Lord, why hast thou made us to err from thy ways, *and hardened* our heart from thy /485 fear? Return, for thy servants’ sake, the tribe of thy inheritance.” From vers. 38–41, as already observed, is not a single noun or a pronoun that can have allusion to Jesus. But we find, in verse 42, the pronoun “him,” implying the Son as absolutely required by the sense, in reference to verse 37, and in consistence with verse 44, in which the name of Jesus is found mentioned. As all the Pharisees believed in God, as well as in Isaiah, one of their prophets, the text could convey no meaning, if the phrase “Nevertheless among the chief rulers also many believed in him” were admitted to bear reference either to God or Isaiah.

Jn 12:37–44

Rm 11:7f.

Is 63:17

If it be insisted upon, in defiance of all the foregoing explanation, that the two last-mentioned pronouns, in verse 41, “When he saw his glory and spake of him,” are applied to Jesus, the passage in the evangelist would be, in that case, more correctly explained by referring it to *John* viii. 56, “[Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day,](#)” which cannot be understood of ocular vision, but prophetic anticipation; whereas the glory seen in the vision of Isaiah, was that of God himself in the delivery

§586

Jn 8:56

of the command given to the prophet on that occasion<sup>1</sup>, as I observed in the Second Appeal (page 286). With a view to invalidate this interpretation, the Editor inquires, (page 569,) “What has Abraham’s day to do with Isaiah’s vision?”<sup>2</sup> In answer to which I must allow, that Abraham’s day had nothing to do with Isaiah’s vision, except that as Abraham saw /486 the day of Christ, (properly speaking, the reign of Christ,) by prophetic anticipation, and not through ocular vision, (*John* viii. 56,) so Isaiah, as another prophet of God, must have seen the glory of Christ (if he had seen it at all) through the same prophetic anticipation, and must have spoken of Christ’s commission (if he had spoken of him at all) through the same prophetic power: the reference, therefore, is one which goes to prove, that whenever the prophets, such as Abraham, Isaiah, or any other prophets, are declared to have seen or spoken of future events, they must have seen or spoken of them through the prophetic power vested in them by God. I never attempted to prove, that the words “day” and “glory” are synonymous, nor did I declare that Isaiah saw the day of Christ, that the Editor should have occasion to advance that “it is not the day of Christ which the Evangelist describes Isaiah as having seen, but his glory.”<sup>3</sup> However, I cannot help being of opinion, that in such phrases, on particular occasion, as “He saw the day of the king Messiah,” or “He saw the glory of the king Messiah,” the words “day” and “glory” amount almost to the same thing. My limited understanding cannot, like the Editor’s, discover how “Isaiah fixes the time when he thus saw Christ’s glory, even when it was said, ‘he hath blinded their eyes,’”<sup>4</sup> &c., for I find the Jews were from time to time charged, by several of the prophets, with disobedience, and with having been blinded and hardened.<sup>5</sup> *Deut.* /487 xxviii. 28: “The Lord shall smite thee with madness, and *blindness*, and astonishment of heart.” xxix. 4: “The Lord hath not given you an heart to perceive, and *eyes to see*, and ears to hear, unto this day.” 1 *Kings* xviii. 37: “Hear me, O Lord, hear me, that this people may know that thou art the Lord God, and that thou hast *turned their heart back again.*” *Isaiah* lxiii. 17, as noticed before.

Dt 28:28; 29:4

1 K 18:37; Is  
63:17

§587

The Editor refers to the prophet Isaiah, (pp. 533, 570,) saying, that Isaiah, in ch. vii., “predicting the birth of Christ, identifies his divine and his human nature, ‘Behold a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel.’ This passage the Holy Spirit applies to Christ, in *Matt.* i. 22, 23.”<sup>6</sup> He regrets my applying the above verse to Hezekiah, in an immediate sense, though totally unable to reject the proof of such application, deduced by me, in my Second Appeal, from its context, and from the sacred history. He rests his rejection entirely upon the

Is 7:14f.

Mt 1:22f.

<sup>1</sup> §229. <sup>2</sup> §372. <sup>3</sup> §372. <sup>4</sup> §372.

<sup>5</sup> Marshman just wanted to express that Isaiah saw Christ’s glory when he saw the Lord in the temple the year when king Uzziah died. It’s not about when the Jews were blinded and hardened.

<sup>6</sup> §324.

phrase, “A virgin shall conceive,” found in the English version, as being used in the future tense, on the ground that “Hezekiah could not have been the child at the time about to be conceived by the virgin, for this plain reason, that God never foretels past things. The birth of Hezekiah was not then a thing to come; for, he was at least six years old when this prophecy was spoken.—This our author will see by merely comparing the fact, that Ahaz reigned sixteen years, and Hezekiah began to reign when he was five-and-/488twenty years old. Hezekiah must then have been six, if not seven, years old when this prophecy was delivered.”<sup>1</sup> The Editor, then, charges me with having expended, in vain, twelve pages on this, as well as on the passage in ch. ix. of *Isaiah*. Here we find again a new instance, in which a diligent study of the Bible, for thirty or forty years, but accompanied with early religious prejudices, has not been able to save the student from making such an error as to take the term הרה, “pregnant,” in the original verse, in Hebrew, as meaning absolutely, “shall conceive,” and to declare, unthinkingly, that “could not have been the child at that time to be conceived.” How will the Editor render the same term הרה, found in *Gen.* xvi. 11, “Thou hast conceived, or art with child”? Will he, on his adopted principle, interpret it, “Thou shalt conceive?” He must, in that case, overlook verses 4th and 5th of the same chapter, which testify Hagar’s having already conceived before the angel of the Lord had seen and spoken to her, in verse the 11th. “He went in unto Hagar, and she conceived; and when she saw she had conceived,” &c. (4). “And Sarai said to Abraham, My wrong be upon thee: I have given my maid unto thy bosom; and when she saw that she had conceived,” &c. (5). Did not the Editor ever reflect upon *Jer.* xxxi. 8, containing the same terms הרה, or “pregnant,” and וילדה, or “bearing,” as are found in *Isaiah* vii. 14?—a passage which might have suggested to the Editor the propriety of not making so positive an assertion, /489 that “Hezekiah could not have been the child at that time to be conceived.” Did the Editor entirely overlook the same term הרה, signifying pregnant, in *2 Sam.* xi. 5, and *Isaiah* xxvi. 17, *Gen.* xxxviii. 24, 25, *Exod.* xxi. 22, *2 Kings* viii. 12, *Amos* i. 13? The fact is, that we find in the original Hebrew, העלמה, signifying “the virgin,” which, if not referred to a particular person before-mentioned, implies, in the figurative language of the Scripture, either a city, or the people of a city, as I noticed in pages 272, 273, and 280, of my Second Appeal;<sup>2</sup> and also we find הרה synonymous with the participle “conceived,” instead of “shall conceive.” The verse, therefore, thus runs: “Behold, the virgin (the city of Jerusalem, or the nation) is pregnant, and is bearing a son, and shall call his name Immanuel.” (14.) “For before the child\* shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the

Gn 16

Jr 31:8

2 S 11:5; Is 26:17;  
Gn 38:24f.; Ex  
21:22; 2 K 8:12;  
Am 1:13

\* In the seventeenth year of the reign of Pekah, the king of Israel, Ahaz was born; and twenty years old was Ahaz when he began to reign in Jerusalem, and he reigned sixteen years. *2 Kings* xvi. 1, 2. Hence

<sup>1</sup> §325. <sup>2</sup> §211, §218.

good, the land that thou (Ahaz) abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings," (16,) i. e. Rezin, the king of Syria, and Pekah, the king of Israel, who, at that time, had besieged Jerusalem, as is evident from the preceding verses; and such personifying /490 phrases as "oppressed virgin," and "bring forth children," are found also applied to the city, or the people of the city, in the prophets, in other instances similar to that of *Isaiah* vii. 14, in question. *Micah* iv. 10: "Be in pain, and labour to bring forth, O daughter of Zion, like a woman in travail." *Isaiah* xxiii. 12: "And he said, Thou shalt no more rejoice, O thou oppressed virgin, daughter of Zidon," But unless orthodox authors changed "the virgin" into "a virgin," and "conceived" into "shall conceive," they could not apply the verse in a direct sense to Mary, the mother of Christ, and to Christ himself; and consequently, to suit their convenience, they have entirely disregarded the original scripture, the context, and the historical facts.

Mi 4:10  
Is 23:12

§588 In noticing my explanation of the **הַעַלְמָה**\* "the virgin," in the Second Appeal, the Reverend Editor states, that "it is true, the ה, the emphatic of Hebrew, is generally rendered in the Septuagint by the Greek article: that they are by no means equivalent in value, however, he may convince himself by referring to that excellent work on the Greek Article for which the learned world is indebted to Dr. Middleton, now Bishop of Calcutta."<sup>1</sup> I am really sorry to observe that the Editor should have given such an evasive answer to so important a point; he, how-/491ever, was obliged to do so, knowing that ה in Hebrew, before a noun, as ج in Arabic, is invariably a definite article. In his attempt to remove the inconsistency between his maintaining the idea of the deity of Jesus and applying to him verses 15 and 16 in *Isaiah* vii., by which he is declared subject to total ignorance, the Reverend Editor attributes (p. 534) such ignorance to the human nature of Jesus,<sup>2</sup> forgetting what he, in common with other orthodox Christians, offers as an explanation of such passages as declare all power in heaven and earth to have been given to Jesus by the Father of the universe, which is, that all power was given him in his human capacity, while in his divine capacity he enjoys independent omnipotence. Is not the power of distinguishing good from evil included in all power given to Jesus, according to the Editor, in his *human* capacity? How, then, can the Editor be justified in maintaining the idea that, in his human

it appears, that he lived thirty-six years only; and as Hezekiah began to reign after the death of his father Ahaz, when he was twenty and five years old, (2 Kings xviii. 2,) he must have been born when his father Ahaz was ten, or at most, eleven years of age, which was rather contrary to the common course of nature.

\* In *Isaiah* lii. 3, the city, or the people of the city, is once called "a captive daughter;" in ch. liv. 1, it is once styled "barren," **עַקְרָה**; "a harlot" in *Ezekiel* xvi. 35, and in other instances.

<sup>1</sup> §324.

<sup>2</sup> §324: "How far the Son chose to sustain or remove these by his native omniscience and omnipotence, his own infinite wisdom decided".

nature, he, though possessed of all power in heaven and earth, was unable, before the age of maturity, to distinguish the good from the evil, as found in verses 15 and 16? I beg also the attention of the Editor to *Luke* ii. 46–50, shewing that Jesus was possessed of knowledge of his divine commission even in his early youth, and also to the Editor’s own declaration, (page 536,) “**The spirit of the Lord was to rest upon him, as the spirit of wisdom and understanding.**”<sup>1</sup> Nothing but early prejudice can persuade a man to believe that *one* being at *one time* should be /492 both subject to total ignorance and possessed of omniscience—two diametrically opposite qualities.

Lk 2:46–50

Let us now refer to the context of the verse in question. The first verse of the same chapter speaks of the king of Syria and the king of Israel having besieged Jerusalem; verses 3 and 4, of the Lord’s having sent Isaiah, the prophet, to Ahaz, the king of Jerusalem, to offer him consolation and confidence against the attacks of these two kings; verses 5 and 6, of the two kings having taken evil counsel against Ahaz, and of their determination to set the son of Tabeal on his throne; verses 8 and 9 foretel the total fall of Ephraim (the ten tribes of Israelites who separated from Judah, which comprised the two remaining tribes) and of Samaria within three score and five years; verses 10 and 11 mention the Lord’s offering to Ahaz a sign, which he (verses 12 and 13) declined; verses 14–16 contain the Lord’s promise to give spontaneously a sign of the destruction of Ahaz’s enemies in the person of the son borne by the virgin of Jerusalem; the delivery of Judah from these two kings before the child should become of age; verse 17, and following verses, foretel what was to happen in Judah, bringing the king of Assyria in opposition to the kings of Syria and of Israel, who were then inimical to the house of David. The first four verses of chap. viii., speak of the birth of a son to Isaiah, the prophet, and of the depredations by the Assyrians on the land of Damascus, the capital of Syria, and on the land of Samaria, the head of /493 Ephraim, before that son should have knowledge to cry, “My father and my mother.” Hence it is evident that the child mentioned in ch. vii. 14, called Immanuel, was much older than the child mentioned ch. viii. 3; for the attacks upon Syria and Israel by the Assyrians took place only before the former became of age to know right from wrong, but while the latter was still unable to pronounce a single word. Verse 6 speaks of the army of Rezin, and of the son of Remaliah, the kings of Syria and Israel, having refused the soft waters of Shiloah,\* a river in Judah, figuratively meaning peace; verses 7 and 8, of the Lord’s declaring that he would bring into the land of Immanuel, upon these invaders, the strong waters of the river, that is, the armies of the king of Assyria; verses 9 and 10, of the combination of the

§589

Is 7

Is 8

\* Shiloh, found in Gen. xlix. 10, implying a redeemer, differs in signification, and also in spelling, from the word “Shiloah,” herein mentioned as signifying rivers: in Genesis, שִׁילֹחַ; in Isaiah viii. 6; שִׁלְחָה.

<sup>1</sup> §326.



people against the king of Judah, which turned to their own destruction, for the sake of Immanuel. It is worth noticing, that the last word in verse 10, is translated in the English version, "God is with us," instead of leaving it, as it is in the original Hebrew, "Immanuel," thou in two other instances (ch. vii. 14, and ch. viii. 8) the word "Immanuel" is left unchanged as it stands in the original. Verses 11–17, pronounce the Lord's displeasure at the disobedience of the tribes of Israel, advising them to /494 fear the Lord, and not fear the confederacy of the kings of Syria and Israel. Verse 18 declares the Lord's having given the prophet and the children for signs and for wonders in Israel; and the remaining verses of this chapter speak of false prophets, of the miserable situation of the Israelites—a fact which is fully related in the 2nd book of *Kings*, xvi. 5: "Then Rezin, king of Syria, and Pekah, son of Remaliah, king of Israel, came up to Jerusalem to war; and they besieged Ahaz, but could not overcome him." Ver. 6: "At that time, Rezin, king of Syria, recovered Elath to Syria, and drove the Jews from Elath; and the Syrians came to Elath, and dwelt there unto this day." Ver. 7: "So Ahaz sent messengers to Tiglath-Pileser, king of Assyria, saying, I am thy servant and thy son. Come up, and save me out of the hand of the king of Syria, and out of the hand of the king of Israel, which rise up against me." Ver. 8: "And Ahaz took the silver and gold that was found in the house of the Lord, and in the treasures of the king's house, and sent it for a present to the king of Assyria." Ver. 9: "And the king of Assyria hearkened unto him: for the king of Assyria went up against Damascus, and took it, and carried the people of it captive to Kir, and slew Rezin."

§590 It is now left to the public to reflect seriously on the above circumstances stated in the context, and to pronounce whether thereby it appears that verse 14 is originally applied to Hezekiah, the son and /495 heir of Ahaz, king of Jerusalem, a child born before the defeat of his enemies, the Immanuel, whose land was Judah; or to Jesus of Nazareth, born at least 500 years afterwards: and also to decide whether or not the land which Ahaz abhorred, had been forsaken by the king of Syria and of Israel, from the interference of the king of Assyria, before Hezekiah came to years of discretion; or whether that event took place only after the birth of Jesus. As to the application of verse 4 to Jesus Christ, by St. Matthew, my language in the Second Appeal was, that "the Evangelist Matthew referred in his Gospel to ch. vii. 14 of *Isaiah*, merely for the purpose of accommodation; the son of Ahaz and the Saviour resembling each other, in each being the means, at different periods, though in different senses, of establishing the throne of the house of David. In the same manner, the apostle referred to *Hosea* xi. 1, in ch. ii. 15 of his Gospel, and in many other instances."<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, the Reverend Editor charges me with having blasphemed

<sup>1</sup> §225.



against the word of God, by attempting to persuade him and others, in my explanation of the above verse, “that the evangelist Matthew ought not to be credited.”<sup>1</sup> I, indeed, never expected such an accusation from the Editor. To acquit myself of the charge, I intreat my readers to refer to the translation of the four Gospels by Dr. Campbell<sup>2</sup>, a celebrated Trinitarian writer, in whose notes (page 9) that learned divine says, “Thus ch. ii. 15, a declaration from the prophet *Hosea* xi. 1, /496 which God made in relation to the people of Israel, whom he had long before called from Egypt, is applied by the historian *allusively* to Jesus Christ, where all that is meant is, that with equal truth, or rather with much greater energy of signification, God might now say, *I have recalled my son out of Egypt*. Indeed, the import of the Greek phrase, as commonly used by the sacred writers, is no more, as Le Clerc has justly observed, than that such words of any of the prophets may be applied with truth to such an event.”<sup>3</sup>

Did these orthodox writers also attempt to persuade people to discredit the evangelical writings by applying *Hosea* xi. 1, originally to Israel, and allusively to Jesus Christ? The Editor will not, I presume, get the sanction of the public to accuse those learned divines of blasphemy. I did no more than adopt their mode of expression in examining *Isaiah* vii. 14, compared with *Matt.* i. 22, 23, and *Hosea* xi. 1, with *Matt.* ii. 15; yet I am charged with blasphemy against the authority of the Gospel of Matthew. I must repeat the very words I used in the Second Appeal, in comparing the book of *Hosea* with the Gospel of *Matt.*, (pp. 263, 264,) that the public may judge whether the language of the Editor, as to my attempt to discredit the Gospel, is just and liberal. “Thus *Matt.* ii. 15, ‘Out of Egypt have I called my Son,’ the Evangelist refers to *Hosea* xi. 1, which, though really applied to Israel, represented there as the son of God, is used by the apostle in /497 reference to the Saviour, in consideration of a near resemblance between their circumstances in this instance:—both Israel and Jesus were carried into Egypt and recalled from thence, and both were denominated in the Scriptures as the ‘Son of God.’ The passage of *Hosea* thus runs from ch. xi. 1–3: ‘When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt. As they called them, so they went from them: they sacrificed unto Baalim, and burnt incense to graven images. I taught Ephraim also to go, taking them by their arms; but they knew not that I healed them;’—in which Israel, who is represented as a child of God, is declared to have sacrificed to Baalim, and to have burnt incense to graven images—circumstances which cannot justly be ascribed to the Saviour.”<sup>4</sup>

§591

Ho 11:1–3

<sup>1</sup> §325. <sup>2</sup> George Campbell (1719-1796), Scottish divine and figure of the Enlightenment.

<sup>3</sup> Campbell, *Gospels Vol. IV*, 9f. Campbell, in these pages, puts a reflection that the word  $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega\theta\eta\tilde{\iota}$ , commonly translated as “fulfilled”, should be translated “verified”: “Those things are said  $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega\theta\eta\eta\nu\alpha\iota$ , which are no predictions of the future, but mere affirmations concerning the present, or the past.”

<sup>4</sup> §184.

§592

Is 9:6

The Reverend Editor likewise, in opposition to my explanation, applies *Isaiah* ix. 6 to Jesus: “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;” and all that he says (page 534) in support of his referring this verse to the deity of Jesus, is in these words: “To secure to Hezekiah that passage in ch. ix., our author gives us a translation, or rather a paraphrase of it by Jonathan, in his Targum, to which we shall merely oppose that given by Bishop Lowth.”<sup>1</sup> Can the interpretation of the Old Testament given by Jonathan and other celebrated Jewish /498 writers, some of whom lived prior to the birth of Jesus, be discredited from the authority of one, or one thousand, Christian bishops, to whom, at any rate, Hebrew is a foreign language? Can a Trinitarian, in arguing with one not belonging to the orthodox sect and establishment, quote with propriety, for the refutation of his adversary, the authority of a Trinitarian writer? The public may be the best judges of these points. As these Jewish writers are not unprocurable, the public may refer to them for their own satisfaction. Is there any authority of the sacred writers of the New Testament authorizing the Editor to apply *Isaiah* ix. 6, even in an accommodated sense, to Jesus? I believe nothing of the kind:—it is mere enthusiasm that has led a great many learned Trinitarians to apply this verse to Jesus. The Editor avoided noticing the context, and the historical circumstances which I adduced in my appeal to prove the application of the verse in question to Hezekiah. It may be of use, however, to call his attention again to the subject. I therefore beg of him to observe those facts, and particularly the following instances. Ch. ix. 1, promises that Israel shall not suffer so severely from the second as from the former invasion of the king of Assyria, when he invaded Lebanon and Naphtali and Galilee beyond Jordan. So we find it mentioned in *2 Kings* xv. 29: “In the days of Pekah, king of Israel, Tiglath–Pileser, king of Assyria, took Ijon, and Abel–beth–maachah, and Janoah, and Kedesh, and Hazor, /499 and Gilead, and Galilee, and all the land of Naphtali, and carried Israel captive to Assyria.” But in the reign of Hezekiah, so far from reducing Israel to captivity, the king of Assyria was compelled to return to his country with great loss, leaving Israel safe in their places. (*2 Kings* xix. 35, 36.) Vers. 2 and 3, declare the joy which Israel were to feel at their delivery from the hands of their cruel invaders, and (verse 4) at throwing off the yoke and rod of the oppressor. We find accordingly, in *2 Kings* xviii. 7, that Hezekiah rebelled against the king of Assyria, and served him not. Verse 5 foretels the destruction of the army of the invaders. So we find, *2 Kings* xix. 34, 35, that the angel of the Lord slew a great part of the army of the Assyrian invaders. Verses 6 and 7 speak of the illustrious son who was then to reign with justice and judgment.

Is 9

2 K 15:29

2 K 19:34–36

2 K 18:3–12

<sup>1</sup> §324.

So we find in *2 Kings* xviii. 3–7, that Hezekiah during his reign did what was right in the sight of God, so that, after or before him, there was none like him among the kings of Judah; and that the Lord was with him wheresoever he went. Verses 9 and 10 speak of the displeasure of the Lord at the pride and stoutness of heart of Ephraim and the inhabitants of Samaria, the enemies of Hezekiah and his father. So we find in *2 Kings* xviii. 10, 11, that the people of Samaria were defeated and made prisoners by the Assyrians in the sixth year of Hezekiah. Verse 11, of the Lord's setting up the adversaries of Rezin, the king of Syria, against him. So we find *Isaiah* vii., that Rezin, the king of Syria, who, with Ephraim, besieged Jerusalem at the time the city had borne the child mentioned in ch. vii. 14, was defeated by his adversaries. Verses 12–20 describe the anger of God, as occasioned by the wickedness of Israel. Verse 21, of Ephraim and Manasseh having joined together to invade Judah. Ch. x. 1–6, denounce punishment to the wicked people of Judah by the hands of the Assyrians. So we find in *2 Kings* xviii. 13, that in the fourteenth year of king Hezekiah, the great king of Assyria came against Judah, and took all her fenced cities. Verses 8–14, of the boasting of the king of Assyria as to his power and conquests of many kingdoms, and his destruction of the gods of different nations, and of his contempt for the living God of the Jews in Jerusalem. So we find in *2 Kings* xviii. 33–35, and xix. 11–14, that the king of Assyria boasted of his great power, and of having subdued the gods of the nations, and that he despised Jehovah, the true, living God, even blaspheming him in a message to Hezekiah. Verses 12–26, promising to punish the king of Assyria, and to bring ruin upon him, for his high boastings, and for his contempt against the Lord. So we find in *2 Kings* xix. 21–34, that the Lord encouraged *the* virgin, the daughter of Zion, and the daughter of Jerusalem, to despise the king of Assyria, whom he had determined to punish for his disrespect; and promised safety to the inhabitants of Jerusalem on the prayer offered by Hezekiah. So also we find in *2 Kings* xix. 35, and *2 Chron.* xxxii. 21, that the Lord sent his angel into the camp of the king of Assyria and slew his mighty men, leaders and captains. Verse 27 promises the king of Judah's liberation from the yoke of the king of Assyria. So we find, *2 Kings* xviii. 7, that Hezekiah rebelled against the king of Assyria, and served him not afterwards. It was not Hezekiah alone that, in the beginning of his reign, acknowledged dependence upon the king of Assyria, but his father Ahaz also confessed the superiority of the king of Assyria, and sued to him for protection against the kings of Syria and of Israel when Hezekiah was only a child. (*2 Kings* xvi. 7, 8.)

Is 10; 2 K  
18:13–35

2 K 19:34–36; 2  
Ch 32:21

2 K 16:7f.  
§593

2 K 18:3–7

The public may now judge whether or not the above circumstances, and the contents of chapters vii. and viii., noticed in the preceding paragraphs, determine the application of *Isaiah* ix. 6, 7, to Hezekiah, who “did that which was right in the sight of the Lord;” “removed high places;” “broke the images and cut down the groves;”

“trusted in the Lord God of Israel;” “clave to the Lord, and departed not from following him;” “which whom the Lord *was*;” who “prospered whithersoever he went;” and prior and subsequent to whose reign, “was none like him among all the kings of Judah.” (2 *Kings* xviii. 3–7.) And they may also decide whether the delivery of Israel from the attack of the Assyrians, and the punishment inflicted upon the /502 king of Assyria in the prescribed manner, took place in the reign of Hezekiah, or that of Jesus Christ. If my readers compare minutely chapters vii.—x., and xxxix. of *Isaiah* with 2 *Kings* xv., xvi., xviii.—xx., they will, I trust, have a still clearer view of the subject.

§594 In common with the son mentioned in *Isaiah* ix. 6, who was called Hezekiah, “*God my strength*,” “*Immanuel*,” “*God with us*,” “Wonderful, Counsellor, mighty God, the Father of the everlasting age, the Prince of Peace,” human beings, and even inanimate objects, were designated by the same terms, or similar epithets, as noticed in pages 283–285, 315, 316, of my Second Appeal, without being held up as the most high Jehovah.<sup>1</sup>

§595 Moreover, the difference between “to be” and “to be called” is worth observing, as I noticed in the note at pp. 315, 316, of the Second Appeal, to which I beg to refer my readers.<sup>2</sup> As to the phrases “no end,” and “for ever,” or “everlasting,” found in *Isaiah* ix. 6, 7, these when applied to creatures are always to be taken in a limited sense, the former signifying plenteousness, the latter long duration, as I observed in note, page 277 of the Second Appeal.<sup>3</sup> Vide *Gen.* xlix. 26; *Heb.* iii. 6.

Gn 49:26; Heb  
3:6

§596 St. Matthew, in an accommodated sense, applies *Isaiah* ix. 1, 2, to Jesus, whose spiritual reign delivered also the inhabitants of Zebulun, and the land of Naphtalim and Galilee, from the darkness of sin, /503 in the same way as in Hezekiah’s reign their inhabitants were saved from the darkness of foreign invasion.

Mt 4:13–16; Is  
9:1f.

§597 As the Editor and many orthodox Christians lay much stress on the application of the term Immanuel to Jesus, I offer the following observations. The sum total of their argument is derived from the following verse, *Matt.* i. 23: “And they shall call his name Immanuel, which, being interpreted, is God with us.” This name is composed of three Hebrew words, “Emma” עם with; “noo,” נו us; “el,” אל God; that is, with us God; hence the advocates for the Trinity conclude that Jesus is here called God, and that he must therefore be God. But let us ascertain whether other beings are not, in common with Jesus, called by designations compounded with *el*, or God, in the sacred writings, or whether the term *el* is exclusively applied to Jehovah and Jesus, and then direct our attention to the above-stated conclusion. *Gen.* xxxii. 24: “And Jacob was left alone, and there wrestled a man with him until the breaking of the day.” Ver 30: “And he (Jacob) called the name of the place פְּנִיֵאל, *Peniel*; for I have

Mt 1:22f.

Gn 32:24–30

<sup>1</sup> §§223-226, §§274-275. <sup>2</sup> §274. <sup>3</sup> §215, note.

seen *God* face to face, and my life is preserved.” Here the place is called the face of *el*, (God,) and the angel who wrestled with and blessed Jacob, and whom he saw there, is styled *el* (God). Ver. 28: “And he (the angel) said, Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but *Israel*; for as a prince hast thou power with God and with men, and hast *prevailed*.” /504 As Jacob in wrestling with the angel, shewed him his power and prevailed, he was called *Israel*, the prince of God, or, properly speaking, the prince of the angel; for it would be the grossest blasphemy to say that Jacob wrestled with the Almighty God, and prevailed over him. So we find in *Gen.* xlvi. 17, “*Malchiel*,” that is, “my king God;” *Dan.* viii. 16, “*Gabriel*,” “mighty God;” 1 *Chron.* xv. 18, “*Jaaziel*,” “strong God;” Vers. 20, *Jehiel*, “living God;” 1 *Sam.* viii. 2, “The name of his first-born was *Joel*,” that is, “*Jehovah* God.”<sup>1</sup>

Gn 46:17; Dn  
8:16; 1 Ch  
15:18–20; 1 S 8:2

Moreover, the very term *Immanuel* is applied immediately in *Isaiah* vii. 14, to the deliverer of Judah from the invasion of the king of Syria, and that of Israel, during the reign of Ahaz; but non esteemed him to be God, from the application of this term to him. Besides, by referring to Parkhurst’s Hebrew Lexicon, on the explanation of the word *el*, (or God,) we find “that Christian emperors of the fourth and fifth centuries would suffer themselves to be addressed by the style of ‘*your divinity*,’ ‘*your godship*.’”<sup>2</sup> And also by referring to the Old Testament we find the terms *אל* *el*, *אלהים* *elohim*, or God, often applied to superiors. No one, therefore, can be justified in charging the apostle Matthew with inconsistency, on account of his having /505 used, even in an accommodated sense, the phrase “*Immanuel*,” for Jesus, appointed by God as the Lord of the Jews and Gentiles.

§598

The Editor denies the truth of my assertion in the Second Appeal, (page 283,)<sup>3</sup> that David is also called the holy one of Israel, in *Psalms* lxxxix., and insists that *Jehovah*

§599

Ps 89:18–27

\* Ezekiel xxxi. 11: *אל גוים* “The mighty one of the Heathen.” Exod. xv. 15: *אלי מואב* “The mighty men of Moab.” 1 Sam. xxviii. 13: *אלהים ראיתי* “I saw God,” that is, Samuel. Exod. xxii. 8: *אל האלהים* “To the Gods;” that is, the judges.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Rammohan seems to apply here Marshman’s remarks about Names in the scripture in §384, at least he now uses Marshman’s terminology (“compound names”).

<sup>2</sup> Parkhurst, *Hebrew*, 15, after mentioning heathen Roman Emperors: “It were to be wished that all such blasphemous appellations to mortals had ceased with Heathenism. But ‘it is strange,’ says *Jortin* (Remarks on Eccles. Hist. vol. iv. p. 5.) ‘that Christian Emperours of the fourth and fifth centuries would suffer themselves to be called, *your Divinity*, *your Godship*, *Numen* §.”

<sup>3</sup> §223.

<sup>4</sup> In Ezk 31:11 and Ex 15:15 BHS reads *איל* instead of *אל*, but Rammohan’s reference, the Polyglotta, reads like he quotes here. 1 S 28:13 is spoken by the confused and depressed Saul. Ex 22:8 is translated by KJV as “to the judges”, which is not necessarily correct. NRSV: “shall be brought before God.” Jacob, *Exodus*, 701, comments: “Die Richter werden also in den mišpatim dann Elohim genannt, wenn der Vorgeladene mangels Zeugen inquiriert werden muß. Dies ist nur möglich, wenn ihm zum Bewußtsein gebracht wird, daß er vor dem Allwissenden aussagt. ER ist es, der durch den Mund der menschlichen Richter die Frage stellt.”

and the future Messiah only are styled the holy one<sup>1</sup>. I therefore beg to refer my readers to the whole context of the *Psalm* in question, a few passages of which I here subjoin. Vers. 19, 20: "Then thou spakest in vision to *thy holy one*, and saidst, I have found *David*, my *servant*; with my *holy oil* have I *anointed* him." Vers. 26, 27: "He shall *cry* unto me, thou art my *Father*, *MY GOD*, and the *Rock of MY SALVATION*. Also I *will* make him my first-born." Ver. 35: "Once have I sworn by my holiness, that I will not lie unto *DAVID*." Vers. 38, 39: "But thou hast cast off and *abhorred*, thou hast been *wroth* with *thine anointed*. Thou hast made *void* the covenant of thy servant." Ver. 44: "Thou hast made his glory to cease." Ver. 45: "Thou hast covered him with shame." The public now may judge whether the above sentences are applicable to king David, or to Jesus, whose *glory* never *ceased*, with whom God has never been *wroth*, and who cannot be supposed to have been covered with *shame*. Besides, it is evident from this passage, that the term "holy one" is applied to one constantly styled a servant.

§600 The Editor inquires, (page 570,) what instances I /506 bring that these names, peculiar to God, such as wonderful, counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace, were applied to certain kings in Israel;<sup>2</sup> I therefore beg to refer him to the passages mentioned in pages 315 and 316 of the Second Appeal, in which he will find the same epithets given to human beings, and even to inanimate objects.<sup>3</sup>

§601 With a view to deduce the deity of Jesus Christ from the comparison of *Isaiah* xxviii. 16, with *Isaiah* viii. 13, and with 1 *Peter* ii. 8, the Reverend Editor thus comments (page 570): "The declaration is, that Jehovah of hosts shall be for a stumbling-stone and for a rock of offence to the two houses of Israel: but after the delivery of this prophecy, was he this to them prior to the coming of Christ? As the house of Israel was carried away captive for a few years after the delivery of this prophecy, if not a year or two before, it is doubtful whether they ever saw this prophecy while in their own land; but Christ has been a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence to all of every tribe for nearly eighteen centuries, while he has been a sanctuary to all who have trusted in him."<sup>4</sup> I need not prolong the discussion by pointing out, that *Isaiah* delivered this prophecy in the reign of Ahaz; that the captivity of one of the houses of Israel took place in the reign of Hezekiah, his son, and that of the other house, in the reign of Zedekiah, the ninth king of Judah, from the time of Ahaz. As the Editor ac-/507knowledges the fact of the house of Israel being "carried away captive a few years after the delivery of this prophecy," he will undoubtedly be persuaded to confess also, the circumstance of their distress and misery just before, as well as during the time of captivity, by an attentive reference to the sacred histories, 2 *Kings* and 2 *Chron*. The necessary consequence, then, will be, that he will clearly perceive that

<sup>1</sup> §373. <sup>2</sup> §373. <sup>3</sup> §§274-275. <sup>4</sup> §374.

the above-stated prophecy of Isaiah had been duly fulfilled before Christ's birth, the Lord of hosts having become for a stumbling-stone and for a rock of offence to the two houses of Israel, soon after the prophet's declaration; and that 1 *Peter* 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, even to them who stumble at the word, being disobedient,") is but a general statement of the ill consequences attached to disobedience, whether on the part of Israel, or of the Gentiles, to the *word* delivered to them by Jesus in his divine commission. Jesus is here represented as a stone, rejected by men but chosen by God; and, consequently, he must be a stumbling-stone to those who reject him, stumbling at his word. Common sense, if not biassed by early prejudice, is sufficient to decide, that a stone, which is chosen and made the head of the corner by a maker, must not be esteemed as the maker himself.

The Editor comments, however, on the phrase, "made the head of the corner," in verse 7, saying, /508 "As to his being made the head of the corner by his heavenly Father, this can no more affect his unchangeable Deity than his being made flesh."<sup>1</sup> This is as much as to say, that the circumstance of his being made the head of the corner is as *much* a proof of his changeable nature as the fact of his being made flesh; for were we to admit, that the circumstance of an object being made flesh, or matter, which he was not before, does not evince the changeableness of the nature of that object, we must then be at a loss to discover even a single changeable object in the world. If one's being made flesh, and his growth and reduction, in the progress of time, should not be considered as an evidence of a change in him, every man might claim the honour of an immutable nature, and set up as God made flesh. §602

The Editor says, (page 571,) that I "attempted to evade *Isaiah* xl. 3, ('The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a high way for our God,') by coupling it with *Malachi* iii. 1, ('Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me; and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come into his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in; behold, he shall come saith the Lord of hosts,') and confining his animadversions to the latter."<sup>2</sup> I trust the Editor, by referring to *Mark* i. 2, 3, will find, that in coupling the above verses, I did no more than follow the /509 example of that evangelist, who also coupled them in his gospel. As the explanation, adopted by me, of the prophecy of Malachi, fully explains the passage of Isaiah, I confined my animadversion to the former; for, "we find in the book of that prophet, distinct and separate mention of Jehovah, and of the Messiah, as the messenger of the covenant: John, therefore, ought to be considered as the forerunner of both, and as the preparer of the way of both; in the same manner as a commander, sent in advance to occupy §603  
Is 40:3; Mk 1:1  
Mk 1:2f.

<sup>1</sup> §374. <sup>2</sup> §375.



a strong post in the country of the enemy, may be said to be *preparing the way* for the battles of his king, or of the general, whom the king places at the head of his army.”<sup>1</sup> (Second Appeal, pp. 285, 286.) On which explanation the Editor observes, that “The fact is, that Malachi does not mention two; it is Jehovah who was suddenly to come into his temple; and afterwards, Jehovah and the messenger of the covenant are identified by the prophets,” adding, “he shall come,” not “they.”<sup>2</sup> But we find, in the original Hebrew, *Mal.* iii. 1, “and the messenger of the covenant,” with the conjunction “and,” after the mention of the Lord. It is, therefore, evident, that the messenger of the covenant is *distinctly* and separately mentioned. How the Editor supposes that “Malachi does not mention two,” I am unable to guess. We find also, immediately after the mention of “the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in,” the prophet adds, “Behold, he shall come, saith the Lord of /510 hosts,” as the saying of Jehovah.—How can the mention of the messenger of the covenant, in the third person, by the Deity, prove the unity of that messenger with the Deity? Were we to admit, that every being spoken of in the third person by God, is identified with God, the number of identified gods must, in that case, amount at least to thousands in the sacred writings. It is worth observing, that in the original Hebrew, “the messenger of the covenant” stands as nominative to the verb **אָבֵן** or “shall come,” with the pronoun “he.” The verse thus stands in the original: “Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me; and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple; *and* the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in; behold, he shall come, (or, IS COMING,) saith the Lord of hosts.” The Editor adds, “That Jesus is Jehovah mentioned in *Isaiah* xl. 3, whose way John was sent to prepare, is confirmed by the testimony of Zechariah, and John his son.”<sup>3</sup> As to the nature of Jesus, Zechariah gives us to understand, (*Luke* i, 69,) that God “hath raised up an *horn* of salvation for us in the house of his servant David.” In the evangelical writings of *Matthew*, *Mark*, and *Luke*, we find Jesus represented by John, as mightier than himself. In *John* we find still more explicit testimony, (i. 29,) “Behold the *Lamb* of God, who taketh away the sin of the world.” (30.) “This is he of whom I said, After me cometh *a man* who is preferred before /511 me.” My readers may now judge whether Zechariah and John confirmed the identity of Jesus with Jehovah, or represented him as a creature *raised* and exalted by his and our Father, the Most High.

Lk 1:69

Jn 1:29f.

§604

Is 40:10; Rv 22:12

Some orthodox divines having attempted to prove the deity of Jesus, by comparing *Isaiah* xl. 10, (“Behold, the Lord God will come with strong hand, and his arm shall rule for him: behold, his reward is with him, and his work before him,”) with *Rev.*

<sup>1</sup> §228. <sup>2</sup> §375. The quotation marks seem to be misprinted. Marshman’s original text is clearer.

<sup>3</sup> §375.



xxii. 12, (“Behold, I come quickly, and my reward is with me, to give to every man according as his work shall be,”) I brought to their notice, (in my Second Appeal, page 296,) *John* v. 30, 22, “The Father judgeth no man, but *hath committed* all judgment *unto the Son;*” and *Matt.* xvi. 27, “For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels, and then he shall reward every man according to his works.”<sup>1</sup> To weaken the force of my argument, the Editor says, (p. 573,) “These passages, however, do not in the least affect the question, which is not, by what authority Christ rewards, but whether he be the person described as rewarding; and this, these very passages confirm, particularly *Rev.* xxii. 12.”<sup>2</sup> If in the administering of judgment and of reward, as well as in the performance of miracles, the authority by which these things are done should be considered as a matter of no consequence, the almighty power of Jesus, and that of several others, might be established on an equal footing. Is it not, therefore, a subject worthy /512 of question, whether Joshua ordered the sun and the moon to stop their motions, by the authority of God, or by his own power? Is it not a question worth determining, whether Elijah raised the dead by the authority of the Most High, or independently of the Almighty power? But if we consider it incumbent on us to believe and to know that those prophets performed works peculiarly ascribed to God, by the authority of his Divine Majesty; why should we not deem it also necessary to ascertain whether the authority to judge men, and reward them accordingly, as well as the power of performing miracles, were vested in Jesus, by the omnipotent God, or exercised by him independently of the Father of the universe? In point of fact, we find the following positive avowal of Jesus himself—“The Father judgeth no man, but *hath committed* all judgment unto the Son.”—“As I hear I judge; and my judgment is just: because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father who hath sent me.” Here the Editor offers the following explanation, saying, that “All power, as to providence and final judgment, is *committed to him not merely as the Son, but as the Son of Man, the Mediator, because he made himself the Son of Man.*”<sup>3</sup> This amounts to the doctrine of the two-fold nature of Jesus, the absurdity of which I have often noticed. I may, however, be permitted to ask the Editor, whether there is any authority for the assertion that Jesus, as the Son of Man, was dependent on God for the /513 exercise of his power; but as the Son of God was quite an independent Deity? So far from meeting with such authority, we find that Jesus, in every epithet that he was designated by, is described to be subject to and dependent on God. *Acts* xvii. 31: “Because he hath appointed a day in the which HE will judge the world in righteousness, *by that MAN whom he hath ordained;* whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that HE *hath raised him* from the dead.” *John* viii. 28. “Then said Jesus unto them, When ye have lifted up the SON of MAN, then

Jn 5:30, 22

Mt 14:27

Jos 10:12f.; 2 K  
4:34f.

Ac 17:31

Jn 8:28; 17:1f.

<sup>1</sup> §243. <sup>2</sup> §376. <sup>3</sup> §377.

shall ye know that I am he, and that *I do nothing of myself*; but as my Father hath *taught me*, I speak these things.” xvii. 1, 2: “Father, the hour is come: glorify thy Son, that THY SON also may glorify thee. *As thou hast given HIM power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him.*” Heb. i. 8, 9: Heb 1:8f. “Thy throne, O GOD, is for ever and ever; a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom: Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity; therefore God, even THY GOD, hath *anointed thee* with the oil of gladness above *thy fellows.*” The Editor says, “His glory he (the Son) may, for a season, lay aside, but his divine nature he can never change.”<sup>1</sup> I wish to be informed what kind of divine nature it was that could be divested of its glory\* and power,<sup>†</sup> even for a season. To my understanding, /514 such divinity must be analogous to matter without space or gravity, or sunbeam without light, which my limited capacity, I must confess, cannot comprehend.

§605 The Editor finally argues, that “as the Father’s committing to the Son the entire work and glory of being the final judge of all, judging no man himself, does not change his glorious nature, so the Son’s laying aside his glory and becoming a man, in no way changes his original nature and godhead.”<sup>2</sup> It is true that God’s committing to the Son the authority of judgment, bestowing on the sun the power of casting light upon the planets round him, and enabling superiors to provide food and protection for their dependents, do not imply any change in his glorious nature; for it is ordained by the laws of nature, that nothing can be effected, in this visible world, without the intervention of some physical means; but that the Son’s, or any other being’s, *laying aside* his glory and becoming a man, must produce at least a temporary change in his nature, is a proposition as obvious as any that can be submitted to the understanding.

§606 I have, of course, omitted to quote *John* v. 23, during this discussion in my Second Appeal, because it has no relation to the subject, and because I noticed it fully in another part of that publication, page 189.<sup>3</sup>

§607 I will also refrain from noticing, in this place, *Heb.* i. 12, alluded to by the Editor, as I have /515 already considered that passage as fully as possible in the preceding chapter, pp. 452, 453.<sup>4</sup>

§608 The Editor next comes to *Isaiah* xlv. 6: “Thus saith the Lord, the King of Israel, and his redeemer Jehovah of hosts, I am the first and I am the last, and beside me there is no God;” comparing it with *Rev.* i. 8, and xxii. 13. This argument has been already replied to in my Second Appeal;<sup>5</sup> it shall be again adverted to shortly. He then endeavours to prove that Jesus cannot be meant as prohibiting John from worshipping him in verse 9, saying, that “In this book five persons address at dif-

\* *John* xvii. 5, 22. † *John* xvii. 2; *Acts* x. 38.

<sup>1</sup> §376. <sup>2</sup> §377. <sup>3</sup> §132. <sup>4</sup> §561. <sup>5</sup> §§240-242.

ferent times: two of the elders around the throne, two angels, and he who is the grand speaker throughout the book—whom he, after the first chapter, often introduces without the least notice, while he previously describes every other speaker with the utmost care.”<sup>1</sup> The Editor, however, has quoted only instances in which John describes the two elders and the two angels in a distinct manner; but I cannot find that he adduces even a single instance where the “grand speaker” is “introduced without the least notice.” Again, he says, “How could Jesus forbid John to worship him, after he received worship by the command of God from all the angels?”<sup>2</sup> I may be, on the same principle, justified in asking the Editor, How the angel could forbid John to worship him, while he knew that other angels of God, and even human beings, had received worship from fellow-creatures? *Joshua* v. 14: “And Joshua fell on his face to the earth, /516 and did worship, and said unto him,” (the captain of the host of the Lord,) “What saith my Lord unto his servant?” *Numb.* xxii. 31: “And he (Balaam) saw the angel of the Lord standing in the way, and his sword drawn in his hand, and he bowed down his head, and fell flat on his face.” *Daniel* ii. 46: “Then the king Nebuchadnezzar fell upon his face and worshipped Daniel.” As the Editor’s argument, therefore, must apply with equal force to angels as to Jesus, it is quite plain that no conclusion can be drawn from it relative to the identity of the being who, in *Rev.* xxii. 9, forbids John to worship him. The fact is, that the word “worship,” in scriptural language, is used sometimes as implying an external mark of religious reverence paid to God; and since, in this sense, worship was offered by John to the angel, or to Jesus, he refused it, as is evident from the last sentence of verse 9, “worship God;”—and sometimes the same word “worship” is used as signifying merely a token of civil respect due to superiors: and accordingly, in this latter sense, not only Jesus, but angels and prophets, and even temporal princes or masters, used to accept of it, as we find in *Matth.* xviii. 26, “The servant, therefore, fell down and worshipped him,” and so in various other instances. It denotes, in this acceptation, merely a mark of reverence, which neither identifies those to whom it is offered with the Deity, nor raises them to a level with their Creator, the Most High. My readers will observe, that the author of the book of /517 Revelation declares himself, in ch. i. 17, to have fallen at the feet of Jesus; and he speaks also, in ch. v. 8, of the four beasts and four-and-twenty elders having fallen down before the Lamb; avoiding, however, in these places, as well as throughout the whole book of Revelation, the use of the word worship to express the reverence shewn to the Lamb; while to

Jos 5:13–15; Nb  
22:31; Dn 2:46

Mt 18:26

Rv 1:17; 5:8

<sup>1</sup> §378.

<sup>2</sup> This quotation from §378 is not literally. Marshman wrote: “that the Son by forbidding John to worship him as a thing in its nature evil, after the Father had commanded all the angels of God to worship him, charges his Heavenly Father with folly”. With this “worship”, Marshman refers to Heb 1:6.

Rv 7:11; 11:16; 19:4; 5:14<sup>1</sup> the words “fell down,” when referring to God, he adds invariably, “and worshipped him.” Vide ch. vii. 11, xi. 16, xix. 4, and v. 14. 3rdly. He says, “How could Jesus, who declares himself to be Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, reject worship from John?”<sup>2</sup> I do not wonder at the Editor’s entirely neglecting to notice my remarks on the terms “Alpha and Omega,” or, “the beginning and the end,” in the Second Appeal, page 295,—to wit, “Alpha and Omega, beginning and end, are, in a quite finite sense, justly applicable to Jesus,”<sup>3</sup>—when I find him regardless of the explanation given by John himself respecting these terms, and by St. Paul, one of his fellow-labourers. Rev. iii. 14: “These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness, *the beginning of the creation of God*: I know thy works,” &c. Col. i. 15: “The first-born of every creature.” 1 Cor. xv. 24: “Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom *to God, even the Father*.” Ver. 28: “And when *all kings* shall be subdued unto him, *then* shall the Son *also* himself be subject unto him, that God may be all in all.” /518

§609 As to Rev. i. 8, introduced again by the Editor, the expressions it contains are given as those of God himself, and not of Christ, since it describes the speaker to be Him Rv 1:4–8 “who is, and who was, and who is to come, the Almighty”—an epithet, peculiarly applied to God five times in the book of Revelation, and very often throughout the rest of the sacred writings, and which is but a repetition of what is found in the preceding verse (4) of that chapter. Being equivalent to “Jehovah,” it has never been applied to Jesus in any part of the Revelation, either separately or joined with the terms “Alpha and Omega.” But, as I have already fully noticed this verse in page 475,<sup>4</sup> I will not return to the subject here. 4thly. The Editor urges, “How could Jesus, who searches the heart, reject the acceptance of worship?” In answer to which, I beg to remind him, that the prophets and the apostles also, as far as they possessed the gift of prophecy, were able to discover what passed in the hearts of other men, or, in other words, were “searchers of hearts.” Thus, in the *Acts of the Apostles*, ch. v. 3, 4, 8, 9, St. Peter is represented as a searcher of the heart; but he is again stated, in ch. x. 25, 26, to have prohibited Cornelius from offering him worship. And in 2 K 6:32 *Kings* vi. 32, Elisha is declared to have known what passed in the heart of the king, without our therefore acknowledging him as an object of religious worship.

§610 The Editor, lastly, lays stress on the phrase found /591 in Rev. vii. 17, “The Lamb Rv 7:17 who is *in the midst* of the throne,”<sup>5</sup> overlooking the application of the same word

<sup>2</sup> Marshman’s words in §378 are: “Our author displays a degree of faith which exceeds any thing found among Trinitarians; it is, that the Son of God after receiving the worship of the highest archangel at God’s express command, *forbids John* to worship him, after having declared himself to be Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last, the Almighty who searcheth the heart.”

<sup>3</sup> §242. <sup>4</sup> §576.

<sup>5</sup> §378: “that while this Angel was shewing John the bride the Lamb’s wife, he was himself the Lamb

“midst” to the elders and the four beasts, in ch. iv. 6. Besides, such a phrase as “to sit with the Father on his throne,” implies nothing in the book of Revelation except an acquisition of holy perfection and honour, which Jesus, in common with every righteous Christian, acquired *through his merits*. Ch. iii. 21. “To him that *overcometh* will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also *overcame*, and am set down with my Father in his throne.” Rv 3:21

In answer to his assertion, that it is “the Lamb whom the blessed constantly adore, crying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty,”<sup>1</sup> I beg to refer my readers to ch. iv. 8, which contains this phrase; nay, rather to the whole of that chapter, where they will find that no mention of “the Lamb,” or Jesus, is once made. §611 Rv 4:8

The Editor observes, (page 577,) that “in verses 5, 6, of ch. xxi., another speaker besides the angel is introduced in an abrupt manner.”<sup>2</sup> I therefore repeat verse 11 of ch. xx., and verses 5–7 of ch. xxi., and leave my readers to judge whether or not the speaker here is introduced in the same abrupt manner as he is alleged to be in ch. xxii. 12, according to the interpretation of the Editor. Ch. xx. 11: “And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and heaven fled away, and there was found no place for them.” Ch. xxi. 5: “And *he that* sat upon the throne *said*, Behold, I make all things new. And he said unto me, Write, for these words are true and faithful.” Ver. 6: “And he said unto me, It is done. I am Alpha and Omega,” &c. Ver. 7: “He that *overcometh* shall inherit all things, and I will be *his God*, and he shall be *my son*.” §612 Rv 21:5f.

I really cannot perceive what the Editor could have meant by the following remark: “He there (in ver. 5) also uses the same language found in ch. xxii. 6, ‘Write, for these words are true and faithful!’”<sup>3</sup> I hope he could not have intended to identify the speaker in ch. xxii. 6, who represents himself as a fellow-servant of John, with the speaker in ch. xxi. 5, who thus, speaking of himself, says, (ver. 7,) “I will be his God, and he shall be my son.” Besides, the language found in ch. xxi. 5, is not “the very same” used in ch. xxii. 6, since in the former the whole speech stands thus—“Write, for these sayings are true and faithful;” but in the latter we find only “These sayings are faithful and true;” but not the verb “write,” nor the casual preposition “for.”<sup>4</sup> §613 Rv 22:6f. Rv 21:5f.

\* In the book of Revelation, John introduces, about eighty times, different speakers, but not once without a distinct notice of the speaker in the context. In ch. xvi. 14, 15, the day of the Lord is metaphorically introduced as a speaker. Vide 1 Thess. v. 3, and 2 Peter iii. 10.

in the midst of the throne”.

<sup>1</sup> §378. <sup>2</sup> §379. <sup>3</sup> §379.

<sup>4</sup> Rammohan seems to be at a loss about Marshman’s opinion. Marshman’s point is, that God can speak to John *directly without introduction of the speaker* throughout the hole book. Rv 22:6f., in his opinion,

§614

The Editor comes next to what he calls internal evidence; saying, “Internal evidence, however, demonstrates that this Angel neither said, ‘Behold I come quickly,’ (ver. 7,) nor ‘I am Alpha and Omega’ (ver. 13).”<sup>1</sup> Let us now examine the context, and the style of the writings of the book of *Revelation*. 1st. there is not a single instance in the whole book of *Revelation*, in which a speech is repeated without the previous introduction of the speaker; and in this instance we find an angel is previously introduced in ver. 6, as the speaker of ver. 7. The passage in question (vers. 6–13) runs thus: “And he said unto me, These sayings are faithful and true: and the Lord God of the holy prophets sent his angel to shew his servants the things which must shortly be done. Behold, I come quickly: blessed is he who keeps the prophecy of this book. I John saw these things, and heard them. And when I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel who shewed me these things. Then saith he unto me, See thou do it not; for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book: worship God. And he saith unto me, Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book, for the time is at hand. He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: he that is righteous, let him be righteous still; and he that is holy, let him be holy still. And, behold, I come quickly, and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last.” I am, therefore, quite at a loss to comprehend how the Editor can justify himself in ascribing verses 6, 8, and 9, to one being, and verse 7 to another, in which there is no notices whatsoever of a new speaker. 2ndly. There is only one agent in the whole train of these verses, extending as far as verse 20, and no unbiassed mind can, in the face of all the rules of composition, reject the relation of a verb to an appropriate nominative standing before it, in order to refer the same to a noun which is not found in any of the immediately preceding sentences. 3rdly. Were we to follow the example of the Editor, and refer verses 6, 8, and 9, to an unknown angel, and verse 7 abruptly to Jesus, (which I conceive we cannot do, without defying common sense, and all the acknowledged laws of grammar,) we must be totally at a loss to account for the strange conduct of John towards Jesus, his Master, in falling down to worship before the feet of the angel, and neglecting Jesus entirely, though he saw and heard them both at one time, or rather his vision of Jesus was subsequent to that of the angel. 4thly. John himself explains whom he meant by the angel mentioned in xxii. 6, identifying this angel with Jesus, expressly named in the first chapter of the *Revelation*. Chap. xxii. 6: “And

Rv 22:6–16

Rv 22:6; 1:1

---

is indeed God’s own address to John, or Jesus’ words, which doesn’t make so much of a difference to Marshman.

<sup>1</sup> §379.



the Lord God of the holy prophets sent his angel *to shew unto his servants the things which must shortly be done.*” Chap. i. 1: “God gave unto him, (Jesus,) *to shew unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass.*” As in the /523 English version there is some difference, though of no consequence, in these two phrases, I therefore quote the original, containing the precise words in both instances, *δειξαι τοις δουλοις αυτου*<sup>1</sup> *α δει γενεσθαι εν ταχει.*

I hope now that the explanation of the author of the book of Revelation, joined with the above-stated circumstances, will not fall short of producing conviction in the mind of the Editor and my other opponents. §615

We may easily find out the angel who is described in the latter end of chap. i. 1, as being sent by Jesus, by reference to chap. xxii. 16: “I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things *in the churches.*” We find here two things distinctly: one, that Jesus, designated as an angel in xxii. 6, *shewed*, as directed by God in ch. i. 1, *all things which must shortly come to pass*; and the other, that he sent his angel to shew to John and his other servants *these things in the churches*, respecting the Christian dispensation, as expressly mentioned in ver. 1 of the book of *Revelation*. as well as in xxii. 16. 5thly. I will now have recourse to the rule recommended by the Editor, “*that when the speaker is not expressly named, his language designates him.*”<sup>2</sup> As the phrase “I come quickly,” found elsewhere in the book of *Revelation*, is used expressly by Jesus as speaker in five different instances, (ii. 5, 16, iii. 11, xxii. 12, 20,) we must naturally ascribe this phrase in ver. 7, to Jesus, and must, therefore, refer the /524 immediately following verses (8, 9) to him, in perfect consistency with all other scriptural writings. It is not only in ver. 9 that Jesus calls himself a servant of God, and addresses Christians as brethren, but also in *Matt.* xii. 18, he represents himself as a chosen servant of the Most High; and in *John* xx. 17, designates the disciples as his brethren. Rv 22:16  
Rv 2:5, 16; 3:11; 22:12, 20  
Mt 12:18; 28:9–10; Jn 20:17

If the Editor should say, according to the general mode of Trinitarian exposition, that the adoption of such designations was in reference to the human capacity of Jesus, he will perhaps give up the present difference from me, under the supposition that in this instance also Jesus calls himself a servant of God, and his followers brethren, as well as forbids John to worship him, merely in his human capacity. §617

I now conclude my reply to this branch of the Editor’s argument, with a few remarks in allusion to such questions of the Editor, as “*Is it that the Son of God, after receiving the worship of the highest archangel at God’s expressed command, forbade John to worship him?*”<sup>3</sup> &c. I would ask, in turn, Can any man be justified in ascribing deity to one whose language is this: “As I received of *my Father*,” (Rev. ii. 27); “I have not found thy works perfect before *God*,” (iii. 2); “I will *confess* his Rv 2:27; 3:2, 5, 12

<sup>1</sup> Read: *αυτου*. Misspelled in all editions. <sup>2</sup> §379. <sup>3</sup> §378.

name *before my Father*, and before his angels,” (ver. 5); “Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of *my God*: I will write upon him the name of *my God*, and the name of the city of *my God*, which /525 cometh down out of heaven from *my God*”? (Ver. 12.) Is it consistent with the nature of God to acquire exaltation through merit? Chap. v. 12: “Saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to *receive* power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing.” Ch. iii.21: “To him that *overcometh* will I grant to sit with me in my throne, *EVEN AS I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne.*” Is it becoming of the nature of God to sing thus, addressing himself to another being: “Great and marvellous are *THY* works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are *THY* *WAYS*, thou King of saints. Who shall not fear *THEE*, O Lord, and glorify *THY* name? for *THOU ONLY* art holy,” &c. ch. xv. 3, 4.<sup>1</sup> Is not the Lamb throughout the whole *Revelation* mentioned separately and distinctly from God? Ch. i. 1: “The *Revelation of Jesus Christ*, which *God gave* unto him.” Ver. 2: “Who bare record of the word of *God*, and of the testimony of *Jesus Christ.*” Vers. 4, 5: “And peace *from him* who is, and who was, and who is to come; *and from* the seven spirits which are before his throne, *and from Jesus Christ*, who is the faithful witness.” Ver. 9: “For the word of *God*, and for the testimony of *Jesus Christ.*” Ch. v. 9: “Thou wast *slain*, and hast redeemed us to *God.*” Ver. 10: “And hast made us unto *our God* kings and priests.” Ch. xi. 15: “The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of *our Lord*, and of *HIS Christ.*” Ch. xiii. 17: /526 “Who keep the commandments of *God*, and have the testimony of *Jesus Christ.*” Ch. xiv. 12: “That keep the commandments of *God*, and the faith of *Jesus.*” Ch. xxi. 23: “For the glory of *God* did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof.” John in ascribing to the Lamb most honorary epithets, those generally printed in capitals,<sup>2</sup> takes great care in the choice of words. Ch. xix. 16: “He (the Lamb) hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, King of kings, and Lord of lords.” Ch. xvii. 14: “For he (the Lamb) is Lord of lords, and King of kings.” The apostle never once declares him to be “God of Gods,” the peculiar epithet of the Almighty Power. So the most holy saints sing first the song of Moses, and then that of the Lamb; having perhaps had in view the priority of the former to the latter in point of birth. Ch. xv. 3: “And they (the holy saints) sing the song of Moses, the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb.”

§619 In answer to one of the many insinuations made by the Editor in the course of his arguments, to wit, “[If this be Christ, what must become of the precepts of Jesus?](#)”<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This song is performed by those “that had gotten the victory over the beast” (v. 2), but it is titled “the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb” (v. 3). Rammohan seems to conclude from this, that like Moses sang songs to the Lord, the Lamb also does, since the title is not “song from Moses to the Lamb”.

<sup>2</sup> We find this capital printing in KJV. <sup>3</sup> §378.



(page 576,) I must reluctantly put the following query in reply: If a slain lamb be God Almighty, or his true emblem, what must be his worship, and what must become of his worshippers?

On the attempt to prove the deity of Jesus Christ by comparing *Isaiah* xlv. 23, (“Unto me,” i. e. God, “every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear,”) with *Rom.* xiv. 10–12, (“But why dost thou judge /527 thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? For we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. So, then, every one of us shall give account of himself to God,”) I observed in my Second Appeal, (page 288,) that “between the prophet and the apostle there is a perfect agreement in substance, since both declare that it is to God that every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall confess *through him* before whose judgment-seat we shall all stand: at the same time both Jesus and his apostles inform us, that we must stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, because *the Father has committed the office of final judgment to him.*”<sup>1</sup> To which the answer of the Editor is this, “We here beg leave to ask our author, where the phrase *through him* is to be found? It must be in the author’s copy of the prophet and the apostle—it is not in ours.”<sup>2</sup> By these words the Editor clearly means to insinuate, that the words in question are gratuitously inserted in my explanation, and without any authority in the Holy Scriptures. At least I am otherwise at a loss to understand what he means by saying that the words of my paraphrase are not to be found in his edition of the Bible; for it would be unworthy to suppose of him that he wished to impress his readers with the idea, that I was quoting a particular passage falsely, instead of the fact that I was only giving my idea of its import. That I was fully warranted in /528 my interpretation, I hope to convince the Editor himself, by referring him to the following passages, in which it is expressly declared that it is *through Jesus* that glory and thanks are to be given to God, and that we have peace with God; and also that it is *by Jesus Christ* that God judgeth the world. *Rom.* xvi. 27: “To God only wise, be glory *through Jesus Christ* for ever. Amen.” Ch. v. i. “We have peace with God *through* our Lord Jesus Christ.” Ch. i. 8: “I thank my God *through Jesus Christ.*” Ch. ii. 16: “In the day when God shall *judge* the secrets of men *by Jesus Christ.*” 2 Cor. v. 18: “All things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself *by Jesus Christ.*” *John* v. 22: “For the Father judgeth no man, but *hath committed* all judgment unto the Son.” After considering these texts, no one can, I think, refuse to admit the correctness of my assertion, that it is *to God* every knee shall bow *through Christ*, before whose judgment-seat we shall stand, “because *the Father has committed the office of final judgment to him,*” as being founded upon the best authority that man can appeal to.

§620

Is 45:23; Rm  
14:10–12Rm 16:27; 5:1;  
1:8; 2:16; 2 Co  
5:18; Jn 5:22

<sup>1</sup> §234. <sup>2</sup> §380.

§621 Upon the interpretation of the above-mentioned passage of Isaiah, to wit, "It is Jesus that swears here by himself,"<sup>1</sup> I observed in my Second Appeal, "How can they escape the context, which expressly informs us that Jehovah God, and not Jesus, swear in this manner?"<sup>2</sup> To this the Editor replies, that "the Son was Jehovah before he was Jesus,"<sup>3</sup> &c. Is not this merely a begging of the question, inas- /529 much as one may equally assert that Moses or Joshua was Jehova before he was Moses or Joshua?

§622 He further says, that "Jesus is so preeminently Saviour, that there is salvation in no other."<sup>4</sup> I agree with the Editor so far as to declare Jesus to be, under God, the only Saviour mentioned in the records of Christian dispensation; but previous to his birth there were many saviours raised by God to save his servants, as noticed already in pages 402, 409.<sup>5</sup>

§623 The Editor adds, that in [*Isaiah* xlv.] ver. 24, righteousness is used in such a sense as is principally applicable to the Son.<sup>6</sup> I therefore transcribe the verse, that the reader may judge whether or not his position has any foundation: "Surely, shall one say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength: even to him shall men come; and all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed."

§624 Respecting the attempt to prove the deity of Jesus from the circumstance of his being figuratively represented as the husband or the supporter of his church, *John* iii. 29, *Eph.* v. 23, and also God's being called the husband of his creatures, *Isaiah* liv. 5—I requested in my Second Appeal, (pages 292, 293,) that "my readers would be pleased to examine the language employed in these two instances. In the one, God is represented as the husband of *all* his creatures, and in the other, Christ is declared to be the husband, or the head of his *followers*: there is, /530 therefore, an inequality of authority evidently ascribed to God and to Jesus. Moreover, Christ himself shews the relation that existed between him and his church, and himself and God, in *John* xv. 1, 'I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman.' Ver. 5: 'I am the vine, ye are the branches,' &c. Would it not be highly unreasonable to set at defiance the distinction drawn by Jesus between God, himself, and his church?"<sup>7</sup> The Editor has not taken the least notice of this last argument; he only glances over the former, saying, (page 579,) "Had our author examined the context with sufficient care, he would have found that those to whom God declares himself the husband, are so far from being all his creatures, that they are only one branch of his church, the Gentiles, the children of the desolate, in opposition to the Jews, the children of the married wife."<sup>8</sup> I wonder how the choice of the designation "thy Maker," in

<sup>1</sup> See Jones, *Catholic Doctrine*, 38. <sup>2</sup> §234. <sup>3</sup> §380. <sup>4</sup> §380. <sup>5</sup> §512, §§522-523. <sup>6</sup> §380: "That righteousness in which sinners glory, is never called the Father's unless by accommodation, while it is *properly* the Son's, wrought out by his obedience in our nature to his Father's law."

<sup>7</sup> §239. <sup>8</sup> §381.

*Isaiah* liv. 5, in preference to others, and its true force, could escape the notice of the Editor, as the phrase “thy Maker is thy husband” implies in a general sense that whosoever is the maker is also the preserver, and, consequently, God is the husband, or the preserver, of all his creatures, including the Jews more especially as his chosen people. I, however, wish to know how the Editor justifies himself in concluding real unity between God and Jesus from the application of the term husband to them, while Jesus declares the relation between God, himself, and his church, to /531 be such as that existing between the husbandman, the vine, and its branches.

Some orthodox divines having attempted to establish the deity of Jesus, by comparing *Jer.* xxiii. 5, 6, (“I will raise unto David a righteous branch, and a king shall reign and prosper—and this is his name whereby he shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS,”) with 1 *Cor.* i. 30, (“Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom and righteousness,” &c.,) I replied, in my Second Appeal, (page 286,) that “I only refer my reader again to the passage in *Jer.* xxxiii. 16, in which Jerusalem also is called ‘THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS,’ and to the phrase ‘IS MADE unto us of God,’ found in the passage in question, and expressing the inferiority of Jesus to God; and also 2 *Cor.* v. 21, ‘that we might be made the righteousness of God in him;’ where St. Paul says, that all Christians may ‘be made the righteousness of God;’”<sup>1</sup> to which the Reverend Editor thus replies (page 580): “This does not at all affect the question in hand, which is simply, whether this righteous branch of David, this king, who shall reign and prosper, be Jesus Christ or not: and to prove this, we need only call in the testimony of the angel to Mary, *Luke* i. 32, 33, ‘The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever.’”<sup>2</sup> The Editor here overlooks again the force of the phrase, “God shall give unto him (Jesus) the throne of his father David,” implying, that the /532 throne and exaltation which Jesus was possessed of, was but the *free gift* of God.

To lessen the force of such phrases as, “being *made* of God,” “God shall give unto him,” &c., the Editor adds, that, “relative to his ‘being made of God righteousness to us,’ this can of course make no alteration in the Son’s *eternal nature*.”<sup>3</sup> I therefore beg to ask the Editor, if one’s being *made* by *another* any thing whatsoever that he was not before, does not tend to prove his mutable nature, what nature, then, can be called mutable in this transitory world? The Editor again advances, that Jesus “was *Jehovah before he became incarnate*,”<sup>4</sup> &c. This is a bare assertion which I must maintain to be without any ground, unless he means to advance the doctrine, that souls are emanations of God and proceed from the deity.

As to Jerusalem being called, “Jehovah our righteousness,” the Editor says, “We may observe, that it is the church of Christ, the holy Jerusalem, who bears this name,

§625  
*Jr* 23:5f.; 1 *Co* 1:30  
*Jr* 33:6  
2 *Co* 5:21  
*Lk* 1:32f.

§626

§627

<sup>1</sup> §230. <sup>2</sup> §382. <sup>3</sup> §382. <sup>4</sup> §382.

to the honour of her glorious head and husband, who is, indeed, Jehovah her righteousness.”<sup>1</sup> (Page 581.) Let us reflect on this answer of the Editor. In the first place, Jr 33:16 the term Jerusalem, in *Jer.* xxxiii. 16, from its association with the term “Judah,” is understood as signifying the well-known holy city in that kingdom, having no reference to the church or followers of Christ. In the second place, if the Editor understands by the term “Jerusalem,” here, the church of Christ, /533 and admits of Jerusalem being figuratively called “Jehovah our righteousness,” on the ground that Christ is its head, and that, consequently, it bears that name “to the honour of her glorious head,” though, in reality, different from and subordinate to him, how can he reject the figurative application of the phrase “Jehovah our righteousness” to Jesus, on the same ground and same principle, which is, that as Jehovah is the head of Christ, consequently Christ bears this name “to the honour of his head,” though, in reality, different from and subordinate to God? Vide 1 Cor. xi. 3: “But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ, and the head of the woman is the man, and the HEAD OF CHRIST IS GOD.”

§628 The Editor shews an instance in *Isaiah*, in which seven women with to be called by the name of a husband, to have their reproach taken away. He must also know, that thousands of sons and descendants are called by the name of one of their fathers, and servants by the name of their masters, to the honour of the father or the master. Vide Is 48:1; Gn 43:6; Ho 11:8f.; Ex 23:21 *Isaiah* xlvi. 1; *Gen.* xliii. 6; *Hosea* xi. 8, 9; *Exod.* xxiii. 21. The Editor then proceeds to divide the honorary names, found in scripture, into two kinds; one given by men, and the other given by God; but he must know that the names given by prophets, or by common men, if used and confirmed by God, or by any of the sacred writers, become as worthy of at-/534tention as if they had been bestowed originally by the Deity himself.

§629 The Editor again uses the following words, “The incommunicable name Jehovah,” the self-existent, from the verb *הוה* *hawah*, “to be or to exist,” “which is applied to no one throughout the Scriptures besides the sacred three,”<sup>2</sup> &c. We know very numerous instances in which the name “Jehovah” is applied to the most sacred God, but never met with an instance of applying to two other sacred persons the simple term “Jehovah.” I wish the Editor had been good enough to have taken into consideration that this is the very point in dispute, and to have shewn instances in which the second and third persons of the deity (according to the Editor’s expression) are addressed by this name. He further observes, that “no one supposes that Jehovah-Jireh, ‘God will see or provide,’ given by Abraham to the place where he offered Isaac, was intended to deify that place, but to perpetuate the fact that the Lord did there provide a sacrifice instead of Isaac;—that Jehovah-nissi, ‘God, my banner,’ given by

<sup>1</sup> §383. <sup>2</sup> §384.

Moses to his altar, intended any thing more than that God was his banner against the Amalekites;—that Jehovah-tsidkenu, ‘Jehovah our Righteousness,’ the name men should call Jerusalem, or Christ’s church, was intended to deify her, but to demonstrate that her Lord and head, who is her righteousness, is indeed Jehovah.”<sup>1</sup> Here I follow the /535 very same mode of interpretation, adopted by the Editor, in explaining the same phrase, “The Lord our righteousness,” found in *Jer.* xxiii. 6, referred to the Messiah; that is, the application of this phrase to the Messiah does not deify him, but demonstrates, that his Father, his EMPLOYER, his HEAD, the Most High, who is his righteousness, is the Lord Jehovah; so that the consistency cannot be overlooked which prevails through all the phrases of a similar nature; for as Christ is represented to be the head of his church, so God is represented to be the head of Christ, as I noticed in the foregoing page 533. Lastly, the Editor says, “Compound names, therefore, do not of themselves express deity, but they express facts more strongly than simple assertions or propositions.”<sup>2</sup> I am glad to observe, that he differs from a great many of his colleagues, in their attempt to deify the Messiah from the application of the above phrase to him; but as to the facts demonstrated by this phrase, they may be easily ascertained from comparing the application of it with that of exactly similar phrases to others, as I have just observed.

The Editor now mentions (page 583) a few more passages which, he thinks, tend to “illustrate, not so much the name as the divine nature of the Son. In *Jer.* v. 22, we have this expostulation, ‘Fear ye not me? saith the Lord. Will ye not tremble at my presence, who have placed the sand for the bound of the sea, by a perpetual decree, that it cannot pass it: /536 and though the waves toss themselves, yet can they not prevail?’ This, however, is only a part of that work of creation ascribed to him, who, while on earth exercised absolute dominion over the winds and the waves in no name beside his own.”<sup>3</sup> But what this passage of *Jeremiah* has to do with the divine nature of Jesus, I am unable to discover. The Editor might have quoted, at this rate, all the passages of the Old Testament, that ascribe to God the supreme controul over the whole world, as evidence in favour of the deity of Jesus, as he was sure to find always many persons of the same persuasion to applaud any thing offered in favour of the Trinity. §630 Jr 5:22

As to his position, that Jesus “exercised absolute dominion over the winds and the waves in no name beside his own,” I beg to quote *John* x. 25, to shew, that whatever power Jesus, in common with other prophets, exercised over wind and water while he was on earth, he did it in the name of God: “Jesus answered them, I told you, and ye believed not; the works that I do in my Father’s name, they bear witness of me.” “And Jesus lifted up his eyes and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard §631 Jn 10:25; 11:41f.

<sup>1</sup> §384. <sup>2</sup> §384. <sup>3</sup> §385.

me.” I say Jesus in common with other prophets, because both Elijah and Elisha the prophets, exercised power over wind and water and other things, like Jesus, in the name of the Father of the universe. 1 Kings xvii. 1, xviii. 44, 45; 2 Kings ii. 21; sometimes without verbally expressing the name of God; ch. v. 8–13, 27, ch. ii. 10. /537

1 K 17:1; 18:44f.;  
2:21; 5; 2:10f.

§632

Upon the assertion in my Second Appeal, that the “epithet God is frequently applied in the Sacred Scriptures to others beside the Supreme Being,”<sup>1</sup> the Editor observes, that “this objection Jeremiah cuts up, ch. x. 11: ‘The gods that have not made the heavens and the earth, even they shall perish from the earth, and from under these heavens,’ which declaration sweeps away not only the gods of the heathen, but all magisterial gods, and even Moses himself, as far as he aspired to the godhead: but from this general wreck of our author’s gods, Christ is excepted, he having made these heavens and laid the foundation of the earth.”<sup>2</sup> Let us apply this rule adopted by the Editor respecting the prophets, to Jesus Christ. We do not find him once represented in the Scriptures as the maker of heavens and earth, this peculiar attribute having been throughout the whole sacred writings ascribed exclusively to God the Most High. As to the instances pointed out by the Editor, *Heb.* i. 10, and *Col.* i. 17, I fully explained them in pp. 447, 448, 452,<sup>3</sup> as having reference to God, the Father of the universe. Moreover, we observe in the New Testament, even in the same book of *Hebrews*, that whatever things Jesus made or did, he accomplished as an instrument in the hands of God. *Heb.* i. 2: “Whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds.” *Ephes.* iii. 9: “Who created all things by Jesus Christ.” It would, indeed, be very strange to our faculties to acknowledge one as the true God, /538 and yet to maintain the idea that he created things by the directions of another being, and was appointed as heir of all things by that other. Again, in pursuance of the same rule of the Editor, I find that Jesus, like other perishable gods, both died and was buried, though raised afterwards by his Father, who had the power of raising Elijah to heaven, even without suffering him to die and be buried for a single day. My readers may now judge whether Jesus Christ be not included, in common with other perishable gods, in the rule laid down by the Editor.

Jr 10:11

Heb 1:2; Ep 3:9

§633

To deify Jesus Christ, the Editor again introduces the circumstance of his being a searcher of hearts, to execute judgment, *Rev.* ii. 23, and also quotes *Heb.* i. 3. Having examined these arguments in pages 449 and 518, I will not return to them here.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> §121. <sup>2</sup> §385. <sup>3</sup> §558, §561.

<sup>4</sup> The original Calcutta Edition reads “page 119 and 200”. Marshman, in his answer, complained that on page 119 there is nothing to be found (see §1090). It seems the London editors corrected 119 to 449 as a reference about *Heb* 1:3 (§558) and 200 to 518 as a reference about *Rv* 2:23 (§609). Anyway, Marshman’s starting point in §385 was *Jr* 17:9f., and by pointing only to the New Testament references, Rammohan does not need to deal with this verse, as Marshman observes in §1090.



He adds, in this instance, “We are hence assured that the Father, who perfectly knows the Son, did not commit to him all judgment so entirely as to judge no man himself, without knowing his infinite fitness for the work.”<sup>1</sup> It is evident that the Father did not commit to the Son all judgment so entirely as to judge no man himself, without qualifying him for so doing, that is, without giving him the power of knowing all the events of this world in order to the distribution of rewards and punishments. *Matt.* xxviii. 18: “All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.” Notwithstanding this, the power of knowing those things that do not respect the execution of judgment by the Son, is not bestowed upon /539 him, and the Son, therefore, is totally ignorant of them. *Mark* xiii. 32: “But of that day and that hour knoweth no man; no, not the angels which are in heaven; neither the Son, but the Father.” No one destitute of the power of omniscience is ever acknowledged as Supreme God by any sect that believe in revealed religion.

§634

Mt 28:18

Mk 13:32

He quotes *Heb.* iv. 13, “Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight; but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him which whom we have to do,” in order to corroborate the idea that Christ knew all the secrets of men.<sup>2</sup> Supposing this passage to be applicable to Jesus Christ, it does not convey any other idea than what is understood by *Rev.* ii. 23, which I have already noticed.<sup>3</sup> But the Editor must know that in the immediately preceding verse, the word of God, or revelation, while figuratively represented as a two-edged sword, &c., is in the same allegorical sense declared to be “a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.”<sup>4</sup> There is, therefore, no inconsistency in ascribing the knowledge of the intents of hearts to him through whom that revelation is communicated, and who is appointed to judge whether the conduct of men is regulated by them in conformity to that revelation.

§635

Heb 4:13

The Editor says, (page 584,) that in “in *Ezekiel* xxviii., God says, respecting a man who arrogated to himself the honours of Godhead, ‘Son of man, say unto the prince of Tyrus, Thus saith the Lord /540 God;—Because thy heart is lifted up, and thou hast said, I am a God,—behold, thou shalt die the death of the uncircumcised,’ &c. How different the Father’s language to the Son: ‘Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever!’ Why this different language to the prince of Tyrus and to Jesus?”<sup>5</sup> Had the Editor attentively referred to the Scriptures, he would not have taken the trouble of putting this question to me; for he would have easily found the reason for this difference; that is, the king of Tyrus called himself God, as above-stated; but Jesus, so far from robbing the Deity of his honour,<sup>6</sup> never ceased to confess that God was both his God

§636

Ezk 28:2–10

Heb 1:8

<sup>1</sup> §385. <sup>2</sup> §385. <sup>3</sup> §609.

<sup>4</sup> Marshman understands, like other commentators of this time, Heb 3:12f. to be spoken about Christ as the “Word of God”, so Rammohan’s reasoning here doesn’t hurt his point.

<sup>5</sup> §386. <sup>6</sup> This is an interpretation of Ph 2:5–11.

Jn 20:17 and his Father. (*John* xx. 17.) Also, that the prince of Tyrus manifested disobedience to God; but Jesus even laid down his life in submission to the purposes of God, and attributed divine favour towards himself to his entire obedience to the Most High.

Rm 5:19 *Rom.* v. 19: “For as by one man’s disobedience, many were made sinners, so by the *obedience of one* shall many be made righteous.”

Jn 10:17f. *John* x. 17: “Therefore doth my Father love me, *because* I lay down my life, that I might take it again.”

Lk 22:42 *Luke* xxii. 42: “Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless, *not my will, but thine* be done.” As the conduct of the prince and that of Jesus towards God were quite different, they were differently treated by the Father of the universe. As to the above verse, (“Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever,”) God does not peculiarly address Jesus with the epithet /541 God, but he also uses for the chiefs of Israel and for Moses the same epithet.

§637 The Editor quotes 1 *Cor.* iv. 5: “Judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the heart; and then shall every man have praise of God.”<sup>1</sup> The passage simply amounts to this: “Judge not either me or others before the time, until the Lord come, who will bring to light the dark and secret counsels of men’s hearts, in preaching the gospel; and then shall every one have that praise, that estimate set upon him by God himself, which he truly deserves.”—*Locke*.<sup>2</sup>

1 Co 4:5

§638 It is not Jesus alone that was empowered by God to know and to judge all secret events; but, on particular occasions, others were intrusted with the same power, as has already been noticed in page 518, and will also be found in *Dan.* ii. 23: “I thank thee, and praise thee, O thou God of my fathers, who hast given me wisdom and might, and hast made known unto me now what we desired of thee; for thou hast now made known unto us the king’s matter.”<sup>3</sup> And in 2 *Samuel* xiv. 19, 20: “And the king (David) said, Is not the hand of Joab with thee in all this? And the woman answered and said, My Lord is wise, according to the wisdom of an angel of God, to know all things that are in the earth.”

Dn 2:22f. 1 *Cor.* vi. 2, 3: “Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? And if the world shall be judged /542 by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters? Know ye not that we shall judge angels?” &c. Here Christian saints are declared to be judges of the deeds of the whole world, and of course to be possessors of a knowledge of all events, both public and private, so as to enable them to perform so delicate a judgment. Besides, a knowledge of future events is by no means less wonderful than that of past things or present secrets of hearts; yet we find all the prophets of God were endued with the former. 1 *Kings* xx.

2 S 14:19f. 1 Co 6:2f.

<sup>1</sup> §387. <sup>2</sup> *Locke, Works III, I Corinthians, 160.*

<sup>3</sup> In §387, Marshman connected Dn 2:22 with 1 Co 4:5, using the keyword “darkness”. Unfortunately, exactly this verse from Dn speaks about an instance where the Lord *shared* his infinite knowledge with the prophet Daniel, delivering Rammohan an easy defence.



22: “And the prophet came to the king of Israel, and said unto him, Go, strengthen thyself, and mark, and see what thou doest; for at the return of the year the king of Syria will come up against thee.” So we find the same gift of future knowledge granted to righteous men in numerous instances. 1 K 20:22

He then cites *Daniel* i. and vii., and founds upon them the following question: §639  
 “If, then, by nature he was not God, by nature the creator of heaven and earth, he and his kingdom must perish from under the heavens.”<sup>1</sup> To this my reply is, that we find Jesus subjected to the death of the cross while on earth, and, after the general resurrection, to Him that put all things under him. (1 *Cor.* xv. 28.) The *Son*, therefore, is not by nature God, the creator of heaven and earth. As to the sophistry that attributes the death and subjugation of Jesus only to his human capacity, it might be applicable to every human individual, alleging that they, being the children of Adam, the son of God, (*Luke* iii. 38,) are possessed of a divine nature also, and that their death, consequently, is in their human capacity alone, but that in their divine nature they cannot be subjected to death. (Vide pp. 464—469<sup>2</sup> of this Essay.) 1 Co 15:24–28  
 Lk 3:38

By applying to Jesus the epithet “most holy,” found in *Dan.* ix. 24, the Editor attempts to prove the eternal deity of the Son, forgetting, perhaps, that the same term “most holy” is applied in the Scripture even to inanimate things. *Numb.* xviii. 10: “In the most holy place shalt thou eat it.” *Exod.* xxix. 37: “It shall be an altar most holy.” §640  
 Dn 9:24–27  
 Nb 18:10; Ex 29:37

The Editor, in noticing Hosea, says, that “the evangelist’s quoting this passage, (‘Out of Egypt have I called my son,’) plainly shews that it referred to Christ as well as to Israel; but the difference is manifest: Israel was God’s adopted son, constantly rebelling against his Father; Jesus was God’s proper Son, of the same nature with his Father, (as is every proper son,) and did always what pleased him.”<sup>3</sup> This assertion of the Editor, that “Israel was God’s adopted son,” is, I think, without foundation; for they are declared, like Jesus, to be begotten sons of God; but were not, like Christ, entirely devoted to the will of the Father of the universe. *Deut.* xxxii. 18: “Of the Rock that *begat* thee thou art unmindful, and hast forgotten God that formed thee.” §641  
*Exod.* iv. 22: “And thou shalt say unto Pharaoh, Thus saith the Lord, Israel is my son, even *my first-born*.” He then quotes *Hosea* iii. 5: “Afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the Lord their God, and David their king.” On which he comments, that David had then been in his grave—he could be sought only in heaven:—as David, in common with other saints, could not search the heart and know the sincerity of prayers, this prophecy must be assigned to the son of David, the Messiah.<sup>4</sup> I really regret to observe, that as the Jews endeavour to misinterpret such passages as are most favourable to the idea of Jesus being the expected Messiah, so Christians, in

<sup>1</sup> §387. <sup>2</sup> §§569-571. <sup>3</sup> §388. <sup>4</sup> §388.

general, try to refer to Jesus any passages that can possibly be explained as bearing the least allusion to their notion of the Messiah, however distant in fact they may be from such a notion. By so doing, they both only weaken their respective opinions. The above citation, on which the Editor now dwells, is an instance. Let us refer to the text of *Hosea* iii. 4: “For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod, and without teraphim.” Ver. 5: “Afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the Lord their God, and David their king, and shall fear the Lord and his goodness in the latter days.” Does not the poetical language of the prophet determine to the satisfaction of every unbiassed man, that, after long sufferings, Israel will repent of their disobedience, and seek the protection of their God, and the happiness which their fathers enjoyed during the reign of David? as /545 it is very natural for a nation or tribe, when oppressed by foreign conquerors, to remember their own ancient kings, under whose governments their fathers were prosperous, and to wish a return of their reign, if possible. If the Editor insist upon referring this prophecy to Jesus, he must wait its fulfilment; as Israel has not as yet sought Jesus, as the son of David, the Messiah, who was promised to them.

§642

Jl 2:32; Ac 2:21f.

The Editor says, (page 586,) that Peter, in *Acts* ii. 21, applies to Jesus *Joel* ii., whereby he identifies Jehovah with him:<sup>1</sup> but we find Peter here quoting only a part of *Joel* ii. 32: “And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved.” So far from applying this to the Son, and identifying him with God, the apostle explains, in the immediately following verse, (22,) his nature, and his total subordination to God: “Ye men of Israel, hear these words; Jesus of Nazareth, a *man approved of God* among you by miracles and wonders and signs, which *God did by him* in the midst of you,” &c. The Editor then adds, that Paul also addressed himself “to all who, in every place, call on the name of Jesus Christ our Lord.” (1 *Cor.* i. 2.) I therefore quote Locke’s paraphrase on this verse, as well as his note on *Rom.* x. 13, with a view to shew the Editor, that the phrase, “call on the name of Jesus,” is not a correct translation in the English version. “To the church of God, which is at Corinth, to them that are separated from the rest of the world, by faith in Jesus /546 Christ, called to be saints, with all that are every where called by the name of Jesus Christ, their Lord and ours.”<sup>2</sup> (Locke on 1 *Cor.* i. 2.) Note on *Rom.* x. 13, page

1 Co 1:2; Rm  
10:13

<sup>1</sup> §389.

<sup>2</sup> Locke, *Works* III, *A Paraphrase and Notes on St. Paul’s First and Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 146-147. Locke notes to this paraphrase: “these Greek Words being a Periphrasis for Christians, as is plain from the Design of this Verse”, and refers to Hammond’s *Paraphrase and Annotations*. Locke seems to understand ἐπικαλουμένοις as passive (“they are called”). It is a passive form, but usually translated in an active sense (“they call”). However, his interpretation in the following quotation by Rammohan differs from this.

384: “Whosoever hath, with care, looked into St. Paul’s writings, must own him to be a close reasoner, that argues to the point; and therefore, if, in the three preceding verses, he requires an open profession of the gospel, I cannot but think, that ‘all that call upon him,’ (verse 12,) signifies, all that are open, professed Christians; and if this be the meaning of ‘calling upon him,’ (verse 12,) it is plain it must be the meaning of ‘calling upon his name,’ (verse 13,) a phrase not very remote from ‘naming his name,’ which is used by St. Paul for professing Christianity, 2 *Tim.* ii. 19. If the meaning of the prophet Joel, from whom these words are taken, be urged, I shall only say, that it will be an ill rule for interpreting St. Paul, to tie up his use of any text he brings out of the Old Testament, to that which is taken to be the meaning of it there. We need go no farther for an example than the 6th, 7th, and 8th verses of this chapter, which I desire any one to read as they stand, (*Deut.* xxx. 11–14,) and see whether St. Paul uses them here, in the same sense.”<sup>1</sup> If the Editor still insists upon the accuracy of the translation of the phrase, “call upon the name of Jesus,” found in the version, he will, I hope, refer to *Matt.* x. 40–42: “He that receiveth you receiveth *me*, and he that receiveth *me* receiveth *him that sent me*. He that receiveth a prophet in /547 the name of a prophet, shall receive a prophet’s reward, &c.—And whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only in the name of a disciple, verily, I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward;”—when he will perceive, that calling on the name of Jesus, as being the Messiah sent by God, is an indirect call on the name of God; in the same manner as one’s yielding to a general sent by a king, amounts to his submission to the king himself, and secures for him the same favour of the king as if he had yielded directly to the sovereign.

Mt 10:40–42

The Editor then quotes *Amos* iv. 13, perhaps on account of its containing the phrase, “declaring unto man what is his thought.”<sup>2</sup> As I have noticed this subject already, oftener than once, pages 518 and 541, I will not return to it here.

§643

He again quotes *Zech.* iii. 2: “And Jehovah said unto Satan, Jehovah rebuke thee, O Satan; even Jehovah that hath chosen Jerusalem, rebuke thee: is not this a brand plucked out of the fire?” The Editor then proceeds to say, that “[this passage, with ch. ii. 8, ‘Thus saith the Lord of hosts, After the glory hath he sent me,’ and ch. xiii. 7, ‘Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, against the man who is my fellow, saith the Lord of hosts,’ form another three-fold testimony to the distinct personality of the Son, and his equality with the Father.](#)”<sup>3</sup> I am unable to discover exactly what the Editor intends by his two first quotations. With respect to the former, /548 that “Jehovah said unto Satan, Jehovah rebuke thee,” &c., the Editor must be well aware

§644

Zc 3:2

<sup>1</sup> Locke, *Works III, Romans*, 316-317. In his paraphrase, Locke keeps the translation “whosoever shall call upon his name shall be saved.”

<sup>2</sup> §389. <sup>3</sup> §389.

that God speaks of himself, very frequently, throughout the sacred books, in the third person, instead of the first. *Isaiah* li. 1: "Hearken to me, ye that follow after righteousness, ye that seek the Lord," &c. 15; "But I am the Lord thy God, that divided the sea, whose waves roared: *The Lord* of hosts is *his name*." Even in this very book of *Zechariah*, we find that the prophet speaks of himself sometimes in the third person.

*Zc* 1:7; 7:8 *Zech.* i. 7: "In the second year of Darius, came the word of Jehovah unto Zechariah," &c. vii. 8: "And the word of the Lord came unto Zechariah, saying," &c. Neither God's nor Zechariah's speaking of himself, in the third person, in poetical language, can be construed into a proof of the plurality of either of their persons, or of the equality of either with some other being. The fact is, that Zechariah prophesies, in the second year of Darius, king of Persia, of the Lord's will to build the second temple of Jerusalem, by Joshua, Zerubbabel, and Semuh; and to rebuke Satan, who would discourage Joshua, the high-priest, from that undertaking; as is evident from the following passage. *Zech.* i. 1: "In the eighth month, in the second year of Darius, came the word of the Lord to Zechariah," &c. 16: "Therefore, thus said the Lord, I am returned to Jerusalem with mercies; my house shall be built in it, saith the Lord of hosts, and a line shall be stretched forth upon Jerusalem." ii. 2: /549 "Then said I, Whither goest thou? And he said unto me, To measure Jerusalem," &c. iii. 1, 2: "And he shewed me Joshua the high-priest standing before the angel of the Lord, and Satan standing at his right hand to resist him. And the Lord said unto Satan, The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan; even the Lord that hath chosen Jerusalem, rebuke thee: is not this a brand plucked out of the fire?" At to Zerubbabel, the prophet says, iv. 9, "The hands of Zerubbabel have laid the foundation of this house; his *hands* shall also *finish it*," &c. Respecting Semuh, vi. 12, 13, "Thus speaketh the Lord of hosts, saying, Behold the man whose name is Semuh; and he shall grow up out of his place, and ye shall build the temple of the Lord: Even he shall build the temple of the Lord; and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne: and the counsel of peace shall be between them both,"—that is, between Semuh and Joshua, mentioned in the immediately preceding verse 11. In the English version the meaning of the name Semuh is used, viz. "Branch," instead of Semuh itself, both here and in ch. iii. 8, and the commentators choose to apply the name thus translated to Jesus, though no instance can be adduced of Jesus Christ's having been so called, and though the prophet expressly says, in ch. vi. 12, "whose name is Semuh." He is speaking of the SECOND building of the temple, which began in the reign of Darius, king of Persia, long /550 before the birth of Christ. Vide the whole book of *Zechariah*.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Marshman explained in §342: "What temple of Jehovah did the man whose name is the Branch build? No material temple certainly. He however changes the hearts of sinful men, and forms them 'a holy temple unto the Lord.'" For him and the Christian tradition "the branch" is certainly Jesus, from Is 11:1. Rammohan understands 𐤓𐤌𐤕 as a personal name.

The second quotation is, “For thus saith the Lord of hosts, After the glory hath he sent me unto the nations which spoiled you; for he that toucheth you, toucheth the apple of his eye.” (ii. 8.) The prophet here communicates to the people the words of God, that “after he has sent me with his will, to the nations who tyrannize over Israel, that\* he who touches Israel touches the apple of his own eye.” Zechariah very often, in his book, introduces himself as being sent by God; but how the Editor, from these circumstances, infers the separate personality of the Son, or his equality with the Father, he will, I hope, explain. If he insists upon the equality of the Most High, with him who says, in the verse in question, “After the glory hath he sent me,” (upon some ground that we know nothing of,) he would be sorry to find at last, that he equalizes Zechariah, instead of Jesus, with God. I will, according to the plan already adopted, notice the third quotation, “Awake, O sword,” (xiii. 7,) in a subsequent chapter, among the other passages alluded to in the second chapter of this work. /551

§645  
Zc 2:8

#### CHAPTER IV. ON THE EDITOR’S REPLIES TO THE ARGUMENTS CONTAINED IN CHAPTER II. OF THE SECOND APPEAL.

To my inquiry, in the Second Appeal, “Have we not his (Christ’s) own express and often repeated avowal, that all the powers he manifested were committed to him as the Son, by the Father of the universe?”<sup>1</sup> the Editor thus replies in the negative (page 588): “No;—that he was appointed by the Father to act as mediator between him and sinners, we have already seen; for without this he could have been no mediator between his Father and his offending creatures.”<sup>2</sup> Every unbiassed man may easily pronounce, whether it is consistent with any rational idea of the nature of the Deity, that God should be appointed by God, to “act the part of a mediator,” by “laying aside his glory, and taking on himself the form of a servant;”<sup>3</sup> and may discern, whether it is not most foreign to the notion of the immutable God, that circumstances could produce such a change in the condition of the Deity, as that he should have been not only divested of his glory for more than thirty years, but even subjected to servitude. Are not the ideas of supreme dominion and that of subjection, just as remote as the east from the west? Yet the Editor says, that while he was stripping /552 himself of his glory, and taking upon himself the form of a servant, he was just as much Jehovah as before.

§646

The Editor, in common with other Trinitarians, conceives, that God the Son, equally with God the Father, (according to their mode of expression,) is possessed

§647

\* The word יַחַד in the original Hebrew, signifies “that,” as well as “for.” See Parkhurst’s Hebrew Lexicon.

<sup>1</sup> §114. <sup>2</sup> §392. <sup>3</sup> §395.

of the attributes of perfection, such as mercy, justice, righteousness, truth, &c., yet he represents them so differently as to ascribe to the Father strict justice, or rather vengeance; and to the Son, unlimited mercy and forgiveness, that is, the Father, the first person of the Godhead, having been in wrath at the sinful conduct of his offending creatures, found his mercy so resisted by justice, that he could not forgive them at all, through mercy, unless he satisfied his justice by inflicting punishment upon these guilty men; but the Son, the second person of the Godhead, though displeased at the sins of *his offending creatures*, suffered his mercy to overcome justice, and by offering his own blood as an atonement for their sins, he has obtained for them pardon without punishment; and by means of vicarious sacrifice, reconciled them to the Father, and satisfied his justice and vengeance. If the justice of the Father did not permit his pardoning sinful creatures, and reconciling them to himself, in compliance with his mercy, unless a vicarious sacrifice was made to him for their sins; how was the justice of the Son prevailed upon by his mercy, to admit their pardon, and their reconciliation to himself, without any /553 sacrifice, offered to him as an atonement for their sins? It is then evident, that, according to the system of Trinitarians, the Son had a greater portion of mercy than the Father, to oppose to his justice, in having his sinful creatures pardoned, without suffering them to experience individual punishment. Are these the doctrines on which genuine Christianity is founded? God forbid!

§648 If the first person be acknowledged to be possessed of mercy equally with the second, and that he, through his infinite mercy towards his creatures, sent the second to offer his blood as an atonement for their sins, we must then confess that the mode of the operation and manifestation of mercy by the first is strange, and directly opposite to that adopted by the second, who manifested his mercy even by the sacrifice of life, while the first person displayed his mercy only at the death of the second, without subjecting himself to any humiliation or pain.

§649 In answer to the Editor's position, that Jesus, even as a mediator, was possessed of every power and perfection that was inherent in his divine nature, I only beg to remind him of a few sacred passages among many of a similar nature. *John* iii. 35: "The Father loveth the Son, and hath GIVEN all things into his hand." Ch. xvii. 22: "And the glory which thou GAVEST me, I have given them," &c. Ch. v. 26: "For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he GIVEN to the Son to have life in himself." /554 *Luke* i. 32: "And the Lord shall GIVE UNTO him the throne of his father David." *Matt.* ix. 8: "But when the multitudes saw it, they marvelled, and glorified God, who *had given such* power to MEN." Ch. xxviii. 18: "Jesus came, and spake unto them, saying, *All power* is GIVEN unto *me* in heaven and in earth." On these texts I trust no commentary is necessary to enable any one to determine whether all the power and glory that Jesus enjoyed were given him by God, or were inherent in his own

Jn 3:35; 17:22;  
5:26

Lk 1:32; Mt 9:8;  
28:18

nature.

The Editor again denies Christ's having "possessed a single power, perfection, or attribute, which was not eternally inherent in his divine nature;" and defies me "to point out one attribute or perfection in the Father, which from scripture testimony the Son has not been already shewn to possess."<sup>1</sup> I therefore take upon myself to

§650

point out a few instances which I hope will convince the Editor that the peculiar attributes of God were never ascribed to Jesus, nor to any other human being who may have been, like Jesus, figuratively called gods in scriptural language. In the first place, the attribute of being the "Most High" or עֵלְיוֹן by which the supreme Deity is distinguished above all gods, is not found once ascribed to Jesus, though invariably applied to the Father throughout the scriptural writings. 2ndly. Jesus was never called almighty, or שָׂדֵי a term peculiarly used for the Deity.<sup>2</sup> Nay, moreover, he expressly denies being possessed of almighty power, *Matt.* xx. 23: "But to sit on my right hand, and on my /555 left, IS NOT MINE TO GIVE, but to them for whom it is PREPARED OF MY FATHER." Ch. xxvi. 53: "Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray TO MY FATHER, and he shall presently GIVE ME more than twelve legions of angels?" *John* xi. 41: "Then they took away the stone from the place where the dead way laid; and Jesus lifted up his eyes, and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me." He also denies his omniscience, *Mark* xiii. 32: "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man; no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." Any being if not supreme, almighty, and omniscient, and, more especially, one subjected to the transitions of birth and death, must, however highly exalted, even by the title of a god, and though for ages endowed with all power in heaven and in earth, be considered a created being, and, like all creatures, be in the end, as the apostle declares, subject to the Creator of all things. Besides, in the creed which the generality of Trinitarians profess, God is described as self-existent, having proceeded from none; but the Son, on the contrary, is represented as proceeding from the Father.<sup>3</sup> Here even the orthodox amongst Christians ascribe the attribute of self-existence to the Father of the universe alone.

Mt 20:23; 26:53

Jn 11:41f.

Mk 13:32

In my Second Appeal I observed, that "the sun, although he is the most powerful and most splendid of all known created beings, has yet no claim to be considered

§651

<sup>1</sup> §392.

<sup>2</sup> עֵלְיוֹן is an often used adjective for God, presenting him as the "Highest" of Gods, literally "above" all others (Is 14:14), see Jacob, *Genesis*, 378-379. אֵל שָׂדֵי is God's self-introductory name in Gn (17:1; 35:11 etc.), when he reveals himself to the patriarchs, but also often used in Jb (31 times), the meaning of this name is often discussed, but remains unclear, see Jacob, *Genesis*, 420.

<sup>3</sup> Rammohan refers to the Nicene Creed: "[...]the only Son of God, eternally begotten of the Father, God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God", see Common Worship, *Services and Prayers*, 139.

identical in nature with God, who has given to the sun all the heat,"<sup>1</sup> &c.; to which the /556 Editor replies, "What is the sun to his Maker?"<sup>2</sup>—I wish he had also added, "but that which a son and creature is to his Father and Creator?" When he again inquires, saying, "If the sun has no claim to godhead, has its Maker none?" (alluding to Christ,) he might have recollected that neither the sun nor Jesus has ever arrogated to himself godhead, but that it is their worshippers that have advanced doctrines ascribing godhead and infinite perfection to these finite objects. Notwithstanding that we daily witness the power of the glorious sun in bringing into life, and preserving to maturity, an infinite variety of vegetable and animal objects, yet our gratitude and admiration recognize in him only a being instrumental in the hands of God, and we offer worship and duty to him alone, who has given to the sun all the light and animating warmth which he sheds on our globe. On the same ground, whether we understand from scriptural authority, that the supreme Deity made through Jesus Christ all the things belonging to the Christian dispensation,<sup>3</sup> or every thing relating to this visible world, (as interpreted by the *worshippers* of Jesus,) we must not, in either case, esteem him as the supreme Deity, in whose hand he is represented by the same Scriptures but as an instrument.

§652 The Editor says, that though the power of effecting a material change, without the aid of physical means, be peculiar to God, "yet this power Christ not only possessed, but bestowed on his apostles."<sup>4</sup> /557 Supposing Jesus alone had the power of effecting material changes without the aid of physical means, and of bestowing on others the same gift, it could have proved only his being singular in the enjoyment of this peculiar blessing of God, and not his being identical or equal with Him who conferred such a power on him; but it is notorious that Jesus was not at all peculiar in this point. Were not the miracles performed by Joshua and Elijah, as wonderful as those done by Jesus? Did not Elijah bestow on his servant Elisha the power of effecting changes without physical means, by putting his own spirit on him? Is Elijah, from the possession of this power, to be considered an incarnation of the supreme Deity? 2 Kings ii. 9–12: "And it came to pass, when they (Elijah and Elisha) were gone over, that Elijah said unto Elisha, Ask what I shall do for thee before I be taken away from thee. And Elisha said, I pray thee, let a double portion of thy spirit be upon me. And he said, Thou hast asked a hard thing, nevertheless if thou see me when I am taken from thee, it shall be so unto thee; but if not, it shall not be so.—And Elijah was taken up by a whirlwind into heaven. And Elisha saw it, and he cried, My father, my father," &c. Vers 14–15: "And when he had smitten the waters,

2 K 2:9–15

<sup>1</sup> §114. <sup>2</sup> §392.

<sup>3</sup> Rammohan refers to the Unitarian position, like in §558, see also the note to that paragraph from the *Improved Version*.

<sup>4</sup> §392.



they parted hither and thither, and Elisha went over. When the sons of the prophets saw him, they said, The spirit of Elijah doth rest on Elisha. And they came to meet him, and bowed themselves to the ground before /558 him.”<sup>1</sup> Besides, we find in the evangelical writings, that notwithstanding the power of performing miracles given by Jesus to his apostles, they could not avail themselves of such a gift, until their faith in God was become firm and complete: it is thence evident that God is the only source of the power and influence that one creature has over another. *Matt.* x. 1: “And when he had called unto him his twelve disciples, he gave them power against unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness, and all manner of disease.” Ch. xvii. 16: “And I brought him (the lunatic child) to thy disciples, and they could not cure him.” Vers. 19–21: “Then came the disciples to Jesus apart, and said, Why could not we cast him out? And Jesus said unto them, Because of your unbelief; for verily I say unto you, if ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to another place, and it shall remove, and nothing shall be impossible unto you. Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by *prayer* and fasting.” *Mark* xi. 22: “And Jesus answering saith unto them, (his disciples,) *Have faith* in God; for verily I say unto you, that whosoever shall say unto this mountain, Be thou removed,” &c.

Mt 10:1

Mt 17:14–21

Mk 11:22

In my Second Appeal I mentioned, that it is evident from the first chapter of *Genesis*, that “in the beginning of the creation, God bestowed on man his own likeness, and sovereignty over all living creatures. Was not his own likeness, and that dominion, peculiar to God, before mankind were partakers of them? Did God then deify man by such a mark of distinction?”<sup>2</sup> On which the Editor thus remarks: “It is in reality asking, Did God make him cease to be a creature by thus creating him? We presume he expects no answer.”<sup>3</sup> If the Editor acknowledges that God, by bestowing on man his peculiar likeness and dominion, did not make him cease to be a creature, is he not, according to the same principle, obliged to admit the opinion, that although God raised Jesus above all, and bestowed on him a portion of his peculiar power and influence, yet he did not make him cease to be a creature?

§653

In my Second Appeal, (pages 157, 158,) I selected nineteen passages out of many, in which Jesus distinctly disavows the divine nature, and manifests his subordination to God;<sup>4</sup> to which the Editor replies, “They can prove nothing to his purpose, till they shew that his thus becoming incarnate, changed that divine nature which he possessed from eternity,”<sup>5</sup> &c. I therefore take upon myself to ask the Reverend Editor, whether the following passages found among those already quoted, do not

§654

<sup>1</sup> Rammohan left out from this story, deliberately or not, the heavenly chariot of fire and its horses carrying Elijah up, and the mantle he left back and Elisha wears from now on as Elijah’s successor.

<sup>2</sup> §114. <sup>3</sup> §392. <sup>4</sup> §115. <sup>5</sup> §393.

Jn 14:31; 5:30  
 Jn 6:37  
 Jn 8:28; 20:17  
 Mt 12:18 (=Is 42:1)

prove the entire humanity of the Son, or (in the words of the Editor) a complete change in his divine nature, if he was ever possessed of it? “As the Father *gave me commandment, even so I do.*” “I CAN OF MINE OWNSELF DO NOTHING.” “All that the Father *giveth me shall come to me.*” “As my Father hath *taught me I speak* these things.” “*To my Father and your Father, /560 and to my God and your God.*” “Behold *my servant* whom I have chosen.” If these declarations do fall short of shewing the human nature of the person who affirms them, I, as well as the Editor, should be at a loss to point out any saying of any of the preceding prophets, that might tend to substantiate their humanity. The Editor may perhaps say, after the example of his orthodox friends, that these, as well as other sayings of the same effect, proceed from Jesus in his human capacity. I shall then entreat the Editor to shew me any authority in the Scriptures, distinguishing one class of the sayings of Jesus Christ, as man, from another set of the same author as God. Supposing Jesus was of a two-fold nature, divine and human, as the Editor believes him to be; his divine nature in this case, before his appearance in this world, must be acknowledged perfectly pure and unadulterated by humanity. But after he had become incarnate, according to the Editor, was he not made of a mixed nature of God and man, possessing at one time both opposite sorts of consciousness and capacity? Was there not a CHANGE of a pure nature into a mixed one? I will not, however, pursue the subject further now, as I have already fully noticed it in another place (pages 464 and 467). The Editor adverts here to *Heb. i. 10, 1 Cor. xv. 24, 25*; but as I have examined the former in page 452, and the latter in page 455, I will not revert to the consideration of them in this place.

§655  
 Ps 146:10  
 Gn 17:8  
 Jr 7:7  
 Dn 7:18

At page 589, the Editor thus censures me: “*To /561 say that in the mouth of the Father, ‘for ever and ever’ means only a limited period, is to destroy the eternity of God himself;*” and he quotes, “*Jehovah shall reign for ever and ever.*”<sup>1</sup> I have shewn by numerous instances, both in my Second, and in the present Appeal, that the terms “for ever,” “everlasting,” when applied *to any one except God*, signify long duration: I therefore presume to think that the Editor might have spared this censure as being altogether undeserved. I will here, however, point out one or two more passages in the mouth of the Father, which contain the term “for ever,” and in which it can imply only long duration. *Gen. xvii. 8*: “And I will give unto thee, and unto thy seed after thee—all the land of Canaan, for an *everlasting* possession.” *Jer. vii. 7*: “Then will I cause you to dwell in this place, in the land that I gave to your fathers *for ever and ever.*” *Dan. vii. 18*: “But the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever.” Is the land of Canaan now in possession of Israel; and will it remain in their possession after all rule, authority, and power have been put down,

<sup>1</sup> §393.

and after the Son has delivered up his kingdom to God the Father of the universe? 1 Cor. xv. 24, 28.

1 Co 15:24, 28

The Editor in the course of this discussion notices *Philipp.* ii. 6, whence he concludes that Jesus was in the form of God, and thought it not robbery to be equal with God, yet took upon himself the form of a servant, and became obedient to death; I will, therefore first give the verse as it stands in the English version, and for the purpose of shewing the gradual progress of truth, I will add some subsequent translations of the same verse, by eminently learned Trinitarian authors, and finally transcribe it as found in the original Greek, with a verbal translation.

§656

Ph 2:5-11

English version. *Philipp.* ii. 6: "Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God."

§657

Secondly. In a new translation from the original Greek, by James Macknight, D. D. verse 6 thus stands: "Who being in the form of God, did not think it robbery to be like God."<sup>1</sup> So John Parkhurst, M. A., the author of a Greek and English Lexicon to the New Testament, who was also an orthodox writer, thus translates, conformably to the opinion of Drs. Doddridge and Whitby, two other celebrated orthodox writers, page 322: "*Philipp.* ii. 6, το ειναι ισα Θεω, to be as God. So ισα Θεω is most exactly rendered, agreeable to the force of ισα in many places in the LXX., which Whitby has collected in his note on this place. The proper Greek phrase for equal to God is ισον τω Θεω, which is used *John* v. 18: 'Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God.'<sup>2</sup> (This is not the only instance that [in which] the Jews misunderstood Jesus, for in many other instances they misconceived his meaning. *John* ii. 19, 21; vi. 41, 42, 52, 60.) /563

§658

Jn 5:18

Jn 2:19-21;  
6:41-65

The term, "to be like God," as it is used by several orthodox writers, neither amounts to an identity of one with the other, nor does it prove an equality of the former with the latter. *Gen.* i. 26: "God said, Let us make man in our image, and after our likeness." 1 *Chron.* xii. 22: "At that time, day by day, there came to David to help him, until it was a great host, like the host of God." Ch. xxvii. 23: "The Lord had said that he would increase Israel like to the stars of heaven." *Zech.* xii. 8: "In that day shall the Lord defend the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and he that is feeble among them at that day shall be as David: and the house of David shall be as God,

§659

Gn 1:26

1 Ch 12:22; 27:23

Zc 12:8

<sup>1</sup> Macknight, *Literal Translation Vol. III*, 416.

<sup>2</sup> Parkhurst, *Greek*, Art. "ισος", 266. This citation actually contains Doddridge's words who refers to Whitby: "Ισα, neutr. plur. used adverbially, As. occ. Phil. ii. 6, Το ειναι ισα Θεω, To be as God. 'So ισα Θεω is most exactly rendered agreeable to the force of ισα in many places in the LXX., which Whitby has collected in his note on this place. The proper Greek phrase for equal to God is ισον τω Θεω, which is used *John* v. 18.' Doddridge." Parkhurst continues with an example from Homer's *Iliad*: "Whom, though a bastard, the generous *Theano* brought up carefully as her own children, to please her husband."

1 Jn 3:2 as the angel of the Lord before them.” 1 *John* iii. 2: “But we know that when he shall appear, we shall be *like him*,” &c.

§660 Another Trinitarian author, Schleusner, in his *Lexicon to the New Testament*, renders the passage “Non habuit prædæ loco similitudinem cum Deo,” “He did not esteem likeness to God in the place of a prey.”<sup>1</sup> The substance of this translation is adopted in the Improved Version of the New Testament.<sup>2</sup>

§661 3dly. The original Greek runs thus:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12  
 Ὁς ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπαρχων, οὐχ' ἀρπαγμον ἠγῆσατο το εἶναι ἰσα Θεῷ.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12  
 “Who in form of God being, not robbery thought the being like God.” Which words, arranged according to the English idiom, will run thus: “Who /564 being in the form of God, did not think of the robbery the being like God.” This interpretation is most decisively confirmed by the context of the verse in question. Verse 3 of the same chapter: “Let nothing be done through strife or vain glory; but *in lowliness of mind*, let each esteem other *better* than themselves.” Ver. 4: “Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others.” Ver. 5: “*Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus.*” Ver. 6: “Who, being in the form of God, did not think of the robbery of being like God.” Ver. 7: “But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men.” Where the sense of a passage is complete without introducing an additional word more than is expressed, no one, unless devoted to the support of some particular doctrine, would think of violating fidelity to the original text by interpolating in the translation. Here the apostle requires of us to esteem others better than ourselves, according to the example of humility displayed by Jesus, who, notwithstanding his godly appearance, never thought of those perfections by which he approached man’s ideas of God, but even made himself of no reputation. It would be absurd to point out one’s own opinion of /565 his equality with God as an instance of humility. How can we be following the example of Christ, in thinking others better than ourselves,

\* We find the verb ἠγέομαι implying to esteem as well as to think, with a simple accusative, [2] Pet. iii. 9: ὡς τινες βραδυτῆτα ἠγοῦνται, “as some men count slackness” (properly speaking, “think of slackness”).

<sup>1</sup> Schleusner, *Novum Lexicon*, Art. “ἀρπαγμὸς”, 256. The English translation Rammohan gives, resembles Thomas Belsham’s translation: “Who, being in the form of God, did not esteem as a prey this likeness to God”, Belsham, *Calm Inquiry*, 88. Belsham refers to Schleusner, but does not quote his Latin words.

<sup>2</sup> NTIV, *Ed. 5*, 413, translates: “Who, being in the form of God, did not esteem as a prey, this resemblance to God.” The Editors explain in the footnote that this refers to the “miraculous powers” Jesus “did not make and ostentatious display of” during his life on earth, of course to exclude any pre-existence of Jesus. This is a case where they dismiss Newcome’s translation (“did not esteem it a prey to be like God”).

if he, as the orthodox say, did not think even his Father higher than himself? We, however, must not suffer ourselves to be misled by any such orthodox interpretation to entertain so erroneous an idea of Christ's opinion of himself, bearing in mind that Jesus himself proclaims, "My Father is greater than I." *John* xiv. 28.

Jn 14:28

No one can be at a loss to understand the difference of essence between Christ and his creator God, implied in the phrase, "being in the form of God;" as the distinction between "being God," and "being in the form of God," is too obvious to need illustration. Even Parkhurst, one of the most zealous advocates for the Trinity, thought it absurd to lay stress on the term "being in the form of God," in support of the deity of Jesus Christ. (See p. 443.) "Μορφῆ, perhaps from the Hebrew מראה *appearance*, and פה *aspect*. Outward appearance, form, which last word is from the Latin *forma*, and this, by transposition, from the Doric μορφα, for μορφῆ. See *Mark* xvi. 12, (comp. *Luke* xxiv. 13,) *Philipp.* ii. 6, 7, where the 6th verse refers not, I apprehend, to Christ's being real and essential God, or essential Jehovah, (though that he is so is the foundation of Christianity,) but to his glorious appearance as God before and under the Mosaic dispensation."<sup>1</sup>

§662

Should any one, in defiance of the common acceptation of the word "form," and of every authority, insist upon its implying real essence in the phrase, "being in the form of God," he must receive it in the same sense in the following verse, "took upon himself the form of a servant;" and he must then admit and believe that Christ was possessed of the real essence of God and the real essence of a servant. How can we reconcile real Godhead with real servitude, even for a moment?

§663

Nor can the phrase, "Was made in the likeness of man," in verse 7, be admitted to identify him with Jehovah, any more than we can allow that Samson is so identified by the use of the parallel expression in *Judges* xvi. 7 and 17: "I shall be weak, and be as a man;" "And be like any man." In the English version, the word *other* is found; that is, "be like *another* man;" which is not warranted by the original Hebrew, as Mr. Brown, an orthodox commentator, justly remarks in the margin.<sup>2</sup>

§664

Jg 16:7

The Editor says, (p. 590,) "Relative to Christ's being the first-born of every creature, we reply with Dr. Owen, whose work on Socinianism has never been answered,—'It is not said Christ is πρωτοκτιστος, *first-created*, but πρωτοτοκος, *the first-born*; and Christ is so the first-born, as to be the only-begotten Son of God, is so the first of every creature that is, he is before them all, above them all, heir to them all, and so no one of them.'<sup>3</sup> Although both "first-created," and "first-born," from the common acceptation of these words, equally imply a created /567 nature, yet the reason for

§665

Col 1:15-18

<sup>1</sup> Parkhurst, *Greek*, Art. "Μορφῆ", 367.

<sup>2</sup> Brown, *Self-Interpreting Bible*, 278, remarks "one" as literal translation for "another", thus translating the Hebrew אחד, which is more than just the indefinite article "a".

<sup>3</sup> §394.

St. Paul's choice of the word "first-born" is obvious; for when used in reference to a creation not produced in the natural course, first-born signifies superiority to other creatures of the same class, and not "an only-begotten son," as Dr. Owen and the Editor seem to suppose. I will here point out the sense in which the word "first-born" is used in the Scriptures when obviously not relating to natural birth. *Exod. iv. 22*, we find in the mouth of Jehovah himself, Israel designated by the terms, "my son, even my *first-born*." Again, *Jer. xxxi. 9*: "I am a Father to Israel, and Ephraim is my *first-born*." *Psalm lxxxix. 27*: "I will make him (David) my *first-born*, higher than the kings of *the earth*." And now I will take upon myself to ask the Editor, whether Israel, as well as David, was so "first-born" as "to be the only-begotten son of God," and was also "before all the creatures, above them all, heir to them all, and so no one of them;" or whether that designation was not rather applied both to the nation and to the individual because they were principal persons, and to shew that they were respectively chosen of God above the rest of his creation? *Rom. viii. 29*: "For whom God did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the FIRST-BORN among many BRETHREN." St. John defines what would be understood by the term "to be *born of God*." Vide 1 *John iv. 7*: "Beloved, let us love one another: for love is of God, and every one that /568 loveth is born of God, and knoweth God." Hence Jesus is considered and declared to be the head of the children of God. So the term "only-begotten son" signifies most beloved among children, whether natural or spiritual, and not an only son of a father; as we find, in *Heb. xi. 17*, this very term applied to Isaac, though Abraham had another son by Hagar.

§666 As to his assertion, "Christ is no one of them," (that is, of creatures,) I only quote a few passages in which Jesus himself and his apostles enumerated him as "one of them." *Matt. xxv. 40*: "Verily, I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these *my brethren*, ye have done it unto me." Here it is the King and Lord, sitting upon the throne of his glory at the last day, who is represented as styling the poor and helpless his brethren. *Ch. xxviii. 10*: "Then said Jesus unto them, Be not afraid. Go and tell *my brethren* that they go into Galilee; and there shall they see me." *John xx. 17*: "But go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend to my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God." 1 *Cor. ix. 5*: "As the *brethren* of the Lord and Cephas." *Heb. ii. 11*: "For he that sanctifieth, and they that are sanctified, are *all of one* (Father); for which cause he is not ashamed to call them *brethren*." *Ver. 12*: "Saying, I will declare thy name unto *my brethren*. In the midst of the church I will sing praise unto thee."

§667 As to the Editor's reliance on the subsequent verses to shew that the creation of all things was effected /569 by Christ, I refer my readers to page 440 of this Essay, where I observe that the apostle Paul means, in these passages, only the creation of

all the things in the Christian dispensation, as is explained in *Eph.* i. 21, 22, which represent Jesus as head over all things belonging to the church.<sup>1</sup> I need not renew the subject of Revelations, repeated by the Editor, as I have already examined it in pages 518, 538.<sup>2</sup>

I have shewn, in pages 512, 513, that whatever power Jesus possessed either as a man, Son of man, God, or Son of God, he received the same from the Father of the universe; therefore the assertion of the Editor, (that “certain powers were conferred on Jesus, not as a man, but as the Messiah, Christ, the anointed Son of God”)<sup>3</sup> is, I presume, one of the mysteries of the doctrine of [the] Trinity. How can the Editor reconcile the passages, quoted in my Second Appeal, to this assertion? Let him answer what is there advanced, in the course of the discussion of this very subject, of a few points of which I beg to remind him.<sup>4</sup> §668

1st. “In *John* xvii. 5, ‘And now, O Father, glorify me with thine ownself, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was,’ with the same breath with which he prays for glory, he identifies the *nature* in which he does so, with that under which he lived with God before the creation of the world.”<sup>5</sup> Is not this petition to God for glory, by the same person, who says he was with God before the foundation of the world? Was he, before the /570 foundation of the world, a man, or of a two-fold nature, human and divine? If he was God almighty before the foundation of the world, how could that God implore another being for the restoration of the glory, which he at one time had, but lost subsequently? Jn 17:5 §669

2ndly. In *John* viii. 42, Jesus declares, that he came not of himself, but that God sent him. Does not he avow here, that his coming to this world was not owing to his own will, but to the will of another being? Was he not entirely at the disposal of God, the Most High, even before his coming into this world? In *Heb.* x. 5–7, the apostle declares, that Jesus, at the time of his coming to the world, saith, that God had prepared him a body, and that he comes to the world to do the *will of God*. Had he been God before he had come to this world, how could he, in common with all other creatures, attribute his own actions to the will of the Supreme Disposer of all Heb 10:5–7 §670

<sup>1</sup> §554. There he still seems to be unclear about his understanding of the “creation by Christ”, as giving both options (Unitarian and Arian). Here he favours clearly the Unitarian position. See also NTIV, *Ed.* 5, 419, note b.

<sup>2</sup> Marshman, §394: “So also when John terms him ‘the first begotten from the dead,’ he describes him as equally omnipotent with the Father to bless the churches with grace and peace,—the Searcher of hearts,—the Almighty.” The topic “searcher of hearts” was treated by Rammohan in §609.

<sup>3</sup> §395. All editions read: “the assertion of the Editor, that (‘certain powers were conferred on Jesus, not as a man, but as the Messiah, Christ, the anointed Son of God’) is, I presume [...]”. I corrected the text according to Marshman’s quotation in §1127 by moving the first bracket.

<sup>4</sup> Marshman will protest in §1127, because he is being misquoted here by Rammohan.

<sup>5</sup> §117.



the events of the universe?

§671 The Editor next quotes a part of *Heb.* i. 12, “Thou art the same.” This I have fully noticed in page 452.<sup>1</sup>

§672 The Editor disapproves highly of my assertion, in the Second Appeal, “Christ was vested with glory from the beginning of the world.”<sup>2</sup> I therefore beg to quote one or two scriptural passages, which, I hope, will justify that assertion. 1 *John* ii. 13: “I write unto you, fathers, because ye have known him that is from the beginning.” *Rev.* iii. 14: “These things /571 saith the Amen, the beginning of the creation of God.”

Jn 2:13; Rv 3:14

§673 The Editor insinuates, that I have contradicted myself by “ridiculing the idea of Christ’s having two natures,”<sup>3</sup> after I had declared that Christ “lived with God before the creation of the world,” and that “it would have been idle to have informed them, (the Jews,) that, in his mere corporeal nature, Jesus was inferior to his Maker, and it must, therefore, have been his spiritual nature, of which he here avowed his inferiority to God.”<sup>4</sup> I cannot perceive what contradiction there is in the assertion, that Christ lived in the divine purpose and decree\* before the world was, and that he, not merely as a man, before the assuming of the office of the Messiah, was inferior to his Creator, but that he was so even after he had been endowed with the Holy Spirit in the river of Jordan, and with the power of performing miracles, which is said to be a spiritual gift.—Supposing he, like Adam, lived with God be-/572fore his coming into this world, (according to the doctrines maintained by some Christians,) and af-

\* On *John* xvii. 5. He had it (the same glory) with the Father before the world was, that is, in the Father’s purpose and decree. In the language of scripture, what God determines to bring to pass, is represented as actually accomplished; thus the dead are represented as living, *Luke* xx. 36–38. Believers are spoken of as already glorified, *Rom.* viii. 29, 30. Things that are not, are called as though they were, *Rom.* iv. 17. And in verse 12 of this chapter, Judas is said to be destroyed, though he was then living, and actually bargaining with the priests and rulers to betray his Master. See also verse 10; *Eph.* i. 4; 2 *Tim.* i. 9; *Rev.* xiii. 8; *Heb.* x. 34. (Improved Version.)<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Marshman, §395: “God, who cannot lie, could not have said of him, ‘*Thou art the same*, since the least addition of the least quality either before or after this period, must have dishonored the Divine veracity for ever”, *Heb* 1:12 was noticed by Rammohan in §561.

<sup>2</sup> §117. Marshman disapproves, 395: “Our author’s saying that Jesus spoke of himself ‘as vested with high glory from the beginning of the world,’ instead of *before the foundation* of the world, is unworthy of him. If it arose from carelessness, such carelessness was unworthy of one professing to investigate the doctrine.—If it did not, it was worse.” Marshman attacked Rammohan because he had avoided the expression *before the foundation* (πρὸ καταβολῆς) in his declaration. However, Rammohan quotes *Jn* 17:24 correctly and uses it some lines below in §117.

<sup>3</sup> §396.

<sup>4</sup> §117.

<sup>5</sup> *NTIV, Ed.* 5, 233. Here Rammohan does not quote the entire footnote. He omitted the first part, where the editors explain: “The same glory the Father had given to him: that is, had reserved it for him, and purposed to bestow it on him.” This contains the Unitarian denial of Christ’s heavenly preexistence before his birth, which Rammohan does not follow.



terwards was sent to the world, in the body of Jesus, for effecting human salvation, as John the Baptist was esteemed to be Elijah, even this doctrine does not preclude us from rejecting the idea of a two-fold nature of God and man.

The Editor says, that when “he (Jesus) emptied himself of his glory, did he lay aside his divine nature, of which his glory was merely a shadow?” and then he recommends me to reflect, for a moment, on what the term glory implies; “understood either of praise or grandeur, it is merely the reflection or indication of a glorious nature.”<sup>1</sup> I have reflected, for some years past, and do now seriously reflect, on the divine nature, but I find it inconsistent with any idea I can admit of the eternal and unchangeable Almighty, that he should empty himself of his glory, (call it praise or grandeur, which you like,) though for a season, and should afterwards offer supplications for the same glory to himself, as if another being; addressing that other self as his own father; since God is often declared to have hardened the heart of men so [as] to disqualify them from perceiving his glory, instead of having degraded himself by setting aside his own title to praise, or the grandeur which is inherent in his nature. §674

The Editor adds, “If it was *deserved* glory, it was that of which his nature was worthy, and the Father’s giving it to him, when no being existed beside /573 *the sacred three*, was the Father’s attestation to the Son’s eternal Godhead.”<sup>2</sup> If the Father’s giving to Jesus *deserved* glory, should be acknowledged as amounting “to his attestation to the Son’s Godhead,” we must be under the necessity of admitting the attestation of Jesus to the eternal deity of his apostles, from the circumstance of his having given them the *same deserved glory*;—*John* xvii. 22, “And the glory which thou hast *given me* I have given them,” &c. §675  
Jn 17:22

The Editor twice says, that “*Micah* informs us that the Son is from everlasting.”<sup>3</sup> I wish he had mentioned the chapter and verse to which he alludes, that I might have examined the passage. §676

He perhaps alludes to the phrase “everlasting,” found in the English version, in *Micah* v. 2, “Out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel, whose goings forth have been from old, from everlasting.” I will, therefore, quote Parkhurst’s explanation of the original Hebrew word **עלם** which is translated in the English version “everlasting;” and then notice the translation of this very Hebrew word, in many other instances, by the authors of the English version; and lastly, I will repeat the context, that my readers may be able to judge whether any stress can be laid on the phrase alluded to by the Editor.—First, from Parkhurst’s Hebrew and English Lexicon, “**עלם** and **עולם** are used both as nouns and participles, for time hidden and concealed from man, as well indefinite, *Gen.* xvii. 8, 1 *Sam.* /574 xiii. 13, 2 *Sam.* xii. 20, and eternal, *Gen.* iii. 22, *Psalms* ix. 8, as finite, *Exod.* xix. 9, xxi. 6, 1 §677  
Mi 5:2

<sup>1</sup> §396. <sup>2</sup> §396. <sup>3</sup> §397.

*Sam.* i. 22, comp. ver. 28, 1 *Sam.* xxvii. 12, *Isaiah* xxxii. 14; as well past, *Gen.* vi. 4, *Deut.* xxxii. 7, *Josh.* xxiv. 2, *Psalms* xli. 14, cxiii. 3, *Prov.* viii. 23, as future. It seems to be *much more frequently* used for an *indefinite*, than for *infinite*, time. Sometimes it appears particularly to denote the continuance of the Jewish dispensation for age, *Gen.* xvii. 13, *Exod.* xii. 14, 24, xxvii. 21, and *al. freq.*, and sometimes the period of time to the Jubilee, which was an eminent type of the completion of the Jewish and typical dispensation, by the coming and death of Christ.<sup>1</sup> 2ndly, the author of this Lexicon (though devoted to the cause of the Trinity) gives the translation of the term עולם found in *Micah* v. 2. In the course of explaining the force of the word יצא says he, "*Micah* v. 1, or 2, ומוצאתיו and his (the Messiah's) goings forth have been from of old, מימי עולם from the days of antiquity."<sup>2</sup> 3dly, from the English version, *Isaiah* lxiii. [11], "Then he remembered the *days of old*," or ימי עולם, exactly as is found in *Micah* v. 2. 1 *Sam.* xxvii. 8, "Those nations were of old," for the same Hebrew term עולם. *Deut.* xxxii. 7, "Remember the *days of old*," for the same Hebrew word. *Gen.* vi. 4, "Which were of old, men of renown," for the same term עולם. *Psalms* lxxvii. 5, "I have considered the days of old, and the years of ancient times." Here the term קדם which is rendered in *Micah* v. 2, "*of old*," and the term עולם translated /575 in the same verse "*everlasting*," are both mentioned. 4thly, the context is verses 2–4: "Whose goings forth have been from [of] old, from everlasting; therefore will he give them up, until the time that she which travaileth hath brought forth; [then] the remnant of his brethren shall return unto the children of Israel: and he shall stand and feed in the strength of the Lord, in the majesty of the name of the Lord his God," &c. Can the phrases, "*his God*," "*in the strength of the Lord*," and "*his brethren*," be consistently used for one who is the everlasting God? If so, how can we reconcile to our understanding the idea of the everlasting God's reigning in the strength of another, having the Jews as his brethren, and looking up to another superior, who is designated by "*his God*"? If a body of men, distinguished for their talents, learning, and situation in life, from time to time, be determined to support their long-established inventions, in defiance of scripture, reason, and common sense; how can truth make its appearance, when so violently resisted? I fact, verse 2d of *Micah* thus correctly stands: "Out of thee (Bethlehem) shall he (the last expected Messiah) come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel, whose sources\* of springing forth have been from of ancient, from the days of old." /576

\* These are the seed of Abraham and that of David, through which God declares, by the mouths of the ancient prophets, that he will raise the Messiah to save the world.—Vide Parkhurst's Hebrew Lexicon, "3, The place whence any thing comes. Job xxviii. 1, *Isaiah* lviii. 11, *Psalms* lxv. 9, lxxv. 7; in which last passage, מוציא is used for that part of the heavens whence the solar light יצא cometh forth, i. e. the

<sup>1</sup> Parkhurst, *Hebrew*, Art. עולם II, 531f. <sup>2</sup> Parkhurst, *Hebrew*, Art. יצא 1, 287.

The Editor advances, that “even son” implies an equality of nature with the Father: §678  
 certainly it does so, when referred to one carnally begotten, but otherwise, it signifies  
 a distinguished creature. 1 *Chron.* xxviii. 6: “And he said unto me, Solomon thy son, 1 Ch 28:6  
 he shall build my house and my courts: for I have chosen him to be *my son*, and I will  
 be his father.” *Job* i. 6: “When the sons of God came to present themselves before the Jb 1:6  
 Lord,” &c. Is Solomon, because he is called a son of God, to be considered a partaker  
 of the divine nature? Are the angels, designated “the sons of God,” considered to  
 be of the same nature with the Deity? The Editor, however, adds, (page 594,) “Our  
 author hints, that in the sacred writings others have been termed the sons of God:  
 this, however, only proves, that Christ is, by nature, the Son of God, while all others  
 are the sons of God by adoption, or metaphorically.”<sup>1</sup> To establish Christ’s being the  
 only Son of God, he quotes *Rom.* viii. 32, in which Christ is termed God’s own son; Rm 8:31f.  
 and *John* i. 16, where he says, that “the Holy Spirit also terms him, not merely the  
 only son, but the only-begotten son of the Father.”<sup>2</sup> I therefore quote here verse 32  
 in question, with the preceding /577 verse of the same chapter of *Romans*: “What  
 shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us? He that  
 spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him  
 also freely give us all things?” Here St. Paul proves, beyond doubt, the unlimited  
 mercy of God towards men, as manifested by his appointment of his own Son to  
 save mankind from death, at the risk of the life of that son, without limiting the  
 honour of a spiritual birth to Jesus, and denying to others the same distinction, who,  
 in common with Jesus, enjoy it according to unquestionable sacred authorities. *Deut.*  
 xxxii. 18: “Of the Rock that *begat* thee thou art unmindful.” *Exod.* iv. 22: “*Israel* is Dt 32:18; Ex 4:22;  
*my son, even my first-born.*” 2 *Sam.* vii. 14: “I will be his (Solomon’s) father, and he 2 S 7:14  
 shall be *my son*. If he commit *iniquity*, I will *chasten him* with the rod of men, and  
 with the stripes of the children of men.” Did St. Paul mean to destroy the validity of  
 these, as well as of many other texts to a similar effect, by representing Christ as the  
*only* being distinguished by the title Son of God, and excluding angels, Adam, Israel,  
 Solomon, and David, from this spiritual dignity? I firmly believe he did not.

If a king, who had several children, sent one of them to fight battles against those §679  
 who committed depredations on his subjects, and his son so sent, gained a complete  
 victory in that war, but with the /578 loss of his own life; and if, with a view to

east. Comp. Psalm xix. 6, 7.<sup>3</sup> Parkhurst also rejects the popular meaning, saying, “Not his (Messiah’s)  
 eternal generation from the Father, as this word has been tortured to signify.”<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> §399.

<sup>2</sup> §399. Marshman didn’t refer to a definite verse. The term “only-begotten” appears in Jn 1:14, 18;  
 3:16, Heb 11:17; 1 Jn 4:9. It is not mentioned in Jn 1:16.

<sup>3</sup> Parkhurst, *Hebrew*, Art. אב 3, 287. <sup>4</sup> Parkhurst, *Hebrew*, Art. אב 1, 287.

exalt or magnify the attachment of this sovereign to his people, one of his subjects declares that his sovereign was so deeply interested in the protection of his people as to send his own son, even the most beloved, to repel the enemies at the hazard of his life, and that he had not spared his own son in securing the lives of his people: does he confine the royal birth to that son, or does he degrade other sons of the king from that dignity? I beg my readers will read *Rom.* viii. 31, 32, and reflect upon their purport.—Besides, we find in the original Hebrew, *Gen.* i. 27, “God created man in *his image*,” and in the English version, “*in his own image*.”

Gn 1:27

§680 Did the original writer of *Genesis* mean, that God created man in some fictitious or adopted image resembling that of God? Did the authors of the English version violate the original construction by adding the word “*own*,” to the phrase “in his image”? Or did they add it only for the energy of expression? *Psalm* lxxvii. 6: “God, even our *own* God, shall bless us.” Does the writer here exclude God from being the God of the world, by the use of the word *own* in the verse, against the declaration of Paul? *Rom.* iii. 29, “Is he the God of the Jews only? Is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also.” Or does he use this word to shew the Israelites’ especial attachment to God? In 1 *Tim.* i. 2, Paul uses the expression, “Timothy, my *own* son in the faith.” Did he thereby exclude his thousands of spiritual disciples from being his sons in the faith?

§680

Ps 62:6

Rm 3:29

1 Tm 1:2

§681 In reply to his allusion to *John* i. 16, in which Jesus is said to be “the only-begotten Son of the Father,” I beg to refer the Editor to *Heb.* xi. 17: “By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac; and he that had received the promises offered up his only-begotten son.” Whence he may perceive that the phrase “only-begotten,” implies only most beloved among the children, as Abraham had, at that time, another son beside Isaac, namely, Ishmael, by Hagar, given to him as his wife, *Gen.* xvi. 3, 15. Were we to take the word of *John*, “only-begotten,” in its literal sense, in defiance of *Heb.* xi. 17, we must discredit the express word of God, declaring Israel his begotten and first-born son, and describing David to be his begotten son.

Jn 1:14; Heb  
11:17

Gn 16

§682

Heb 1:5; Ps 2:7

It is worth noticing, that the author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, applies the last phrase, “begotten son,” in an accommodated sense to Jesus, *Heb.* i. 5. I say, in an accommodated sense, since, in *Psalm* ii. 7, it is David that declares, during the prosperous time of his reign, “The Lord hath said unto me, Thou art *my son*, *this day* have I begotten thee.” Besides, how can the orthodox Christians, who consider Jesus as the begotten Son of God from eternity, with consistency maintain the opinion, that God had begotten him, at a particular day, during the reign of David? They may, perhaps, apply /580 some of their mysterious interpretations to this passage of the Psalms; but they will, of course, in that case, pardon my inability to comprehend them. I will not return to the subject of *Rev.* i. 8, and *Heb.* i. 10, though the Editor recurs to them in this place.

As to his frequent repetition of such phrases as “Jesus is Jehovah God,” “a tremendous being in his wrath,” &c.,<sup>1</sup> I only say, they are best calculated to work upon the minds of those that are brought up in the notion of the trinity, but do not carry any weight with them, in an argument subject to the decision of an enlightened public. §683

I asserted in my Second Appeal, that Jesus removed the doubt that arose with regard to the sense in which the unity should be taken in *John* x. 30, (“I and my Father are one;”) by representing the unity so expressed to be such as he prayed might exist among his apostles, which was, of course, the unity of will and design, and not identity of being, as is evident from *John* xvii. 11, “that they [may] be one as we are;” and verse 22, “that they may be one, even as we are one;” on which the Editor makes the following remarks. §684  
Jn 10:30  
Jn 17:11; 22

“The declaration, *John* xvii. 22, ‘that they [may] be one even as we are one,’ was made at a time, and to persons totally different from that in *John* x. 30, ‘I and my Father are one;’ the latter was made to the gainsaying Jews, and the former in prayer to his heavenly Father; nor is there the least hint given /581 that any doubt had arisen among the disciples respecting the expression ‘I and my Father are one.’”<sup>2</sup> §685  
 It astonishes me very much to meet with a new rule laid down by the Editor, that no commentary upon, or explanation of a passage or phrase by the author of it, can have any weight, if it is made or given at a subsequent period in the course of a solemn prayer to God, or before a body of new hearers, without an express declaration of their doubts at to the meaning of it. If this rule stand good many commentaries and notes by authors on their respective works must cease to be of use, and the universally adopted rule, that passages on Scripture should be explained by their reference to one another, must be annulled. In ch. x. 30, “I and my Father are one,” Jesus declares unity to subsist between himself and God; and in ch. xvii. 11 and 22, by praying that “they (his disciples) may be one, as he and the Father are one,” he explains that the unity between him and the Father was of the same kind as that which he prayed to be granted to his disciples; hence by the unity so prayed for, cannot be meant any thing else than unity of will and design. Although that unity may not be of the same degree that subsisted between him and the Father, yet the force of the preposition “AS” shews that it is of the same kind.

Jesus could not mean in praying for his apostles, verse 11, an unity in nature among them, whence we might have inferred unity in nature between him and his God; since they were long before this prayer /582 created in the one human nature; nor could he pray for a renewed spiritual nature to be given to them, (as the Editor §686

<sup>1</sup> The latter phrase in §362 and §398, the former very often used by Marshman as a foundation of his christology.

<sup>2</sup> §400.

Jn 17 thinks to be the case,<sup>1</sup>) because they were already endued with that spiritual union, as is evident from the passage of the very chapter, (xvii. [6, 8, 16, 22,]) “They have kept thy word.”—“And have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst *send me*.”—“*They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world*.”—“The glory which thou gavest me, *I have given them*.” Besides, unity in spiritual nature is not the same kind of unity which subsists between the individuals of one nature.

§687 Supposing unity of nature existed between God and Jesus Christ, (as the Editor believes,) in the same manner as it is found in one begotten by a man or animal and his parents, and that Jesus actually meant by the words, “my Father,” in verse 30, to affirm God to be his real Father, would it not be quite idle in Jesus to have declared, that he as a Son was of the same nature with his Father, instead of saying that he was a Son entertaining the same will and design with his Father, since the former circumstance is natural and obvious, but the latter is not always found to exist, as we daily find among the children of men? Were the circumstances of one’s calling God his Father received as proof of his being actually the son of God, and, of course, of his unity in nature with the Deity, we must consider David as a real son of God, and of the same nature. /583 *Psalm lxxxix. 26*: “He shall cry unto me, Thou art MY FATHER, my God, and the rock of my *salvation*,” and we also must esteem Israel one in nature with God; (*Jer. iii. 4*, “Wilt thou not from this time cry unto me, MY FATHER, thou art the guide of my youth?”) We must even admit all Christians to be one in nature with the Father of the universe, for we are taught to pray to OUR FATHER in heaven, *Matt. vi. 9*. See also verses 1, 4, 6, 8, 14, 15, 18, and 32 of the same chapter. *John xx. 17*: “My Father and your Father,” &c. *2 Cor. i. 3*: “The Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,” and “the Father of mercies,” &c. To enable my readers to take a clear view of this passage, I here quote the context, as well as the note found in the Improved Version upon it. Vers. 29, 30: “My Father, who gave them me, is greater than all: and none is able to pluck them out of my Father’s hand. I and my Father are one:” that is, “To snatch my true disciples out of my hand would be to snatch them out of my almighty Father’s hand; because ‘I and my Father are one;’ one in design, action, agreement, affection. See ch. xvii. 11, 21, 22. *1 Cor. iii. 8*: ‘Now he that planteth, and he that watereth are one.’” (Improved Version.)<sup>2</sup> Both in the Scriptures, and in ordinary composition, unity, when referred to two substances,

<sup>1</sup> §400: “What is the basis of that union between the followers of Christ, which he prayed might become as perfect as that between the Son and the Father? Is it not a common human nature? Further, what completes their perfect union as Christians? Is it not their partaking of *one renewed nature*—nay, is not their union perfected in exact proportion as they *equally* partake of this renewed nature?”

<sup>2</sup> Rammohan copied the footnote from *NTIV, Ed. 5, 217*. The editors of the *NTIV* quoted this text from Newcome’s revision, see Newcome, *NT Vol. I, 430*, note to Jn 10:30.

implies invariably perfect concord of will, or some other qualities, and by no means oneness of nature,—a fact which my readers will perceive by a slight attention to the common usage of language, /584 and also to the following verses: *Gen.* ii. 24: “And he (the husband) shall cleave unto his wife, and they two shall be *one flesh*.” *Ezek.* xxxvii. 19: “I will take the stick of Joseph, and will put them with him, even with the stick of Judah, and make them *ONE* stick, and they shall be *one* in mine hand.” *1 Cor.* x. 17: “For we being many are *one* bread, and *one* body; for we are all partakers of that *one* bread.”

Gn 2:24

Ezk 37:19

1 Co 10:17

I never amused myself<sup>1</sup> with the thought that Christ did “pray that his disciples might be one with him and his heavenly Father,” nor did I ever rejoice at the idea, that Jesus, “a man approved of God,” was one in nature with the invisible Most High; I only observed in my Second Appeal, that if Trinitarian authors succeeded in their attempt to prove the deity of Jesus Christ from a perverted interpretation of such phrases as “the Father in me, and I in him;” “he dwelleth in God, and God in him;” they would unavoidably increase the number of the persons of the godhead much beyond three, since similar expressions are frequently found applied to the disciples of Jesus. *John* xiv. 20: “At that day ye shall know, (addressing himself to his disciples,) [that] I am in my Father, and ye *in me*, and I *in you*.” *Ch.* xvii. 21: “Thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be *one in us*.” *John* vi. 56: “He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.” *1 John* iv. 15: “Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of /585 God, *God dwelleth in him, and he in God*.” *2 Peter* i. 4: “That by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature.”

§688

Jn 14:20

Jn 17:21

Jn 6:56

1 Jn 4:15

2 P 1:4

The Editor seems displeas'd at my having declined to submit indiscriminately to my countrymen the whole doctrine of the New Testament, because certain passages therein, having undergone human distortions, occasion much dispute.<sup>2</sup> I therefore beg to refer him to page 360 of this Essay, as well as to all church history, which shew that my plan was conformable to the example laid down by the apostles and primitive Christians, who used to accommodate their instructions to the gradual progress of their followers.

§689

In answer to his question, “[How was it that I did not feel struck with the absurdity of a creature’s creating all things,](#)”<sup>3</sup> &c.? I beg only to reply by another question, viz. How does the Reverend Editor justify the idea, that one who was in the human shape, possessed of human feelings, and subject to the calls of nature, was the very God whom he defines as existing for ever, immaterial, invisible, and above all mortal causes or effects?

§690

The Reverend Editor says, that “[nothing can be more incorrect than my assertion, p. 168, that Jesus in \*John\* x. ‘disavowed the charge of making himself God:’—after](#)

§691

<sup>1</sup> §400, Marshman refers to §120. <sup>2</sup> §401. <sup>3</sup> §401.

having borne the fullest testimony to his equality with God, in chapters v. and viii., at length prevaricates and retracts for fear of death.”<sup>1</sup> I therefore refer to chapters v. and viii., and /586 now ask the Editor whether he calls the following sayings of Jesus, found in chapters v. and viii., the fullest testimonies to his equality with God? “The Son can do nothing of himself.” “For the Father loveth the Son, and *sheweth him* all things that himself doeth.” “So the Son quickeneth whom he will; for the Father judgeth no man, but hath *committed* all judgment unto the Son.” “He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that *sent me*, hath everlasting life.” “So hath he *given to the Son* to have life in himself, and hath given him authority,” &c. “I can of *mine* ownself do nothing.” “I seek not *mine own will*, but the will of the Father who hath *sent me*.” “For the works which the Father hath *given me* to finish,” &c. “I am come in *my Father’s name*.” Ch. viii.: “But he that sent me *is true*.” “I do *nothing of myself*, but as my Father hath taught me I speak these things.” “But now ye seek to kill me, *a man* that hath told you the truth which I have *heard of God*.” “Neither came I myself, but *he sent me*.” “I seek not mine own glory.” “I know him (God) and keep *his saying*.”\* Do these testimonies amount to the equality of Jesus with his God and Father? If so, the Editor must have in view a definition of the term “equality” quite different from that maintained by the world. I at the same time entreat the Editor to point out a /587 single verse in either of these two chapters containing a proof of the equality of Jesus Christ with God, setting in defiance all the phrases I have now quoted from these very chapters. After reflecting upon the above-cited phrases, the Editor will, I hope, spare the charge, that Jesus “at length prevaricates and retracts for fear of death;” for his disavowal of deity in ch. x. 36, was quite consistent with all the doctrines and precepts that he taught in the evangelical writings. (Vide the whole of the four gospels.)

Jn 5:19–30; 36;  
43

Jn 7:28; 28; 40;  
42; 50; 55

§692

The Editor then adds, that “the confession, (in x. 34–36,) which our author terms a disavowal of deity, was the very confession for which they sought again to take him, because they still thought he made himself God.”<sup>2</sup> I am, therefore, under the necessity of quoting the context, to shew that the Jews seemed appeased at the explanation given by Jesus himself, as to their misunderstanding of him, and that they sought again to take him on account of another subsequent assertion of his. The context is, (32–39,) “Many good works have I shewed you from my Father; for which of those works do ye stone me? The Jews answered him, saying, For a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God. Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said ye are gods?

Jn 10:32–39

\* As to John v. 23, I beg to refer my readers to the subsequent chapter of this Essay, where I will examine the same verse fully.

<sup>1</sup> §402, quoting §121. <sup>2</sup> §402.



If he called them gods unto whom the word of God came, (and the scripture cannot be broken,) say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, /588 thou blasphemest, because I said I am the Son of God? If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not: but if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works; that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me,\* and I in him. *Therefore* they sought again to take him, but he escaped out of their hand.” Does not Jesus here appeal to scripture, on the ground that if the sacred writings, every assertion of which is but true, are justified in calling magistrates and prophets gods, and that the Jews in reading the Scriptures stiled those superiors by the epithet dogs, in conformity to their Scriptures, they could not in justice accuse him, the sanctified Messiah of God, of blasphemy, for his having called himself only the Son of God? Does not Jesus here justify the use of the phrase “Son of God,” for himself, in the same metaphorical sense that the term “gods” was used for the magistrates and prophets among Israel? If so, he of course relinquishes his claim to the use of the phrase “God,” and “Son of God” in its real sense. If a commoner, who holds a high situation under government, suffers himself to be called “honourable,” and, consequently, be accused of presumption in permitting himself to be designated by that title, on the ground that he was not actually the son of a /589 nobleman, would he not justify himself against this charge by saying, “You call all the judges Lords in their judicial capacity, though they are not noblemen by birth; yet you charge me (who hold a more dignified situation than the judges) with arrogance, because I suffer myself to be addressed as ‘honourable’—a title which the children of noblemen enjoy”? In following the example of Jesus, I now appeal to scripture, and also to common sense, that my readers may judge thereby whether verses 34–36 contain a confession of godhead, or a disavowal of deity, made by Jesus himself.

It is not only a single instance in which Jesus omitted to correct the Jews in their misconceiving the phrase, “The Father is in me, and I in him,” (verse 38,) but in many other instances he left them in ignorance. (*John* ii. 19, 21.) When Jesus told the Jews to destroy the temple, that he might raise it again in three days, they misunderstood him, and supposed that he intended to raise the temple of Jerusalem, and found fault with him, from this misconceived notion, before the high-priest. *John* ii. 21: “But he spoke of the temple of his body;” as well as *John* vii. 34–36, viii. 21, 22, as I noticed before in pages 433, 562. The Editor, lastly, says, that “[Jesus at last chose to die under this very charge, rather than clear up the mistake, if it was such. This was their last and grand charge: ‘We have a law, and by that law he ought to die, because he made](#)

§693

Jn 2:18–22

---

\* I have already in a preceding page (584) stated that such a phrase as “one is in another, and the other is in him,” implies in scriptural language only unity in design and will, as it is frequently applied to the apostles in reference to God, and to their Lord and Master Jesus Christ.

himself the Son of God,' which they esteemed /590 blasphemy worthy of death."<sup>1</sup> The Editor must be well aware that the Jews had such an inveterate enmity against Jesus, that they not only charged him with what they found in him contrary to their law, but even with wilful exaggerations. *John* v. 15: "The man departed and told the Jews, that it was Jesus who had made him whole." Ver. 16: "And therefore did the Jews persecute him, (Jesus,) and sought to slay him, because he had done these things on the sabbath day." (To perform a cure on the sabbath day, is supposed by the Jews to be a breach of the traditions of the elders, and not a crime worthy of death; yet they sought to kill Jesus under that pretence.) Ver. 17: "But Jesus answered them, My Father worketh hitherto, and I work. Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God." Although the Jews, in their own defence, called God their Father, without subjecting themselves to the charge of blasphemy, (*John* viii. 41, "*We have one Father, even God,*") yet they sought to kill Jesus on the false ground, that he equalized himself with God by calling God his Father. It is worth observing, that, lest the Jews should infer his independence in doing miracles, and wrest his words from the purpose, ("My Father worketh hitherto, and I work,") Jesus firmly avows his entire dependence on God in whatever he had performed, in verse 19, ("Verily, I say unto you, /591 the Son CAN to *nothing* [of] himself," &c.,) and also in the following verses, insomuch that the Jews, being unable to find any plea for his destruction, remained quiet, and left Jesus in peace. (Vide the whole of ch. v.) In *Luke* xxiii. 2, the Jews charged him with having perverted the nation by representing himself as their king, and having forbidden to give tribute to Cæsar—a charge which was full of misrepresentation.

§694 Let us return now to the text quoted by the Reverend Editor: "We have a law, and by our law he ought to die, because he made himself the *Son of God*;"—whence it is evident, that, notwithstanding the great hatred which the Jews entertained towards our Saviour, and the misrepresentation they were guilty of in their accusation against him, the severest charge which they preferred under the pretence of religion, was, that "he made himself the Son of God," and they would have, of course, accused him of having made himself God, to Pilate, whom they found inclined to release Jesus, and in presence of the multitude, this being better calculated to excite the wrath of the latter and horror of the former, had the Jews ever heard him declare himself God, or say any thing that amounted to his claim to the Godhead. The high-priest and other chief accusers knew very well that their people were taught to consider God as their Father, and to call themselves the children of the Most High (correctly speaking, /592 the sons of the Most High, *Psalms* lxxxii. 6); and this idea was so

<sup>1</sup> §402.

familiar among them, that Jesus also admitted them to be the particular children of the Deity. *Mark* vii. 27: “But Jesus said unto her, Let the children first be filled,” &c.

Mk 7:27

The Editor says, (page 597,) that “our author queries on what principle any stress can be laid on the prophetic expression quoted in *Heb.* i. from the Psalms, ‘Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever.’ We reply merely on this principle, that it is spoken by God, who cannot lie.”<sup>1</sup> Are not these words also, “Ye are gods,” spoken by Him who cannot lie? Is not the very verse of *Hebrews*, “Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever,” applied originally to Solomon by Him who cannot lie, and, in accommodated sense, to Jesus by the apostle? I will not introduce the subject again, it having been noticed in page 449.<sup>2</sup> The Editor expresses his astonishment at what I say in the the Second Appeal, that the phrase “for ever” must mean a limited time when referred to an earthly king or a creature, and therefore it carries no weight in the proof of deity of Jesus when applied to him. The reason which he assigns for his surprise is, How could I take this phrase in a finite sense when applied to Jesus, the eternal Jehovah? Did not the Editor feel astonished at the idea that he employs the application of the phrase “for ever” in his attempt to prove the deity of Jesus, and then employs the circumstance of the eternal /593 deity of Jesus for the purpose of proving that infinite duration is understood by the phrase “for ever,” when referred to Jesus?

§695

Heb 1:8f.  
(=Ps 45:6–8)

As he admits that “for ever,” when referred to a creature, implies a limited time only; he, therefore, must spare this phrase, and try to quote some other term peculiar to God, in his endeavour to establish the deity of Jesus.

§696

The Editor says, that the expression of Jesus to Mary, (*John* xx. 17,) “Go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God,” was merely in his human nature.<sup>3</sup> I wish the Editor had furnished us with a list enumerating those expressions that Jesus Christ made in his human capacity, and another shewing such declarations as he made in his divine nature, with authorities for the distinction. I might have, in that case, attentively examined them, as well as their authorities. From his general mode of reasoning, I am induced to think that he will sometimes be obliged, in explaining a single sentence in the Scriptures, to ascribe a part of it to Jesus as a man, and another part to him in his divine nature. As for example, *John* v. 22, 23: “For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son, that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father who [hath] sent me [him]”. The first part of this sentence, “hath committed all judgment unto the Son,” must have /594 been (according to the Editor) spoken in the human nature of Jesus Christ, since the Almighty, in exercising his power, does not

§697

Jn 20:17

Jn 5:22f.

<sup>1</sup> §403, quoting §121. <sup>2</sup> §559. <sup>3</sup> §404.

stand in need of another's vesting him with that power. The second part of the same sentence, "all men should *honour* the Son, [even] as they *honour* the Father," must be ascribed by the Editor to Jesus as God, he having been worthy to be honoured as the Father is. And the last part, "who hath sent me, [him,]" relates again to Christ's human capacity, since it implies his subjection to the disposal of another. Is this the internal evidence of Christianity on which the orthodox divines lay stress? Surely not.

§698 As to the exclamation of Thomas, (*John* xx. 28,) "My Lord and my God!" it is neither a confession of the supreme deity of Jesus by him, nor is it a vain exclamation, since it is evident, from verse 25, that Thomas doubted Christ's resurrection without any reference to his deity; and that, when he saw Jesus and the print of the nails, he believed it, and being struck with such a circumstance, made the exclamation, "My Lord and my God!" according to the invariable habits of the Jews, Arabs, and almost all other Asiatic nations, who, when struck with wonder, often make exclamations in the name of the Deity; and that Jesus, from these apparent circumstances, and having perceived his heart, says, "Because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed" (verse 29); by which Jesus acknowledges the belief of Thomas in the fact which he doubted in verse 25, /595 that is, his resurrection; for the subject in question, as it stands in the context, has no allusion to the deity of Jesus; and the form in which a confession is made, is totally different from that of exclamation, both in the Scriptures and in ordinary language. How can Thomas be supposed to have meant to confess the deity of Jesus in a mere exclamation, "My Lord and my God!" without adding some phrase conveying confession, such as "thou art" my Lord and my God, and "I believe you to be" my Lord and my God? I beg that my readers will attentively refer to the context, and to the common habits of Asiatics on occasions similar to this, and form their opinion respecting this subject. The Editor quotes *Matt.* v. 37, which, with its context, forbids all sorts of swearing;<sup>1</sup> but what relation this has to the exclamation of Thomas, in *John* xx. 28, I am unable to discover.

§699 The Editor quotes six passages from the Gospel and the book of the *Revelation*, four of which I have already examined, and I notice now the remaining two verses. First, *John* i. 1:<sup>2</sup> "In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God." By the first sentence, ("in the beginning was the word,") the Editor attempts to prove the eternity of the Son; by the second, ("the word was with God,") his distinct personality; and by the third, ("the word was God,") his deity.

§700 Let us first take this verse in its literal sense, and ascertain whether or not it is, in that case, intelligi-/596ble. "In the beginning"—i. e. in the first time—"was the word"—i. e. existed such a sound as was capable of conveying a meaning. "The word

<sup>1</sup> §404. <sup>2</sup> §407.

was with God”—i. e. this sound existed in the Deity, since no sound can exist of itself. “The word was God”—i. e. the word was the deity, or a deity, or being like other attributes of the deity—it was divine. The whole verse thus stands: “From the beginning the word of God, or Revelation manifesting his will and commandments, existed with him as God himself;” and by the same word God made or established all things; as the Jewish and Mohummudan, as well as Hindoo, theologians believe, on the authority of the works respectively acknowledged by them, that God made and established all things by his word only. (Vide *Gen.* i. 3, et seq.) And he communicated that Revelation to the world through Jesus Christ, (as testified beforehand by John the Baptist,) for the purpose of effecting the salvation of those that received and believed the authority of that Revelation. This is detailed throughout vers. 2–12.\* In verses 13, 14, John expressly personifies “the word” in Jesus, as the bearer and deliverer of that Revelation: “The word was made flesh,” (or the word was flesh,) “and dwelt among us,” &c. To explain fully this metaphorical representation, John /597 designates Jesus by this name, with the additional words “of life,” once in his Epistle, 1 *John* i. 1, “The word of life,” and with the additional words “of God,” once in *Rev.* xix. 13, “His name is called the Word of God;” whereby he manifests that Jesus, as the deliverer of the word of God, is called by that name, and not actually identified with the word, as otherwise might have been supposed from his Gospel, i. 1. *John* i. 1, is not the only instance in which an attribute of the Deity is thus represented as one with God; for the very same writer identifies love with the Deity, in 1 *John*<sup>1</sup> iv. 8, 16, on the ground that love is of God, and is manifested in the world by him, 1 *John* iv. 7.

Gn 1

1 Jn 1:1; Rv 19:13

1 Jn 4:7–16

Secondly, I have to notice the orthodox exposition of the verse in question: they interpret the word “beginning,” as signifying all eternity, and by the term “word,” they understand Jesus the Son of God; that is, from all eternity the Son of God existed with God, distinct in person, and he was also God. The interpretation is, I presume, equally unscriptural as it is revolting to the understanding, and for several reasons: First, as long as a passage can be consistently taken and understood in its literal sense, there can be no apology for taking it in a figurative one. Here we find no authority for identifying Jesus with the “word,” or designating him by that term in any of the preceding gospels; he is only figuratively so called in *Revelation*, by the name of “the word of God.” Under these circum-/598stances, to understand Jesus literally and so abruptly, by the term “word,” in *John* i. 1, (against the established doctrine of the Jews and the rest of the oriental nations,) and to assume this word as existent

§701

\* The reason for the use of the masculine gender in these verses, both in the original Gospel and in the English version, is obvious, as the original word *λογος*, signifying the “word,” is masculine.

<sup>1</sup> This is misprinted as “*John*” in London1823 (instead of 1 *John*); correct in Ghose.

in the beginning, and as instrumental in the hands of God, in moral and physical creations, is entirely inadmissible. 2ndly, The Evangelist John, in his Gospel, uses the word “beginning” in a finite sense, and generally implying the beginning of the Christian dispensation, *John* xvi. 4, xv. 27, viii. 25, 44, vi. 64, ii. 11, and not once for “all eternity.”<sup>1</sup> Hence, to understand the word “beginning” in an infinite sense, is opposed to the sense adopted throughout the whole of his Gospel. 3rdly, In the first verse of *Genesis*, “In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth,” we find, in a similar connexion, the same phrase, “in the beginning.” Were we to follow the orthodox interpretation, and take it in an infinite sense, (i. e. from eternity God created the earth and heavens,) we should be compelled to profess the eternity of the world and become materialists. 4thly, To acknowledge the Son to be the true God, and to have lived with the true God from eternity, destroys at once the idea of the unity of God, and proves, beyond every question, the plurality of the Deity. For, if we see one real man living with another real man, though both of them are one in nature and design, are we not compelled, by the ordinary course of nature, to apprehend the duality of man, and to say that there are two men? Can /599 orthodox ingenuity prove, that there are not two, but one man, or prevent the comprehension of the duality of man? If not, I wish to know whether, after admitting that the real God, the Son, exists with the real God, the Father, from eternity, the Editor can consistently deny the existence of two real Gods? 5thly, The exposition of the Editor must render *John* i. 1, directly contradictory of *Deut.* xxxii. 39, “I am he, and there is *no God with me.*” Here Jehovah himself expressly denies having another real God with him in the universe, for he is often said to have fictitious gods with him, and, therefore, Jehovah’s denial, in this verse, must be rendered and confined to real gods. *Psalm* lxxxii. 1: “God standeth in the congregation of the mighty, he judgeth among the gods.” He then addressed himself to those nominal gods of Israel, among whom he stood, “I said, *ye are gods,*” (in verse 6). But we firmly believe that John, an inspired writer, could not utter any thing that might contradict the express declaration of Jehovah, though the Editor and others, from a mistaken notion, ascribe this contradiction to the Evangelist.<sup>2</sup> 6thly, They thus render the last sentence of the verse, “the word was God,” without the indefinite article “a” before “God,” while they translate *Exod.* vii. 1, “I have made thee (Moses) a god to Pharaoh,” though, in the original Hebrew, there stands only the word אלהים or “God,” without the indefinite article “a” before it. If regard for the divine unity /600 induced them to add the article “a” in the verse of *Exodus*, “a god to Pharaoh,” why did not the same regard,

Jn 16:4; 15:27;  
8:25, 44; 6:64;  
2:11

Dt 32:39

Ps 82

Ex 7:1

<sup>1</sup> The verses listed by Rammohan refer to Jesus’ work in the world and among his disciples. Only Jn 8:44 stands out as the devil was probably not only a murderer from the beginning of the “Christian dispensation”, but from his own beginning.

<sup>2</sup> Marshman, §408, addresses this contradiction and denies it.

as well as a desire of consistency, suggest to them to add the article “a” in *John* i. 1, “the word was a god”? We may, however, easily account for this inconsistency. The term “God,” in *Exodus*, is applied to Moses, the notion of whose deity they abhor; but as they meant to refer the same term, in *John* i. 1, to Jesus, (whose deity they are induced by their education to support,) they leave the word “God” here, without the article “a,” and carefully write it with a capital G. Lastly, If eternity be understood by the phrase “In the beginning,” in *John* i. 1, and Jesus be literally understood by the “WORD,” then we shall not only be compelled to receive Christ as an eternal being, but also his apostles; since *Luke* (ch. i. 2) speaks of himself and his fellow-disciples, as “eye-witnesses and ministers of the word from the beginning.” Lk 1:2

Thirdly, I shall now quote the interpretation of this passage, by searchers after truth, who have been enabled to overcome their early-acquired prejudices. See Improved Version, for which the Christian world is indebted to its eminently-learned authors.<sup>1</sup> §702

“*The Word.*] ‘Jesus is so called because God revealed himself or his word by him.’ Newcome. The same title is given to Christ, *Luke* i. 2. For the same reason he is called the Word of life, 1 *John* i. 1, which passage is so clear and useful a comment upon the proem to the gospel, that it may be proper /601 to cite the whole of it. ‘That which was *from the beginning*, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have *looked upon*, and our hands have handled of *the Word of life*; for *the Life* was *manifested*, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and *show* unto you, that eternal *Life* which was *with the Father*, and was manifested unto us, that which we have seen and heard, declare we unto you.’ By a similar metonymy Christ is called the Life, the Light, the Way, the Truth, and the Resurrection. See Cappe’s *Dissert.* Vol. I. p. 19.” §703

“*In the beginning.*] Or, from the first, i. e. from the commencement of the gospel dispensation, or of the ministry of Christ. This is the usual sense of the word in the writings of this Evangelist. *John* vi. 64, Jesus knew from the beginning, or from the first; ch. xv. 27, ‘Ye have been with me from the beginning.’ See ch. xvi. 14, ii. 24, iii. 11; also 1 *John* i. 1, ii. 7, 8; 2 *John* 6, 7. Nor is this sense of the word uncommon in other passages of the New Testament. 2 *Thess.* ii. 13; *Phil.* iv. 15; *Luke* i. 2.” §704

“*The Word was with God.*] He withdrew from the world to commune with God, and to receive divine instructions and qualifications, previously to his public ministry. As Moses was with God in the mount, *Exod.* xxxiv. 28, so was Christ in the wilderness, or elsewhere, to be instructed and disciplined for his high and important office. See Cappe, *ibid.* p. 22.” /602 §705

“*And the Word was a God.*] ‘Was God.’ Newcome. Jesus received a commission §706

<sup>1</sup> In the following paragraphs Rammohan copied annotations to Jn 1:1-3, 14 from NTIV, Ed. 5, 184-186.

as a prophet of the Most High, and was invested with extraordinary miraculous powers. But in the Jewish phraseology they were called gods to whom the word of God came. (*John* x. 35.) So Moses is declared to be a god to Pharaoh. (*Exod.* vii. 1.) Some translate the passage, God was the Word, q. d. it was not so properly he that spake to men as God that spake to them by him. Cappe, *ibid.* See *John* x. 30, compared with xvii. 8, ii. 16, iii. 34, v. 23, xii. 44. Crellius conjectured that the true reading was Θεου, the Word was God's, q. d. the first teacher of the gospel derived his commission from God. But this conjecture, however plausible, rests upon no authority."

§707 "Was in the beginning with God.] Before he entered upon his ministry he was fully instructed, by intercourse with God, in the nature and extent of his commission."

§708 "All things were done by him.] 'All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made.' Newcome; who explains it of the creation of the visible, material world by Christ, as the agent and instrument of God. See his notes on ver. 3 and 10. But this is a sense which the word εγενετο will not admit. Γινομαι occurs upwards of seven hundred times in the New Testament, but never in the sense of *create*. It signifies, in this gospel, where it occurs fifty-three times, to /603 be, to come, to become, to come to pass; also, to be done or transacted, ch. xv. 7, xix. 36. It has the latter sense, *Matt.* v. 18, vi. 8, xxi. 42, xxvi. 6. All things in the Christian dispensation were done by Christ, i. e. by his authority, and according to his direction; and in the ministry committed to his<sup>1</sup> apostles, nothing has been done without his warrant. See *John* xv. 4, 5, 'Without me ye can do nothing.' Compare vers. 7, 10, 16; *John* xvii. 8; *Col.* i. 16, 17. Cappe, *ibid.*"

§709 Verse 14: "Nevertheless, the Word was flesh." "Though this first preacher of the gospel was honoured with such signal tokens of divine confidence and favour, though he was invested with so high an office, he was, nevertheless, a *mortal man*.' Cappe. In this sense the word flesh is used in the preceding verse. 'Flesh,' says Mr. Lindsey, *Sequel to the Apology*, p. 136, 'is frequently put for *man*.' *Psalms* lxxv. 2; *Rom.* iii. 20. But it frequently and peculiarly stands for man as mortal, subject to infirmities and sufferings; and as such, is particularly appropriated to Christ here, and in other places. 1 *Tim.* iii. 16; *Rom.* i. 3, ix. 5; 1 *Pet.* iii. 18, iv. 1. 'Ο λογος σαρξ εγενετο, the Word *was* flesh, not *became* flesh, which is Newcome's translation, or, was *made* flesh, which is the common version. The most usual meaning of γινομαι, is *to be*. In this sense εγενετο is used in this chapter, ver. 6; also in *Luke* xxiv. 19. The things concerning Jesus of Nazareth, ος εγενετο, who *was*, not who /604 became a prophet. See Cappe, p. 86; and Socinus in loc."

§710 Now my readers may judge which of these interpretations of *John* i. 1, is consis-

<sup>1</sup> "his" is written double in London1823. Ghose is correct.



tent with scriptural authority and conformable to the human understanding.

The Editor denies, positively, the charge of admitting three Gods, though he is in the practice of worshipping God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. I could wish to know what he would say, when a Hindoo also would deny Polytheism on the same principle, that if three separate persons be admitted to make one God, and those that adore them be esteemed as worshippers of one God, what objection could be advanced, justly, to the oneness of three hundred and thirty three million of persons in the Deity, and to their worship in different emblems? for, oneness of three or of thirty millions of separate persons is equally impossible, according to human experience, and equally supportable by mystery alone. §711

The second passage of *John*, quoted by the Editor, which I have not yet noticed, is *John* xvi. 30, "Now are we sure that thou knowest all things."<sup>1</sup> I admit that Jesus knows all things concerning his ministry and the execution of final judgment, but not those that bear no relation to either of them, as I noticed in pages 449, 518, and 538, since the phrase "all things," is very often used in a definite sense, both in the Old and New Testament. In *Joshua* i. 17, /605 when the people said, "We hearkened to Moses in all things," they meant, of course, things with regard to the divine commandments. So, in *Matt.* xvii. 11, Elias is said to have "restored all things," that is, all things concerning his office as the forerunner of the Messiah. In *Mark* xiii. 23, Jesus said to his disciples, "I have foretold you all things," of course what respected their salvation. *Eph.* vi. 21: "Tychicus, a beloved brother, and faithful minister in the Lord, shall make known to you all things," of course belonging to their salvation. Besides, the Scriptures inform us, that those who devote themselves to the contemplation of the Deity are endued with the free gift of knowing all things; but from this circumstance they are not considered to be elevated to the nature of God, nor numbered as persons of the Godhead. *Prov.* xxviii. 5: "They that seek the Lord, understand *all things*." *2 Tim.* ii. 7: "And the Lord give thee understanding *in all things*." *2 Sam.* xiv. 20: "And my Lord is wise, according to the wisdom of an angel of God, to know *all things* that are in the earth." §712  
Jn 16:30  
 Jos 1:17  
 Mt 17:11  
 Mk 13:23  
 Ep 6:21  
 Pr 28:5; 2 Tm 2:7;  
 2 S 14:20

The Editor quotes Paul, (page 598,) "God our Saviour," and 1 *Peter*, "The righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ," and also *Jude*, [25,] "To the only wise God our Saviour."<sup>2</sup> He intends, perhaps, to shew, that as both God and Jesus are styled "Saviours," consequently Jesus is God.—I have fully noticed that several others, beside Jesus, were, like him, appointed by God to save people /606 from time to time, and named Saviours in the Scriptures; but that the use of this appellation does not serve to prove the deity of any of them. Vide pages 402 and 405. §713  
2 P 1:1; Jude 25

The Editor expresses his despite of Hindoo Polytheism, triumphing in his own §714

<sup>1</sup> §405. <sup>2</sup> §405.

pure profession.<sup>1</sup> I wonder how it could escape the notice of the Editor, that the doctrine of plurality in unity maintained by him, and that professed by Hindoos, stand on the same footing, since the Editor, as well as the Hindoos, firmly declares the unity of God, while at the same time both acknowledge the *plurality of persons* under the same Godhead, although they differ from each other in the exact number. The following passage quoted by the Editor, “The gods who have not made the heavens and the earth, shall *perish from the earth*, and from under these heavens,”<sup>2</sup> is equally applicable to several of the divine persons of both parties.

Jr 10:11

§715 In answer to the Editor’s query, Where does the unity of mankind exist?<sup>3</sup> I entreat to be allowed to ask the Editor, where the unity of the Godhead exists? If he say, that it is one divine nature that exists between the three sacred persons, I answer, that the unity of mankind is one human nature, and exists between so many individual persons.

§716 In answer to his question, When were all mankind one even in design and will? I shall say that mankind has always been one, and shall be one even in will and design, in the glorious and prosperous /607 reign of Christ; and that present difference in will and design, or in rank and situation among its persons, does not preclude them from unity of nature, as the Editor himself admits that “*one equal in nature to another may yet be subordinate in office.*”<sup>4</sup> Besides, we find that the will of God the Father was

Mt 26:39

sometimes at variance with that of God the Son. *Matthew* xxvi. 39: “O my Father, if it be possible, *let this cup pass from me*; nevertheless, not as *I will*, but as *thou wilt.*”

Mk 14:36

*Mark* xiv. 36: “And he (Jesus) said, Abba, Father, all things are possible unto *thee*; *take away* this cup from me; nevertheless, not what *I will*, but what *thou wilt.*”

§717 The Editor appeals to common sense, saying, that “*she sees around her every day,*” that one man “*equal in nature to another is yet subordinate in office.*”<sup>5</sup> She sees so indeed; but when she sees one man equal in nature to another, she reckons them *two* men, whether one is subordinate in office to the other or not. To this part of the evidence, I beg the Editor will pay some attention. It is indeed astonishing, that in all his illustrations the Editor brings the Godhead to a level with any genus, including various species under it, but feels offended if any one should observe this fact to him.

§718 The Editor says, (page 601,) “*Nor is it true that it was the constant practice of the Saviour to pray to the Father for the power of working miracles; for he never did them in his Father’s name, as was the /608 invariable practice of the ancient prophets.*”<sup>6</sup> In reply to this, I only refer the Editor to *John* xi. 41, to *Mark* viii. 6, where we find Jesus had actually prayed to the Father in raising the dead, and breaking

Jn 11:41f.; Mk 8:6

<sup>1</sup> §409: “Respecting the dreams and fables of Hindoo Polytheism, while we triumph in that pure and holy Revelation given by the Triune Jehovah”.

<sup>2</sup> §409. <sup>3</sup> §409. <sup>4</sup> §406. <sup>5</sup> §406. <sup>6</sup> §410.

the bread; and especially to *John xi. 42*, in which Jesus, by saying “thou hearest me *always*,” avows that, during the whole period of his executing the divine commission, God *heard* his supplications, though in several instances of performing miracles he had not used verbally the name of God, in imitation of the practice of some of the ancient prophets. See *2 Kings v. 27*, in which Elisha is said to have made Gehazi a leper without verbal supplication to God; and in chap. *ii. 10*, Elijah bestowed on Elisha his power of performing miracles, without praying verbally to the Most High. As to the Editor’s assertion, that “**he never did them (miracles) in his Father’s name**,” I again refer him to *John x. 25*, “The works that I do *in my Father’s name*, they bear witness of me.” Ver. 43: “I am come in my *Father’s name*, and ye receive me not; if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive.” Here Jesus rests his divine commission on the name of God, and rejects the claims of any one who comes in his own name. He certainly sent his disciples to work miracles in his own name, as the Messiah sent from God, that his apostles might procure faith in him from Jews and Gentiles, whereby they both might have their access to God through him.<sup>1</sup> *Matthew x. 40–42*: “He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth *me* receiveth him *that sent me*. He that *receiveth* a prophet *in the name of a prophet*, shall receive a prophet’s reward; and he that receiveth a righteous man in the name of a righteous man, shall receive a righteous man’s reward. And whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only *in the name of a disciple*, verily I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward.” These shew evidently that man should be rewarded for any act that he may perform in the name of a disciple, even in the name of a righteous man. How much more is he to be approved in the sight of God, if he acts in the name of the Messiah of the Most High!

I do not wonder at the idea of Christ’s empowering his apostles to work miracles when we find other prophets doing the same at their own choice, as I have often noticed. The Editor says, “**If it be declared in scripture, that the Father created all things by and for the Son, it proves only that the Son is equal to the Father**,” and that the passages, “He hath given to the Son to have life in himself; ‘the first-born of every creature,’ **place the equality of the Son with the Father beyond all dispute**.”<sup>2</sup> This must be a new mode of proof, invented for the support of the Trinity, founded on mystery, far beyond my understanding. For if a creature’s being endowed with life by, or employed as an instrument */610* in the hands of another, puts them both on a footing of equality, then, in the Editor’s estimation, the clay is equal to the potter;<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> §410: “That he manifested his Godhead in sending his disciples *to work miracles in his own Name*, is a fact that will never be disproved.”

<sup>2</sup> §411.

<sup>3</sup> Rammohan is referring to *Is 64:7*, but also to his own interpretation of Hinduism in the *Abridgment*: “God is the efficient cause of the universe, as a potter is of earthen pots; and he is also the material cause

the rod with which Moses performed his miracles was equal to that great prophet; and Moses himself, by whom, and for whom, God exhibited so many wonderful works, was equal to the Deity./611

CHAPTER V. REMARKS ON THE REPLIES TO THE ARGUMENTS FOUND IN CHAPTER THE THIRD OF THE SECOND APPEAL.

[1. Jesus' ubiquity.]<sup>1</sup>

§720 The Editor now comes (p. 602) “to the last, and by far the easiest part of this work,”<sup>2</sup> that of meeting my objections to the seven positions formerly advanced in support of the deity of Christ. The first of these is, that Jesus was possessed of ubiquity, deduced from *John* iii. 13, “No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man, who is in heaven.” The ubiquity of Jesus is by the Editor grounded on the phrase, “who is in heaven,” found in the present tense, while Jesus was at that time on earth. I in the first place observed in my Second Appeal, (page 175,) that this argument might, perhaps, carry some weight with it, were not the frequent use of the present tense in a preterite or future sense observed in the sacred writings; and were not a great number of other passages to determine that the term “is” in this instance must be understood in the past tense; and to support this assertion, I quoted several passages, a few of which the Editor has discussed, leaving the rest quite unnoticed. One of these is *John* viii. 58: Jn 3:13 “Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Adam was, I am.” To Jn 8:58f. /612 weaken its force, the Editor says, “Why must this declaration, ‘Before Abraham was, I am,’ be taken in a preterite sense? Because if it be not, our author’s cause dies.” No; but because it would bear no sense unless thus understood, “Before Abraham was, I was.” The Editor further says, “Did the Jews, however, understand it thus? So far from it, that they esteemed it a decided declaration of Jesus’s equality with the Father, and took up stones to stone him as a blasphemer.” The Jews understood Jesus as declaring himself to be more ancient than Abraham, which they first inferred from Jn 8:56 his assertion “Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it, and was glad.” (*John* viii. 56.) But there is nothing in the context that can convey the least idea of the Jews having esteemed the phrase “Before Abraham was, I am,” a “decided declaration of Jesus’s equality with the Father,” or of their having, in consequence, taken up stones to stone him. Nor can the circumstance of their attempt to stone of it, the same as the earth is the material cause of the different earthen pots”, Rammohan, *Abridgment*, 12.

<sup>1</sup> §§412-420. <sup>2</sup> This and the following quotations are from §412.

Jesus be considered as a proof of their viewing the above declaration respecting his priority to Abraham, as blasphemy against God, for they sought to slay Jesus once on account of his having healed a man on the sabbath day, which they considered as a breach of their law, and not as a claim to equality with the Deity; (*John* v. 16;) and they wanted again to destroy Jesus merely from his affirming, “I know him, for I am from him, and *he hath sent me;*” (*John* vii. 29, 30;) and finally from motives of political safety, as far as regarded their connexion with the Romans, the Jews resolved to kill him. (*John* xi. 47, 48, 53.)

The Editor says, that “Jesus himself, meek and lowly as he was, although he knew precisely in what sense they understood him, rather chose to work a miracle for his own safety, than to deny his own divinity.” From what I have just stated, and from all that I mentioned in pp. 589, 562, it obviously appears that neither the Jews understood his deity from the assertion, “Before Abraham was, I am,” nor was it usual with Jesus to correct them whenever they mistook his meaning. The Editor might further perceive, in *John* v. 20<sup>1</sup>, and its context, that Jesus, though charged with having a demon, omitted to correct fully their mistaken notion; and also, in *John* viii. 48, 49, that, on the Jews reproaching him with being a Samaritan, and with being possessed by a demon, the Saviour only denied the second, and omitted to notice the former, which was the grossest charge that one Jew could ever prefer against another.

The Editor seems doubtful as to the force of the arguments he has adduced in turning the above verse to his purpose, as he thought it proper to have recourse to “the body of evidence previously adduced” in his attempt to prove “Christ’s ubiquity;” but my readers may be able to judge, from a calm examination of this body of evidence, whether or not it has any weight in proof of the ubiquity of the Son. /614

The Editor now lays down a rule for those instances where the present tense is used in the Scriptures for the past, saying, “In poetry, and sometimes in lively narrative, the present is, with strict propriety, used for the past, because the transaction is narrated as though passing before the reader’s eyes.” I therefore beg the Editor to explain, conformably to this rule, the instances I noticed, (Second Appeal, pp. 175, 176,<sup>2</sup>) and numerous other instances. *John* xi. 8: “His disciples *say* unto him,” instead of *said* unto him. Ver. 38: “Jesus *cometh* to the grave,” that is, *came* to the grave. Ch. xiii. 6: “Then *cometh* he to Simon Peter,” that is, he *came* to Simon Peter. Do these come under the denomination of poetry or lively narration? If not, the Editor’s rule must fall to the ground. If the Editor insists upon their being lively narration, because the circumstances are “narrated as though passing before the reader’s eyes,” how can we be prevented, in that case, from taking the assertion in *John* iii. 11, also

<sup>1</sup> Read: “*John* vii. 20”. This is a mistake in all editions.    <sup>2</sup> §126.

for a lively narration, on the same ground, that the circumstances are narrated in the verse in question “as though passing before the reader’s eyes,” although Jesus had in reality meant by present, the past tense?

§724 The Editor further observes, that “it is a didactic discourse, on the clearness and accuracy of which depended the salvation of a man (Nicodemus) who had hazarded much in coming to Jesus for instruction.”<sup>1</sup> It is true that Jesus, as the greatest prophet /615 of God, (or an omniscient being, according to the orthodox creed,) though well aware of the slow apprehension of Nicodemus, instructed him in a language far from being clear and comprehensible to him, both in the preceding and following verses. Vide verse 3: “Except a man *be born again*, he cannot see the kingdom of God.” Ver. 8: “So is every one that is *born of the Spirit*.” Ver. 13: “No man hath *ascended up to heaven* but he that came down from heaven,” &c. Ver. 14: “And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man *be lifted up*”—foretelling him of his death on the cross by these ambiguous words. Nay, moreover, he, in his discourse with the Jews and the multitude, very often expressed his ideas in such a manner, that not only the Jews, but his own disciples, mistook his meaning; but he always regulated his instructions as he was guided by his and our heavenly Father. It would be, therefore, presumptuous in us to lay down rules for his conduct, maintaining that “common humanity, therefore, demanded that in further discourse with him, no word should be used but in its *direct and proper sense*.”<sup>2</sup>

Jn 3:1-21

§725 In answer to his assertion, “If, then, he would only tell us how Jesus was regarded in those realms of light and truth previously to his descent on earth, he would himself settle this point,”<sup>3</sup>—I beg to refer the Editor to such authority as no Christian can ever deny; I mean 1 *Peter* i. 20: “Who verily /616 was *foreordained before the foundation of the world*, but was *manifested* in these last times for you.” And also to 2 *Tim.* i. 9: “Who hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which *was given us* in Christ Jesus *before the world began*.” If this plain explanation fall short of convincing the Editor of the real sense in which the pre-existence of Jesus and of his followers was meant, my endeavour to correct his notion on this head must be of no use.<sup>4</sup>

1 P 1:20

2 Tm 1:9

§726 In order to weaken the force of the argument I founded on *John* vi. 62, “The Son of Man ascend up where he *was before*,” shewing the absence of Jesus from heaven while he was talking to men on earth, the Editor quotes *Gen.* xi. 5, xviii. 33, xxxv. 13, in which Jehovah is stated to have moved from one place to another, though

Jn 6:62

Gn 11:5; 18:33;  
35:13

<sup>1</sup> §412. <sup>2</sup> §412. <sup>3</sup> §413.

<sup>4</sup> In Rammohan’s answer there is a shift from Marshman’s question: Marshman is asking about the time between the creation and Jesus’ birth, and Rammohan answers about the time “before the foundation of the world”. See Marshman’s critique in §1173.

possessed of omnipresence.<sup>1</sup> But the Editor overlooked, or thought it judicious to omit to notice, the real point of my argument in the Second Appeal, which I now repeat: “For the attribute of omnipresence is quite inconsistent with the human notions of the ascent and descent effected by the *Son of Man*.”<sup>2</sup> It is not impossible for the omnipresent God that he should manifest himself wherever he chooses without violating his omnipresence; but the notion of occupying two very distant places at one time by a *son of man*, is, of course, contrary to the ideas acquired by /617 human experience, unless this extraordinary circumstance be ascribed to the power of performing miracles bestowed on man by God.

Jesus, however, took every precaution in wording his discourse with Nicodemus, §727 by the use of the term *man* in the very same verse, (13,) thus establishing his humanity; but, notwithstanding this, the prejudices of a great number of his followers have induced them to infer his ubiquity, and thereby his deity, from the same verse.

I will not recur to the examination of such passages as “who made all things,” §728 “who upholds all things,” &c., alluded to here by the Editor, having often noticed them in the former part of this work.

Let us now come to the real point, and ascertain whether or not the word, in the original Greek, which is rendered “is” in the English version, in the phrase “who is in heaven,” actually signifies the present tense, as a candid inquiry into this very point will bring us to a satisfactory decision at once. The word in the original is ὢν, a participle, and not a verb; and all that I said in my Second Appeal may be compressed into three remarks. In the first place, that the time of the participle is referred to the time of the verb found in the sentence; and to corroborate this opinion, I quoted Bishop Middleton’s *Doctrine of the Greek Article*, Part i. p. 42, Note: “We are to refer the time of the participle to the time of the act, &c. implied in the verb; for past, present, and future, cannot be meant otherwise than /618 in respect of that act.”<sup>3</sup> And I also cited *John* i. 48, Οὐτα εἶδον σε, “I saw thee when thou wast;” literally, “I saw thee being,” in which the present participle implies the past in correspondence which the verb εἶδον, or “I saw,” found in the same verse. I now also beg the attention of the Editor to the common usage of almost all the languages that have the use of a present participle, in which he will find the participle generally referring to the time of the verb related to it. In English, for example, in the following phrase, “Being ill, I

---

\* The Editor has given, in p. 607, a quotation from Bishop Middleton, with some remarks of his own; but I am perfectly willing to leave it to the discerning reader to judge whether it corroborates my opinion or makes against it.

<sup>1</sup> §414.    <sup>2</sup> §126.

<sup>3</sup> Middleton, *Doctrine*, 23, quoted by Rammohan in §127, and the counter-quotation from Marshman is in §416, note.



could not call upon you,” the time of the present participle “being,” refers, I presume, to the verb “could not call,” implying the past tense.

§730 In the second place, I quoted *Levit.* vii. 33, xiv. 47, in which the present participle  
Lv 7:33; 14:47 is accompanied with the definite article, observing, that “these present participles are referred to a time present with respect to the act of the verbs connected with them, but future, with respect to the command of God”<sup>1</sup>—that is, when the definite article is prefixed in Greek to a present participle, it has reference to the verb connected with it in an indefinite manner. So we find many instances in the New Testament similar to those quoted from Leviticus. In the third place, I said, “Moreover, we frequently find the present /619 participle used in a past tense<sup>2</sup>, even without reference to the time of the verb. *John* ix. 25: Τυφλός ων αρτι βλέπω, “Being blind, now I see;” that is, “Having been blind, now I see.”<sup>3</sup>

§731 The Editor, omitting to notice the second and third arguments adduced by me, makes remarks only on the first, saying, that “were this criticism” (“being in heaven,” instead of “is in heaven”) “perfectly correct, it would not be of the last service to our author, as, he being in heaven, is precisely the same as, he who is in heaven.”<sup>4</sup>—I positively object to the accuracy of this assertion of the Editor; for the verb “is,” generally affirms an act or a state at the time present when spoken; but the present participle ων, or “being,” even when preceded by the definite article ό, or “the,” implies time indefinitely, though the article ό is often rendered by a relative pronoun “who” or “which,” and the participle by a verb, for the sake of elegance in English composition. I beg to refer the Editor first to those texts quoted in my Second Appeal. *Levit.* vii. 33: Ὁ προσφερων—αυτω εσται ό βραχιων ό δεξιος, “The offering (person) for him shall be the right shoulder.” Although the participle “offering” is found here in the present tense, yet it indisputably implies, that at any time in future in which the offering may be made, “the offerer shall be entitled to the right shoulder.” *Lev.* xiv. 47: Ὁ εσθων—πλυνει τα ιματια αυτου, “The eating (person) shall wash his clothes.” The word “eating,” thou found here in the pre-/620sent participle, preceded by the definite Greek article ό, signifies any part of the future in which the act of eating shall take place. The phrase, “the eating;” (person,) is rendered in the English version, “he that eateth,” conformably to the idiom of the English language; but this change of construction does not produce any change in the real meaning conveyed by the original Greek. As this phrase, “he that eats,” bears no allusion to the support of the doctrine of the Trinity, no one will, I presume, scruple to interpret it in its original sense; that is, he who eats at any time future with respect to the commandment of God, shall wash his clothes.

§732 Secondly, I refer the Editor to the passages he quoted in p. 608,<sup>5</sup> to save me the

<sup>1</sup> §127. <sup>2</sup> Read: “sense”. <sup>3</sup> §127, note. <sup>4</sup> §416. <sup>5</sup> §418



trouble of selecting them. *John* iii. 4: “How can a man be born when he is old?” Jn 3  
 literally, “being old,” that is, at any point of time, no man being old can be born.  
 Ver. 15: “That no man believing on him should perish;” that is, no one who may  
 be induced to believe Jesus at any time, even up to the last day, should perish. Ver.  
 18: “He not believing is condemned already;” that is, he who rejects me at any time,  
 is condemned already in the divine decree. Ver. 20: “Every one doing evil hateth  
 light,” at any time whatsoever. Ver. 29: “He having the bride is the bridegroom,”  
 at any period of time. Ver. 31: “He being of the earth, is earthly,” at any period  
 of time. Again, ch. v. 3: “In these lay a great multitude of folk impotent,” &c. In Jn 5:3-5  
 the original Greek, the verb “to /621 lie,” is in the imperfect tense, and consequently  
 the participle may be thus rendered, “Who were impotent up to that time.” Ver.  
 5: “And a certain man was there who had an infirmity thirty and eight years.” In  
 this verse the participle is not preceded by the article: this, however, signifies that  
 a certain man had an infirmity when he was present at the pool—not at the time  
 when St. John narrated this circumstance. But with a view to expose my argument  
 to ridicule, the Editor puts his own words into my mouth, saying, (p. 608,) “In this  
 chapter, ver. 4, we have, ‘How can a man be born when he is old,’ literally, ‘being  
 old,’ on our author’s plan ‘having been old and now not being so;’”<sup>1</sup> and so on in all  
 the above-stated verses. But I wonder how he could mistake what I have advanced  
 in my Second Appeal in explanation of a present participle preceded by the article *ὁ*  
 in the following words: “The offering (person) for him shall be the right shoulder:—  
 the eating (person) shall wash his clothes. These present participles are referred to a  
 time present with respect to the act of the verbs connected with them, but future with  
 respect to the command of God.”<sup>2</sup> Now my reader may judge whether I confined the  
 meaning of a present participle to the past tense, as the Editor, no doubt inadvertently  
 misrepresents my arguments.

Thirdly, I beg to refer the Editor to the translation of that verse by the celebrated §733  
 Dr. Campbell: “For none ascendeth into heaven, but he who de-/622scended from  
 heaven, the Son of Man, whose abode is in heaven;”<sup>3</sup> in which the sense of the  
 participle is referred to an indefinite time; for a person whose abode is in London,  
 may have his temporary residence in Paris.

Fourthly, I beg also to refer to the explanation of the article *ὁ* before a participle, §734  
 given by Parkhurst: “xi. With a participle it may generally be rendered by *who*, *that*,  
*which*, and the participle as a verb. Thus 1 *John* ii, 4, *ὁ* λεγων, he who saith, i. e. the  
 (person) saying. *John* i. 18, *ὁ* ων, *who is* or *was*.”<sup>4</sup>

As to the assertion of the Editor, that were the time of the participle “being,” §735  
 found in the phrase “being in heaven,” referred to the verb “to ascend up to heaven,”

<sup>1</sup> §418. <sup>2</sup> §127, note. <sup>3</sup> Campbell, *Gospels Vol. III*, 348. <sup>4</sup> Parkhurst, *Greek*, Art. “*ὁ*”, 383.

it would completely prove the ubiquity of Christ, or involve perfect absurdity<sup>1</sup>; I presume there would be neither of these difficulties, in the event of the participle being referred to the verb mentioned in the verse; for one's being in heaven, or having his abode in heaven, does not render his ascent to heaven impossible, nor does it tend to prove his deity. Let us apply these circumstances as they stand literally to Moses and Elias, who descended from their heavenly abode, and appeared with  
 Mt 17:1-9 Jesus Christ to his apostles, (*Matt.* xvii. 3,) and again ascended, would it prove their ubiquity, or involve absurdity? But is there any thing more absurd than an attempt to prove the ubiquity of a son of man capable of occupying only a certain small space on earth? /623

§736 In reply to his assertion, that “when John wishes to describe a past state of action or being, he chooses some past participle,”<sup>2</sup> I only beg to remind him, that in the Greek language there is no past or future participle for the verb εἶμι, *to be*, and, consequently, the present participle is used for those tenses under the specific rules.\*

§737 As to the second passage which he quoted to demonstrate the ubiquity of Jesus, (*Matt.* xviii. 20, “For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am  
 Mt 18:20 I in the midst of them,”) I observed in my Second Appeal, “Is it not evident that the Saviour meant here, by being in the midst of two or three of his disciples, his guidance of them when joined in searching for the truth, without preferring any claim to ubiquity? We find similar expressions in the Scriptures wherein the guidance of the prophets of God is also meant by words that would /624 imply their presence.

Lk 16:29 *Luke* xvi. 29: ‘Abraham saith unto him, They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them.’ No one will suppose that this expression is intended to signify that the Jews actually had Moses and the Prophets in person among them, or that they could hear them speak, in the literal sense of the words; nor can any one deduce the omnipresence of Moses and the prophets from such expressions.”<sup>3</sup>

§738 The Editor, to avoid entering into the main argument, puts the following ques-

---

\* The true explanation of the verse is given in the IMPROVED VERSION, as follows: “Now no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he who came down from heaven, † even the Son of Man, [who is in heaven.]” ‡ † “*He who came down from heaven.*” This clause is correlative to the preceding. If the former is to be understood of a local ascent, the latter must be interpreted of a local descent. But if the former clause is to be understood figuratively, as Raphelius and Doddridge explain it, the latter ought in all reason to be interpreted figuratively likewise. If ‘to ascend into heaven,’ signifies to become acquainted with the truths of God, ‘to descend from heaven,’ is to bring down, and to discover those truths to the world. And this text clearly explains the meaning of the phrase wherever it occurs in the evangelist. ‘Coming down from heaven,’ means coming from God, (see ver. 2,) as Nicodemus expressed it, who did not understand this of a local descent, but of a divine commission. So Christ interprets it ver. 17. Sn.” ‡ “*Who is in heaven.*” This clause is wanting in some of the best copies. If its authenticity is allowed, it is to be understood of the knowledge of Christ possessed of the Father’s will. See John i. 18.”<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> §416. <sup>2</sup> §419. <sup>3</sup> §127. <sup>4</sup> NTIV, *Ed.* 5, 193-194.

tions, to which I shall now reply. 1st. “If Christ guided them, must he not have been with them for that purpose?”<sup>1</sup> Yes, he has been with them in the same manner as Moses and the prophets have been with the Israelites, as is evident from the above-quoted passage of Luke, as well as from another which I shall now cite. 1 *John* iii. 24: “And he that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him, and he in him: and hereby we know that he *abideth in us, by the spirit which he hath given us.*” Jn 3:24

2ndly. “If there were only two such little companies searching for the truth at the same moment, must he not have possessed ubiquity to guide them both?” I reply by two other questions. If the Jews of Galilee and of Jerusalem “have Moses and the Prophets” at the same time for their guidance, are Moses and the Prophets to be supposed to have possessed of ubiquity? After Elijah went up to heaven, (2 *Kings* ii. 11,) and his spirit was seen resting on Elisha, who remained on /625 earth, (ver. 15,) does the circumstance of Elijah’s being in heaven, and being with his servant Elisha on earth in spirit at the same time, prove the ubiquity of Elijah? 2 K 2:9–15

3rdly. The Editor asks, “If he (Jesus) was with Christians to guide them, has he left them now?” I reply, neither Jesus nor Moses and the Prophets have now forsaken those that sincerely search into truth, and are not fettered with early-acquired human opinions.

4th. “How, then, can he be the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever?” My reply is, he has been the same in like manner as David has been, in “keeping the law continually for ever and ever.” (Psalm cxix. 44.) 5th. “Does our author need to be told that this meant the writings of Moses and the Prophets?” I reply, that this expression means their words preserved for ever by means of writings as the statutes of God. *Psalm* cxix. 152: “Concerning thy testimonies, I have known of old that thou hast founded them for ever.” Ver. 89: “For ever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven.” And *Deut.* xxxii. 1, Moses exclaims, “Give ear, O ye heavens, and I will speak, and hear, O earth, the words of my mouth; my doctrine shall drop as the rain, my speech shall distil as the dew,” &c. 6th. “Did Jesus mean that they had his writings with them?” I reply, he meant, of course, that they had his lowly spirit, and his words, which were afterwards published and preserved in writing. 7th. “Where were the writings of Jesus at that time?” I said not a word of his writings in my Second Appeal. Why /626 the Editor puts this question to me, I know not. It is, however, evident, that Jesus himself, while on earth, like other prophets of God, never omitted to express his doctrines and precepts, which have been handed down in writings up to this day. Ps 119 Dt 32:1f.

SECOND POSITION.

[2. Jesus’ knowledge of God.]<sup>2</sup>

The Editor quoted *Matthew* xi. 27, “No man knoweth the Son, but the Father; §739

<sup>1</sup> §420. <sup>2</sup> §421.

Mt 11:27 neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him,” to shew that Jesus ascribes to himself a knowledge and an incomprehensibility of nature equal to that of God. I consequently asked the Editor in my Second Appeal, “If he, by the term ‘incomprehensible,’ understands a total impossibility of being comprehended in any degree, or only the impossibility of attaining to a perfect knowledge of God?”<sup>1</sup> If the former, we must be under the necessity of denying such a total incomprehensibility of the Godhead; for the very passage cited by the Editor declares God to be comprehensible not to the Son alone, but also to every one who should receive revelation from the Son; and in *John* xvi.<sup>2</sup> 16, 17, Jesus ascribes to his disciples a knowledge of the Holy Ghost, whom the Editor considers one of the persons of the Godhead, possessed of the same nature with God. But if the Editor understands by the passage he has quoted, the incomprehensibility of the real nature of the God-/627head, I admit the position, but deny his inference that such an incomprehensibility proves the nature of the object to be divine, as being peculiar to God alone, for it appears evident that a knowledge of the real nature even of a common leaf, or a visible star, surpasses human comprehension. The Editor, although he filled one page (610) in examining that part of the reply, yet made no direct answer to the foregoing question, but repeats his inference from these passages, “that Jesus himself can comprehend the nature of the Father, and that his own nature is equally inscrutable;” but the verse in question does not convey one or other of these positions. As to the first, we find the latter part of the sentence (“neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him”) declaring an exception to the general assertion made in the former part of it; (“neither knoweth any man the Father;”) that is, the Son, and those to whom the Son reveals God, were the only individuals that knew the nature of the Father. Would not this exception be distinctly contrary both to the sacred authorities, and to common sense; as the scripture declares positively that the nature of God is incomprehensible to men? *Job* xxxvi. 26: “God is great, we know him not;” and common sense teaches us every moment, that if the real nature of the works of God is incomprehensible to the human intellect, how much more must the nature of God himself be beyond human understanding! As to the second, if the circumstance of the /628 Son’s declaring himself (according to the Editor) to be inscrutable in nature, be acknowledged as equalizing him with God, similar declarations by his apostles would of course raise them to the same footing of equality with the Deity. 1 *Jn* 3:1 *John* iii. 1: “Therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not,” corroborated by *John* xvii. 25, “O righteous Father, the world hath not known thee,” &c. *Jn* 17:25 It is, therefore, evident, that neither can an impossibility of comprehending God, in

<sup>1</sup> §128. <sup>2</sup> Read: xiv.

any degree, he meant by this passage, the apostles having known God by revelation; nor can the comprehension of the real nature of God be understood by it, as such a knowledge is declared to be unattainable by mankind. The verse in question must be thus understood, as the meaning evidently is, “that no one but the Father can fully comprehend the object and extent of the Son’s commission, and no one but the Son comprehends the counsels and designs of the Father with respect to the instruction and reformation of mankind. It is impossible that Jesus can be speaking here of the person and nature of the Father, for this he did not, and could not reveal, being essentially incomprehensible. Neither, therefore, does he mean the nature and person of the Son. What Christ knew and revealed ‘was the Father’s will;’ corresponding to this, ‘that which the Father, and the Father only, knew, was the nature and extent of the Son’s commission.’” IMPROVED VERSION.<sup>1</sup> /629

THIRD POSITION.

[3. Jesus forgives sins.]<sup>2</sup>

As the Editor expressed his opinion that “Jesus exercised in an independent manner the prerogative of forgiving sin, which is peculiar to God,”<sup>3</sup> founding this opinion upon the authority of *Mark* ii. 5, *Matt.* ix. 2, “Thy sins be forgiven thee,” I inquired in my Second Appeal, “Does not this passage, (‘But when the multitude saw it, they marvelled, and glorified God who had given such power unto men,’ *Matt.* ix. 8,) convey an express declaration that Jesus was as much dependent on God in exercising the power of forgiving sins, and healing the sick, as the other prophets who came forth from God before him?”<sup>4</sup> To which the Editor replies, “We answer, only in the opinion of the multitude, who knew him not, but took him for a great prophet.”

§740

Mk 2:5; Mt 9:2

Mt 9:8

I feel surprised at the assertion of the Editor, that it was the ignorant multitude, who knew not the nature of Jesus, that made the following declaration, “who had given such power to men;” since it is the Holy Spirit which speaks by the mouth of the evangelist Matthew, saying, “when the *multitude* saw it, *they* marvelled, and *glorified* God, who had given such power unto men.”

§741

I wonder how the Editor could allow his zeal in support of the Trinity so far to bias his mind, that he has attempted to weaken the authority of the holy evangelist, by ascribing his words to the ignorant /630 multitude of Jews. I wonder still more, to observe, that notwithstanding the Editor declares the apostles and primitive Christians, (whom he does not esteem as persons of the Godhead, but admits to be mere men,) to have been possessed of the power of pardoning sins through the influence of Jesus; yet he maintains the opinion, that none, except God, can forgive sins even through the gift of the Deity himself.

§742

<sup>1</sup> NTIV, *Ed.* 5, 23, note c. <sup>2</sup> §§422-424. <sup>3</sup> §422. <sup>4</sup> §130.

§743 The Editor says, “Not, however, in the opinion of the Scribes, who were better acquainted with their own scriptures, and who, although they glorified him not as God, could not restrain themselves from acknowledging the display of his Godhead by accusing him of blasphemy on that very account.”<sup>1</sup>

§744 The Jews were so ill-disposed towards Jesus, that this is not the first instance in which they sought a pretence for destroying him under the charge of blasphemy; for in *John* v. 16, they resolve to slay him merely on pretence of his having healed a man on the sabbath day, as I noticed before; and, in chapter xii. 10, 11, they came to a determination, under the cloak of religion, to kill him and Lazarus also, whom Jesus raised after death, though they knew that many of their prophets raised the dead, without offending God or the people. And they also very frequently mistook his meaning. But Jesus often forbore to repel their charges, some instances of which I have already pointed out in page 562. As to Jesus’s knowledge of the human heart, /631 as far as it respects his divine commission and future judgment, and his power of performing miraculous deeds, even sometimes without verbal reference to God, having often noticed these matters in pp. 439 and 536, I shall not recur to them here.

§745 The Editor denies the apostles having been impressed with a belief, that it was the Almighty Father that empowered Jesus to forgive sins and to perform miracles. I therefore refer the Editor to the very phrase, “Who had given such power unto men,” and to *Acts* v. 31, “Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins.” xiii. 38, “Through this *man* (meaning the Saviour)<sup>2</sup> is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins.” Do not these verses shew, beyond a doubt, that Jesus received from God the power of forgiving sins on sincere repentance?

§746 The Editor makes no direct answer to *Luke* xxiii. 34, in which Jesus prays to the Father for the pardon of the murder perpetrated by the Jews upon him, nor to *Luke* xi. 4, *Matt.* vi. 14, which I quoted in my Second Appeal, page 184.<sup>3</sup> The Editor alludes to the importance of the expression “That thy Son may glorify thee.” But by referring to the Scriptures, he will find, that similar terms are as common in the language of the Jews, in their address to God, as any other expressions of reverence for the Deity.<sup>4</sup> /632

<sup>1</sup> §422.

<sup>2</sup> Here, Rammohan did not compare the original Greek. There is no “man” to be found, but only δὲ τούτου “through this one” (referring to the one who has been risen from the dead).

<sup>3</sup> §130.

<sup>4</sup> Marshman does not talk about the Son glorifying the Father, but the other way round, §424: “Hence when he asks his Father to glorify him even as he had glorified the Father, (no very modest request from a creature, for it was no less than as God over all,) he does not ask for any *new* glory, but only for that which he had with his Father from eternity.”

FOURTH POSITION.

[4. Jesus is almighty.]<sup>1</sup>

With a view to substantiate his fourth position, that almighty power is claimed by Jesus in the most unequivocal manner, the Editor thus comments on the passage *John* v. 19–36, quoted by me in my Second Appeal: “Jesus, when persecuted by the Jews, for having healed a man on the sabbath day, said, ‘My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.’ This provoked the Jews still more, because he had now said, that God was his Father, making himself equal with God.” The Editor adds, “This observation shews us, that not only the Jews, but John himself, understood Christ’s calling God his Father, to be making *himself God*.”<sup>2</sup> It would have been a correct translation of the original Greek, if the Editor had said, “making himself equal with, or like God,” instead of “making himself God” (vide the original Greek). It is obvious, that one’s calling another his Father, gives apparent ground to understand that there is an equality of nature or likeness of properties between them, either in quantity or quality of power in performing works. But to know what kind of equality or likeness should be meant in ch. v. 18, we have luckily before us the following texts, in which Jesus declares, that his likeness with God consisted in doing what he saw the Father do, and quickening the dead; avowing /633 repeatedly, at the same time, his inferiority to and dependence on God, in so plain a manner, that the Jews who heard him, abstained from the measures of persecution that they had intended to adopt, although the Saviour continued to call God his Father, through the whole of the remaining chapter, in the hearing of the Jews. Nay, further, from the whole of his conduct and instructions, so impressed were the Jews with his dependence upon and confidence in the Father as his God, that when he was hanging on the cross they fixed upon this as a ground of taunt and reproach, saying, “He trusted in God; let him deliver him now, if he will have him, for he said, ‘I am the Son of God.’” *Matt.* xxvii. 43. §747 Jn 5:17f. Jn 5:19–36 Mt 27:43

The Editor then proceeds to say, “ This (charge of equality) Jesus neither denies nor corrects, but adds, ‘The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do,’ which must necessarily be the case, if, as our author affirms, the Father and the Son are one in will and design.”<sup>3</sup> I ask the Editor whether this be the language of one who is almighty? If the Father and the Son be equally almighty, why should the Son wait until the Father acts, and then imitate him? If a subordinate officer, having been accused of equalizing himself with his superior, thus declares, “I cannot march a single step myself, but where I see him march, I do march,”—would this be considered an avowal of his equality with his superior? My readers will be pleased §748

<sup>1</sup> §§425-428. <sup>2</sup> §426. <sup>3</sup> §426.



to judge. The Editor then says, that “Jesus /634 adds further, ‘For whatever things he doth, these also doth the Son likewise;’ a more full declaration of equality with the Father cannot be imagined. How could the Son do whatsoever the Father doth, if he were not equal to him in power, wisdom, truth, justice, mercy?” &c. The Editor here omits to quote the very next line, “FOR the Father loveth *the Son*, and *sheweth* him all things that himself doth,” in which the preposition “for” assigns reasons for the Son’s doing what the Father doth; i. e. since the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him his works, the Son is enabled to do what he sees the Father do. To the Editor’s query, “What finite being could understand all that God doth, if shewn him?”<sup>1</sup> I reply, Divine wisdom will of course not shew any thing to one whom it has not previously enabled to comprehend it. How could the following passages escape the memory of the Editor, when he put the question: *Amos* iii. 7, “Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets;” *Psalm* xxv. 14, “The *secret* of the Lord is with them that fear him, and he will *shew them* his covenant”? Did not the understand all that was shewn and revealed unto them? If they did, were they, in consequence, all infinite beings, as the Editor argues, from this circumstance, Jesus is?

Am 3:7

Ps 25:14

§749

The Editor proceeds to say, “Jesus adds, ‘For as the Father quickeneth the dead, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will.’ Here, then, he declares /635 himself equal with the Father in sovereignty of will, as well as in almighty power.”<sup>2</sup> The Editor again omits a part of the sentence<sup>3</sup> which runs thus: “So the Son quickeneth whom he will; FOR the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son.” Does not the latter part of the sentence shew clearly, that the power which the Son enjoyed, in quickening those whom he chose, was entirely owing to the commission given him by the Father? In order to weaken the force of verse 22, the Editor says, “The Father, however, whose it is equally with the Son, commits all judgment to the Son, as the incarnate mediator between God and man, because he is the Son of Man.” My readers may observe, that if Jesus received all power of judging men in his human nature, he must have quickened whom he pleased, as the consequence of that power, in his human capacity; how, then, could the Editor infer the deity of Jesus from one circumstance, (quickening the dead,) which entirely depends upon another, (the power of judging,) enjoyed by him in his human nature? Lest it should be supposed that individual instances of the dead being raised by Jesus is here meant, I may just mention that he exercised this power in common with other prophets.

§750

Mt 19:28; Lk 22:29f.

As to his assertion, that the work of judging mankind belongs, by nature, equally to the Son and to the Father, I only refer the Editor to *Matt.* xix. 28, and *Luke* xxii. 29,

<sup>1</sup> §427. <sup>2</sup> §427. <sup>3</sup> Marshman did not “omit” it, but rather explains it some lines below.



30, in which the apostles are re-<sup>/636</sup>presented as invested with the power of judging the Twelve Tribes of Israel, and to 1 *Cor.* vi. 2, which ascribes the power of judging the world to righteous men; and I hope that the Editor will be convinced, from these authorities, that the “work of judging mankind” does not “belong, by nature, to the Son and to the Father.” He introduces, in the course of this argument, *John* viii. 58, and *Rev.* i. 8, which I have often examined in the preceding pages 611, 475. 1 Co 6:2

He at last comments on verse 23, “That all men should honour the Son as they honour the Father,” saying, that “to this glorious declaration of the Son’s Godhead, our author merely objects, that this means likeness in nature and quality, and not in exact degree of honour. But what are the nature and quality of the honour paid to God the Father? Divine honour of the highest kind, and such as can be given to no creature?”<sup>1</sup> The phrases, “to honour God,” and “to adore God,” are used in quite different senses; the latter being peculiarly applicable to God, but the former generally implying only such manifestation of reverence as one may bestow on his father, or on another worthy of respect. *Mal.* i. 6: “A son honoureth his father, and a servant his master: if then I be a *Father*, where is mine honour?” &c. Here God requires the same kind of honour to be paid him as is due to a father. Does God here bring himself, in consequence, to a level with a parent? 1 *Sam.* ii. 30: “But now the Lord <sup>/637</sup> saith, Be it far from me; for them that honour me, I will honour.”—Here the manifestation of honour between God and men, is reciprocal; but in any sense whatsoever, no worship can be reciprocally offered by God and his creatures. The Editor again advances, that “the fact is, that this phrase ‘as,’ really refers to degree as well as to nature; see *Matt.* xx. 14: ‘I will give unto this last even as unto thee,’ that is, precisely as much as one penny.”<sup>2</sup> I deny the accuracy of this rule of the Editor, since “as,” in almost all instances, refers either to degree or nature, or to some kind of resemblance, a few of which I shall here notice. *Gal.* iv. 14, Paul says to the Galatians, “But received me *as an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus.*” Did Paul permit the Galatians to receive him with precisely the same kind of honour, both in kind and degree, as was due to Christ Jesus? *Matt.* x. 25: “It is enough for the disciple that he *be as his master*, and the servant as his Lord,” &c. Did Matthew mean here, precise equality in kind and degree, between a disciple and his master, and a servant and his Lord? *xix.* 19: “Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.” Did the Saviour mean here, that precisely the same quality and degree of love, which one entertains towards himself, should be entertained towards others? *Gen.* iii. 22: “Behold the man is become *as one of us.*” Did Adam then become, both in nature and degree, equally wise with the Omniscient God? Now, my readers will judge whether or not such a phrase as <sup>/638</sup> “men should, or may, honour the Son as they honour

§751

Ml 1:6

1 S 2:30

Mt 20:14

Ga 4:14

Mt 10:25

Mt 19:19

Gn 3:22

<sup>1</sup> §427. Marshman put at the end of his sentence an exclamation mark; Ghose: full stop. <sup>2</sup> §427.

the Father,” equalizes the Son, in nature and degree, with the Father. As to the verse above-quoted, (*Matt.* xx. 14,) it implies sameness in degree, and not necessarily sameness in kind, for the same sum may be given in different currency. The Editor quotes *Heb.* iii. 3, 4, in order to shew “in what sense the Prophet to be sent was like Moses.”<sup>1</sup> As I examined this verse in page 478, I will not recur to it again. I only remind the Editor of *Deut.* xviii. 15, 18, where he will perceive in what sense Jehovah himself drew a likeness between the Saviour and Moses, which passage is repeated in *Acts.* iii. 22, and also of *St. Matthew* xvii. 3, as well as of *Mark* ix. 4, wherein they express a wish to manifest the same reverence to the Saviour as to Moses and Elias; but it is quite optional with the Editor to treat Moses in any manner he pleases.

Heb 3:3f.

Dt 18:15-18

Ac 3:22; Mt 17:1-9; Mk 9:4f.

§752 In answer to his inquiry, “Why should it offend our author, that when the Son, for the suffering of death, took upon him the form of a servant?”<sup>2</sup> &c. My reply is, that it does not offend me in the least; but I must confess, that such an expression as when God, “for the suffering of death, took upon him the form of a servant,” seems to me very extraordinary, as my idea of God is quite at variance with that of a being subjected to death and servitude.

§753 The Editor overlooked several other passages, quoted by me, among which there was *Matt.* xx. 23, “To sit on my right hand, and on my left, is /639 not mine to give, but to them for whom it is prepared of my Father.”<sup>3</sup>

§754 He perhaps hesitated to rely on the sophistry used by the orthodox, that Jesus denied being possessed of almighty power only in his human capacity. The Editor, it is possible, perceived, that as the *gift* of all power to Jesus, mentioned in *Matt.* xxviii. 18, is explained by the orthodox of his human capacity; the *denial* of almighty power could not, therefore, be understood of that *very human nature* in which he is said to have possessed it.

Mt 28:18

#### FIFTH POSITION.

[5. Jesus is omniscient judge.]<sup>4</sup>

§755 The Editor says, that “our author’s objections to the fifth position, that Jesus’s having all judgment committed to him, proves his omniscience, have been so fully met already, that scarcely any thing remains to be added.”

§756 In answer to which, I have only to say, that the arguments adduced by the Editor having been previously noticed, it is therefore left to my readers to examine them, and to come to a determination whether they tend to prove the omniscience of the Son or not. The Editor, however, adds here, that omniscience is essential to the act of judging mankind. As I have already dwelt much on this subject in the preceding

---

<sup>1</sup> §428. <sup>2</sup> §428. <sup>3</sup> §132. <sup>4</sup> §429.

position, pp. 634, 635, and also in p. 511,<sup>1</sup> I beg to refer my readers to them, wherein they will find that the Son’s knowledge of the events of this /640 world extends no farther than as respects the office of judging mankind; that others are declared to be vested with the power of judging the world as well as the Son; and that the Son positively denies his omniscience in *Mark* xiii. 32. The Editor concludes by saying, that “his (Father’s) giving him ‘to have life in himself,’ refers wholly to his being the mediator in human flesh.” It settles the question at once, that whenever and in whatever capacity Jesus is declared to have had life, he had it as a gift of the Father; and the object of our inquiry and reverence is the Son endowed with life, and not one destitute of it.

Jn 5:26

SIXTH POSITION.

[6. Jesus accepts worship.]<sup>2</sup>

The Editor begins by observing, that “to the sixth position, that Jesus accepted worship due to God alone, our author objects, ‘That the word ‘worship,’ both in common acceptation and scriptural writings, is used sometimes as implying an external mark of religious reverence paid to God, and at other times as signifying merely the token of civil respect due to superiors; that those who worshipped Jesus did not believe him to be God, or one of the three persons of the Godhead; and Jesus, in his acknowledged human capacity, never prayed to himself, or directed his followers to worship or pray to him.’ Granting that ‘worship’ in English, and προσκυνέω in Greek, are sometimes used to denote /641 civil respect, and that the worship paid by the servant to his master, *Matt.* xviii. 26, and by the people to David, meant merely civil respect, still the position is not touched in the least degree.”<sup>3</sup> The reason which the Editor assigns for this position not being touched, is, that “whether the blind man, the lepers, the mariners, and others, knew what they did in worshipping Jesus, is not so much the question, as whether Jesus knew; for if he suffered them, even through ignorance, to yield him divine worship, when Peter did not suffer it in Cornelius for a moment; unless he were God, he must have had less discernment, or less piety and concern for the Divine honour, than his own disciples.” P. 618.

§757

Mt 18:26

Ac 10:25f.

As the Editor agrees that the term “‘worship’ in English, and προσκυνέω in Greek, are sometimes used to denote civil respect,” it is of course necessary to ascertain whether the blind man, &c. knew what they did in worshipping Jesus; that is, whether they meant to bestow civil respect, or to offer religious reverence. But from all the local circumstances which I pointed out in the Second Appeal, page 193, it is evident that they, as well as Jesus, knew that they were manifesting civil respect

§758

<sup>1</sup> §749 and §604. <sup>2</sup> §§430-431. <sup>3</sup> §430, quoting §§134-135.

only by worshipping him, in the same way as it is evident, from the circumstances of David's not declining to receive worship from the people, and Daniel from king Nebuchadnezzar, that the people and king intended merely civil respect to them. As to Peter's rejection of the worship offered him by Cornelius, it /642 may easily be accounted for, since, as Jesus was endowed with the power of knowing things connected with his divine commission, so Peter had the knowledge of secret events concerning his apostolic duty. From the language which the blind man and others used, and from his knowledge of their thoughts, the Saviour, like other ancient prophets, gave a tacit consent to the worship (or, properly speaking, civil reverence) offered by them; while Peter rejected the worship offered him by Cornelius, knowing that he meant it as an external mark of religious reverence, which was due to God alone, as is evident from the language of Peter, "I myself am a man." Having already noticed the exclamation of Thomas in page 594, and Heb. i. 10, in page 452, I shall not recur to the subject in this place.<sup>1</sup>

§759 The Editor says, "Was Stephen (ignorant) when he committed to him his departing  
Ac 7:59 soul in language similar to that in which Christ on the cross had committed his spirit to the Father?"<sup>2</sup>

§760 The language of Stephen alluded to by the Editor, and that of Christ, bears little  
Lk 23:46 resemblance. Among the many expressions attributed to Jesus on the cross, none of them resemble the invocation of Stephen, except that given *Luke* xxiii. 46, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit;" which is natural for every human being having any idea of God, or feelings of devotion on the approach of death. Stephen's exclamation (*Acts* vii. 59, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit") was merely an application /643 to Jesus in preference to the angels of death, whom he expected to receive his soul, and convey it to the bosom of the Divinity. The notion of angels of death receiving and conveying away the spirit at the time of dissolution, is familiar to the Jews, in common with other Eastern nations, as appears from their traditions, and from *Prov.* Pr 16:14 xvi. 14, "The wrath of a king is as messengers" (in the Hebrew, properly "angels") "of death"—i. e. in a despotic country, the displeasure of the tyrant is equivalent to death. From Stephen's saying, that he saw "the *Son of Man standing* on the right hand of God," we may easily perceive the notion which he had formed of the nature of Jesus Christ.

§761 As to Christ's offering prayers and worship to the Father, and directing his apostles to do so, the Editor attributes them to the "state of humiliation in which his infinite love to sinners had placed him."<sup>3</sup> If Jesus deemed it necessary, in his human capacity, to offer up prayers, thanksgiving, and worship, to God the Father alone, notwithstanding he was *filled* bodily with God the Son, (according to the Editor,)

<sup>1</sup> §698 and §561. <sup>2</sup> §430. <sup>3</sup> §431.

and [to] direct his apostles to follow his example, is it not incumbent upon us also, in following his pattern, to thank, pray to, and worship the Father *alone*, as long as we are human? But the truth is, that the assertion of the Editor, attributing Christ’s devotion towards God to his human nature, is entirely unsupported by scriptural authority.

The Editor further says, that if Jesus were not /644 God, the apostles, the primitive saints, and the angels in heaven, would be guilty of idolatry, and the Eternal Father of encouraging it.<sup>1</sup> §762

To quit the Father and Jesus Christ of the charge of encouraging idolatry, and the apostles, and the saints, and the angels, of the sin of idol worship, it suffices to quote *Matt.* iv. 10, Αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεῦσεις, “Him only shalt thou serve.” This commandment of the Father of the universe, to be found in *Deut.* vi. [13], repeated and communicated to Christians by the most exalted among the prophets, (who enjoins religious adoration to be offered to the Father *alone*,) sufficiently vindicates God and his Christ from the above charge. The apostles so strictly observed this divine communication through their Master, under the Christian dispensation, that, throughout the *whole* New Testament, the applied exclusively to *God alone* this verb, λατρεῦω, (rendered in the English version “to serve,”) and not once to Jesus, or to any other being in any book of the New Testament; while, on similar occasions, the used for him or others the verbs δουλεῦω or διακονεῶ, rendered also in the English version “to serve,” which tends no less to vindicate them. They further pronounce those who *serve* (from the verb λατρεῦω) any one excepts God, to be rebels and idolators,—*Rom.* i. 25; *Acts* vii. 42. I now entreat the Editor to examine the subject, and, by following the example of the apostles and primitive saints, glorify a religion intended to be raised far above the debasement of idolatry. /645 §763  
Mt 4:10; Dt 6:13  
Rm 1:25; Ac 7:42

THE SEVENTH AND LAST POSITION.

[7. The trinitarian formula.]<sup>2</sup>

The Editor having attempted to prove the deity of the Son, and the personality of the Holy Ghost, from the circumstance of their names being associated with that of the Father of the universe, I observed in my Second Appeal, that “a profession of belief in God is unquestionably common to all the religions supposed to have been founded upon the authority of the Old Testament; but each is distinguished from the other by a public profession of faith in their respective founders, expressing such profession in a language that may clearly exhibit the inferior nature of those founders to the Divine Being, of whom they declare themselves the messengers.” §764  
Mt 28:16–20

<sup>1</sup> §430. <sup>2</sup> §§432-435.

Ex 14:31 “The Jews claim that they have revelation rendering a belief not in God alone, but in Moses also, incumbent upon them. *Exod.* xiv. 31: ‘The people feared the Lord, and believed the Lord, and his servant Moses’ (to which Jesus also refers in *John* v. 45, ‘There is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye *trust*’). If baptism were administered to one embracing Christianity, in the name of the Father and Holy Spirit, he would thereby no more become enrolled as a Christian than as a Jew or as a Mohummudan; for both of them, in common with Christians, would readily submit to be baptized in the name of God, and his prevailing influence over the universe.”<sup>1</sup> I afterwards added, in the discussion re-/646specting the Holy Spirit, that “God is invariably represented in revelation as the main object of belief, receiving worship and prayers that proceed from the heart through the first-born of every creature, the Messiah, (‘No man cometh unto the Father but by me.’) and leading such as worship him in spirit, to righteous conduct, and ultimately to salvation, through his guiding influence, which is called the Holy Spirit (‘When he, the spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth’). There is, therefore, a moral obligation on those who avow the truth of such revelation, to profess their belief in God as the sole object of worship; and in the Son, through whom they, as Christians, should offer divine homage; and also in the holy influence of God, from which they should expect direction in the path of righteousness, as the consequence of their sincere prayer and supplication. For the same reason also, in publicly adopting this religion, it is proper that those who receive it should be baptized in the name of the Father, who is the object of worship; of the Son, who is the mediator; and of that influence by which spiritual blessings are conveyed to mankind, designated in scripture as the Comforter, Spirit of Truth, or Holy Spirit.”<sup>2</sup> And to prove the error of the idea that the association of names of individuals with that of God, in a religious profession or belief, which is more essential than any external mark of profession, could identify or equalize those individuals with God, I quoted *Exod.* xiv. 31, which I have just repeated, and 2 *Chron.* xx. /647 20, “Jehoshaphat stood and said, Hear me, O Judah, and ye inhabitants of Jerusalem; believe in the Lord your God, so shall ye be established; believe his Prophets, so shall ye prosper;”—wherein the names of Moses and the Prophets of God are associated with that of the Deity.<sup>3</sup> Besides, I observed to the Editor, that “fire-worshippers, for instance, insisting on the literal sense of the words, in example of the Reverend Editor, might refer to that text in the 3rd chapter of *Matthew*, repeated in *Luke* iii. 16, in which it is announced that Jesus Christ ‘will baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire;’ and they might contend, that if the association, in the rite of baptism, of the names of the Son and Holy Ghost with that of the Father, be supposed to prove their divinity, it is clear that

Ex 14:31

Jn 5:45

Jn 14:1-13

2 Ch 20:20

Mt 3:11; Lk 3:16

---

<sup>1</sup> §136. <sup>2</sup> §159. <sup>3</sup> §158.

Fire also, being associated with the Holy Ghost in the same rite, must likewise be considered as a part of the Godhead.”<sup>1</sup> He keeps all these arguments out of view, and, according to his usual mode of reasoning, repeats again in his reply what he thought the purport of *Heb. i. 10, Rev. ii. 29*, and has recourse again to the angel of Bochim, &c., which, having no relation to the subject in question, and having been often examined in the preceding pages, I shall pass by here. His only remark concerning this last position is, that “had the passage” (respecting *belief in God and his servant Moses*) “quoted from *Exod. xiv. 31*, been *that* formulary, instead of being a part of a narrative, the omission in the baptismal rite of the clause ‘his /648 servant,’ would have been fatal to his objection. If, then, the phrase ‘his servant’ marks the inferior nature of this messenger of God, the omission of it in the circumstances just mentioned, unavoidably proves the equality of the Father and the Son,”<sup>2</sup> &c. In the first place, it is too obvious to need proof, that every circumstance mentioned in the Sacred Scriptures, even in the form of narrative, if approved of God, is worthy of attention, though not stated in the formulary of a religious rite. But, in the second place, the passage quoted by me from *2 Chronicles*, is a commandment enjoining belief in God and his Prophets, even with the omission, so much desired by our Editor, of the term “his servants.” Does this formulary, I ask, with the omission of the term “his servants,” prove the equality of the Father and the Prophets, from the circumstance of their being associated with God in a solemn religious injunction?

Ex 14:31

In the third place, the term “Son,” equally with the word “servant,” denotes the inferiority of Jesus as plainly as any expression intended to denote inferiority can possibly do. But the Editor says, that “never was there a more humble begging of the question than the assertion that the epithet ‘Son’ ought to be understood and admitted by every one as expressing the created nature of Christ;—why ought it thus to be understood and admitted?”<sup>3</sup> I answer, because common sense tells us that a son, as well as a servant, must be acknowledged to be inferior to his father or master. Again, we find David called the /649 son of God, Solomon the son of God, Adam the son of God, and, in short, the whole children of Israel denominated as sons of God; yet represented in scripture as inferior to God their Father; nay, moreover, Jesus the Son of God positively declares himself to be inferior to his Father,—“My Father is greater than I.”

§765

Jn 14:28

Our Editor puts again another query, (p. 622,) “Can he even prove that among men a son must be of nature inferior to his father?”<sup>4</sup> I reply by putting another question to him: Can the Editor ever prove, that among man a servant *must be* of a nature inferior to his master? If he cannot, are we to suppose Moses, a servant of God, equal in nature with the Deity? The fact is, that among men a servant, a

§766

<sup>1</sup> §158. <sup>2</sup> §432. <sup>3</sup> §434. <sup>4</sup> §434.



son, and a grandson, are of the same nature with their masters, or fathers; but when creation is not effected in the ordinary course of nature, there need not to be, and is not, an identity of nature between one who is called father, and another called son; so when service is performed by *men* to others not of their own kind, oneness of nature is not necessarily found between the servant and the person served.

§767 The Editor concludes the proposition, saying that “Our author declines renewing  
Mt 28:16–20 the subject relative to Christ’s declaration, ‘Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world,’ which, however, we are not aware he has ever yet discussed.”<sup>1</sup> The fact  
Mt 18:20 is, in examining *Matt.* xviii. 20, “For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the /650 midst of them,” which the Editor quoted to establish the ubiquity of the Son, I inquired in my Second Appeal, “Is it not evident that the Saviour meant here, by being in the midst of two or three of his disciples, his guidance to them when joined in searching for the truth? We find similar expressions in the Scriptures, wherein the guidance of the Prophets of God is also meant by words that  
Lk 16:29 would imply their presence.” *Luke* xvi. 29: “Abraham saith unto him, They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them.”<sup>2</sup> And upon the Editor’s quoting *Matt.* xxviii. 20, “I am with you always, even to the end of the world,” in all probability to establish the ubiquity of Jesus, I said in my Second Appeal, (p. 199,) “I will not renew the subject, as it has been already discussed in examining the first position;”<sup>3</sup> having shewn there that by the presence of Christ, and that of other Prophets that may be observed in any part of the Bible, their spiritual guidance should be understood. My readers, therefore, may judge whether or not the purport of the last-mentioned verse is connected with the subject discussed in examining the first position. I entreat the Editor, however, to reflect on the last phrase of the verse in question, i. e. “always to the end of the world,” which, so far from evincing Christ’s eternal existence, implies that his influence over his disciples extended only to the end of the world, when he shall be himself subject to the Father of the universe. (1 *Cor.* xv. 28.) /651  
1 Co 15:28

## CHAPTER VI. ON THE HOLY SPIRIT AND OTHER SUBJECTS.

§768 I EXPRESSED my surprise, in my Second Appeal, p. 227, at the Editor’s having “noticed, in so short and abrupt a manner, the question of the personality and deity of the Holy Ghost, although the Editor esteems the Son and the Spirit as equally distinct persons of the Godhead.”<sup>4</sup> I feel now still more surprised to observe, that the Editor, in his present review also, has noticed, in the same brief manner, the personality of the Holy Ghost; as, while he fills more than a hundred pages in support of the deity of the *second* person, he has not allowed even a single page to the question of

---

<sup>1</sup> §435. <sup>2</sup> §127. <sup>3</sup> §138. <sup>4</sup> §157.



the *third*. He, at the same time, overlooks almost all the arguments I have advanced against his feeble attempt to prove the personality and deity of the Holy Spirit, from pp. 227—241, and in many other places of the Second Appeal. The Editor, however, first says, that “If he, in whom dwelt all truth, has declared him (the Holy Ghost, in *Matt.* xxvii. 19) to be as distinct in person, and as worthy of worship and adoration, as the Father and himself, no farther evidence is needed either to his personality or Godhead.”<sup>1</sup> Had the Editor thought the quotation of a single verse a sufficient excuse for avoiding the discussion of the /652 personality of the Holy Ghost, he might have, on the same ground, omitted to discuss the subject of the deity of Jesus Christ, by noticing, in like manner, a single verse of scripture, which he considered as a proof of the divine nature of the Son, and thus saved me the trouble of a long controversy. If the association of names, in a religious rite, were to be admitted as a proof of the personality of the Holy Spirit, the power of God, another divine attribute, should be considered God himself, it being also mentioned jointly with the Holy Spirit in the rite of unction (*Acts* x. 38); and Fire also should be supposed to be a distinct person of the Godhead, because we find Fire associated with the Holy Ghost, in the same rite of baptism as I before observed (*Luke* iii. 16); but I shall not recur to this subject, having fully examined it in pp. 646, 647.<sup>2</sup>

Ac 10:38

Notwithstanding my plain declaration, in the Second Appeal, p. 239, that “with respect to the Holy Ghost, I must confess my inability to find a single passage in the whole Scriptures, in which the Spirit is addressed as God, or as a person of God, so as to afford believers of the Trinity an excuse for their profession of the Godhead of the Holy Ghost;”<sup>3</sup> the Editor thought it advisable not to dwell on the subject, and only observes, “Were it needful, indeed, a rich fulness of scripture proof could be adduced respecting the Holy Spirit, as well as the Son; but the selection of a few passages will be quite sufficient.”<sup>4</sup> These are as follows: the first are /653 from the Gospel of *St. John*, xiv. 13, 26, xvi. 8, 11<sup>5</sup>, and the last are from *Acts* x. 20, and xii. 2.<sup>6</sup> The Editor here overlooks entirely what I stated in the Second Appeal, on this very point; that is, if from the consideration of such expressions as, “God will send the Holy Spirit,” “The Holy Spirit will teach you,” “The Holy Spirit will reprove the world,” “The Holy Spirit will glorify me,” the Spirit be acknowledged a separate person of the Deity, what would the Editor say of other attributes, such as mercy, wrath, truth, &c., which are also, in a similar manner, personified in various instances? *Psalm* lvii. 3: “God shall send forth his mercy and truth.” lxxxv. 10: “Mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other.” lxxxix. 14: “Mercy and truth shall go before thy face.” xciv. 18: “My foot slippeth; thy mercy, O Lord, held me up.” “Thy mercy, O Lord, is in the heavens.” “For there is wrath gone out from

§769

Jn 14:13; 26; 16:8; 14; Ac 13:2

Ps 57:3; 85:10

Ps 89:14; 94:18; 36:5

Nb 16:46

<sup>1</sup> §436. <sup>2</sup> §764. <sup>3</sup> §163. <sup>4</sup> §436. <sup>5</sup> Read: “14”. <sup>6</sup> Read: “xiii. 2.”

the Lord.” *Numb.* xvi. 46.

§770 In the course of citing the above verses of *John* and *Acts*, the Editor quotes *Acts*  
 Ac 5:3f. v. 3, “Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Spirit?” [4,] “Thou hast  
 not lied unto men, but unto God;” whence he concludes, that he that lieth to the  
 Holy Spirit, lieth to God, and, consequently, the Spirit is God. On this inference  
 I have already observed, in my former Appeal, that any sin or blasphemy against  
 one of the attributes of God, is, of course, accounted a sin or blasphemy against  
 God himself.<sup>1</sup> /654 But this admission amounts neither to a recognition of the self-  
 existence of the attribute, nor of its identity with God. I then referred the Editor  
 Mt 10:40 to *Matt.* x. 40, “He that receiveth you receiveth me;” and now I beg his attention  
 1 Co 8:12 to 1 *Cor.* viii. 12, “But when ye sin so against the brethren, and wound their weak  
 conscience, ye sin against Christ.” Do these passages identify or equalize the apostles  
 of Jesus, with himself? Nothing but early-acquired and long-established prejudices  
 can prevent any literary character from perceiving such a gross error. As to *Acts* x.  
 Ac 10:17–20 20, if the speaker be admitted, according to the Editor, as a separate person, he must  
 then be identified either with the spirit of Cornelius, who had actually sent the three  
 men mentioned in ver. 19, as is evident from ver. 8, or with the angel of God, who  
 ordered Cornelius to send them to Peter, (ver. 5,) a conclusion which would not, after  
 all, suit the purpose of the Editor. I entreat the Editor to take notice, at least, of some  
 of my arguments against the personality of the Holy Spirit, mentioned in Chapter  
 VI. of the Second Appeal, pp. 231–234, or, if he declines adventuring on this point  
 of theology, let him candidly reduce the supposed persons of the Godhead from a  
 Trinity to Duality, and this point being gained, I may then continue my efforts with  
 renewed hope of reducing the Duality to the Everlasting and Indivisible Unity.

§771 The Editor concludes his Essay with saying, (p. 624,) “The deity and the per-  
 sonality of the /655 Son and the Holy Spirit, being established, the doctrine of the  
 ever-blessed Trinity needs no further confirmation: it follows of course. We shall,  
 therefore, close our testimonies from Scripture, by laying before our readers three  
 passages, which bring the sacred Three fully into view. The first we select from  
 Is 48:13 *Isaiah* xlvi. [13,] in which one is introduced who previously declares, ‘My hand  
 also hath laid the foundation of the earth,’ &c., and whom, therefore, we are at no  
 Is 48:16 loss to recognize. He, however, declares, verse 16, ‘And now the Lord God and his  
 Spirit hath sent me.’”<sup>2</sup> Now, supposing the person who declares himself, in verse  
 16, to have been sent by the Lord God and his Spirit, is one of the persons of the  
 Godhead, whose hand hath laid the foundation of the earth, according to the Editor;  
 this admission would be so far advantageous to the cause of the Editor, as respects  
 the plurality of persons in the deity; but it would be totally fatal to his grand object,

<sup>1</sup> §163. <sup>2</sup> §437.

since it would substitute Isaiah as a divine person, in the place of Jesus Christ. Isaiah the Prophet is the grand speaker throughout the whole of his book; who declares himself often to have been sent by God as a messenger to Israel. He often speaks abruptly in behalf of God, as if God were speaking himself in the course of his own discourse, as I noticed in page 430,<sup>1</sup> and sometimes again he suddenly introduces his own sentiments, while he is announcing the words of Jehovah, without making any distinction. I mention here only a few instances. *Isaiah* lxiii. 6: “I will tread down the people in mine anger, and make them drunk in my fury, and I will bring down their strength to the earth.” (7.) “I will mention the loving-kindness of the Lord, and the praises of the Lord, according to all that the Lord hath bestowed on us.” Does not the Prophet *introduce himself*, in verse 7, most abruptly, while speaking himself in behalf of God, in verse 6? Ch. l. 3: “I clothe the heavens with blackness, and I make sackcloth their covering.” (4.) “The Lord God hath *given me* the tongue of the learned, that I should know how to speak a word in season to him that is weary,” &c. Here the Prophet introduces himself, in verse 4, in the same abrupt manner, without intimation of any change of person.

Is 63:6f.

Is 50:3f.

I now cite the context of the very verse of *Isaiah* quoted by the Editor, to enable my readers to judge how far “it brings the sacred Three fully into view.” (14.) “All ye (the inhabitants of Judah) assemble yourselves, and hear; who among them (Israel) hath declared these things? The Lord hath loved him (Cyrus\* of Persia, the conqueror of Babylon). He (the Lord) will do *his pleasure on Babylon*, and his <sup>657</sup> arm shall be on the Chaldeans.” (15.) “I, even I, have spoken; yea, I have *called him*, (Cyrus) I have brought him, and he shall make his way prosperous.” (16.) “Come ye near unto me, (says the Prophet,) hear ye this, I have not spoken in secret from the beginning; from the time that it was, there am I: (that is, from the first time of these events) and now the Lord God and his Spirit hath sent me.” (17.)<sup>2</sup> Expressions similar to the phrase, “From the time that it was, there am I,” are often used by the Prophets. Vide *Jer.* i. 5: “And before thou camest forth out of the womb, I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a Prophet unto the nations.” And so *Isaiah* xlix. 1. No one, I presume, that ever read, even with common attention, the book of *Isaiah*, (in which speakers are introduced without any distinction, more frequently than in the other scriptural books,) would attempt to prove the Trinity or the Deity of Jesus Christ, from the passage quoted by the Editor, unless he is previously biassed by some human creed, and thereby

§772

Jr 1:5

Is 49:1

\* *Isaiah* xliv. 6–8: “And who, as I, shall call and shall declare it?” &c. (28.) “That saith of Cyrus, He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure.” xlv. 11: “*Calling* a ravenous bird from the east, the man that executeth my counsel from a far country: yea, I have spoken it, I will also bring it to pass; I have purposed it, I will also do it.”

<sup>1</sup> §§545-546. <sup>2</sup> This “(17.)” is in all editions, although verse 17 is not quoted anymore.

absolutely prevented from comparing impartially one passage with the other.

§773

The Editor perhaps means the personality and the deity of the Holy Spirit by the phrase, “The Lord God and his Spirit hath sent me,”\* (verse 16,) /658 seemingly representing the Spirit of God as a cooperator with himself. He might, in that case, on the same ground, endeavour to establish the personality and the deity of *Righteousness*, another attribute of the Deity, as being represented with God as an agent in *Isaiah* lix. [16,] “Therefore his arm brought salvation unto him, and his Righteousness, it sustained him.” And he might also attempt to prove the personality and deity of the breath of God, which is, in like manner, represented as a cooperator with the Spirit of God. *Job* xxxiii. 4: “The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of him hath given life.” Is this the best of the proofs of the Trinity with which the Editor closes his testimonies? If such be his proofs, I am at a loss to guess what his illustrations will be. The second passage, quoted by the Editor, is what I have just examined in pp. 645—648.<sup>1</sup> The third is, *2 Cor.* xiii. 14, “The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit, be with you all. Amen.” Here the apostle prays, that the guidance of Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the constant operation of the holy influence of God, may be with Christians, since, without the guidance of Jesus, no one can be thoroughly impressed with the love of the Deity under the Christian dispensation, nor can that love of God /659 continue to exist unless preserved by divine influence; a fact which I have demonstrated, pages 651—653, in examining *Matt.* xxviii. 19.<sup>2</sup> But what has this passage to do with the proof of the deity of Jesus and the personality of the Holy Spirit? Does not Paul call the Philippians partakers of *his own* grace? *Phil.* i. 17. Is not every man pure in heart declared to be possessed of the grace of his lips; that is, verbal instructions? *Prov.* xxii. 11. Is not, in *Psalms* xxiii. 6, the communion of goodness and mercy desired for all the days of life? Can such expressions be also considered as proofs of the deity of Paul, or of the personality of these attributes? I hope and pray the Editor may take all those circumstances into his consideration.

Is 59:16

Jb 33:4

2 Co 13:13f.

Ph 1:17

Pr 22:11; Ps 23:6

§774

I now examine the remaining few of those passages which I intended to notice in a subsequent chapter of this Essay. The first is, *Zech.* xii. 10, “In that day they shall look upon me whom they have pierced,” compared with *John* xix. 37, “They shall look on him whom they pierced.” To shew the error in the translation of the verse in the English version, I quoted in my Second Appeal, the verse of the original Hebrew, and a translation thereof from the Arabic Bible, and another from the Septuagint,

Zc 12:10; Jn 19:37

\* In the original Hebrew, the last phrase stands thus: “The Lord Jehovah hath sent me and his Spirit,” which bear two constructions; first, “The Lord Jehovah hath sent me, and hath sent his Spirit.” The second is, “The Lord Jehovah and his Spirit hath sent me.”

<sup>1</sup> Mt 28:19, discussed in the “seventh position”, §§764-767. <sup>2</sup> §§768-769

with a literal English translation, which I repeat: “And they shall look toward me on account of him whom they have pierced.”<sup>1</sup> But in order to destroy the validity of the Arabic Bible and that of the Septuagint, the Editor says, that “the /660 Greek and Arabic versions are nothing to the original text itself.”<sup>2</sup> I perfectly agree with him in this assertion, but I am convinced, that the Editor must be better acquainted than myself with the prevailing and continued practice among Christian theologians, to have recourse to the versions, especially to the Septuagint, when a dispute arises in the interpretation of any text of the Old Testament, and to give preference to the authority of the Septuagint, even over that of Jerome’s, which the Editor quotes in opposition to the Arabic and Greek versions.

As to the original text, the Editor first observes, that “as to the particle אֵת *eth*, which the best Hebrew grammars define a particle marking the accusative case governed by active verbs, or an emphatic particle denoting the very thing itself.”<sup>3</sup> I therefore think it proper to quote Parkhurst’s opinion on the particle אֵת *eth*, from his Hebrew Lexicon, that my readers may judge whether or not the above rule, laid down by the Editor, is founded upon good authority. Parkhurst (p. 48): “The Lexicons say, that when joined with a verb, it (*eth*) denotes the *accusative* case, if the verb be *active*; see *Gen.* i. 1, and *al freq.*, but the *nominative*, if the verb be *passive* or *neuter*. *Gen.* xxvii. 45; *Deut.* xx. 8; *Josh.* vii. 15, &c., *al freq.* But, in truth, it is the sign of no particular case, that *distinction* being *unknown* in *Hebrew*. See *Josh.* xxii. 17; *Ezek.* xxxv. 10; *Numb.* x. 2; 1 *Sam.* xvii. 34; 2 *Sam.* xv. 23; *Neh.* ix. 19, 34; 2 *Kings* vi. 5.” Parkhurst gives also /661 the second meaning of this particle—“2, *with, to, towards*, *Exod.* i. 1, *Deut.* vii. 8,”<sup>4</sup> which the Editor also partially admits.

The fact is, this particle denotes an accusative case as well as other cases, and also stands for the English prepositions, “with,” “for,” “towards,” &c., and, therefore, the verse in question, as it is found in our Hebrew copies of the Old Testament, should indisputably be thus read, in consistence with its context, 31, “And they shall look towards me for (or on account of) him whom they have pierced,” or “They shall look upon me with him whom they have pierced.”\*

\* Newcome reads, “And they shall look on him whom they pierced.” His note on this translation is as follows: “On him.] Thirty-six MSS. and two ed. read אֵלָיו: three other MSS. read so originally; six perhaps read so; six read so now; and eleven have אֵלָיו in the margin, as Keri. And yet אֵלָיו on me, may be traced in the ancient versions and Chal. אֵלָיו was also noted as a various lection by R. Saadiah, who lived about the year 900. See Kenn. diss. gen. §43. ‘Citant אֵלָיו Talmud et R. Saadiah Hagggaion. Poc. Append. in Mal.’ Secker. Dr. Owen shews that Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, and Barnabas, favour the reading of אֵלָיו Inquiry—Sept. Version, Sect. iv.”<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> §§245-248. <sup>2</sup> §343. <sup>3</sup> §343. <sup>4</sup> Parkhurst, *Hebrew*, 48.

<sup>5</sup> Newcome, *Attempt*, 330. Newcome also adds a remark about the unreliability of the Septuagint in this verse, which is not quoted by Rammohan.

§777 The Editor quotes, to my great surprise, (in p. 546,) some verses in which the particle **את** requires an accusative case, and, consequently, no preposition “for,” “to,” or “with,” can be properly placed. But I beg to ask the Editor, how he can turn the following verses to his purpose, wherein no accusative case after the particle **את** can be at all admitted? *Exod.* i. 1: “Now these are the names of the children of Israel, which came into Egypt; every man and his household came *with* Jacob.” Would the Editor thus render the particle here requiring an accusative case,—“every man and his household came Jacob”? Would the verse in this case bear any sense? *Gn* 44:4 *Gen.* xliv. 4: **הם יצאו את העיר** “They were gone *out* of the city.” There the particle *Gn* 4:1 stands for “out of,” or “from.” *iv.* 1: “I have gotten a man *from* the Lord.” Here the *Dt* 7:8 preposition “from” is substituted for this very Hebrew particle. In *Deut.* vii. 8, we have **כי מאהבת יהוה אתכם** literally, “on account of the love of God for you,” thou thus rendered in the English version, “Because the Lord loved you.”\*

§778 In the course of examining this subject, the Editor quotes, “Thy throne, O Jehovah, is for ever and ever.” I shall feel obliged, if he will kindly let me know from what book of the Old or New Testament he has selected this verse, containing the term “Jehovah,” in the first part of the text.

§779 As to my remarks on *Zech.* xiii. 7, “Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith Jehovah of hosts; smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered,” the Editor agrees partly with me; saying, “**No one doubts that the Saviour placed himself in subjection to the Father, when condescended to become subject to death.**”<sup>1</sup> He, however, wishes to prove the deity of Jesus Christ by the application of the word *fellow* (**עמית**) to him. He here quotes *Micah* [v. 2], “Whose goings forth were from everlasting;” and *John* [i. 1], “And the word was with God,” which have no relation to the term **עמית** or *fellow*, found in the verse in question; and as these quotations of the Editor have been examined in pp. 573, 595,<sup>2</sup> I shall not recur to them in this place. He lastly quotes Parkhurst, to shew that **עמית** “implies a neighbour, a member of the same society.” Is not this quotation, defining the Hebrew word **עמית** as “a neighbour,” directly against the object of the Editor? If Christ is represented, either in a real or figurative sense, as standing on the *right hand* of the Deity, taking precedence of all those that believe in him as the promised Messiah sent from God, would it be inconsistent in itself, or an acknowledgment of his deity, to use the word **עמית** or neighbour, for Christ? My readers will observe, from the following quotations, that this very term **עמית** which is rendered *fellow* in the verse in question, is translated “neighbour” by the very authors

\* Archbishop Secker, in Newcome, has the following remark: “Potest **את אשר** notare *eo quod*, ut vertunt *ó ch. vel. quem*. Vide Nold. Et sic post *Dativum* adhibetur, *Jer.* xxxviii. 9.”<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> §345. <sup>2</sup> §677 and §699. <sup>3</sup> Newcome, *Attempt*, 381.

of the English version, in many other instances. *Levit.* vi. 2, “or hath deceived his neighbour.” The last word is a translation of the term עִמִּית: xix. 17, “Thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy ‘neighbour;” or *immeeth*: ch. xxv. 14, 15. /664

Lv 6:2  
Lv 19:17  
Lv 25:14f.  
§780  
Rm 9:5

The Editor, in speaking of Christ, repeats, now and then, the phrase, “God blessed for ever,” perhaps alluding to *Romans* ix. 5.—Among all the interpretations given to this text, for or against the Trinity, there is the Paraphrase of Locke, of whose name the literary world is so justly proud, which I here first quote:—“Had the patriarchs, to whom the promises were made, for their (the Israelites) forefathers; and of them, as to his fleshly\* extraction, Christ is come, he who is over all, God be blessed. Amen.”<sup>1</sup> Secondly, I shall cite here some scriptural passages to shew that it was customary with Jewish writers to address abrupt exclamations to God while treating of some other subjects, that my readers may be convinced that the sudden introduction of the phrase, “God be blessed for ever,” in ver. 5, by St. Paul, was perfectly consistent with the style of the sacred writings. *Psalms* lxxxix. 51, 52: “Wherewith thine enemies have reproached, O Lord; wherewith they have reproached the footsteps of thine anointed. *Blessed be the Lord for evermore. Amen, and Amen.*” *Psalms* civ. 35: “Let the sinners be consumed out of the earth, and let the wicked be no more. *Bless thou the Lord, O my soul. Praise ye the Lord.*”

Ps 89:51f.  
Ps 104:35

If St. Paul, in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, and in that to the Ephesians, declares positively that /665 the Father is the only being who has the right to the epithet “*God*,” under the Christian dispensation, he could not, as an inspired writer, be guilty of so palpable a contradiction, as to apply this very epithet to the Christ of God, on another occasion. *1 Cor.* viii. 6: “But to us (Christians) there is but *one God the Father.*” *Eph.* i. 17: “That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the *Father of glory,*” &c. iv. 5, 6: “One Lord, one faith, one baptism: *One God and Father of all,* who is above all, through *all,* and in us *all.*”

§781  
1 Co 8:6; Ep 1:17;  
4:5f.

Respecting 1 *John* v. 20, I beg to refer to the rule laid down by Bishop Middleton, (of whom the Editor speaks highly and justly, in p. 535,) in his work on the Greek Article, p. 79: “When two or more attributives, joined by a copulative or copulatives, are *assumed* of the same person or thing, before the first attributive the article is *inserted*; before the remaining ones it is omitted.”<sup>2</sup> In the passage under consideration there are two attributives joined by a copulative, and in order to ascertain whether they are assumed of the *same* person, or of *different* persons, it is only necessary to observe, that the article is inserted not only before the first attributive, but also before the second, and that, consequently, “the true God” is one person, and “the

§782  
1 Jn 5:20

\* Vide ver. the 3rd of the same chapter, in which Paul speaks of his “kinsmen according to the flesh.”

<sup>1</sup> Locke, *Works III, Romans*, 310. <sup>2</sup> Middleton, *Doctrine*, 44.



eternal life” is another.<sup>1</sup> This perfectly corresponds with the preceding part of the verse, in which “he that is true,” and “his son Jesus Christ,” are separately mentioned.  
/666

§783 Finding the practice of the primitive Christians, during the first three centuries, unfavourable to his sentiments, the Editor prudently keeps it out of view altogether, merely observing, (p. 625,) into that “we do not even enquire. Paul tells us, that, even in his time, ‘the mystery of iniquity,’ had already begun to work; and John adds, that ‘many antichrists had already gone out into the world.’”<sup>2</sup> The Editor must be well aware that those in whom the mystery of iniquity was found, and who were detected as antichrists, were not in the fellowship of true Christians, and consequently church histories treat of the practice of the latter entirely distinct from that of the former; and it is therefore evident, that the practice and professions of primitive Christians, who were, generally, the contemporaries of the apostles or their disciples, are worthy of inquiry for the regulation of the conduct of the Christians of these days.

2 Th 2:7  
1 Jn 2:18

§784 As to Mosheim, the Editor says, “Even Mosheim, suspected as he is of being unfavourable to the truth, establishes their faith in Christ’s deity in the very passage quoted, p. 247, by our author against this doctrine.” It appears from this quotation, that they, when baptized, “made solemn profession of their confidence in Christ.”<sup>3</sup> The Jews, as well as almost all the Gentiles, professed their belief in God; but the thing which was required of them by the apostles was, that they should make profession of confidence in Jesus as the Christ of God in the rite of /667 baptism. If such a profession of confidence in Christ is admitted by the Editor as a sufficient acknowledgment of his deity, why should he be so hostile to those (whom he styles Unitarians) who are baptized in the name of Jesus, and also *profess* their solemn *confidence in him*? Still further am I surprised that, when the apostle John expressly wrote his Gospel to prove “that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God,” (ch. xx. 31,) the Editor, so far from being satisfied with those who receive Jesus in the character expressed by these terms, (“the Christ, the Son of God,”) in the sense which they uniformly bear in the Scriptures, requires them, moreover, to believe that Jesus Christ is the very and eternal God, and thus not only defeats the object of the apostle, but even contradicts him in express language.

Jn 20:31

§785 The Editor then proceeds to say, “Respecting Locke and Newton, our reply is precisely the same; their opinions in divinity are nothing to us.”<sup>4</sup> The Editor, elated by the general prevalence of the orthodox system, effected only perversions of the sense of the divine writings, attempts to turn the authorities of these great men also to his

<sup>1</sup> The *Received Text* reads οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς καὶ ἡ ζωὴ αἰώνιος. The article ἡ is excised on text-critical grounds in modern editions. (See Griesbach, *NT Graece Vol. II*, 521f. and Nestle/Aland, *NT Graece*, ad. loc.) Anyway, it is doubtful if Middleton’s rule is at all applicable to this verse.

<sup>2</sup> §438. <sup>3</sup> §438, referring to §171. <sup>4</sup> §439.



own purpose. “If” (says he) “Locke, as our author affirms, (p. 305,) really thought that the faith which makes men Christians, includes their receiving Christ for their Lord and King, Locke knew that this included the belief of his omniscience and omnipresence, as, without this, his being their King was only a solemn mockery.” The Editor prudently /668 quotes here only a part of the sentence of Locke quoted by me, which he thought might give him an opportunity of making comments favourable to his creed; but it is fortunate for us that his works, being written and printed in English, are not liable to much critical perversion. Locke says, “that the believing Jesus to be the Messiah, includes in it a receiving him for our Lord and King, PROMISED AND SENT FROM GOD.”<sup>1</sup> The phrase chosen by that celebrated author, “*sent from God*,” denies the deity of Christ beyond doubt, since one sent by another is of course different from him who sends him. To avoid every misconstruction being thrown upon his definition, Locke chose the term “God,” instead of any other term in the above phrase, that Jesus might be understood separately from God, without the least room for the sophistry that might represent him as God the Son, sent from God the Father. We, however, are not at a loss to discover what Locke meant by the terms “Lord and King,” when referred to Jesus, as he fully explained them in his Paraphrase on the Epistles to the Corinthians. As to the term “*Lord*,” I refer to the note on 1 *Cor.* i. 2: “What the apostle means by *Lord*, when he attributes it to Christ, vide viii. 6.”<sup>2</sup> Paraphrase on viii. 6: “Yet to us Christians there is but *one God, the Father and Author of all things*, to whom *alone* we address *all* our worship and service; and one Lord, viz. Jesus Christ, by whom all things come *from God to us*, and by whom we have access /669 to the Father.”<sup>3</sup> As to the term “*King*,” I quote his paraphrase on ch. xv. 24, which clearly represents his sovereignty as *finite*: “After that shall be the day of judgment, which shall bring to a conclusion and finish the whole dispensation to the race and posterity of Adam, in this world: when Christ shall have *delivered up the kingdom to God the Father*, which he shall not do till he hath destroyed all empire, power, and authority, that shall be in the world besides.”<sup>4</sup>

The Editor says of Sir Isaac Newton, “His belief of Christ’s deity appears as clear as the light, from our author’s own quotation, when he said that Christians of all ages

§786

<sup>1</sup> Rammohan here quotes again his citation from Locke, *Works II, Second Vindication*, 669, as in §257.

<sup>2</sup> Locke, *Works III, I Corinthians*, 147.

<sup>3</sup> Locke, *Works III, I Corinthians*, 175. This is Locke’s paraphrase of “But to us there is only 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.”

<sup>4</sup> Locke, *Works III, I Corinthians*, 204. This is Locke’s paraphrase of “Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power.” Rammohan is, of course, focusing on the point that the kingdom will be delivered to God.

are represented as worshipping God and the Lamb,”<sup>1</sup> Newton was too circumspect to leave his word liable to perversion by the popular opinion. He explains the sense in which Christians worship God, and also the sense in which they worship Jesus—the one as directly opposed to the other as the West to the East. Newton says, “God for his benefaction in *creating all things*, and the Lamb for his benefaction in *redeeming* with his blood; God as sitting upon the throne and living *for ever*, and the Lamb exalted above all *by the merits of his death*.”<sup>2</sup> The worship offered to the latter is therefore merely a manifestation of civil reverence, as I pointed out in p. 640.<sup>3</sup>

§787 To equalize a being exalted and worshipped for his meritorious *death*, with the eternal Supreme Sovereign of the universe, is only an attempt to bring /670 the nature of the Deity on a level with a mortal creature, and by no means serves to elevate that creature to the rank of the Deity. If the Editor consider these quotations from Locke and Newton really orthodox, how inconsistent he must be in condemning those whose sentiments as to the person of Jesus Christ are precisely the same; to wit, that he is the anointed Lord and King promised and sent from God, is worthy of worship for his mediation and meritorious death, but by no means as a being possessed of a two-fold nature, divine and human, perfect God and perfect Man!

§788 As to my remarks on certain abstruse reasonings resorted to by the orthodox, the Editor says, that he needs them no, thereby avowedly relinquishing reason in support of the Trinity; but, happily, he asserts at the same time, that “*to us the Scriptures are sufficient*.”<sup>4</sup> I therefore entreat him to point out a single scriptural authority, treating of a compound God of three persons, and of a compound Messiah, one of these three persons, constituted of a two-fold nature, divine and human.

§789 The Editor alludes to the term “antichrists,” found in the Epistle of John; but I am glad that we most fortunately are furnished with the definition of this term by that inspired writer, which decides at once the question who are the real subjects of its application. 1 *John* iv. 3: “Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God; and this is that spirit of antichrist.” /671 We accordingly rejoice to confess that Jesus Christ, who came in the flesh, is OF GOD, and that not only he, but his apostles also were of God (1 *John* iv. 6, v. 19); but we feel sincerely for those who violate this standard, either by falling short or going beyond it, by denying that Jesus Christ is OF GOD, or by affirming that Jesus Christ is God himself, since both these assertions,—to wit, “Jesus Christ is NOT of God,” and “Jesus Christ is God,”—are equally incompatible with John’s proposition, that “Jesus Christ is OF GOD.”<sup>5</sup> For example: The prime minister, by the law of the land, is appointed

1 Jn 4:2f.

1 Jn 4:6; 5:19

<sup>1</sup> §439, referring to §258. <sup>2</sup> Newton, *Observations*, 455, as cited in §258. <sup>3</sup> §757. <sup>4</sup> §440.

<sup>5</sup> Rammohan misunderstands the verse. “Is not of God” (ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἔσται) refers to the one who does not believe that Christ came in flesh. It is not about whether Christ “is of God” or not. This, of course, does not escape Marshman, see §1214.

by the king, and consequently is acknowledged to be OF THE KING; to say, therefore, that he is not of the king, would be to detract from the minister's dignity; but to say that the prime minister is the king, is not only inconsistent with the assertion that the prime minister is of the king, but would be pronounced high treason; in like manner as deifying the Christ of God, is both an affront to God, and an *antichristian* doctrine.

Lastly, I tender my humble thanks for the Editor's kind suggestion in inviting me to adopt the doctrine of the Holy Trinity; but I am sorry to find that I am unable to benefit this advice. After I have long relinquished every idea of a plurality of Gods, or of the persons of the Godhead, taught under different systems of modern Hindooism, I cannot conscientiously and consistently embrace one of a similar nature, though greatly refined /672 by the religious reformations of modern times; since whatever arguments can be adduced against a plurality of Gods, strike with equal force against the doctrine of a plurality of persons of the Godhead; and, on the other hand, whatever excuse may be pleaded in favour of a plurality of persons of the Deity, can be offered with equal propriety in defence of Polytheism. §790

I now conclude my Essay by offering up thanks to the Supreme Disposer of the events of this universe, for having unexpectedly delivered this country from the long-continued tyranny of its former rulers, and placed it under the government of the English,—a nation who not only are blessed with the enjoyment of civil and political liberty, but also interest themselves in promoting liberty and social happiness, as well as free inquiry into literary and religious subjects, among those nations to which their influence extends. §791

FINIS.



# 9 Marshman: First Review of the Final Appeal – The Atonement of Christ

## Editorial Introduction

In his *Final Appeal*, Rammohan had proposed the project of a new mode of debate in a monthly magazine (§§451-452), but his plan didn't find any positive response among the Serampore missionaries. Marshman claims that he had no interest in continuing the debate for years and that the readers also would lose the overview (§803). He used again his own established magazine, the *Friend of India*, for his response and review.

In §802 Marshman reflects about the growth of text material through the debate. The *Final Appeal* was the longest contribution so far, but Marshman, although he complains about this length, will exceed this in his two articles. The first article is from December 1823 about the Atonement of Christ, the second is from January 1825 about the Deity of Christ. Together these Articles are longer than the *Final Appeal* because of Marshman's strategy to work through every argument of his opponent. Rammohan will not answer any more.

In his first article Marshman is able to use a new way of argumentation. He complements the strategy to "prove" the atonement out of the Old Testament with the question of God's justice in the face of the crucifixion as historical fact (§887). He also explains the exclusivist centre of Pauline theology in Galatians, as there is no other way to salvation except the cross (§821). Beside this new aspects his text is still filled with arguments to disprove Rammohan through the whole Bible. Whenever Rammohan wrote about his inability to understand certain lines of argument and biblical evidence taken for granted by Marshman, this is not accepted by the Missionary. For him this is rather a weakness of his opponent than a reason to make himself clearer (e. g. §872).

Marshman's article is also filled with personal arguments against Rammohan. As Rammohan used to reason about prejudices his opponents carried from their childhood and early education, Marshman now answers by referring to Rammohan's Hindu origin. Rammohan's enmity against Hindu polytheism turns against the Trinity (§906) and the two natures of Christ (§927), although these Christian

teachings are totally different and contain not a bit of polytheism from Marshman's perspective. Marshman also claims that he finds the Hindu idea of Karma in Rammohan's thinking (§939), but Karma is not appropriate in explaining the Bible.

In this way Marshman excludes Rammohan from Christianity and from biblical exegesis. From his point of view a non-Christian is not able to read the Holy Scriptures in a true, spiritual way, as he made clear in a previous article in the *Friend of India*: "The real fact is, that until enlightened by the Divine Spirit all mankind are equally ignorant of spiritual things, whatever be the extent of their natural capacity."<sup>1</sup>

In a certain way these expressions of exclusion and exclusivism end the constructive debate. They are intensified by Marshman's sinister allusions to Rammohan's supposed fate on judgement day: The Hindu might have reasons to fear for his eternal salvation if he does not change his believes.<sup>2</sup>

The use of italics and small capitals for emphasis in his last two articles is growing, showing stronger emotional emphasis within the author.

The text basis for this edition is *The Friend of India. Quarterly Series. Vol. III., No. IX. December 1823*, pp. 89-186. The headlines of the chapters and sections are taken from a later, separate reprint of Marshman's text (Serampore 1823). As they don't belong to the original text in the *Friend of India*, they are marked with [brackets]. The quotation marks in the original print are sometimes unreliable and confusing. In this edition the quotation marks have been tacitly revised and corrected, as there was nowhere essential doubt about the correct usage.

---

<sup>1</sup> *FIMS 1821*, 252. <sup>2</sup> The index of topics in this edition shows the ongoing growth of this allusions, see there under "Rammohan Roy, threatened by eternal damnation."

/89 ART. IV.—*Review of Rammohun Roy’s “Final Appeal to the Christian Public in defence of the Precepts of Jesus,”* pp. vii. and 379. Calcutta, 1823. §800

[Introductory Observations]

WE have now before us our author’s Final Appeal to the Christian Public against the Atonement and the Deity of Him whom the blessed in heaven constantly adore as having “redeemed them by his blood out of every nation, and people, and kindred, and tongue.” In this appeal, our author, as if understanding the nature of Jesus better than those who now see his face in the realms of light, anew denies that he ought to be adored, or that he has redeemed any by his blood; and makes his final Appeal to the public in behalf of the Precepts of Jesus against his Atonement, insisting, that the grand end of his coming into the world, was, not to redeem men by dying for their sins, but (like Mahomet) to give them precepts, by obedience to which added to repentance, they may save themselves. The blessed in heaven and he therefore, are perfectly at issue on the subject; and, appalling as is the thought, it is a melancholy fact, that the Indian public are now called upon to say whether they do not believe that they who “see the Redeemer as he is,” have acted wrong all these centuries in *adoring* “the Lamb that was slain,” and that they ought immediately to change the subject of their songs of praise. §801  
Rv 5:9  
1 Jn 3:2

Before we examine our author’s arguments against the Atonement and Deity of the Redeemer, courtesy to him requires that we should take some notice of his Introductory Remarks. We therefore begin with his Preface, from which we learn, that he has at length taken a dislike to large publications in this controversy. On this subject few are more capable of judging. He has answered a reply of thirty-two pages by one of a hundred and seventy-three; and in the present instance one of a hundred and twenty-eight, by a volume of three hundred and seventy-nine, beside a preface of seven. No one therefore has a better right to complain of large publications on this subject than himself, as he has created the evil of which he complains. Nor is he unwise in expressing this dislike precisely at this period. While he insists that our Reply contains as many words as his, he cannot deny that his present Appeal contains more than double that quantity. Should this Appeal then be answered, not after his example by one of double its quantity, but merely by one of equal size, and should he continue as he has begun, doubling in each reply his quantity of letter press, his next must consist of nearly eight hundred pages. With whatever grace therefore, this complaint may come from him who has created the evil, no one can doubt of the wisdom of its being made at the present time. §802

To some however it may appear doubtful whether his new method will be found more favourable to the attainment of his object. We ought to suppose that in this work of nearly four hundred pages, our author has added nothing beyond what he §803

deemed necessary to the support of his cause. But were this quantity divided into “monthly portions of a dozen or sixteen pages,”<sup>1</sup> the whole could not come before his readers in less than two years; and perhaps those who have little “leisure or perseverance,”<sup>2</sup> may find it quite as difficult to keep their minds on the stretch respecting this subject for the space of two /91 years, that they may connect the first portion of argument with the last, as to read through a volume of four hundred pages in two months. And without thus connecting the whole in their minds, their judgment when formed, can be of little value.

§804 Our author urges however, that our Reply to his last Appeal, is really as long as that work, although it is nearly fifty pages less. Granting this, our author should remember that it was a reply, and that in his replies to us he has always more than doubled our quantity. Our readers however need not fear that we are about to double his quantity of letter press in replying to this Appeal. We do not think that the Atonement and the Deity of our Lord Jesus require any such labor to demonstrate their truth, and we hope that we shall not give them in reply three or even two hundred of our pages. In this Number indeed, we do not intend to trouble them with one hundred, as we shall now merely consider our author’s allegations against the Atonement of Christ, reserving those which he has brought against his Deity for our next. But before we enter on these, we must notice some of his preliminary remarks, lest he should accuse us of neglect.

[Section I. Remarks on his Preliminary Observations]

§805 Our author begins with begging permission to notice “a few unjust insinuations in some parts of our essay.”<sup>3</sup> As any one who may support truth itself by incontrovertible arguments, may be said to insinuate or imply that his opponent has been supporting error, which unless he be convinced of his error, his opponent will be sure to deem *unjust*, it is scarcely possible wholly to avoid charges of this nature if an opponent chuse to make them; since the more convincing the arguments against his opinions are, the stronger will be the insinuation that he has been hitherto in the wrong. We fear therefore /92 that we must in some measure plead guilty, for we did intend, not only to imply, but to prove that we thought him in the wrong. But of any other unjust insinuation we are certainly guiltless as far as relates to intention. So firmly are we convinced of the Atonement and Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ, that it would grieve us to employ not only the least unjust insinuation in their defence; but even a weak argument, assured as we are, that if nine-tenths of those capable of being employed, were wholly dropped, so many would remain to establish these doctrines, that even the gates of hell could not prevail against them.—We would advise however, that on subjects so important as this, the public should never have

---

<sup>1</sup> §452. <sup>2</sup> §447. <sup>3</sup> §454.



their attention turned from the real state of the argument by complaints of “unjust insinuations.” This is an exhaustless subject of complaint; and the cause of it generally lies deep. If a man be successful in defending his cause, all such insinuations fall to the ground: and if he be not, he is seldom pleased; and hence he may easily find insinuations against him in one shape or other in almost every argument, though nothing may have been farther from his opponent’s intention.

Among these imagined insinuations of ours, we find one to be, that we have charged our author with “the arrogance” of taking upon himself “to teach doctrines directly opposed to those held by the mass of real Christians in every age.”<sup>1</sup> Here we must inform our readers that “arrogance” is not our phrase; and that we have used no such word respecting him: all we can justly claim of this, is, “his teaching doctrines directly opposed to those held by the mass of real christians in every age.” Since this however is a fact which our author does not attempt to deny, we wonder at his being angry that it has been said. As he really does it, we did not /93 expect that he would have been ashamed or displeased at its being affirmed of him; hence we had no idea that this would be accounted “an insinuation,” and still less an *unjust* one. We now begin to fear that we have filled our whole reply with insinuations; for there is not an argument brought which does not at least *imply*, that we believe him wrong from beginning to end.

§806

But we are ready to suspect that the “insinuation” must lie in the word “teach,” for he says p. 5. “In reviewing the first appeal the Rev. Editor fully introduced the doctrines of the Godhead of Jesus and the Holy Ghost, and of the Atonement, as the only foundation of Christianity, whereby he compelled me, as a professed believer of one God, to deny for the first time publicly those doctrines; and now he takes occasion to accuse me of presumption in teaching doctrines which he has compelled me to avow.”<sup>2</sup> We hence imagine that our author must have been put out of temper by some mistake respecting the word “teaching.” In using this word however we did not mean, that he went out on the high road like a missionary, and taught such as he met, or sat down under a tree with them; although had he done so, we should not have greatly blamed him; for when a man has found the way to heaven, we think he ought to teach it to others as far as he has opportunity. Nor, on the other hand, did we suppose that he concealed his ideas when in conversation with his friends, but that he disseminated them whenever he found occasion, which we considered as warranting the application of the term, not to say that he had now published them to the world, which rendered the term still more proper. And if we *have* “compelled him to avow” what he before believed, we cannot see that we have been guilty of any great crime; for we think it /94 quite as well for a man to avow even his disbelief

§807

---

<sup>1</sup> §455, quoting §284.   <sup>2</sup> §456.

of the Atonement and the Deity of the Saviour, as for him to hold it secretly without avowal. We however feel it an unspeakable consolation, that if we have compelled him to *avow* this disbelief, we did not *create* it in him: had we, we should never have forgiven ourselves this side of the grave.

§808 Our author after thus complaining that we compelled him to avow these doctrines, with a strange inconsistency, expresses his astonishment that before this his avowal, we only feared that he held them.<sup>1</sup> We did indeed greatly fear that he disbelieved the Atonement and the Deity of Christ, when he published “the Precepts of Jesus;” but as we were not certain that he had openly avowed such disbelief, we felt unwilling to charge him with it, lest we should do him injustice, much as we feared the real state of his mind. Surely in this there can be little which ought to displease him.

§809 Another of these insinuations is, that “*vanity has led me to presume that freedom from the powerful effects of early religious impressions has enabled him to discover the truths of Scripture, in its most important doctrines more fully in three or four years than others have done by the most unremitting study in thirty or forty.*”<sup>2</sup> Here too we must remind our readers that “vanity” is our author’s addition; and that we have not even mentioned the word as applicable to him. It is created by his own displeasure at our mentioning his own words relative to “*early religious impressions,*” together with, what must be a fact if it be really *the truth* which he has discovered, and which therefore ought to excite in his mind no kind of anger.

§810 As to his being “*pretty sure, that no one possessed of merely common sense will fail to find out the un-/95scripturality of the doctrine of the Trinity,*”<sup>3</sup> after studying the Scriptures in the way he mentions, he should recollect that his being “pretty sure” of this, is no kind of argument. We might be “pretty sure” of the contrary, and this would be none; but it would be just as good as his. Both, unless intended to prejudice the case, would be wasting paper and the reader’s time, and would tend only to awaken the suspicion that the cause which resorted to such modes of support, was really driven to straits. Of precisely the same nature is his assertion relative to “*a few independent and diligent natives studying attentively both the Old and New Testaments in their original languages, and then offering their sentiments as to the doctrine of the Trinity being scriptural, or a mere human invention.*”<sup>4</sup>

§811 Our Author has his anger again kindled by what he terms our “*holding up to ridicule*”<sup>5</sup> his suggestions relative to studying the Scriptures unbiassed by early religious impressions, because we observed that, “*could it be relied on indeed, his compendious method would deserve notice with a view to Christian education, as then the most certain way of enabling any one to discover in a superior manner the truths and doctrines of Christianity, would be, to leave him to the age of thirty or forty*

<sup>1</sup> §457. <sup>2</sup> §458, quoting §283. <sup>3</sup> §458. <sup>4</sup> §458. <sup>5</sup> §459.

without any religious impression.”<sup>1</sup> Here too we must beg our reader to recollect that “ridicule,” is wholly our author’s term, as well as the “vanity” and “arrogance” with which we are said to have charged him before. If he wishes to persevere in the search after truth however, we would advise him to guard against these ebullitions of irritation. The only question here is, whether this be a legitimate inference from his reprobating so strongly the effect of early religious impressions in biasing the mind; and if it be, which he does not attempt to deny, to be offended at the imagined ridicule it brings in its train, to some of his readers may possibly appear in somewhat bordering on the ridiculous.

Our author’s classing the doctrine of “the Trinity in Unity”<sup>2</sup> with a Hindoo’s believing that his idol is endued with animation, or with the polytheism of the Hindoos “brought up with the notion of the godhead of the sun, of fire and of water;” or “the polytheistical faith of the Greeks”<sup>3</sup> who believed in Mars, and Venus, and Juno, and Jupiter, we presume he does not adduce as argument. If he does, we think he himself can scarcely be ignorant, that in doing it he is wretchedly begging the question in debate. Before he had ventured on such classification, indeed, we think he should have shewn that the Hindoos profess to prove “the godhead of the son, of fire, and of water,” from inspired writings as fully authenticated, as much tending to abase all human pride, and as evidently intended to promote real holiness, as the Sacred Scriptures; and that the Greeks had inspired writings equally authentic, and equally holy in their effects, on which they founded the godhead of Jupiter, and Mars, and Juno, and Venus. Till he has done this, he may, by acting thus, lead the young and unwary to class the Sacred Writings with the cunningly devised fables of the Hindoos; he may indeed lead those “altogether indifferent to religion,” and “those who are rather unfavourable to the doctrines of Christianity as generally promulgated,”<sup>4</sup> to whom he appeals in this work, to such a disregard of the Sacred Writings as many end in their eternal ruin. But as for those acquainted with the subject, while such miserable begging of the question may convince them of the state to which his cause is reduced, it will only move them to pity the man who, if the Holy Scriptures will not establish his own dogmas, can be well content that they be classed with the Hindoo and Greek legends of idolatry.

§812

Our own acquaintance with the Hindoos convince us however, that it is not their belief of “their idols being endued with animation,”<sup>5</sup> which keeps up idolatry among them, but their love of that iniquity which this system fosters. Let them once love “righteousness and true holiness,”<sup>6</sup> and no prejudices of education will detain them

§813

Ep 4:24

<sup>1</sup> §283. <sup>2</sup> §459. <sup>3</sup> §460. <sup>4</sup> §445. <sup>5</sup> §459.

<sup>6</sup> These are attributes of the “new self” after receiving a new life in Jesus and the spirit according to Ep 4:20–24.

in idolatry. Nor is it any wonder that the “sublime works among the Greeks,” and “the Vedant among the Hindoos;”<sup>1</sup> have totally failed in suppressing idolatry, when, amidst all their sublimity, they so completely foster human pride and the sins of the heart. In doing this, they leave a man just as much alienated in heart from a pure and holy God, who “cannot look upon iniquity” and, who “will not give his glory to another;” as idolatry itself. It is therefore not strange that the Greek writings, sublime as they are, never extinguished idolatry in a single village. But the doctrines of the Atonement and Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ, have destroyed the reign of idolatry and iniquity in every heart in which they have been cordially received.<sup>2</sup> Has Satan now learned to cast out Satan? If he has, where is the *veracity* of Him whose precepts are, “the guide to happiness and peace?”<sup>3</sup>

Hab 1:13; Is 42:8

§814 Our Author takes it for granted that all those who believe in the Atonement and Deity of Christ have blindly adopted the creed of their parents; and insists that “the unbiassed judgment of a person who has searched the Scriptures only for a twelve-month with an anxious desire to discover the truth they contain, ought as far as authority goes in such matters, to outweigh the opinions of any number who have either not thought at all for themselves, or have studied after prejudice had laid /98 hold of their minds.”<sup>4</sup> He therefore thinks, he may perhaps be excused for the confidence with which he maintains his own opinions against those of so great a majority who appeal to the same authority for theirs, inasmuch as he attributes their different views, not to any inferiority of judgment compared with his own limited abilities, but to the powerful effects of early religious impressions.

§815 But in this does not our author deceive himself? Had he no early religious prejudices? Was he not brought up in the Hindoo system? Granting him therefore, that for which he has not yet adduced a shadow of proof, that in rejecting the Atonement and the Deity of Christ he has found the truth; how came he to surmount those early religious impressions, and to find the truth? Will he say that it is through the Divine goodness manifested to him? if he does, will he add that he alone and those who disbelieve like him, are the sole objects of this goodness, while those who believe the Atonement and Deity of Christ are abandoned by the Divine goodness, and thus declare himself and them the only favourites of heaven? Or will he say that he did it by his own diligence and strength of mind, and that those who believe in Christ’s Atonement and Deity have not equal diligence and mental strength, and thus declare

<sup>1</sup> §460.

<sup>2</sup> Marshman contradicts Rammohan’s view that even Christianity has been infiltrated by Polytheism in the early church in §460: “Nay, even when Christian converts became numerous, did not those who were brought up in the ancient superstition introduce some vestiges of their idolatry into their new persuasion?”

<sup>3</sup> Reference to Mt 12:24–26, where Jesus states that Satan will not be driven out by Satan. <sup>4</sup> §460.

that he and his companions “are the men, and wisdom shall die with them?”

Jb 12:2

He would therefore do well to consider the obvious meaning of this language, which he uses so abundantly. If his opponents were brought up from their infancy in the belief that “the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin,” and that he is “God over all blessed for ever more,” was he not brought up in the belief of the Hindoo system, which teaches that a man who has been guilty of a thousand acts of wickedness, is still capable of doing acts of merit which in themselves deserve a place in heaven? Should he say, “I was diligent and examined things for myself,” will he venture to affirm that his opponents have not been equally diligent in examining things for themselves? Should he add further, “My success proves my superior judgment or superior diligence. In rejecting the Atonement and Deity of Christ I have found *the truth*, while my opponents in holding these doctrines have held fast error;” would not this be begging the question still in debate? May not his opponents have possessed equal judgment, diligence, and impartiality, and have *held fast* the Atonement and Deity of Christ, *because* the more carefully and impartially they examined the scriptures, the stronger appeared the evidence for these doctrines? This argument therefore, upon which he lays so much stress, when duly examined will be found lighter than a feather; and this superior freedom from religious prejudices which is to give a twelve-months’ examination of the scriptures greater authority than many years’ examination by others, resolve itself into a mere bubble. All royal ways of arriving at the truth utterly fail: indeed they only serve to sink the side on which they are retained, by displaying the wonderful opinion its supporters have of themselves. After all the question itself is left to be decided precisely by the weight of solid argument adduced on either side.

§816

1 Jn 1:7; Rm 9:5

We confess indeed that we now have our doubts whether our author *may really* have surmounted his own early religious prejudices, and whether he be not under the influence of them to this very day; and as on his own principle this may throw light on his disbelief of the Atonement and the Deity of the Saviour of men, it may not be wholly foreign to the subject if we state our reasons for these doubts; since if his early religious prejudices were in direct opposition to the doctrine that sin is so “exceeding sinful” as to need such Atonement, unless he *has* surmounted them, we need not wonder that he has never been able to find the doctrine of the Atonement in the sacred scriptures, although others who know their real state as sinners by nature and practice, can perceive it shining throughout the whole scriptures. In page 89, he combats the doctrine of eternal punishment, on the ground that every man however wicked “has performed at last one single righteous act during the whole period of his life, though he cannot be supposed to have escaped every sin in this tempting world;” and that hence “every man must be both guilty of infinite sin and an agent of infinite virtue;” and therefore “if we suppose that this very person is to be punished

§817

for eternity for the infinite sin he has committed, there will be no opportunity of his enjoying an infinite reward for his *good work*. But according to the position he must be either rewarded for his good or punished for his evil actions for eternity, while justice requires that he should experience the consequences of both.”<sup>1</sup> Here we have the soul and substance of the Hindoo system! “*Justice requires,*” that the man who has been a certain time in hell for his crimes, if their number has preponderated, should then ascend to heaven to enjoy there the reward of his deeds of merit;—and it no less demands that the man who has enjoyed in heaven the reward of his deeds of righteousness, should these have preponderated, should afterwards descend to hell and suffer the just reward of his deeds of sin. This, the very soul and essence of Hindooism, is brought by our author against the doctrine of eternal happiness and eternal misery!!<sup>2</sup>

§818 It should seem therefore that our author, so far from /101 surmounting his own “early religious impressions” holds fast the essence of them to this very hour. The images of Hindooism he has discarded and its gods and goddesses, as have thousands of Hindoos beside him; but the essence, the soul, the substance of the system, he still retains, and with it encounters the doctrines adduced from scripture. Thus while he imagines that, free from all religious prejudices, he has been searching the Sacred Scriptures to discover the simple truth, he has been endeavoring to bend them to his preconceived system of refined, but real Hindooism! As easily might he constrain the east to meet the west, however, as cause the gospel of the meek and lowly Jesus to coalesce with the Hindoo doctrine of human merit. Nothing in nature can be more opposite than the spirit of the gospel and the spirit of Hindooism, whether manifested in its grossest idolatry, or in the highest refinement of the Vedanta. That gospel which is founded on the doctrine, that “every imagination of man’s heart is evil, is *only evil continually*,”—that among men, “there is none that doeth good no not one,”—that “he who offendeth in one point of the Divine law is guilty of all,”—that he is cursed “who *continueth not* in *all* things written in the book of the law to do them,”—that “the carnal mind is enmity against God and is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be,”—“that no fountain can send forth both salt water and fresh”—and that “an evil tree cannot bring forth good fruit,” must be death to the spirit of Hindooism, and to the pride of man in every false religion.

§819 Yet to this system does our Author attempt to unite the intercession of Christ! And we are asked, “whether it be not *scriptural as well as reasonable that all men should be judged after death according to their good /102 and evil works, and then that*

<sup>1</sup> §539.

<sup>2</sup> Marshman is referring to the system of Karma, where all good and evil deeds have consequences. He is taking up this point again in §§937-940.

through the intercession of one who stands as a mediator between God and man, those who have through Christ truly repented, shall be admitted to enjoy *infinite beatitude*, through the free bounty of the father of the universe to which they are not entitled by their own merit!"<sup>1</sup> To all this it is sufficient to reply, that "without SHEDDING OF BLOOD *there is no remission*,"—that "Christ was *once offered to bear the sins of many*," and that he maketh intercession for none but those who, renouncing all their own righteous deeds, yea their repentance, and counting them "loss and dung," *trust in his blood for the forgiveness of sins*; and further, that those who obtain eternal life through his intercession, in heaven adore him for "*having been SLAIN and having redeemed them to God BY HIS BLOOD*." Thus the Hindoo system of human merit is excluded in every form, and 'till it be from the heart renounced, no one can have any part or lot in the intercession of Christ.

Heb 9:22, 25-28

Ph 3:8

Rv 5:9

That while holding fast the Hindoo system, that an evil tree may bring forth good fruit, and that even an wicked man may perform deeds which justice must reward with heaven in another state, although his evil deeds be also punished with hell, our author should not discern the doctrine of Christ's atonement, and should be equally blind to the Deity of Christ on which his atonement is founded, will excite little surprize in those who consider the humbling nature of the gospel. It is not "the whole who need a physician, but those who are sick." Yea if he should discover the greatest enmity against both these doctrines, it would excite no surprize. If they be true, he is ruined both for time and eternity, unless he take refuge in the death of Christ. His repentance cannot atone for even the least sin: it is itself so inadequate, so worthless, so defiled with sin, that were he guilty of no other sin than those which cleave to his repentance, unless he take refuge in the death of Christ, infinite justice must condemn him to eternal death for there alone, or stand itself eternally dishonored.—How accommodating is the system termed Unitarianism! It claims affinity with every false religion. That the Moosulmans are complete Unitarians, has been often said; but we now see that the Hindoo system purged of its grossness, the moment it assimilates the Scriptures to its own doctrines, becomes Unitarianism in all it glory.

§820

Mt 9:12

With his mind thus full of the Hindoo doctrine of merit in the deeds of a man whose general course of life may be wicked, it is no wonder that our Author should stumble at the very threshold respecting the Precepts of Jesus. One would scarcely imagine indeed how any one not imbued with the doctrine of human merit, could think that Christ intended by his Precepts to set aside his "giving his life a ransom for many," his "shedding his blood for the remission of sins." Yet our Author still insists that men obtain eternal peace and happiness by their own obedience to the

§821

Mt 20:28

<sup>1</sup> §539.



precepts preached by Christ, and not through his death and merits; and complains (p. 14) that when we advanced the position, that “the most excellent precepts, the most perfect law, can never lead to happiness and peace unless by causing men to take refuge in the doctrine of the cross, instead of endeavoring to demonstrate the insufficiency of the precepts to conduct men to happiness, we introduced a number of passages which we thought well calculated to prove that the death of Christ was an atonement for the sins of mankind;” and then “regrets, that we should have adopted such an irregular mode of arguing in solemn religious discussion.”<sup>1</sup> Real-/104ly we were not aware that the Scriptures held out two ways to heaven. We thought that if Christ’s death and merits were the way, men’s own merits *could not* be so too; and that there was no other name given under heaven whereby we must be saved. We thought that “if righteousness came by man’s obedience to the most perfect law, *Christ is dead in vain*.” nor did we think it possible that any man who had studied the scriptures, could think that to prove Christ’s death to be the *only* atonement for sin, was and “irregular way” of proving, that man’s repentance and obedience were none whatever.

Ac 4:12

Ga 2:21

§822

To please our author however, we will now adduce the reasons why the most perfect law can never lead men to happiness, but by causing them to take refuge in the doctrine of the cross, or in Christ’s Atonement for sin. One is founded on the apostle’s declaration made after Christ had, according to our author, “perfected the law,”<sup>2</sup> “therefore by the deeds of the law shall *no flesh* be justified in God’s sight, *for by the law is the knowledge of sin*.” The law can pronounce peace only on those *who continue to keep it*; and it must unavoidably pronounce *a curse* on those who *do not*; since its language is “Cursed is *every one that CONTINUETH NOT in all things*.” Now as no man continues observing the divine law, (which includes every precept of Jesus,) there is no man upon earth on whom it does not in the strictest justice pronounce a curse; for the language of the Old Testament, “there is no man that liveth and sinneth not”—“there is none that doeth good, no not one,” is made the language of the New by St. Paul, *Rom. iii.* and is confirmed by James, ch. iv. “In many things we sin all,” and by John, “If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us.” Men’s knowledge of the nature and extent of the Divine law, therefore, can /105 only tell them that they have violated its precepts, and that they are most righteously under its curse. Hence the divine law, even though it may have been

Rm 3:20

Ga 3:10 (Dt  
27:26)

Qo 7:20; Ps 14:3;  
53:3; Rm 3:12

Jm 3:2; 1 Jn 1:8

<sup>1</sup> §464. Marshman’s quotation omits and alters several words.

<sup>2</sup> §470: “St. Paul, knowing the efficacy of the perfection introduced by Jesus into the law given by Moses, declares, that had the system of the Mosaical law been sufficient to produce light among the Jews and Gentiles, without being perfected by Jesus, this attempt made by Christ to perfect it would have been superfluous, and his death, which was the consequence of his candid instructions, would have been to no purpose.”



perfected by Jesus himself, can never lead those to happiness and peace, who do not *continue* in keeping it, unless by enabling them to discern how justly they are under its curse, and thus leading them to take refuge in the sacrifice of Christ as the only atonement for sin.

Setting Christ's atonement aside therefore, the holiest man upon earth, would be, §823  
to the hour of his death, exposed to its curse even for his daily transgressions of the "Precepts of Jesus;" and he has never a moment's true peace, but when, as a sinner righteously condemned, he takes refuge in the atonement of Christ for sin. To a mind filled with the idea of a man's having a right to heaven for a certain time even while his evil actions deserve the punishment of hell, these facts may be a stumbling block; but to one who knows his own guilt, whether he have been brought up in the study of the scriptures, or in the darkest heathenism, they are as clear as the light. Thus the apostle preached "Christ crucified," to the Jews who wished to establish their own righteousness, "a stumbling block," and to the Greeks who felt no need of an atonement, "foolishness;" but to those who, like the apostle, knew that in them "dwelt no good thing," Christ as the atonement for sin was, "the wisdom of God and the power of God." 1 Co 1:22-25

The rock on which our Author is continually splitting, is, his not thoroughly examining his own ideas and tracing the consequences which inevitably follow from his own assertions. Hence he is almost continually contradicting the spirit and tenor of the sacred writings, he sometimes flies in the face of its plainest declarations,—and melancholy as it may be, as we proceed we shall /106 be constrained to observe, that some of his assertions destroy the fundamental principles even of natural religion. It is only the want of deeper acquaintance with the scriptures which makes him declare, (p. 16.) that "Jesus's dying *actually as a sacrifice for the sins of men—has no relation to a proof or disproof of the sufficiency of his precepts for salvation.*"<sup>1</sup> §824  
Surely a mind unoccupied with previous prejudices, would need no other proof of this than the apostolic declaration; "if righteousness came by" our obedience to "the law" which includes all his precepts, "*Christ is dead in vain.*" If Christ died as a sacrifice for sin, it was because our *transgressing* his precepts, rendered them insufficient for our salvation. In themselves the precepts of Christ are holy, and just, and good;<sup>2</sup> but to bring salvation to any one, they must be *constantly and perfectly observed*; and this, John, who wrote after they were delivered, testifies they are not by any man on earth; "if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us." Ga 2:21 1 Jn 1:8

The same inattention to the scriptures appears in his asking because our Lord §825

<sup>1</sup> §465.

<sup>2</sup> Marshman is modifying Rm 7:12: "Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good." By this Paul tries to defend himself against accusations of antinomianism.

after pointing out the commands of the first and second table, love to God and our neighbour, added, there is none other commandment greater than these, “Is there another commandment absolutely enjoining refuge in the doctrine of the cross, so as to shew that these commandments are insufficient for salvation, and comparatively insignificant?”<sup>1</sup> The commands in scripture enjoining us to take refuge in Christ’s atonement, are too numerous to be all adduced; and it is self-evident, that to those who fail in constantly keeping Christ’s precepts, they must of course be “insufficient for salvation;” and John has already told us, that he who says he does not, “deceives himself and the truth is not in him.” But “insignificant” they are not. They shew the man who /107 duly weighs them, the greatness of his own transgressions, and urge him to flee for refuge to the hope set before him in the atonement of Christ; they invite the humbled sinner thus to come to him, while pointing out the extent and spirituality of the divine law, they serve to direct the believer in his future course, to humble him under his greatest attainments, and constrain him to cleave to Christ’s atonement to the last moment of his life.

§826 His asking whether Christ’s saying in Matt. v–vii, do not afford “a stable foundation on which may be raised the indestructible edifice of eternal life,”<sup>2</sup> discovers no less inattention. To this we answer, that they do, but not through human merit; Mt 5:3 for the very first of them is, “blessed are the *poor in spirit*, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.” He who thinks he has an atom of merit to plead before God, however, *is not* poor in spirit: he has something of his own to bring before God; while he who is poor in spirit, feels that he has nothing but guilt to plead, and flies to the cross of Christ for refuge. Another saying destroys every hope arising from men’s obedience and merit, “Verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one title shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled;” and if so, surely its penalty, its curse, cannot pass away, till it be fulfilled in the death of the sinner or of his Surety Ga 3:13f. “who hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us.” Another saying, “Agree with thine adversary quickly,” unless our Lord wholly confined Mt 5:25 himself to human affairs when no such case was before him, gives no very obscure advice relative to our seeking that Almighty Surety who can on our behalf answer the utmost demands of the divine law violated by us. And a fourth, cuts up /108 by Mt 7:18 the roots the whole of our author’s doctrine by declaring; “neither can a *corrupt tree* bring forth *good fruit*.” Until our author can erase the Divine records therefore, the declaration, pronounced after the most solemn examination made by God himself, Ps 14:3 “Men are all gone aside; they are all together become filthy, there is none that doeth good, no not one,” his system of salvation by human merit, must lie prostrate in the dust.

<sup>1</sup> §466. <sup>2</sup> §467; Rammohan was referring to Mt 7:24f..

To the question, “Did not Jesus declare in his description of the day of judgment that acts of charity and beneficence toward fellow-creatures, will be accepted as the manifestation of love towards God, and be the sufficient cause of eternal life?”<sup>1</sup> we answer, that they manifest the reality of that faith in Christ’s Atonement which “worketh by love,” and without which no one will ever enter heaven. But it has been already shewn, that they cannot be the “sufficient cause of eternal life;” for if examined as perfect obedience to a Divine law, the best of these works would justly bring a curse on the soul through the sin mixed with them. Did the redeemed indeed esteem these the “sufficient cause of eternal life,” how could they adore Christ, as having *washed them from their sins in his own blood?*

§827

Mt 25:31–46

Ga 5:6

Rv 1:5f.

In telling the lawyer, “this do, and thou shalt live,” Jesus told him no more than the Divine law had told him before; as Paul witnesses, *Rom. x. 5.* “For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law, That *the man who doeth these things shall live in them.*” But Jesus did not say that he should live if he *did not continue to do these things:* and his examining whether he did them or not, might have convinced him that he did not, and have shewn him his need of a Redeemer. That this man did them not, is evident from its being the united voice of the Old and New Testament, that “all /109 have sinned and become guilty before God.” Hence “whatsoever the law saith,” even when perfected by Jesus according to our author, “it saith to them who are under the law,” as was this lawyer, “that every mouth may be stopped and all the world become guilty before God.” Unless Jesus therefore came to *destroy* the law, it inevitably follows, that his thus directing the lawyer to it, was, that his mouth might be stopped, and that he might find himself to be guilty before God. The same reasoning applies to every other case of this nature. Had our Lord told his disciples, that the man who does not continue in all things written in the law, *shall not be cursed,* and that “all men are not gone aside and together become filthy,” he would have come to *destroy* both the law and the prophets.

§828

Lk 10:25–28; Rm 10:5

Rm 3:19f.

Although to those who then had no idea that he was come to die at all, our Lord wisely forbore to point out the doctrine of his death as an atonement and the only way of salvation “in the same explicit manner” as he pointed them to the law, as enjoining “love to God and our neighbour,”<sup>2</sup> yet after he had actually “suffered for sins, the just for the unjust,” and his death was publicly known to all, he explicitly enjoined it on his apostles to build up his kingdom on this doctrine. Nor did he forbear to give numerous intimations to his disciples as they were able to bear them, which on duly weighing they themselves would find evidently leading them to the doctrine of the cross. Even his explicitly pointing men to the Divine law as enjoining perfect love to God and our neighbour, would lead as many to feel their need of his

§829

1 P 3:18

<sup>1</sup> §467. <sup>2</sup> §467.

atonement, as duly weighed their own state, since it would “stop their mouths and make them feel themselves guilty before God.” And so far is this from being “a mode of interpretation that would only suit our /110 convenience and render the Bible no longer a guide to mankind,”<sup>1</sup> that this doctrine unavoidably follows from interpreting the scripture justly by comparing one part with another and tracing their meaning to the bottom.

§830 While our author admits that the sentence, “If righteousness come by the law, Christ is dead in vain,” includes the moral law as given by Moses, his comment frustrates the design of Christ’s coming into the world. “St. Paul knowing the efficacy of the perfection introduced by Jesus into the law given by Moses, declares, that had the system of the Mosaical law been sufficient to produce light among the Jews and Gentiles without being perfected by Jesus, this attempt made by Christ to perfect it would have been superfluous, and his death which was the consequence of his candid instructions, would have been to no purpose.”<sup>2</sup> We beg here to ask, What “perfection” did Jesus introduce into the *moral* law given by Moses? Was not this law, the essence of which is, “thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and thy neighbour as thyself,” perfect of itself? What did Christ add thereto? Is there a single precept given by Jesus which is not comprehended in love to God or to our neighbour? And as for the *ceremonial* law, *that* he came to abolish, a strange way of rendering it perfect.

Mk 12:29–31

§831 To *fulfil* the moral law is as different from *perfecting* it, as light from darkness; it is to yield obedience to it as being already perfect. To fulfil the ceremonial law, was, not to add to it, but to abolish it, as Paul declares Christ to have done.<sup>3</sup> Further, if Christ had perfected the law, it must have continued *the law* still; this could not change its nature and render it no law; and it is *of this very law* AFTER Christ had introduced all this supposed perfection into it, that Paul speaks when /111 he says, “if righteousness come by the law, Christ is dead in vain.” Hence this axiom, which stands firm to all eternity, takes away the most distant hope of our obtaining remission of sins by our repentance or any other act of obedience to the law, even if it had been thus perfected as our author affirms, and fixes it wholly on the death of Christ as the only sufficient cause of our salvation, declaring as it does, that to mention our righteousness as its sufficient cause, is, to “frustrate the grace of God,” and say, that “Christ is dead in vain.”

§832 Further, is our author aware of the consequences of his thus asserting that the

---

<sup>1</sup> §468. <sup>2</sup> §470.

<sup>3</sup> Marshman alludes to Mt 5:17f., where Jesus states he came to “fulfil” the law. The meaning of *πληρῶω* (KJV: “fulfil”) can be understood as “confirmed”, “completed”, “fulfilling” by living according to its rules, or even “fulfilling” and ending it by his death, see Luz, *Mt Bd.* 1, 309-310.

death of Christ “was in consequence of his candid instructions,”<sup>1</sup> instead of being an atonement for sin? Is he aware that *it pleased* JEHOVAH *to bruise him*? Will our author venture to affirm that a holy God *bruised him in CONSEQUENCE of his candid instructions*? Did Jehovah say, “Awake, O sword, against the man that is my fellow,” because of his candid instructions? To say this, is to sap the foundation of all religion both natural and revealed, by holding forth the Divine Being, with awful reverence be it spoken, as acting in the most iniquitous manner towards a being perfectly sinless and holy. Is 53  
Zc 13:7

The same inattention pervades our author’s declaration that “Repentance alone is the sure and only remedy for human failure,”<sup>2</sup> and that it can procure us the blessings or pardon, *without the atonement of Christ*. Even a child in divinity would scarcely have blundered in this manner. It is indeed true that God never yet pardoned a sinner without repentance, and that every sacrifice brought him without real repentance, was an insult to him. He never pardons the sinner who despises Him and forgiveness too; but does any one who is not blinded by his ideas of human merit, ever dream that /112 a sinner deserves pardon and life through the merit of his saying from the heart, “I deserve death?” This is in its own nature impossible. What is perfect and adequate repentance? It is the love of God revived in the heart, so as to cause a man to abhor himself for having at all sinned against God. This then is obedience to the command, “thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart.” If perfect and complete then, it is neither more nor less than an act of righteousness commanded by the law. It is therefore wholly cut off by the axiom already quoted, “If righteousness come by the law, Christ is dead in vain.” The accepting of repentance as righteousness, or as a “sufficient cause of pardon,” would wholly frustrate the grace of God and declare that “Christ is dead in vain.” §833

The Apostle writing to the Galatians when they wished to substitute obedience as matter of righteousness, at once sets every thing of this nature aside on one general principle; “whosoever of you are justified by the law, *he is fallen from grace*,”—“*Christ is become of none effect to you*.” Whether it be therefore repentance, or love the only source of genuine obedience, or any other act, he who brings it “as the sufficient cause of pardon,” at once renounces Christ. Nor does the apostle allow of the *least mixture* of works or obedience, as the sufficient cause of pardon; His language is “if it be of works, it is no more of grace, otherwise *grace is no more grace*.” But they who are saved by Christ are saved by “the *GRACE of the Lord Jesus Christ*.” Hence he who seeks salvation on account of his repentance as its sufficient cause, may be a Hindoo, §834  
Ga 5:3  
Rm 11:6  
Ac 15:11

<sup>1</sup> §470.

<sup>2</sup> §471: “The guilt occasioned by the want of due obedience to the precepts in question may be pardoned through repentance, prescribed by the author of those precepts as the sure and only remedy for human failure.”

or he may be a Moosulman; but of Christ as a Saviour he as yet knows nothing.

§835 This then would be the case even if the repentance our author holds up as the only means of procuring pardon, /113 were perfect and adequate, if it noticed every sin, and were as deep as the sin is great. But is there any man on earth whose repentance is thus adequate to the heinousness of his sins against God? Who can understand all his errors? or who does not again in some degree relapse into sin, yea the very sin of which he has professed to repent? Then such a man does not yield full obedience to this law of repentance; he does not “continue in” what it justly requires; he is a transgressor even of this command. If he therefore feel as he ought, he will himself be ashamed even of his repentance, and feel his mouth stopped and himself constrained to plead guilty before God. Hence, abhorring himself for the sin which cleaves even to his repentance, he shudders at the thought of bringing it before God as the *only*, or as ANY ground on which he deems himself deserving of pardon. Such an idea might enter the mind of a Hindoo, who while he knows that his deeds render him worthy of hell, still thinks that there is something so meritorious in certain others as justly to entitle him to heaven; but it was never yet acted upon by a real christian. The death of Christ is the only atonement he dares to mention before God.

§836 Farther, repentance itself is the fruit of the Saviour’s *grace*, as well as forgiveness; He GIVES “repentance to Israel and the forgiveness of sins:” and to make the receiving of one gift from God the “sufficient cause” of deserving another, is a pitch of arrogance quite unknown to the poor in spirit—and theirs alone is the kingdom of heaven.

§847 God never bestows forgiveness on the sinner without repentance, however. The hardened sinner, who, never repenting of sin, would of course go on therein without compunction throughout eternity, has no share in forgiveness. To pardon him, would be to fill heaven itself /114 with contumacious iniquity and rebellion. Hence our Lord came to call sinners to repentance as well as to receive pardon; and he declared to the Jews, “except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish.” Hence too the sacrifices of the hardened sinner were formerly “an abomination to the Lord.” They were a solemn mockery, since the sinner pretended to bring a beast to atone for sin which he did not deem evil, and in which therefore, he really intended to persevere. Hence the sacrifices of God are declared to be, a broken heart, which God will not despise; and hence Ezekiel exhorted Israel to turn from *their iniquities* that they might not be their ruin, as they certainly would, if they persisted in them, notwithstanding all their mockery of sacrifices. Hence also Isaiah declares, “though your sins be as scarlet they shall be white as snow,” without the least hint however that the sinner’s “coming and reasoning with God” took them away. Instead of this he declares “HE was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities,” and “the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquities of us all;” a strange procedure this, if they could

be taken away by our repentance. In what manner could our author have read the scriptures to mistake in this palpable manner?

That to the declaration “that human justice inquires not about the repentance of the robber and murderer, but respecting his guilt,”<sup>1</sup> our author should reply nothing; but, turning from the subject, merely “wish to know whether or not human justice suffers an innocent man to be killed to atone for the guilt of theft or murder committed by another,”<sup>2</sup> is in reality giving up his cause relative to the efficacy of repentance. He offers *nothing in reply* to the arguments against it; for what he has added belongs to another subject. Even that /115 however we will by no means overlook when we come to examine his objections brought against the Atonement, merely adding here, that no case can occur among men which can be parallel to that between God and his offending creatures; and that therefore we can *safely* affirm that God *cannot* admit of an Atonement, an Almighty Surety for sinners, it is incumbent on us “to find out the Almighty to perfection.” Even human laws allow a man to become surety for the debts of another, which he never contracted himself, and this is at least admitting the principle. To prevent our author’s complaining of neglect, we have thus examined his Introductory Observations; and now proceed to his arguments against the ATONEMENT of *Him* who once “suffered for sins, the just for the unjust to bring us to God.”

[Section II. Rammohun Roy’s objections to the evidence for the Atonement adduced from the Pentateuch, considered]

Previously to adducing evidence for the *Atonement* and the *Deity* of Christ, we observed, that as all Divine Revelation originates in the spirit of God, *one* passage clearly proving either of these doctrines, is quite sufficient, since twenty cannot render a doctrine more true than one; and the only reason why we can wish for more than one, is, that if one stand alone we *may possibly* mistake its meaning. We also mentioned, that evidence of the Atonement and the Deity of Christ may be obtained from *Five different Sources*; the writers of the Old Testament,—our Lord’s own declarations,—the language of the Evangelists,—the Apostolic writings,—and the testimony of the blessed above as given by John in the Revelation; and that the concurrent testimony of any two of these, although it cannot of course make it the more true, may more fully convince us that we have not mistaken their meaning.<sup>3</sup> Of these five sources, as our author had intimidated that “were it a practice among Christians to /116 study first the Old Testament as found arranged in order,—and then to study the New Testament, comparing the one with the other, Christianity would no longer be liable to be encroached upon by human opinions,”<sup>4</sup> we began with the Old Testament that we might meet him on his own ground, although the

<sup>1</sup> §286. <sup>2</sup> §473. <sup>3</sup> §§294-299. <sup>4</sup> §255.



evidence found in the Old Testament, must of course be more obscure than that given us by the New. We began by adducing the first promise made to man, as at least *implying* the Atonement of the Messiah, in the declaration, “It (or he) shall bruise thy head and thou shalt bruise his heel.” In attempting to repel this, our author employs four pages, with what success we shall now examine.

Gn 3:15

§840

In reply to our asking, “[what could a reptile feel relative to the fate of its offspring through future ages? and of what individual serpent did the seed of the woman break the head, so as for it to bruise his heel?](#)”<sup>1</sup> he is constrained to admit, that a reptile as far as human experience goes, is incapable of feeling relative to the fate of its offspring through future ages. Still to free Satan from this malediction, he wishes to know “[if a mere reptile could not have the power of conversation so as to persuade a woman to adhere to its advice, whether the ass of Balaam could be possessed of the power of seeing exclusively the angel of God and conversing with Balaam, and whether ravens could diligently supply the wants of Elijah by bringing him bread and flesh morning and evening;—and whether we are to understand the ass and those ravens as either angelical or demoniacal spirits, as the reptile \(serpent\) is represented to have been no other than Satan?](#)”<sup>2</sup> To this we reply; that we are not sure that the ravens were at all endued with rationality, or that any miracle was /117 wrought on them beyond their being so guided by Him who had endued them originally with instinct, that for a season they took bread and flesh and brought it to Elijah. If however they acted rationally for a season, it was their Maker who enabled them thus to act; and he is expressly said to have opened the mouth of the Ass. But while we most firmly believe these facts, we cannot believe that God endued the serpent with rationality for a season, that he might cause men to sin against their Maker, till we are certain that he loves iniquity.

1 K 17:1-7

Nb 22:21-35

§841

If our author indeed will carefully examine the conversation of the serpent with the woman, he will find little difficulty in ascertaining from whom the ideas came. He will find it to be, not simply the act of a rational being, but of one breathing such horrible malice against God, and such hatred to man, united too with such daring and subtle falsehood, that it can have been only the act of one of the most wicked and depraved of beings. Now unless our author believes in the fall of beasts and their consequent malice against their Maker, and this too before the fall of man, (and if he does, we assure him that we do not,) this could not be the language of a reptile alone, it must be that of some impious, false, and malicious rational being, speaking by him. Unless God communicated to the serpent therefore, not only the power of acting rationally for a season, but all this impiety, falsehood, and malice, that he might tempt and destroy man, as he enabled Balaam’s ass to reprove his master’s madness,

---

<sup>1</sup> §300. <sup>2</sup> §475.



there is no way whatever of averting the crime and the malediction from Satan. And we cannot believe that the early religious prejudices of our author, are now so strong on his mind as to make him ascribe to God all the iniquity of deceiving and seducing our /118 first parents. We think he will not find it difficult to identify “the serpent who beguiled Eve by his subtilty,” according to Paul, with “that old Serpent the Devil, who deceiveth the whole world,” mentioned by John, and of whom our Lord declares, John viii. 44. “He was a murderer from the beginning and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it.”

2 Co 11:3

Rv 12:9

Jn 8:44

While therefore we do not deny that a real serpent was the apparent speaker, nor that the malediction was denounced on a reptile as far as it could apply to him, if he who was a superior to the serpent in malice and impiety as in rationality, had no share in this malediction, what becomes of Divine justice? It must therefore be between his seed and the seed of the woman who was manifested to destroy the works of the devil, that the enmity exists, and to him must righteously belong all that is included in bruising the head of the serpent. For the following paragraph we blush when we consider that our Author lays claim to such a knowledge of the Scripture;

§842

“But in fact has the power of Satan over the seed of the woman been destroyed? The consequences of the sin which our first parents committed by the ill advice of the reptile, and which they implanted in the nature of their posterity, have been, that women bring forth children in sorrow, and are ruled by their husbands, and that the earth brings forth thorns also, and thistles to men who eat the herbs of the field with labour and return at last to dust. (Genesis iii. 16–19.) If Jesus actually atoned for sin and delivered men from its consequences; how can those men and women who believe in his atonement be still, equally with others, liable to the evil effects of the sins already remitted by the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus?”<sup>1</sup>

§843

Can any one who really understands the Scriptures /119 believe that these are the only or even the chief consequences of sin? Is the reign of sin in the heart nothing, from which Christ saves all his real followers? Is “the wrath to come” nothing, from which Christ delivers his people? From this may the Redeemer deliver him.

§844

1 Th 1:10

Still our author, terming what he has advanced, “facts and arguments,” declares that should they fail, and “Jesus be really the seed of the woman, this cannot apply in the least to the doctrine of the Atonement. It would imply only that as Satan opposed the power of Jesus to procure salvation for all men as he intended, so Jesus diminished his power, and disappointed him by leading many to salvation through his divine precepts.”<sup>2</sup> Does this mean any thing at all? We have already shown

§845

<sup>1</sup> §476. <sup>2</sup> §477.

that no precepts however perfect, can lead any to glory who do not *perfectly obey them*; and that if we say we have no sin, (or that we perfectly obey them) we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us. Hence there is no way in which Jesus himself can lead any one to glory but by his fulfilling the law for them, his atoning for their sins, and, of his free grace, working all their works in them. While the prophet declares, “the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquities of us all,” the apostle adds, “In whom we have redemption *through his blood* even the forgiveness of sins;”<sup>1</sup> and the blessed in heaven, “unto him that loved us and *washed us from our sins in his own blood.*” This threefold testimony to the Atonement can our Author invalidate?

Is 53; Col 1:14

Rv 1:5f.

§846

We then adduced the sacrifice of Abel, as proof that sacrifices were offered by the first human household and accepted of God; and observed, that a man who in a right spirit brought a living creature and offered it for sacrifice, thereby declared his own desert of death for sin, and that he offered the victim instead of himself. We then /120 adverted to the fact, that although God graciously accepted sacrifices when brought with these feelings of repentance and self condemnation, it was not on account of any power in the sacrifice to take away sin, because “it is impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sin;” but that God’s acceptance of these sacrifices thus accompanied with repentance and faith, arose from their pointing to the future atonement to be made by the Messiah, confirming this by Heb. vii. “Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not; but a body hast thou prepared me.” We expected our author would have attempted to invalidate this chain of scripture evidence in favor of the atonement by evidence from scripture against it. Of such evidence he adduces—*not a word.*

Heb 10:4–7

§847

He adds however, “I am unable to find out what relation there could exist between the acceptance of the offering of Abel by Jehovah, and the death of Jesus whether sacrificial or not.”<sup>2</sup> That this is no argument against it is fully evident. He himself may regard sin as too trifling a thing to need any atonement; or he may think that a man is quite able to atone for his own sins, and hence may wish never to find the atonement of Christ in the Scriptures; for it cannot prophesy good unto him but evil, unless he renounce all his hope in his own deeds of repentance, and fly for refuge to the hope set before him. The question here is, what connection his readers who feel themselves “poor in spirit,” and with the Apostle count all their own righteousness “loss and dung,” can see between sacrifices and Christ’s atonement; and unless he can shew by solid scripture evidence that we have been mistaken, and this he does not even attempt, his not seeing it himself, with them will weigh little indeed.

Mt 5:3

Ph 3:8

<sup>1</sup> Marshman quotes literally from Col 1:14. In modern editions the words “through his blood” (διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ) are excised on text-critical grounds. A parallel phrase we find in Ep 1:7.

<sup>2</sup> §478.

Our author endeavours to raise a shadow of objection to this chain of evidence by saying, that we founded Abel's having looked forward to the atonement of Jesus "on Abraham's seeing the day of Christ by prophetic anticipation, and on Moses's having esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt."<sup>1</sup> The reader can easily see that we founded it on nothing of the kind; and that it stands quite independent of these facts, although these were fruits of the same faith. §848

Our Author now adverting to the apostolic declaration that, "by faith Abel offered a more excellent sacrifice than Cain," and that "without faith it is impossible to please him, for he that cometh to God must believe that he is and that he is a rewarder of all those that diligently seek him;" adds, "here Paul gives us to understand that the faith which procured for Abel, Enoch, Noah, and all the other patriarchs, the grace of God, was their belief in the existence of God and in his being their rewarder, and not in any sacrifice personal or vicarious."<sup>2</sup> We here ask; and does faith PROCURE the grace of God? What! a man's faith, or even his repentance "procure" God's free favor! And this idea fathered upon St. Paul too! Such an idea he would have rejected with unspeakable abhorrence. A man's money procures him food, for he buys it; a man's excellent qualities procure him admiration, for they merit it; his good conduct procures him general esteem, for he deserves it. But can a man's faith procure, or deserve God's free grace? Surely this would well comport with a Hindoo's belief that though he has done many wicked deeds, yet his good actions will still "procure" him a place in heaven. §849  
Heb 11:4; 6

Let us examine Paul on this point. He insists, that if any thing be procured by works or righteous deeds, whether these be faith, or repentance, or love, then "it is no more of GRACE," "otherwise work is no more work;" and that if any thing be of grace, it is no longer procured by WORKS, "otherwise grace is no more grace." Nay respecting *faith*, he, Eph. ii. explicitly declares, that instead of its PROCURING the grace of God, *it is given BY his grace*, "For by grace are ye saved through faith, and this not of yourselves, *it is the gift of God*," and that it is thus freely given, that salvation might not be "of works," whether of faith, or love, or repentance, "lest any man should boast" of having procured it for himself. Until the fruit therefore originate the tree from which it springs, our author's doctrine must destroy itself. He would do well to study St. Paul more closely before he favors us with any more comments on his meaning. §850  
Rm 11:6  
Ep 1:8-10

Indeed if we thoroughly examine Paul's definition of faith even in this passage, Heb. xi. we shall see that it unavoidably includes a belief in the Atonement: "He that cometh to God must believe that he is." But what is included in believing that God §851

<sup>1</sup> §478. <sup>2</sup> §479.

is? That he is possessed of every perfection. Deprive him of one of these, and we no longer have a just idea of God,—we believe in an idol of our own imagination. But *justice* and *truth* are perfections of God; and he that really cometh to him must believe that he *is just* and *true*, and consequently the righteous *punisher* of the guilty, who have violated his holy law; otherwise what becomes of his truth which declares, “The soul that sinneth shall die?” These patriarchs however, knew that they were sinners; and that justice and truth required the execution of the law upon them. But he is also a God of *mercy*; yet how could *mercy* be exercised without violating *justice* and *truth*? Only through a Mediator, “whom God hath set forth a propitiation through faith in his blood, to de-/123clare his righteousness in the remission of sins—that he might be *just* and yet the justifier” or *forgiver* “of him that believeth in Jesus.”

Ezk 18:4  
Rm 3:24–26  
Jn 14:6

This will appear still more evident when we recollect our Lord’s declaration, “no man *cometh* to the father but by me.” “He that cometh to God” therefore, *must come through Christ*. Hence as these patriarchs knew their own sin and guilt, it is evident, that in coming to God, they must have come through the future Messiah, and have had either a more clear or more obscure view of his atonement.

§852 That Abraham thus beheld Christ, and by prophetic anticipation rejoiced in contemplating the day when, having “redeemed men from the curse of the law, by being *made a curse* for them,” he should cause “the blessing of Abraham to come on the Gentiles,” we have the united evidence of Paul and of our Lord himself. And that Moses esteemed the reproach of Christ\* greater riches than the treasures of Egypt, is also testified by St. Paul. And how Moses felt interested in *Christ’s DEATH* and its design, may be learned from the joy with which he and Elias, after spending so many centuries in heaven, made it the grand subject of conversation, when, appearing in glory on the holy mount, “they spake of his decease which he should accomplish in Jerusalem.” Quere, did he learn it in heaven, or was he acquainted with it before?

Ga 3:13f.

§853 Our author now has fourteen or fifteen pages against sacrifices in general as pointing to an atonement. These, /124 as we wish to *follow him* that we may give him every advantage, rather than chuse our own course, we will now carefully examine. He begins them, p. 31, with observing that “*sacrifices are divine institutions as a manifestation of obedience to God through the oblation of any thing that may be dear to man, whether common as an animal, or dearly valuable as a man’s own*

\* To our author’s critical hint that “*the Israelites were called Christs, or anointed;*” we answer, that this being well known to Paul, had he meant to say “the reproach of the Israelites” he could easily have substituted, “Israel” for “Christ.” No instance however occurs in his writings of his using “Christ” to express “Israel,” or to express any one but the Lord Jesus. The Socinian comment of Crellius, Lindsey, and others, “*such reproach as Christ endured,*” overthrows itself. Did Moses endure shame and spitting, and scourging, and crucifixion? and from the Israelites themselves?<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Rammohan had all this quoted from NTIV, *Ed.* 5, 473, in §478, note.

son”<sup>1</sup> This representation we cannot consider as correct. The doctrine of sacrifices as prefiguring the atonement, is not that of men’s offering *any thing* that may be dear to them. Where for instance, (Abraham excepted,) are men commanded to offer their sons in sacrifice, or their wives, or their parents, though unspeakably dearer than any beast? Nor was it merely as an *oblation* that beasts were offered, but as *sacrifices*, to be deprived of life, and either partially or wholly consumed with fire. This attempt to disguise the nature of sacrifices, instead of bringing fair arguments against the doctrine, we are unable to commend. Of course we never said that they had “*intrinsically the power of procuring men pardon,*”<sup>2</sup> when we have so often quoted the apostolic declaration, that it is “impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sin.”

In adding page 32, that “*they seem, in fact, intended for men unaccustomed to the worship of God in spirit and truth,*”<sup>3</sup> our author does not seem to have weighed the consequences of his own assertion. Were Noah and Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, unaccustomed to the worship of God in spirit and in truth? Were Moses, and Aaron, and Joshua, and Samuel? Was the man after God’s own heart, and Jehoshaphat, and Hezekiah, and Josiah? Were Elijah and Elisha? So far indeed were sacrifices from being “*intended*” for those “*unaccustomed to the worship of God in spirit and in truth,*” that if /125 ever they were offered by such, they were instantly rejected, as appears from the very examples which he has quoted to confirm his assertion! Thus the quotation from Micah vi. Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of ram, &c.—What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God? complains of what beside *their not* worshipping God in spirit and in truth? “Indeed walking humbly with God,” forbad a man’s bringing his repentance to God to “procure” his grace, and led him to bring a beast to be slain in his stead to shew that he himself deserved death, and expected God’s favor wholly through a real atonement which this prefigured. Thus also God declares Hosea vi. 6, that sacrifice and burnt offerings are vain, unless mercy, and the knowledge of God dwell in the heart, i. e. unless God be worshipped in spirit and in truth. Thus Isaiah I. “To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me?” Why this interrogation? They did not worship him in spirit and in truth. “It was iniquity, even their solemn meeting. Their hands were full of blood.” But did he ever forbid or frown on the *sacrifices* of those who worshipped him in spirit and in truth? In how many instances did he testify his approbation of them by causing fire to come down from heaven to consume them! It is the sacrifice of the wicked only, i. e. of

§854

Mi 6:7f.

Ho 6:6

Is 1:16–18

<sup>1</sup> §480.

<sup>2</sup> §480: “But they are not represented in any of the sacred books as means having intrinsically the power of procuring men pardon and eternal salvation.”

<sup>3</sup> §480.

those who *do not* worship him in spirit and in truth, which is “an abomination to the Lord.”

§855 To our Author’s question (p. 33,) “Does not Jehovah here substitute good works alone for sacrifices as real means of taking away sin?”<sup>1</sup> We answer, No. The prophet  
 Is 53 declares “The Lord hath laid on Him the iniquities of *us ALL*,” which includes the iniquities of all who have ever done good works: and if God himself laid our iniquities upon Christ, of course they were never taken away /126 by our good works. Further,  
 Ps 50:8–15 the reasoning of our author, that because God had said, “Will I eat the flesh of bulls and drink the blood of goats?” therefore he had no delight in the death of his dear Son, which he chuses to term having “*delight in human blood*,”<sup>2</sup> is directly contrary to the declaration of scripture. Did it not *please* the Father to bruise Him? Did he not  
 Zc 13:7 say, “Awake, O sword against the man who is my fellow?” Did not our Lord himself submit to even the accursed death of the cross, *because* it was his father’s will? Did  
 Jn 10:17f. he not previously declare, “*Therefore* doth my father *love* me *because* I lay down my life?” Is it not strange that our author should thus commit himself and his cause by such gross ignorance of the Scriptures?

§856 He adds, (p. 34,) It is now left for us to ascertain in what sense we should take such phrases as, “This man after he had offered one sacrifice for sins.” “Christ hath once appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.” “Jesus also that he might sanctify the people with his own blood suffered without the gate.” “I am the living bread. If any man eat of this,” &c.<sup>3</sup> We hope that our author’s representing the *fact*  
 Jn 6:51 of Christ’s suffering without the gate, as equally figurative with his saying, “if any man eat of this bread,” &c. is done without design; but if it be,—if he himself believes them to be equally figurative, he deceives himself; as the first is a literal fact, the subject of history, and the latter so evidently figurative that to understand it literally would be absurdity of which a child could not be guilty. Whatever child yet thought that Jesus Christ was literally *bread*? Unless we take the inspired penmen for men who wished to deceive, or men ignorant of the common meaning of words, we must take the “phrases” which speak of Christ’s /127 death in the sense of plain narrative detailing a *real fact*.

§857 Our Author asks however, (p. 34,) “Do they mean that Jesus knowing already that the fulfilment of his divine commission would endanger his life, never hesitated to execute it, and suffered his blood to be shed in saving men from sin through his divine precepts and pure example, which were both opposed to the religious system adopted by his contemporary Jews?”<sup>4</sup> This interrogation is too shallow to bear examination. It has been already shewn that Divine precepts can never save those who violate them, which is done by all men in a greater or less degree; and

<sup>1</sup> §480. <sup>2</sup> §480. <sup>3</sup> §481. <sup>4</sup> §481.

that Paul who wrote AFTER Christ's precepts were all delivered, has settled this point for ever. Every one of Christ's precepts falls within the first or the second table of the divine law. But the Apostle has declared that by the deeds of the law even thus perfected, "shall no flesh be justified in God's sight," for "by the law is the knowledge of sin," in other words, by comparing our deeds with the law we learn how much we fall short of fulfilling its precepts, and how fully we are under its curse, since its language is, "cursed is every one, that CONTINUETH not in ALL things written in the book of the law to do them." Nor is his "pure example" more capable of saving us, as it only condemns us by shewing how different our conduct is from his. To talk of a sinful man's being saved by "the divine precepts and pure example" of Christ, is contradicting the whole current of scripture. To plead our keeping his precepts and imitating his example as the "sufficient cause" of forgiveness, instead of "procuring," would "frustrate the grace of God" and declare that "Christ is dead in vain." Rm 3:20 Ga 3:10 Ga 2:21

Our author's talking of our Lord's "*endangering* /128 his life by fulfilling his commission," is sufficiently weak. To "*lay down*" and not merely to "endanger" his life, was the very subject of his commission; it was his commission itself. Not only did he humble himself that he *might* become obedient unto death,—not only was he made a little lower than the angels that he MIGHT *taste death for every man*, but, as has been already mentioned, after having declared that his father loved him *because* he laid down his life, and that he laid it down of himself without *any man's taking* it from him, our Lord adds, "*this commandment have I received of my Father.*" Why then say that Jesus "*endangered*" his life by fulfilling his divine commission? his Father's commandment was not fulfilled till he had, not merely "endangered," but actually *laid down* his life. §858 Heb 2:9 Jn 10:17f.

His adding (p. 35) "*Were we to take all these phrases in their strictly literal sense, we must be persuaded to believe, that God not being contented with the blood of bulls and goats and other animal sacrifices, offered to him by the Israelites, insisted upon the offer of the blood and life of his son as the condition of his forgiving the sins of men,*"<sup>1</sup> is in reality saying, that if we must take these passages in their strictly literal sense "we shall be persuaded to believe"—precisely what God has declared to be the truth, that sacrifice and offering, and burnt offerings, and offerings for sin, having in them "no intrinsic value," it was "impossible that they could take away sins;" and that hence he hath set forth Jesus "a propitiation through faith in his blood for the remission even of sins that are past." We leave our author's representing God as "*delighting in human victims,*" with God himself. His saying "*human victims,*" when he knows that the scriptures speak only of *One Saviour's* offering himself, and his coupling the expressions *relative* to eating Christ's flesh which are so Rm 3:24–26 §859

<sup>1</sup> §481.



evidently figurative, with those which describe the *actual fact* of Christ's suffering without the gate of Jerusalem, that he might thereby represent God as "[directing men to cannibalism](#),"<sup>1</sup> must excite the pity of good men for himself, and for the cause which needs such means of support.

§860 Relative to "[avoiding the stigma on the pure religion of Christ](#),"<sup>2</sup> he may either avoid or bear that of "cannibalism," as he likes, as it is of his own creation; but let  
 Heb 9:25–28 him not attempt to take away the stigma of Christ's having "offered up himself" "a sacrifice" "to bear the sins of many," lest he bring on himself the thunder of the apostle Paul's denunciations. Would Paul have thanked him for his anxiety to take away this stigma? Would he not have felt it as robbing him of his highest glory? "God forbid," says he, "that I should *glory* save *in the cross of Christ*."—Yea he determined to know nothing save Jesus Christ and *him crucified*. Had any taught such doctrine in his days, would not he have esteemed them the enemies of the cross of Christ? Would he have shewn them any more mercy than he did those in 2 *Cor.* xi. of whom  
 Ga 6:14 he declared, "For such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ?" Does not this desire to avoid the stigma of a crucified Saviour, form a key to the arguments and the course of our author? We pray that it may not be his eternal ruin.  
 2 Co 11:13

§861 Our author's question (p. 36,) whether "[this belief in the unbounded beneficence of Jesus ought not to excite superior gratitude, love, and reverence to him, than that he, as God above mortal afflictions, borrowed human nature for a season, and offered this fictitious man as a sacrifice for the remission of sin, while he himself was no more affected with that sacrificial death than /130 with the sufferings of other human individuals](#),"<sup>3</sup> the redeemed above have decided, who "see him as he is." But their opinion is fully against his; for it is, "Thou art worthy, *FOR thou wast slain* and hast *redeemed us to God by thy blood*, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation." Here his redeeming by "his precepts or his example," (if the blessed ever deemed this redemption,) is so eclipsed by his redeeming *by his blood*, that it is completely swallowed up thereby. Must not our author learn the same song before he can obtain a place among them?  
 1 Jn 3:2  
 Rv 5:9

§862 His next sentence excites our fear and our pity "[If there be in this latter case any gratitude felt for the afflictions which attached to the death of the cross, it should be manifested to that temporary man Jesus, and not to Jesus the Christ, whom the Editor and other Trinitarians esteem as God above pain and death](#)."<sup>4</sup> For his terming the blessed Jesus a "*fictitious*" and "*temporary*" man, we leave him to answer before that *Man*, when he shall come in the clouds to judge the world and *every eye* shall see him, (his among the rest,)—and men shall say to the rocks and mountains, "fall  
 Rv 1:7  
 Rv 6:15–17

<sup>1</sup> §481. <sup>2</sup> §482. <sup>3</sup> §483. <sup>4</sup> §483.



on us and hide us from the face of him that sitteth upon the throne and from the wrath of the Lamb; for the great day of his wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand?" But we cannot avoid noticing with pity the ignorance of the scriptures discovered in affirming, that it was not Jesus "the Christ" who suffered. In this he flatly contradicts Jesus himself when addressing the two disciples, going to Emmaus, "O fools and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken! Ought not *Christ to have suffered* these things and to enter into his glory?"—and his parting address after he had enabled them to understand the /131 scriptures; "thus it is written, and thus it behoved CHRIST *to suffer* and to rise from the dead the third day;"—and Paul, Acts xxvi.—"saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come: that CHRIST *should suffer*;"—and Peter "for CHRIST *also hath once suffered for sins*, the just for the unjust to bring us to God." After this, who can rely on him respecting any point of scripture doctrine? Lk 24:13–27; 46

With scarcely less ignorance of scripture does he urge against the doctrine of atonement, (p. 37) that "*sins have been pardoned in consequence of the intercession of righteous men without any atonement.*"<sup>1</sup> All this is cut off by one scripture declaration made with an immediate allusion to the Old Testament history; "*without shedding of blood there is no remission.*" The question is not whether Moses and David and Hezekiah offered sacrifice *every time* they prayed for themselves or for others; but whether they ever thus interceded without a view to that "shedding of blood by which remission is brought." Unless God had *two* ways of pardoning sin, it inevitably follows, that, he never pardoned it, but with a view to that propitiation for sin he was about to set forth, "that he might be just" and yet the forgiver of sins, and that when the prophets interceded either for themselves or others, if they did it with no view to this great propitiation, prefigured by their stated sacrifices, they were never heard. §863  
Heb 9:22

That our author should think that "*to represent the blood of God in human form in lieu of animal blood, an indispensable atonement for sin, is unscriptural,*"<sup>2</sup> is no wonder after the ignorance of scripture we have already seen; but, is it contrary to the scripture declarations that "without shedding of blood there is no remission,"—"the blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin?"—If he deem /132 it strange, (see p. 40,) that "*God who preserves man and beast, nor suffers a sparrow to fall to the ground without his permission, and by whom sacrifices were never desired for their own sake, should have caused millions of animals to be slaughtered at different times by men under the mistaken notion of their being an atonement for sins, while he has been remitting iniquity from eternity referring only to the real and sufficient atonement made by Jesus;*"<sup>3</sup> what has this to do with the *evidence* brought of its §864  
Heb 9:22; 1 Jn 1:7

<sup>1</sup> §484. <sup>2</sup> §485. <sup>3</sup> §486.

truth? Let him *disprove the evidence* adduced that God commanded and accepted sacrifices,—that yet in sacrifices and burnt-offerings simply considered, he had no delight—that “he prepared a body” for his son, and “set him forth a propitiation for sins through faith in his blood.” Until he do this, its being strange to him, can prove nothing. Does he expect to “find out the Almighty to perfection,” and this even in his way of saving men from the wrath to come? Does he expect that those things which the angels desire to look into, the “mystery of godliness” which will furnish matter to the blessed above for admiration and praise throughout eternity, should contain nothing strange to him?

Heb 10:4–7; Rm  
3:24–26

1 P 1:12; 1 Tm  
3:16

§865 That God should have accepted a burnt-offering from the hand of Abraham “*in the stead of Isaac*,” and that he should “*receive burnt-offering with reference solely to the future sacrifice of a being far superior in excellence to Isaac*,”<sup>1</sup> is inconsistent with what? with scripture evidence? The Scripture tells us that he forbad Abraham to sacrifice his son;—and that it PLEASED *him to bruise and put to grief* his own son and “make his soul an offering for sin.” What further evidence do we desire?

Is 53

§866 Does “*the author of the epistle to the Hebrews*” really declare the “*dissatisfaction of God with sacrifices in general terms without limiting them to any particular species whether of man or animal*?”<sup>2</sup> Does he declare God’s dissatisfaction with CHRIST’S sacrifice, when he declares that Christ after having *purged our sins*—after having “offered one sacrifice for sins” sat down at the right hand of the majesty on high? Did Christ do this without the Father’s approbation? What then can be weaker than our author’s assertion that after Christ had thus expressed God’s dissatisfaction with mere sacrifices and offerings in *Heb. x.* “Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not,” his saying, “but a body hast thou prepared me,” meant merely “*that God prepared a body for him through which he could impart to mankind the perfection of the will and laws of God, in a manner consistent with the divine nature, teaching them to yield to God a heartfelt, instead of a ceremonial and outward obedience, and thereby putting an end to the effusion of blood as a testimony of humility, gratitude, and devotion*?”<sup>3</sup> The assertion in fact destroys itself. What were the “*humility, gratitude and devotion*,” of which “*the effusion of the blood of sacrifices*” was intended as a testimony, but “*heart-felt obedience*?” Whence then did they learn that God required heart-felt obedience, before Jesus came? Were Moses, and Samuel, and David, and all the prophets ignorant that God required heart-felt obedience? If then Jesus had a body prepared him merely to teach men that God required “heart-felt obedience,” he came to do that which was done before he came! Where could our author’s knowledge of the scriptures be, to venture on such assertion?

Heb 1:1–4; 10:12

Heb 10:4–7

§867 What can our author’s idea be (p. 42) when he wishes us to believe that “*the*

<sup>1</sup> §487. <sup>2</sup> §488. <sup>3</sup> §488.

phrase the offering of the body of Jesus Christ means, the death of Jesus as a spiritual and virtual sacrifice for the sins of all those for /134 whom he became a mediator?"<sup>1</sup> Does he by a "spiritual and virtual sacrifice" for sins, mean an *actual* sacrifice? If he does, he accords with us, and gives up his cause. If he means any thing below an actual sacrifice, the Scriptures testify of Jesus, that he *actually* suffered for sins, "the just for the unjust to bring us to God." And we have yet to learn that he has any other way of bringing us to God, but through his blood and righteousness. To the stale and long exploded error that mankind render themselves worthy of the Divine mercy, by "sincere repentance offered by them instead of perfect duty,"<sup>2</sup> it is sufficient to reply, that the divine law knows nothing of repentance; its language is, "the soul that sinneth shall die." It therefore leaves the sinner no hope, but through the death of Christ as "redeeming us from the curse of the law by being made a curse for us."—Of course we can account for the Apostle's adopting with respect to Christ such terms as "sacrifice" and "atonement for sin" when these were used to prefigure the atonement of Christ and ceased, together with all the blood offerings which the Jews and their high priests were accustomed to offer for the remission of sins, when Christ, after he had "offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down at the right hand of God."

1 P 3:18

Ezk 18:4

Ga 3:13f.

Heb 10:12

Our author is at length driven to say, (p. 43,) "How inconsistent would it be in the author of the epistle to the Hebrews to declare in one place that God would not have sacrifice and offering, and again to announce almost at the same moment, that he was so pleased with sacrifice, even with a human sacrifice, (i. e. that of Christ,) that for its sake he would forgive the sins of the world."<sup>3</sup> This inconsistency exists wholly in his own mind. The Scriptures declare both of these facts, as has already been fully shewn. Even if it ap-/135peared inconsistent to any who revere the Divine writings, they would not readily reject what God's word has so fully declared. But to "the poor in spirit" who feel that in them "dwelleth no good thing," nothing appears *more* consistent, than that God, accepting sacrifices as leading the mind to Christ, should have yet no pleasure in them considered separately from his atonement; and that he should be well pleased with the propitiatory sacrifice of his dear Son, offered up to take away sin.

§868

Rm 7:18

That they who had been redeemed with the precious blood of Christ, should afterwards offer up "*spiritual* sacrifices" acceptable to God by Jesus Christ, and no more offer bodily sacrifices, proves the perfect efficacy of Christ's Atonement. Since without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins, had not Christ by one sacrifice for ever perfected them that are sanctified, they must still have offered sacrifice, or have been without remission of sins. But these sacrifices after the death of Christ

§869

Rm 12:1

<sup>1</sup> §489. <sup>2</sup> §489. <sup>3</sup> §490.

Heb 10:26 could not please God; for the apostle tells us that “if we sin wilfully after we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth *no more* sacrifice for sin, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and of fiery indignation that shall devour the adversary.” That the acceptance of our spiritual sacrifices, even the fruit of our lips giving thanks to his name, therefore, proclaims throughout eternity the efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ, who was ONCE offered *to take away the sins of many*, is confirmed by John, Rev. i. “Unto him that loved us and *washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests* unto God and his father.” That our author should bring men’s being made priests to God by Christ after being *washed from their sins in his own blood*, as a proof /136 that his blood *was never shed to wash any one from sin*, is a mode of proof peculiar to himself.

§870 To our author’s asking (p. 44), If protestant commentators understand the phrase  
 Jn 6:51–58 “unless ye eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of man, ye have no life in you,” figuratively “in order to avoid the idea of cannibalism being a tenet of Christianity, why should I not be justified upon the same principles and on the authority of the apostle in understanding by sacrifice in the language of the apostle a virtual oblation, that Christianity may not be represented as a religion founded on the horrible system of human victims;”<sup>1</sup> we reply, because Christ ACTUALLY died the just for the unjust; because he was *actually* once offered to bear the sins of many, as really and actually as men once die, and afterwards actually appear at the judgment seat of God,—as must our author to answer before him who founded Christianity on his own death and sufferings, for terming this doctrine a “horrible system of human victims.”

§871 Such then is the whole that our author is able to bring against the doctrine that the sacrifices ordained of God were intended to direct men to the Messiah’s Atonement, and ceased when it was made. And we submit it to those of our readers who are best acquainted with the scripture whether he has adduced against this doctrine even a single argument really founded on scripture. We turn to his observations on the particular instances we adduced relative to sacrifices.

§872 We adduced Noah’s sacrifice offered on his coming out of the ark, a burnt-offering, of which God was pleased to express his approbation, as alluding to the future atonement of Christ, since God never delighted in the blood of bulls and goats, Gn 8:20f. but as they referred to *his blood* “in whom God is always well /137 pleased.” We also pointed out the peculiar importance of this evidence, as Noah’s religion gave a direction to that of the new race of mankind; and added, that all the genuine religion of the whole world was founded on the future Atonement of the Messiah.<sup>2</sup> To invalidate this evidence our author brings from scripture—*nothing whatever*. He merely

<sup>1</sup> §491. Original text: “a virtual oblation”.

<sup>2</sup> §305: “All the genuine religion of the new world then was founded on the future atonement.”

mentions the name of Noah, and adds (p. 45,) "I must confess my inability to find out the connection between these authorities and the conclusion drawn by the Editor from them."<sup>1</sup> How much more to the purpose would it have been, could he *have shewn* from scripture that *there is none!*

To his question, (p. 45,) "Did God who had no delight even in animal sacrifices, anticipate great delight in human sacrifice when Noah made an offering to him?"<sup>2</sup> we reply, that if by "human sacrifice" he intends to designate the death of the Redeemer of men who "in the end of the world" appeared "to put away sin by the SACRIFICE OF HIMSELF," we answer, Yes; for He who thus offered himself having testified, "I do *always* the things that please him," it inevitably follows that his offering himself a sacrifice for sin pleased God. Indeed the Saviour adds, "therefore doth my father LOVE me, because I lay down my life that I might take it again." §873  
 Heb 9:25-28  
 Jn 8:29  
 Jn 10:17f.

Respecting Job's testimony, "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand in the latter day on the earth," our author asks, (p. 45,) "Could not Job or any one call another his redeemer without having allusion to his blood?"<sup>3</sup> To this we answer, Yes; a temporal deliverer may in a certain sense be termed a redeemer. But did Job regard Christ, who was to stand in the latter day on the earth, as merely his *temporal* Redeemer? Even if he did, this would prove that he believed him to be the God who was then about to deliver him. It is not likely how-/138ever, that a man who declared himself vile, and that "he abhorred himself in dust and ashes," should content himself with mere temporal deliverance. Indeed it is matter of doubt whether at this time Job had any hope whatever of temporal deliverance. The probability is, that he referred to spiritual deliverance alone.—Our author in saying that Isaiah in ch. lxiii. 16, "Thou O Lord, art our father, our Redeemer," and in lx. 16,— "Shall know that I Jehovah, am thy Saviour and thy Redeemer," refers to God the Father,<sup>4</sup> is only begging the question. He has not yet proved that Christ himself is not meant there by Jehovah, particularly in the latter passage. §874  
 Jb 19:25f.  
 Jb 42:6  
 Is 63:16; Is 60:16

At our declaring that the Messiah in Job's case is not termed a Redeemer because of his teaching or his example, as these could be of no value to Job who lived so long before the appearance of Christ in the flesh, our author "wonders (p. 55,) because if he was an inspired writer, the circumstances of Christ's atoning for sin, and the nature and import of his divine instructions were equally known to him, and he could call the Messiah redeemer in either sense."<sup>5</sup> If this be granted, it has been already shewn that no one can redeem another by giving him the choicest precepts, §875

<sup>1</sup> §492. <sup>2</sup> §492. <sup>3</sup> §494.

<sup>4</sup> §494: "Cannot one being redeem another without sacrificing his own blood? How is it, then, we find Jehovah, the Father of all, called redeemer, though in that capacity not considered even by Trinitarians to have had his blood shed as an atonement?"

<sup>5</sup> §495.

and we beg leave to add, that Job calls him HIS Redeemer, from the *personal* benefit he derived from him. But unless our author will go full into Hindooism again, and assign Job another body on earth in or after the time of Christ, Job could certainly derive no *personal* benefit from his instructions delivered so many centuries after his death.

§876 To weaken the force of the evidence arising from Christ's being compared to a sacrificial lamb, our author asserts (p. 48) that "[such terms as 'lamb' and 'sheep' were applied to the disciples of Jesus as merely figurative terms for innocence subjected to persecuti-/139on.](#)"<sup>1</sup> We merely remark on our author's adding "sheep," to "lamb," that the necessity of such a course shews what kind of cause he has in hand; and that men's being termed lambs on account of their innocence, does not touch the question in the least degree. The force of the argument lies in the circumstances *which accompany* Christ's being termed a lamb; and these are such as are evidently connected with sacrifice. Thus John the Baptist terms him not merely a lamb, but  
Jn 1:29 "the lamb of God *that taketh away the sins of the world;*" not only an allusion to a sacrificial lamb, but a declaration that he was about to be sacrificed for this purpose.  
1 P 1:19 Peter describes him as redeeming men with his blood, as with "*the blood of a lamb without blemish and without spot,*" a double designation of a sacrificial lamb.<sup>2</sup> John  
Rv 5:6, 9 designates him as a lamb "*as it had been slain;*"—and the redeemed above declare that *he had been slain* and had "*redeemed THEM by his blood.*" But in what part of scripture is any one of Christ's disciples represented as a "lamb slain to redeem men," or "to wash them in his blood," or to "take away the sin of the world?"—To  
1 Co 5:7 the Apostle Paul's saying, "Christ our *passover* was sacrificed for us," he does not find a single word to object; for this is Christ actually represented as the Paschal Lamb. Assertion however is not wanting; "[upon the same principle](#)" says he, (p. 50) "[the Apostles generally used 'blood' for condescension to death; and 'sacrifice' for a virtual one.](#)"<sup>3</sup> Why did they thus use one word instead of another? Has he himself done it in this work? Surely not. Why then should he charge the inspired penmen with that want of common sense or common honesty, of which he would himself have been ashamed?

§877 Our author's objection (p. 50) to the argument for the Atonement drawn from  
Lv 16:1–30 the Scape goat, "[By no /140 means can it be supposed a sign of the atonement of Christ, who according to the author bore the sins of men by the sacrifice of his own life,](#)"<sup>4</sup> originates wholly in his inattention to the passage in question. Had he carefully examined the passage, he would have found that one goat *was sacrificed* for a sin-offering; and that after this was done, Aaron was to lay his hands on the head of another goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel,

<sup>1</sup> §496. <sup>2</sup> As described in Ex 12:5 and many other verses. <sup>3</sup> §497. <sup>4</sup> §498.



putting them on the head of the goat, which was to be sent away by the hand of a fit person into the wilderness. Does our author need to be informed that our Lord “*laid down his life* for sinners—and then *took it again?*” This however could not have been represented by one goat unless the goat had been annually raised by a miracle after it was slain and burnt. But God does not needlessly work miracles; he appointed two goats to be chosen for the annual atonement, one to be slain for a sin-offering, and another figuratively to bear away their sins into the land of forgetfulness.—As to Aaron’s bearing sins, could our author overlook the fact that, a few verses before in this chapter, he is directed to offer his bullock for a sin-offering and make *an atonement for himself* and for his house?<sup>1</sup>

[Section III. Rammohun Roy’s observations on the Evidence for the Atonement adduced from the Book of Psalms, considered.]

We now come to the Evidence of the Messiah’s atonement derived from the book of Psalms; in which, as David lived so many centuries nearer to the event than Moses, we might naturally expect a clearer discovery of this doctrine, particularly when our Lord makes it the subject of a distinct reference, by saying, (Luke xxiv. 44) “all things must be fulfilled which were written—in the *Psalms* concerning me.” Here however we have to witness on our author’s part, a complete desertion of his cause. Twelve proofs were adduced /141 from the book of Psalms, and corroborated by references from the New Testament applying them to the death and sufferings of Christ. As this vitally affected his cause, we of course expected, that in a reply of nearly four hundred pages, he would have examined each passage and stated the reasons from scripture which forbad its being applied to the atonement of Christ. Instead of this, he passes over this body of evidence without attempting to invalidate a single proof of the *twelve* advanced, but merely saying “*I regret that none of these Psalms appear to me to bear the least reference to the principle of vicarious sacrifice as an atonement for sin except Psalm fourteenth.*”<sup>2</sup> Can any desertion of a cause be more evident? The very life of his system was suspended on his *invalidating the proofs* here given, by adducing evidence from scripture to shew that these point to no atonement, and that Christ never died for our sins according to the scriptures. Instead of this he does not examine a single link of this chain of evidence, with the exception of the fourteenth Psalm, (qu. the fortieth?) but after desiring his readers to look over all the Psalms introduced here, merely adds (p. 52,) “*should they find them having little or no relation to a proof of the atonement, they may then judge whether the frequent*

§878

Lk 24:44

<sup>1</sup> Rammohan’s argument was: “Were we to consider at all the annual scape-goat as an indication of some other atonement for sin, we must esteem it as a sign of Aaron’s bearing the iniquities of Israel, both the scape-goat and Aaron having alike borne the sins of others without sacrificing their lives”, §498.

<sup>2</sup> §499.

complaint of the Editor of *the want of room is or is not well founded?*"<sup>1</sup> If by this he means to beg his reader to reject the Atonement with him, he begs him to reject a chain of evidence in its favor given by the Psalmist, the Apostles, the Evangelists, and our Lord himself, which he has not ventured to meet by a single scripture proof.

§879

While our author thus shrinks from examining this mass of scripture evidence however, he spends nearly ten pages in combating three remarks we made on it /142 although comprized in less than two pages. The first is, "These declarations inform us that the *grand design* of the Son in becoming man was, that of being a *sacrifice*, which fully refutes our author's assertion that, the sole object of his mission was to preach and impart divine instruction."<sup>2</sup> It is our author's great unhappiness that he builds his arguments on insulated passages of scripture, without weighing their connection and comparing them with other passages, a method which would render, not only the scriptures, but any other book, capable of supporting the most monstrous falsehoods. Happening to find the following declaration in our Lord's last prayer, "I have finished the work thou gavest me to do," he affirms from hence that to lay down his life a sacrifice for sin, was *no part* of the work given him to do.<sup>3</sup> In asserting this he not only contradicts the plainest declarations of Scripture, but impeaches the veracity of our Lord himself, as we proceed to shew.

Jn 17:4-8

§880

Paul after declaring, Gal. iii. "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law being made a curse for us," adds, ch. iv. "but when the fulness of the time was come *God sent forth his Son* made of a woman made under the law *to redeem them that were under the law*," which redemption Paul affixes neither to his teaching nor to his pure example, but to *his being made a curse* for us by hanging on the cross,—*"cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree."* Here then the Spirit of God makes Christ's redeeming men by hanging on a tree and being made a curse for them, so much the grand design of God's sending forth his Son made of a woman, in other words, of his preparing for him a body, that he mentions *no other* cause. There were undoubtedly other causes; but the Spirit of God did not think them worthy /143 to be mentioned at the same time with his dying for men. Again, Paul says, Cor. xv. 3—*Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures*: and Gal. i. 3—(Christ,) *gave himself for our sins according to the will of God*: and again Heb. x. repeating Christ's words, "lo I come to do thy will, O God;" he adds, "*by the WHICH WILL* we are sanctified through *the offering of the body of Christ* once for all," thus telling us, that the very will of God which Christ in this Psalm declares he "delights to do," is, his sanctifying us through the *offering of his own body* on the cross a sacrifice for sin once for all. Still

Ga 3:13f; 4:4f.

1 Co 15:3; Ga 1:3f.

Heb 10:4-7, 10

<sup>1</sup> §499. <sup>2</sup> §317, Marshman quoting §140.

<sup>3</sup> Rammohan, §529, quoting his *Appeal*, §140: "Had his death on the cross been the work, or part of the work, for the performance of which Jesus came into this world, he, as the founder of truth, would not have declared himself *to have finished* that work prior to his death."



our author asserts that Christ's offering himself a sacrifice for sins, was no part of his work!

In addition to this, he by excluding all that Christ did after offering this prayer, §881 from being "any [part of the work](#)<sup>1</sup> God had given him to do," makes Jesus Christ (with reverence be it spoken,) impeach his own veracity. If nothing that he did after offering up this prayer, was part of the work God had given him to do, then his striking the Jews to the ground by miracle,—his healing the high priest's servant,—his turning and looking upon Peter—his witnessing a good confession before Pontius Pilate—his committing his mother to the care of his disciple,—his pardoning the thief—yea his sending forth his disciples into all the world, as well as his drinking the cup of wrath and his offering himself a sacrifice, were all done MERELY by his own will, contrary to his own express declaration that, he "came down from heaven NOT TO DO HIS OWN WILL, but the will of him that sent him." Further we have Christ's *prior* declarations relative to his death. He had previously affirmed, that HE CAME "to give his life a ransom for many:" and long before he offered up this prayer, he had not only declared that his Father loved him *because* he laid down his life that he might take it again, Jn 6:28 /144 and that he had power to lay it down and to take it again; but he adds, "THIS COMMANDMENT have I received of my Father." Unless therefore our author will say that Christ was capable of impeaching his own veracity, and of leaving a command of his father's disobeyed, he must cease to construe an insulated phrase contrary to the general meaning and intention of the speaker; a course indeed, which if adopted with his own writings, might easily make him appear to affirm that of which he never had the most distant idea. Mt 20:28 Jn 10:17f.

Our second observation is, that these passages from the above quoted Psalms and §882 the Hebrews, prove that the SON DELIGHTED *in offering himself a sacrifice*. On this our author says, (p. 56,) "I find no mention made in Heb. x. much less in Psalm xl. of the son's delighting in offering himself as a sacrifice." No! surely it is worth his labor to look again. Does he not himself overthrow his own assertion? He adds, "[on the contrary it is evidently found in Hebrews x. that whatever the Son performed with the body, was entirely through his implicit obedience to the will of the father.](#)"<sup>2</sup> Granted; but *had he no delight* in thus "implicitly doing" the will of his heavenly Father? Yet this "will," as our author himself has just acknowledged was, that the son should die; and the apostle informs us, that it was, "the offering of his body once,"—"one sacrifice for sins." And can our author find nothing relative to this will of his heavenly father in Psalm xl. which expresses the Son's *delight* therein? Has he overlooked verse the 8th, "I DELIGHT *to do thy will*, O my God: yea thy law is within my heart?" Is it by such gross inattention to the Divine Records, that our author has Heb 10:10, 12 Ps 40:7-9

<sup>1</sup> §529. <sup>2</sup> §503.

been led to his present disbelief of Christ's Atonement?<sup>1</sup>

§883 That Christ should not delight in those unspeakably /145 tremendous sufferings he underwent in cheerful obedience to the will of his heavenly Father, considered merely *as sufferings* and separately from that "will" which secured our salvation, was in its own nature perfectly right; and the contrary would have been totally wrong. Neither suffering nor death is in its own nature joyous, otherwise it could be *no suffering*; and it became the holy nature of our Lord, to feel and to regard things *as they REALLY WERE*. But that he delighted in offering himself "once for all,"—"a sacrifice for sins," as being the will of God, and, "for the joy set before him endured the cross despising the shame," is established by the Psalmist and the Apostle in the fullest manner.

Heb 12:2

§884 Our third conclusion from the Psalmist and the Apostle's unitedly declaring that it is this will of God, which sanctifies us through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all, "one sacrifice" for sins, is, that these furnish a complete answer to the declaration that "it would be a piece of gross iniquity to afflict one innocent being who had all the human feelings and who had never transgressed the will of God, with the death of the cross for the crimes committed by others;"<sup>2</sup> for "this iniquity" if it be such, God willed, since he prepared the Son a body in which to suffer "this palpable injustice." On this our author (p. 58) professes "perfectly to co-incide with us, that the death of the innocent Jesus took place, like that of many preceding prophets by the unsearchable will of God, who hath ordained that all the sons of men shall die, some by a violent and painful death, others by an easy and natural extinction."<sup>3</sup> We beg here to remind him however, that these are *not our* words, and that we should no more think of *likening* the death of Jesus to that of any prophet, than we should think of likening the Almighty /146 God to a worm of the dust. Nor is the fact that the "innocent Jesus," though perfectly sinless and holy, was ordained to die on the cross a sacrifice for the sins of many, left in darkness to be referred to "the unsearchable will of God," after he has so plainly and fully revealed his will respecting the death of Christ, as has been already so fully shewn.

§885 To our author's asking (p. 59) "was it for this that John the Baptist was slain, and Zechariah and the Prophets who were killed in Jerusalem?" we reply by asking him, Were these perfectly sinless and holy? Have the Scriptures declared that any one of them "died the just for the unjust?" that he bore our sins in his own body? Our author knows that this is not the case. Yet he declares, "The proposed inference from the bare fact would be as legitimate in these cases as that of Jesus!"<sup>4</sup> Shall we

1 P 3:18

<sup>1</sup> Rammohan's interpretation of Ps 40:8–10 is to be found in §500.

<sup>2</sup> This phrase, originally coming from the *Second Appeal*, §142, is continually quoted through all the texts (§317, §505).

<sup>3</sup> §505. <sup>4</sup> §505.

ascribe this declaration to his being so blinded with the idea of human merit as not to perceive any difference, or to a worse cause? Candor requires the first, and in this we acquiesce; but in no controversy have we ever before seen manifested more gross inattention to the subject under debate. If these suffered to satisfy the justice of their maker, it was *for their own sins*; for they had “all sinned and come short of the glory of God.” But will our author venture to say, that Christ suffered to satisfy the justice of God for *his own sins*? He will not, he cannot: blasphemy itself has never risen so high.<sup>1</sup> But how could he prevent the fact from unavoidably bursting on his mind, that if Christ did not suffer for his own sins, he must have suffered *for the sins of others*. How could he, with this truth thus flashing upon his mind, have committed his cause so completely as to pen the following paragraph, without any thing to support it beside his own *ipse dixit*? /147 “The plain and obvious conclusion to be drawn from the text is, that God prepared for Christ a body that he might communicate a perfect code of divine law to mankind, and that he loved him for the devotion with which he fulfilled his divine commission, regardless of the comfort or safety of that body and his readiness to lay it down when it suited the purpose of the maker.”<sup>2</sup>

Rm 3:23

We now ask our author, whether he has ever considered the consequences which *inevitably follow* from his denying, that Jesus Christ suffered to atone for the guilt of others. Let us for a moment trace them. He declares that “it would be a piece of gross iniquity to afflict one innocent being who had all the human feelings and who had never transgressed the will of God, with the death of the cross for the crimes committed by others;” and that “the iniquity of one’s being sentenced to death as an atonement for the faults of another is such, that every just man would shudder at the idea of one’s being put to death for a crime committed by another, even if the innocent man himself should willingly offer his life in behalf of that other.”<sup>3</sup> But why would this be gross iniquity? It could be no iniquity for one to *desire* to die for another. It would on the contrary be an act of the most pure and disinterested love. The gross iniquity then could not lie in his *wishing to die for another*; for this, our Lord declares, would be the height of love, which is the perfect of all virtue, as love is “the fulfilling of the Divine law;” since “greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friend.” The “gross iniquity” would lie in the “infliction of the death of the cross on a being perfectly sinless,” “which” according

§886

Jn 15:13

<sup>1</sup> Rammohan, in his *Second Appeal*, §141, seemed to be quite open for this kind of “blasphemy”: “I can only say, that we find in the Scriptures that several other Prophets in common with Jesus suffered great afflictions, and some even death, as predicted. But I know not whether those afflictions were the consequences of the sins committed by them or by their parents, or whether these distresses were experienced by them through some divine purpose unknown to us”.

<sup>2</sup> §505. <sup>3</sup> §142, §317, §505.

to our author “would be so great that even his love in willingly offering himself to die for another could not take it away.” And is /148 this really fact? *Then our Author’s cause and system are IRRETRIEVABLY LOST. All this gross iniquity lies on his cause without the LEAST redeeming circumstance.* This gross iniquity HAS BEEN perpetrated. The “sinless Jesus” HAS BEEN “afflicted with the death on the cross.” Since Christ then *has really suffered death* without the gates of Jerusalem, if he did not suffer as an atonement for others, still “an innocent being with all the human feelings who had never transgressed the will of God,” has been put to death on the cross, as a guilty and impious transgressor;—and our author’s system leaves this gross iniquity, unquestionably the greatest crime ever committed in the universe, upon whom? we almost tremble to write it—upon GOD HIMSELF.

§887 In no instance since the creation of the world has there been a parallel to the gross iniquity committed in *permitting* the murder of the sinless and holy Son of God, if he did not die a sacrifice for the sins of men. If the angels were reserved in chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day, it was because they had sinned against their Maker. If the prophets suffered pain, misery, and death, they had all sinned and “were by nature children of wrath even as others.” The only Being perfectly sinless and righteous, who has ever been afflicted with death, is the Son of God, he who “did no iniquity, neither was guile found in his mouth.” Since then the dreadful deed HAS BEEN perpetrated, and the perfectly sinless One HAS suffered as though he had been the vilest of transgressors; as he had no sin, of his own for which he could suffer, our author’s denying that he suffered as an Atonement for others, throws the “gross iniquity,” the horrible injustice of *suffering* this to take place, upon the government and character of God, a reproach and a dishonor to all eternity. /149

§888 The least degree of reflection may convince us, that if Christ did not suffer for the sins of others, the *bare permission of his murder*, infinitely righteous as he was, must remain an indelible stain on the justice or the power of God throughout eternity. A sinless being whose righteous deeds merited the highest reward, could not be afflicted with the least punishment, much less with death, without its reflecting the highest dishonor on the Almighty Governor of the universe. No such instance has ever appeared in the annals of the creation. The only instances wherein pain and misery have been permitted, are those of fallen angels and fallen men; but these were tainted with sin, and pain and misery were their righteous desert. Jesus Christ however, was not only free from the least taint of sin; he was infinitely worthy of reward. With him God was ever well pleased, because he “did always the things that pleased him.” Unless *he* SUFFERED FOR OTHERS therefore, to permit him to suffer *in the least degree*, was an act which must reflect eternal dishonor on the Divine character. Should it be replied, that Jesus was in the hands of his enemies, and God could not prevent his suffering, though it was unjust; this would be, to dethrone

God at once, as it would deny him that infinite wisdom and power, which are essential to the government of the universe. After he had suffered his own sinless and well beloved Son to perish unjustly by the hands of his enemies, who among all his creatures could ever trust in him for deliverance? Unless he suffered for others therefore, to affirm that God has *even permitted* Jesus Christ to suffer as a transgressor, is, to blaspheme his justice. “That the righteous should be as the wicked, that be far from Thee. Shall not the judge of all the earth DO RIGHT?”<sup>1</sup> AS CHRIST HAS BEEN SLAIN there-/150fore, nothing can redeem the character of God from eternal dishonor, but his having “suffered the just for the unjust,” and this being in itself perfectly righteous.

Gn 18:25

But if such would have been inevitably the consequence of God’s *merely permitting* his Son’s death, what shall we say if the Scriptures represent him as *actually consenting* thereto, yea AND ASSISTING THEREIN? Yet this is precisely the case. Peter declares, “Him being delivered by the *determinate counsel* and foreknowledge of God, ye with wicked hands have crucified and slain;” and Isaiah, “it pleased the Father to bruise him; HE hath put him to grief.” In Zech. God says, “Awake O sword, against the man that is my fellow;” and Paul, Gal. iii. declares that God hath even made him a CURSE. Unless Christ died a sacrifice for the sins of others therefore, God has not only *permitted* the grossest act of murderous iniquity ever perpetrated in the universe; but he has *consented thereto*, and has himself become *the Chief Agent in the deed*; to say which, is at once to destroy the character of God as a righteous and holy Being,—and to annihilate the felicity of all the blessed throughout eternity.

§889

Ac 2:23

Is 53

Zc 13:7

Ga 3:13f.

Such then since Christ HAS SUFFERED, is unavoidably the language of our author’s system, and of every system which denies Christ’s death to be an atonement for the sins of others, just and righteous in its nature. Every such system, traced in its just consequences, inevitably represents God as guilty of perpetrating the most horrid crime ever yet known in the universe, and the Holy Scriptures as totally false in declaring him to be, a God “righteous in all his ways and holy in all his works.” From this nothing can redeem our author’s system, but his erasing all the records of the past eighteen centuries, and declaring, that Christ was never “with wicked hands crucified and slain.”<sup>2</sup> /151

§890

Ps 145:17

<sup>1</sup> This is Abraham’s question to God, when he heard that God wants to destroy all people in Sodom and Gomorrah.

<sup>2</sup> This seems to be the way of Islam, and Yates in 1822 made the direct connection: “It should seem that [Rammohan] felt himself in a great dilemma on this subject; he could not, like Mohummud, deny the death of Christ, as that would have been invalidating the testimony of the Apostles; and yet he knows not how to reconcile such a death with the justice of God: hence to account for that which is to us as plain as the sun in the firmament, he thinks himself justified in having recourse to the *mysteries* of providence; while on another occasion he claims the victory for having driven his opponent to such a refuge”, Yates, *Defence*, 127.

§891 Nor does his theory respecting Christ’s having suffered death *merely for the benefit of men*, remove this in the least degree. This, representing God as having actually perpetrated for the benefit of men, the grossest act of injustice and iniquity ever known in the universe, charges him with “doing evil that good may come,” and degrades him, while possessed of infinite wisdom and power, to the level of those who say, “let us do evil that good may come,” of whom the Apostle declares that “their damnation is just.” All the “gross injustice,” which our author attempts to charge on the doctrine of Christ’s Atonement for the sin of others, therefore, is interwoven with the vitals of his own system. It charges God with perpetrating the most tremendous injustice and iniquity, and the Scriptures of truth with the grossest falsehood; it renders Christianity either a system of falsehood, or of blasphemy against the holy and righteous Sovereign of the universe, and causes revelation to sap the very foundations of all natural religion.

§892 If however Christ “died *for our sins according to the Scriptures*” every thing in this mystery of godliness, is holy, and just, and righteous. Certain that God perfectly knows his own nature, and that his judgment is according to truth, we may rest assured, than when God so loved the world as to give his only begotten Son “a sacrifice” that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life, it was because HE KNEW this to be *infinitely just and righteous*;—that when the Son gave himself to die for our sins according to the Scriptures it was because HE KNEW that it was *righteous* thus to give himself “the just for the unjust;”—that when God commended his love towards us in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died “a sacrifice” for us, this act of in-/152finite love was perfectly consistent with *righteousness*; and that in his setting forth Jesus Christ “to be a propitiation for sin through faith in his blood,—to DECLARE *God’s righteousness* for the remission of sins, that God *might be JUST* while he is the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus;” GOD declared—*precisely* the TRUTH.

[Section IV. Rammohun Roy’s observations on the Evidence for the Atonement adduced from the Prophets, considered.]

§893 Our pointing out that our author’s applying Isaiah vii. 14. “behold a virgin shall conceive and bring forth a son and shall call his name Immanuel,” to Hezekiah, must fall to the ground from Hezekiah’s being at least *six* or *seven* years old when it was delivered,<sup>1</sup> he refers to his chapter on the Trinity, as having “*no relation whatever to the doctrine of atonement.*”<sup>2</sup> He does the same with Isaiah ix. 6. “to us a child is born, to us a Son is given,” &c. Before he had affirmed that these have nothing to do with the atonement of Christ however, he would have done well to erase the Apostolic declaration, “but when the fulness of time was come, God *sent forth his*

<sup>1</sup> §325. <sup>2</sup> §510.

*Son made of a woman* TO REDEEM them that were *those* under the law.”

Our Author is unable to ascertain what we meant to establish by our quoting §894  
Isa. xi. “the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him; and shall make him of quick Is 11:1-9  
understanding in the fear of the Lord.” We said, that it described the Redeemer in terms which preclude the possibility of his atonement’s being an act of gross iniquity, by asking, *Does the fear of the Lord lead to acts of palpable iniquity?*<sup>1</sup> This it must if Jesus’s suffering the just for the unjust, was an act of “gross iniquity.” He however thinks (p. 63,) that “*the force of truth*” induced us, while in the course of an attempt to prove the deity and the atonement of Christ “*to cite a verse, which, containing such phrases as ‘make him of quick understanding’ and ‘in the fear of the Lord,’ go to prove his /153 created nature!*”<sup>2</sup> Did we ever say that Christ could atone for sin *without* his human nature? or that his human nature is *uncreated*?—If he can discover no allusion to Christ’s Atonement in Isaiah xix. 19, 20, “in that day there shall be an Is 19:19f.  
altar to Jehovah in the midst of the land of Egypt,—for they shall cry unto Jehovah because of their oppressors and he shall send them a Saviour and a great one, and he shall deliver them;” can he discover none to his *Kingdom* respecting which it was cited? Can he prove it to be spoken of any *other* kingdom?

Our Author’s attempt to invalidate the proof of Christ’s Deity arising from his §895  
being termed “our Lord and Saviour,” by selecting four passages from the Old Testament in which the word is applied to men, we had noticed by shewing that two of these belong to Christ’s kingdom, and had observed, that to quote Christ’s own deeds (of salvation) *against* his Deity, was quite a new mode of proof.<sup>3</sup> Our Author leaving this unanswered, says, (p. 64,) “*The Editor though unable to deny this fact,* (that all those who have been instrumental in effecting the deliverance of their fellow-creatures of whatever nature were dependant themselves upon God, and only instruments in his hands,) *thus turns away the subject, saying, It surely required but little knowledge to discern that a man’s delivering his country does not elevate him to an equality with God, or that to overcome an invading enemy is an act totally different from saving sinners from their sins.*”<sup>4</sup> Was this, turning away the subject? May not a nation be delivered by any mortal man whom God may commission? But does not the other require an innate almighty power?—We never denied that God *sent forth* his Son—to redeem those who were under the law by *being made* A CURSE *for them*, any more /154 than that he sent Gideon, Sampson, and others to deliver Israel; but we affirmed that he BY NATURE possesses that almighty power and grace which FITTED him *to be sent* for this purpose;—and this our author has not disproved in the least degree.

To our Author’s observation (p. 65,) that Jesus is “*entitled to the appellation of a* §896

<sup>1</sup> §326. <sup>2</sup> §511. <sup>3</sup> §327. <sup>4</sup> §512, Rammohan quoting §327.



saviour from the saving power of his divine instructions,”<sup>1</sup> we have already replied, by shewing that no precepts or law *can* save a *sinner*. Even the passages he brings to support this idea, completely destroy it. Thus the very first of them, John v. 24, says, “he that believeth on him that sent me,”—“to be *the propitiation for our sins*,” adds John, 1 Ep. iv. 10. To believe on him then, is, to believe that “God hath sent him to die for our sins.”—In reply to his remark, (p. 66,) that “neither previous to Christ’s coming, nor subsequently, have the Egyptians cried to Jehovah—or joined Israel and Assyria, in asking a divine blessing,”<sup>2</sup> we ask, Can he say that they never will? All the nations of the earth have *not yet* been blessed in Abraham’s seed; yet will they never be thus blessed?<sup>3</sup>

Jn 5:24; 1 Jn 4:10

§897 Our Author does not dispute that Isa. xxxv. “the ransomed of Jehovah shall return,” refers to Christ’s kingdom.<sup>4</sup> Will he then permit us to ask him, who came to give his life *a ransom* for many? Surely not the Father, for he never became incarnate. Yet these are “the ransomed of JEHOVAH.” But our author adds, (p. 66,) “If this have any allusion to Jesus, it must have reference to his implicit obedience to the will of Jehovah even to the laying down his own life for the safety of mankind.” The dreadful consequences of asserting that Jesus suffered death on any other ground than as an atonement for others, have been just shewn; but our author’s attempt to explain away the meaning of “ransom” /155 by rendering it “extreme attachment or obedience”<sup>\*</sup> is singular enough. No doubt these were the “obedient” as well as “the ransomed” of the Lord; but the whole of the context relates to their ransom, and not to their obedience.

Is 35:10

§898 On Isa. xliii.<sup>5</sup> “the Lord is well pleased for his righteousness’ sake; he will magnify the law and make it honourable;” we observed, that, for those whom Christ justifies by his righteousness, he also atoned, as Paul testifies, 2 Cor. v. “for he hath made him to be *sin* for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the *righteousness* of God in him.”<sup>6</sup> This passage our author (p. 67) affirms, “has no reference to Christ’s Atonement;” and he quotes Locke to shew, that “it implies no more than that God hath made him subject to sufferings and death, the usual punishment and conse-

Is 42:21  
2 Co 5:21

---

\* That whatever be its present acceptation either in Arabic or Persian, the word here used for “ransom,” occurs in Scripture in this sense, both as a noun and a verb, is easily shewn. As a noun it occurs in Exod. xxi. 30, “If there be laid on him a sum of money, then he shall give for the *ransom* of his life whatsoever is laid upon him.” And in Hosea xiii. 14, “I *will ransom* them from the power of the grave,” it occurs as a verb: and the incongruity of rendering it in either case by “obedience” instead of “ransom,” is sufficiently obvious.

<sup>1</sup> §512. <sup>2</sup> §513.

<sup>3</sup> Marshman was convinced of the success of Christian world mission. In an essay against Abbé Dubois in the *Friend of India*, May 1824, he proves this success from scripture, *FI QS 1825*, 206-222.

<sup>4</sup> §514: “I do not dispute it in the least.” <sup>5</sup> Read: xlii. <sup>6</sup> §329.



quence of sin, as if he had been a sinner, though he were guilty of no sin; that we in and by him might be made righteous, by a righteousness imputed to us by God." See Locke's works, vol. viii.<sup>1</sup> We have already given him our opinion of Locke;<sup>2</sup> but can he be ignorant that Locke here confirms the very doctrine he himself is opposing? Why did God make him who "was guilty of no sin," subject to the usual punishment and consequence of sin but *as an atonement for others*? We have already shewn that on any other principle, nothing could have been more iniquitous and horrid. And whose "righteousness" is it which is "imputed to us by God?" Is it not His, who "of God is made unto us /156 *righteousness*?" Locke's testimony here, instead of refuting, only confirms the doctrine he brings it to oppose.

Instead of meeting the fulness of evidence in Isa. liii. our author, quoting the following passages, "Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows."—"He was wounded for our transgressions"—"the Lord hath laid on him the iniquities of us all."—"He shall justify many, for he shall bear their iniquities," asks, (p. 67,) "Do these sentences prove that he like a sacrificial 'lamb' or 'sheep' atoned for the sins of others?"<sup>3</sup> To this we reply, YES; and we further ask, why he has not brought proof that they do not? Why has he thus deserted his cause? They do indeed prove that "God hath laid on Him the iniquities of us all," that "he was wounded for our transgressions;" and that "by his stripes we are healed," and not by our own meritorious deeds, repentance itself being given as a fruit of his death. When he adds, "my readers may peruse the whole of ch. liii. and may find that it conveys but the idea that Jesus as a prince though innocent himself, was to suffer afflictions or rather death for the transgressions of his guilty people while interceding for them with a king mightier than himself," what does he mean? Is this his refutation of Christ's dying the just for the unjust? Is Christ's kingdom a temporal one? Who are his "guilty people," but those who are redeemed by his precious blood? What does he mean by asking, "Did ever a sacrificial lamb or goat bear the iniquities of men?" What by his saying, that "the scape goat's bearing the iniquities of Israel was not applicable to Christ even typically, for he made no escape from the hand of his enemies?" Is he ignorant that of the two goats taken for a sin-offering, one was slain, and the other sent into the /157 wilderness, as we have already shewn?<sup>4</sup> And have we not repeatedly said that "it is impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sin," and that a sacrificial lamb or goat never bore the iniquities of men in any other way than by prefiguring the sacrifice of Christ? Are these interrogatives all he has to adduce against the irresistible weight of evidence for Christ's atonement furnished by this chapter alone?

§899

Is 53

Heb 10:4-7

\* See p. 140.

<sup>1</sup> §515, Rammohan quoting Locke, *Works III, II Corinthians*, 229. <sup>2</sup> §439. <sup>3</sup> §516. <sup>4</sup> §877.

§900 Our Author’s affirming (p. 68,) that “our repentance is sufficient to make atonement with the All merciful,”<sup>1</sup> has been already answered so fully, that any thing more on that head would tire the reader. We wonder however that the absurdities it involves had not kept him from saying, “Had the human race never transgressed, or had they repented sincerely of their transgressions, the Son of God need not have been sent to teach them repentance for the pardon of their sins; to lay before them the divine law calculated to prevent their further transgressions, the fulfilment of which commission was at the cost of his life.”<sup>2</sup> We presume he will not affirm that Christ redeemed any by his teaching before he began to teach,—before he came into the world. But did not men repent sincerely of their transgressions as really before Jesus was born, as they have since? Were Abel, and Abraham, and Moses, and the Prophets, saved without sincere repentance? or were they not saved at all? We ask further, was there no “divine law” given to men before Christ came?—And still further, had all the patriarchs and prophets no share in Christ’s redemption? They certainly had none in his teaching, nor could they derive any personal benefit from his pure example. Who were the blessed in heaven whom John saw adoring the Lamb that had been slain? How was all this overlooked by our author?<sup>3</sup> /158

§901 We adduced *Jeremiah* xxiii. as mentioning the Righteous Branch,—“in whose days Judah shall be saved and Israel dwell safely, and whose name is Jehovah our Righteousness,” and ch. xxxi.—“I will *forgive their* iniquities, and remember their sins no more,” as alluding to Christ saving sinners by his blood and righteousness, according to Paul’s declaration, 1 Cor. i. 30, “Christ is made unto us wisdom, *righteousness*, sanctification, and *redemption*.” This threefold proof our author passes by with merely observing (p. 69) “*what these quotations have to do with the vicarious sacrifice of Christ, I am again at a loss to perceive*.”<sup>4</sup> What! does he not recollect, that Paul in Heb. x. after repeating from this very prophecy “and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more,” adds, “now where *remission of these* is, there is no more *offering* for sin;” and this after he had previously laid it down as a maxim “*that* without shedding of blood there is no remission?” nay that he closes the whole by declaring that we have boldness to enter into the holiest *by the blood of Christ?*

Jr 23:5f.  
Jr 31:31–34  
1 Co 1:30  
Heb 10:17–19  
Heb 9:22

<sup>1</sup> §517, Rammohan quoting Marshman, §330: “To this question of the Editor, ‘Is not our repentance sufficient to make atonement with the All-merciful?’ my answer must be in the affirmative.”

<sup>2</sup> §517.

<sup>3</sup> Rammohan has already stated in the *Second Appeal*, §142, that Christ’s appearance on earth had a finite effect: “That the effects of Christ’s appearance on earth, whether with respect to the salvation or condemnation of mankind, were finite, [...] is evident from the fact, that to the present time millions of human beings are daily passing through the world, whom the doctrines he taught have never reached, and who of course must be considered as excluded from the benefit of his having died for the remission of their sins.” (See also §537.)

<sup>4</sup> §519.

What shall we say to this inattention to scripture? “As for Christ’s being sent *only* or principally *to direct mankind to sincerity in worship, righteousness in conduct, sanctification in purity of mind,*”<sup>1</sup> we have already shewn, that mankind were directed to these many ages before Christ came, and that if Jesus did not come to save them by his death and righteousness, there was no other way in which he himself could save guilty creatures.

Respecting, *Ezekiel xxxiv.* 13, “I will set up one shepherd over them and he shall feed them, even my servant David;” our Author asks, (p. 70,) “*how is it that the Editor thinks is necessary to attempt so often to prove the kingdom and redemption of Jesus as the promised Messiah in the course of his arguments in favour of the /159 atonement?*”<sup>2</sup> We reply, that we do not think it particularly necessary, because we have such an abundance of proof besides; but that when his “kingdom and redemption” occur in the course of our examining the Scriptures, we do not think it improper merely to mention them, because his kingdom is founded on his death; and the redemption, his subject obtain, is, “*through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins.*”<sup>3</sup>

§902  
Ezk 34:23

Col 1:14

Our author’s new translation of *Daniel ix.* 26, “Messiah shall be cut off but not for himself.” “*Shall Messiah be cut off and no one be for him,*”<sup>4</sup> would be of no value to his cause were it granted him. The phrases “to finish the transgressions and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness,” sufficiently testify the design of the Messiah’s being “*cut off,*” even though we should read, “and no one be for him.” No end was made to sins, but by his atonement; for our author himself testifies that the Jews continued to sin, nay even more than before.<sup>5</sup> No “reconciliation was made for iniquity” but by the Messiah’s blood; and no “everlasting righteousness was brought in” but by Him who is, “Jehovah our Righteousness.” But ’till he bring stronger proof, we shall content ourselves with the present English translation;\* /160 particularly as he himself has so little confidence in his amendment as to provide himself with the following reserve; “*But were we to admit this mistranslation or perversion of the original scriptures, the words, ‘shall the Messiah be cut off but not for himself,’ would to my mind convey*

§903  
Dn 9:24–27

\* That the Hebrew conjunction *vau* ו is often rendered “but” as well as “and,” is too well known to the biblical student to need the least proof. Indeed were it here rendered “and;” as, “the Messiah shall be cut off *and* not for himself;” the idea conveyed would be substantially the same. And that in rendering the prefix *lamed* ל with the third personal pronoun, “for himself” our translators are fully justified, will be evident from the following passages among others in which precisely the same prefix and pronoun occur. Lev. ix. 8. Aaron slew the calf of the sin-offering which was *for himself*. Lev. xvi. 11. Aaron shall make an atonement *for himself*; and ch. xvi. 24. “And make an atonement *for himself*.” Numbers xxxi. 53, “for the men of war had taken spoil every man *for himself*.” Deut. xxxiii. 21, “and he provided

<sup>1</sup> §519. <sup>2</sup> §520. <sup>3</sup> For Col 1:14, see §845, note. <sup>4</sup> §520. <sup>5</sup> §520, also §527.

nothing more than that the Messiah should be cut off, not for any guilt he committed himself, but by the fault of his subjects, who continued to rebel against the divine law though instructed by their intercessor even at the hazard of his own life.”<sup>1</sup> Against this interpretation, to say nothing of other things, rises the fact already mentioned, that God *himself* was pleased to bruise him, and to command his sword against him; yea, and even to make him A CURSE. Does our author perceive the blasphemy that this inevitably involves, even that Christ perished by “the fault of”—*God himself*?

Is 53; Zc 13:7; Ga  
3:13f.

§904

To *Hosea* iii. “afterward shall the children of Israel return and seek the Lord their God and David their king, and shall fear Jehovah and his goodness in the latter days,”—*Joel* ii. 28, “and it shall come to pass afterwards that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh,” &c. and *Amos* ix. “in that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David which is fallen,” &c. our Author making no reply, assigns as his reason, (p. 71.) that “their relation to the question is certainly not obvious.”<sup>2</sup> Did Peter think thus when he, in *Acts* ii. describes that of *Joel* as being fulfilled by Christ’s shedding forth his holy spirit at the day of Pentecost in consequence of his death? Did James think thus of that in *Amos*, when he, *Acts* xv. adduced it to support his decision in the debate whether the standard doctrine of Christianity should be, forgiveness through man’s obedience and merit, or solely through the death of the Lord Jesus Christ? How unhappy for his cause that our author should not discern /161 that passages have any relation to the question, which were quoted by the apostles as sanctioning the doctrine that cuts up his cause by the roots!

§905

*Obadiah*, ver. 21, “and saviours shall come upon mount Zion to judge the mounts of Esau, and the kingdom shall be Jehovah’s,” was adduced as foretelling Christ’s kingdom; and hence we asked our author “When have the mounts of Esau been so judged by any one beside Christ, as that the kingdom has in consequence become Jehovah’s? And does this refer to any thing but a display of Christ’s power in converting sinners?”<sup>3</sup> Instead of answering either of these queries, he urges, that saviours in the plural are mentioned. Now as no one expects Christ to descent in person to convert these nations, but that he will do it through the instruments of his ministers, this does not invalidate in the least its application to Christ’s kingdom, the object for which it was quoted. Our author’s doctrine relative to the Hebrew plural,

Ob 21

---

the first part *for himself*:<sup>1</sup> *1 Kings* xix. 4. *Elijah* requested *for himself* that he might die; and *Psalms* iv. 3. “But know that the Lord hath set apart him that is godly *for himself*.” What sense would our author’s changing “*himself*” for “*him*” make in these passages?<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> §520. <sup>2</sup> §521. <sup>3</sup> §337.

<sup>4</sup> Rammohan’s point was rather that *no person* was with the Messiah (as a supporter) for him(self). In Marshman’s examples there is always an object given which is “for himself”, but not in *Dn* 9:26.

we will consider when we come to his allegations against the *Deity* of Christ.<sup>1</sup>

Does not our author's reason adduced (p. 73) for not acknowledging the Triune God, namely that "having relinquished the notion of the triune, quadrune, and decimune gods which he once professed when immersed in the grosser polytheism prevailing among modern Hindoos, he cannot reconcile it to his understanding to find plausibility in one case, while the same notion is of acknowledged absurdity in another,"<sup>2</sup> serve a key to his present course? He found it impossible to reconcile his mind to the rabble of gods connected with Hindooism. He *therefore* rejects the distinction of persons in the Godhead, so strongly expressed in Christ's command to teach all nations "baptizing them in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost." But does /162 not this resemble the conduct of a child, who, having found himself cheated with a glass bauble, throws away when offered him a diamond of inestimable value?<sup>3</sup> Did the doctrine of his "quadrune or decimune gods in Hindoo polytheism," profess to be grounded on works possessing an equally authentic claim to Divine inspiration, and equally holy in their tendency and effects, as the Sacred Scriptures? §906

Mt 18:19

The testimony of *Micah* to the birth-place of that Saviour "whose goings forth have been of old, from everlasting," our author promises to notice when he comes to he subject of the Trinity, but declines it here, because "any testimony relative to the birth of Christ has nothing to do with his atonement."<sup>4</sup> Has then Christ's being "made of a woman to redeem those who were under the law," nothing to do with his "being made a curse for them?" §907

Mi 1:5

Ga 4:4f.; 3:13f.

Our quotation from *Nahum*, "behold upon the mountains the feet of *him* that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace. O Judah, keep up thy solemn feasts, perform thy vows; for the wicked shall no more pass through thee," he (p. 74) terms a subject "totally foreign to that of the vicarious sacrifice of Christ."<sup>5</sup> It was quoted as alluding to Christ's *kingdom*, which is "righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost;" and our author has brought no proof that these are ever found in the heart §908

Na 1:15

<sup>1</sup> Marshman, in §337, had given the impression that "saviours" refers to Christ, and that either the plural is not of any meaning or it is connected with the Trinity. Rammohan's answer was, that (also the verb having a plural form) the text talks clearly about a plurality of saviours (§522). As a plurality of gods must be rejected, it must be a plurality of human saviours (§523). By elaborating his position here, that the verse should be about Christian missionaries, Marshman actually agrees to Rammohan's opinion, without admitting it.

<sup>2</sup> §523.

<sup>3</sup> This argument is resembling Yates, *Defence*, 168: "The Compiler [Rammohan] appears to be more averse to the doctrine of the Trinity than to any other embraced by the generality of Christians, because in his estimation it bears some resemblance to the system he has renounced."

<sup>4</sup> §524.

<sup>5</sup> §525.

of any but those who rely wholly on Christ's atonement. It seems strange that *Habakkuk's* axiom also, "the just shall live by his faith," as adopted by Paul, Gal. iii. 11, when he declares "that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God," should have nothing to do with the atonement on which this faith is founded. Had he only read a few verses farther, he would have found Paul adding as the sequel of his reasoning, "Christ hath re-/163deemed us from the curse of the law, *being made a curse for us.*" Has this "nothing to do with the atonement? the sacrificial death of Jesus?"

Hab 2:4; Ga 3:11

§909 Scarcely less strange is it that *Haggai* ii. "thus saith Jehovah; the Desire of all Nations shall come, and I will fill this house with glory," should have "no allusion to either the atonement or the Deity of Christ." Our author's attempt to support this, furnishes another proof of what we have already observed, that his assertions often contradict the plain sense of the scriptures. He says (p. 75,) "were we to understand by the word 'temple' in both instances in the verse, a *material* one, which is evident from its context in the prophecy was alone in the contemplation of Haggai, we must be persuaded to believe that the latter temple was more magnificently built by Zerubabel and Joshua in the reign of Darius, than the former built by Solomon."<sup>1</sup> That Haggai had in view a *material* temple is certain; but our believing hat Zerubabel's temple was more magnificently built than Solomon's, though it might get rid of this prophecy, would be in direct opposition to the plain fact as related in the context. Ver. 2, runs thus; "speak now to Zerubabel, &c. and to the residue of the people, saying, Who is left among you that saw this house in her first glory? and how do ye see it now? Is it not in your eyes in comparison of it as nothing?" Here God himself declares that in their eyes the second house was as nothing compared with the first,<sup>2</sup> and lays this as the foundation for the prophetic declaration that "Jehovah would fill this house with glory," in that "the Desire of all Nations should come." If our author's assertions are so contrary to plain scripture *facts*, which require only to be read /164 in order to be understood, how can we rely on them respecting its *doctrines* so deep in their very nature?

Hg 2:6-9

Hg 2:2f.

§910 We observed that *Zechariah's* predictions relative to the human nature and the atonement of Christ can scarcely be examined without their testifying his Deity. As our author however, passes over our remarks with the promise of noticing them when treating of his Deity, we shall refer ours thither. Yet his remark on *Zech.* iii. "I will remove the iniquity of that land in one day;" we may notice here. It is assertion without the least proof to support it. See p. 75; "the phrase found in the verse, 'I

Zc 3:8f.

<sup>1</sup> §526.

<sup>2</sup> Modern commentators assume that in Haggai's time the temple was still in ruins and that he was looking forward to a new and bigger reconstruction, which was begun during his prophecy, see Macchi, *Haggai*, 505.

will remove the iniquity of that land in one day,' does not attribute to the removal of the iniquities of the land of Israel to the sacrificial death of Jesus, so as to justify the Editor in quoting it as a proof of the doctrine of the atonement!"<sup>1</sup> Why does it not? Our author is silent. We must however beg to remind him that it is a real transaction which is here predicted. Can he mention any other transaction which in one day took away iniquity, beside that related, Heb. ix. "Once in the end of the world hath Christ appeared to take away sin by the sacrifice of himself?"

Heb 9:25-28

It is singular that our author should add, "besides, the verse can by no means be applied to the death of Jesus whether vicarious or accidental, since after the day of his crucifixion, the Israelites, so far from being freed from sins, continued more vehemently than ever to pursue sinful conduct in their violent persecution of Christians,"<sup>2</sup> &c. We never said that all Israel according to the flesh belonged to Christ's kingdom, or that his kingdom was confined to Israel; and had our author examined the whole of the passage, of which this declaration forms a part, he would have found the very circumstance he urges against this prophecy's applying to Christ's death, to be a part of the prophecy itself. See ver. 11.—"And many nations shall be joined to the Lord in that day and shall be my people." Thus as the rejection of the Jews and the admission of the Gentiles, took place immediately on Christ's death, and never before, what he urges against this prophecy's referring to Christ's atonement, decidedly fixes its application on his death and the circumstances which immediately followed.

§911

Zc 2:11

After thus examining the evidence for the Atonement furnished by the Old Testament, we added, "by examining the Old Testament on the subject of Christ's Atonement, and comparing it with the New in every instance required, as our author suggests, although no passage has been considered which does not relate to the work or the kingdom of Christ, we have before us such a body of evidence, corroborated by the Apostles, the Evangelists, and by Christ himself, as indisputably confirms, not only the doctrine of his Atonement, but that of his Deity." And further, "that the evidence from the Old Testament is of peculiar weight, as the Prophecies nourished the faith and hope of the best of men for above seven hundred years, the Psalms embodied their devotion for a full thousand years, and Sacrifices offered by faith, formed the soul of all real religion from the very beginning of the world. For these then to have deceived men, would have destroyed the character of God, and the happiness of all righteous beings throughout eternity."<sup>3</sup> In reply to this our author here offers—not a word.

§912

---

<sup>1</sup> §527. <sup>2</sup> §527. <sup>3</sup> §348.



[Section V. Rammohun Roy’s observations on the Evidence for the Atonement adduced from the Evangelists, considered.]

§913 Our author begins his remarks on the evidence derived from the declarations of Christ and of the Evangelists, by occupying nearly a page in controverting the incidental observation, that “had our Lord himself /166 made no direct declaration respecting the design of his death, his referring his disciples to those predictions already named would have been sufficient, particularly in their circumstances.”<sup>1</sup> It is however easy to prove its truth; since Christ had merely referred to this mass of evidence delivered by the patriarchs and prophets, and said “thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer,” &c. we must have believed it, or have incurred the just reproof he gave his disciples, “O fools and slow of heart to believe *all that the prophets* have spoken;” and had we not believed Himself, we must have denied that his “precepts are the guide to happiness and peace.” Still it is so immaterial, that to spend a moment on it, to us seemed trifling, when such a mass of evidence yet remains for consideration.

Lk 24:25–27

§914 We added that “direct intimations of this nature were not withheld”<sup>2</sup> Some of these we adduced, as, “the Son of man came to give his life a ransom for many,” and “this is my blood which is shed for many for the remission of sins,” with various others. But instead of answering these, our author charges it on us (p. 78) as “a strange mode of conducting a controversy, that after quoting some of those in our former reply, we should bring them forward again with some additions, overlooking his observations on them.”<sup>3</sup> Surely there can be nothing strange in this. If we “brought these forward again with some additions,” it was that he might answer them, because we thought his observations on them formed no answer. This we still think, and now submit them to our readers that they may judge for themselves; “Do these passages reasonably convey any thing more than the idea that Jesus was intrusted with a divine commission to deliver instructions leading to eternal beatitude, which, whosoever should /167 receive should live for ever? and that the Saviour foreseeing that the imparting of those instructions would, by exciting the anger and enmity of the superstitious Jews, cause his life to be destroyed, yet hesitated not to persevere in their promulgation as if a king who hazards his life to procure freedom and peace for his subjects, were to address himself to them saying, I lay down my life for you.”<sup>4</sup> We think that these passages DO “reasonably convey” MORE than Jesus’s having been invested with a commission to deliver instructions leading to eternal beatitude, and

Mt 20:28; Mt 26:28

<sup>1</sup> §349. <sup>2</sup> §349.

<sup>3</sup> §529: “Entirely overlooking my observations, however, he has thought proper to repeat them here, with some additions. This is indeed a strange mode of conducting a controversy; but is lays me under the necessity of again adducing my remarks in the Second Appeal on those passages.”

<sup>4</sup> §529, Rammohan quoting himself §140.



merely losing his life in consequence, for the two following reasons:

We have already shewn that all Jesus's precepts are included in the Divine Law, which he himself declares "shall not pass away till heaven and earth pass away." This declaration alone refutes our author's observations. Were our Lord's precepts, MORE *strict* and *holy* than the Divine law given by Moses? If they were, instead of leading men to beatitude, they would only involve them in deeper condemnation, as the law had already "stopped every mouth and brought the whole world guilty before God." Were they LESS *strict and holy*? Then they left the Divine law in full force on the sinner still, for "till heaven and earth pass, the law cannot pass away," either in its precepts or its penalty. Again if Jesus delivered precepts neither *less nor more* strict and holy, than the Divine law before delivered, not only did he come to do what had been already done, but he left mankind in precisely the same condemnation in which they were before; and he thus could save no one whatever, as he came, "not to destroy, but to *establish* the law." Salvation by Jesus therefore, except through his own obedience and atonement, is *totally impossible* in its own nature. /168

§915

Mt 5:17f.

Rm 3:19f.

Further, the death of Christ is not represented in Scripture as an accidental thing arising merely from "the anger and enmity of the superstitious Jews, excited by his imparting his instructions." Had it been so indeed, we have already shewn that for God to *permit* the death of a sinless Being so meritoriously righteous, would have been a fact unparalleled in the annals of the universe, and one which must have reflected infinite dishonor on the Divine government and character throughout eternity. But the Scriptures represent *the Father himself* as CHIEF in this scene of unparalleled injustice and iniquity. He not only commanded him to lay down his life; but, "it pleased the Father to bruise him," his own sword awoke against him, and *he himself made him* A CURSE. As our author rejects the doctrine of Christ's dying for the sins of others, therefore, his system cuts up by the roots every principle of natural religion, by representing God, not only as suffering a being perfectly sinless and holy to perish for want of power to deliver him from his enraged enemies, but as implicated himself in this tremendous scene of injustice and iniquity. Since then Christ, though infinitely righteous, HAS BEEN thus put to death as a sinner, and made A CURSE even by God himself, on our author's system must this lie with such weight as to sink it for ever. It causes Unitarianism to charge the Sacred Scriptures with falsehood in declaring that "God is just and without iniquity," and makes revelation sap the very foundations of all natural religion.

§916

Is 53; Zc 13:7; Ga 3:13f.

The only time in which our author's system could have been promulgated with the least plausibility, was before Christ's coming. It might then indeed have opposed the prophecies respecting the Redeemer, and insisted that, repentance being a sufficient atonement for /169 sin, sacrifices meant nothing,—no Redeemer would ever come; or—if he came, being sinless and holy, he could never suffer death, or the

§917

least misery. And those who saw little evil in sin and felt no need of an atonement, might have believed this doctrine. Still the whole would have been a delusion, which the coming of the Messiah and his suffering death while infinitely righteous, would have completely dispelled. But not *the deed* IS DONE, it is too late for Unitarianism to live in the mind of any one who duly weighs its inevitable consequences. All the records of time for the last eighteen centuries must be obliterated before it can exonerate itself from charging the Almighty Sovereign of heaven and earth with having inflicted the punishment due to a sinner alone, on one perfectly sinless and holy, so as even to make him *a curse and an execration*.—Our author’s assertion that Jesus’s suffering death on the cross was no part of the work for the performance of which he came into the world, we have already examined, and have shewn that while it flies in the face of the plainest declarations of scripture, it impeaches the veracity of Jesus himself.

§918 To invalidate Christ’s dying as an atonement, he brings forward the stale objection, (p. 80,) that “God forgives mankind *freely, without any equivalent*,”<sup>1</sup> and quotes Locke as supporting this idea. Of Locke we have already said, that we regard him no farther than as we find him accord with scripture.<sup>2</sup> We have already seen in a passage quoted from him, that he ascribes men’s salvation to the *death and righteousness* of Jesus Christ;<sup>3</sup> and if his ideas of redemption were so confused as to make him contradict himself, we leave him wholly to our author’s mercy. But he may safely dismiss his fear that the Atonement of Christ will obscure the /170 free grace of God. Whenever our forgiveness, or justification, or redemption, is said to be *free*, he will find this spoken wholly with a view *to us*; and to declare that these are not purchased or “procured” by any merit or work of *ours*, whether it be repentance, or faith, or love, or obedience; nay that even these holy dispositions are given us as *freely* as justification itself, and that they are a part of the redemption thus *freely* given *through the blood of Christ*.

§919 But when our redemption is mentioned with reference to CHRIST the Redeemer, it is never said to be FREE or *gratis to Him*. On the contrary it cost his *vital BLOOD*. It is constantly described as the *purchase* of his blood, the *merited reward* of his sufferings, death, and righteousness. This is the case even in the passages which our  
Ep 1:7 author brings to prove the contrary doctrine!<sup>4</sup> See Eph. i. 7. “In whom we have redemption, *through his blood*, the forgiveness of sins, according to the *riches of his grace*.” Here redemption or the forgiveness of sins, comes to us through no desert or merit of ours, but through the *riches of his GRACE*; yet it is so far from being granted as matter of *grace* to the Redeemer; that it cost no less than his BLOOD;—and hence  
Rv 1:5f. the redeemed in heaven adore him as worthy for having “*washed them from their*

<sup>1</sup> §529. <sup>2</sup> §439. <sup>3</sup> §898. <sup>4</sup> §530.

sins IN HIS OWN BLOOD.”

Of course we do not suppose that “redeeming in the sacred scripture language,” §920 always means “precisely paying an equivalent.”<sup>1</sup> We know that it sometimes means the gracious exertion of almighty power in a person’s behalf, as in Israel’s being delivered from their oppressors in Egypt. But redemption by Christ is defined as being the forgiveness of sins, and this is expressly said to be *through Christ’s blood*, while we are told that “it is impossible for the blood of bulls and of goats to /§171 *take away sin*,” and that “*without shedding of blood* there is no remission.” We are further told that God hath set him forth a propitiation through *faith in his blood*; Heb 10:4–7; 9:22 Rm 3:24–26 and were we to adopt the suggested alteration, (p. 80,) “whom God hath set forth to be the propitiation or *mercy seat* in his own blood,”<sup>2</sup> the meaning would still be, that Christ *by HIS BLOOD* forms the *medium* through whom God can be just, and yet shew mercy to the sinner. The apostle’s adding indeed, that he might be JUST and the *justifier* of him that believeth in Jesus, inevitably implies, that God *COULD NOT have been just* had he forgiven sinners in any other way, as well as that to forgive the sinner now through his blood *is PERFECTLY JUST*.

In reply to our author’s assertion (p. 82,) that the redemption price “*must be paid to those whom the redeemed are in bondage to, viz. Sin and Satan*,”<sup>3</sup> we beg to ask him, Who is Sin? and what price did Sin originally pay for men prior to holding them in bondage? We ask him further, what equivalent did a righteous God pay to Pharaoh when he redeemed his people from the bondage in which he held them, beside humbling his pride in the Red Sea? An equivalent like this our Redeemer “paid to” Satan when, after declaring, “now shall the prince of this world be cast out,” he “spoiled principalities and powers, triumphing over them.” As for our author’s fear lest God should have more than his due in having “*both the thing redeemed, and the price paid for its redemption*,”<sup>4</sup> we beg him first to answer Elihu’s question, Job. xxxv. 7. “If thou be righteous, what givest thou him? or what receiveth he of thine hand?”—Such then is the amount of what our author has offered in reply to the proofs for the Atonement of Christ adduced from the language of the /172 Evangelists and the declarations of our Lord himself. And whether he has invalidated one of them we leave to the judgment of every serious and impartial mind.

[Section VI. Rammohun Roy’s observations on the Evidence for the Atonement adduced from the Epistles, considered.]

From the *Forth* Source of evidence, the writings of the Apostles, of course the fullest of all, we selected only twenty-four passages, beside those which had been already quoted in corroboration of the evidence drawn from the Old Testament. To these what does our author reply?—*Not A SYLLABLE*. Of these *twenty-four* proofs he §922

<sup>1</sup> §530. <sup>2</sup> §531. <sup>3</sup> §530. <sup>4</sup> §530.

does not examine even *one*; but contents himself with saying, (p. 83,) “As these teachers merely illustrated the sayings of their gracious Master, their writings must be understood with reference only to what had been taught by Him. I will therefore not prolong the present subject of discussion by examining these passages separately, especially as I have already noticed some of them in the examination of the Psalms and the Prophets.”<sup>1</sup> Was ever a cause thus DEFENDED before? Was it ever before known that a man coolly refused to examine *twenty four* of the clearest and most decided of the proofs brought against his own cause, particularly when he added nearly three hundred pages more to his book? The reason assigned too, overthrows itself, “they merely illustrated the saying of their gracious Master.” But this was precisely the reason why they should have been examined with the greatest care! We ourselves termed what “their gracious Master” had said merely “intimations.”<sup>2</sup> Whence then should the clear and decided meaning of these “intimations” have been sought, but from those who, commissioned by himself to build up his church, “had illustrated them” after his death by the infallible guidance of his Holy Spirit? They are adduced as *new evidence* in the following words, however; “Were more necessary the following passages are sufficient,”<sup>3</sup> &c. and as such *prudence* itself would have dictated their being examined. Had an advocate for the atonement thus acted, what bounds would have been set to the triumphs of unitarianism?

§923 To cover his thus quitting the field our author professes to introduce fifteen scripture witnesses to prove that Christ did not die a sacrifice for sins;—but he uncovers not their faces to enable the reader to discern their features and complexion.<sup>4</sup> Straitened as we are for room however, we shall not after his example decline examining them. We will make them all speak in the order in which he has arranged them.

Rm 5:10 Rom. v. 10. “For if when we were enemies, we were *reconciled to God by the death of his Son*, much more being reconciled we shall be saved by his life?” What does this testify against the Atonement? Even that the *death of Christ* takes away our guilt

Heb 2:17 and reconciles us to God.—Heb. ii. 17. “Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a *faithful high priest* in things pertaining to God, to *make reconciliation* for the sins of the people.” How did he make this reconciliation? Paul informs us, ch. ix. 26. “Once in the end of the world hath he appeared to *put away sin by the SACRIFICE* of HIMSELF.” Is this one of our author’s

Heb 9:25–28 witnesses against Christ’s atonement?—Eph. v. 2. “Christ, hath given himself for us, an OFFERING and a SACRIFICE to God for a sweet smelling savor.” Is this another

Ep 5:2

<sup>1</sup> §532. <sup>2</sup> §349. <sup>3</sup> §350.

<sup>4</sup> Marshman alludes to the list of verses Rammohan gives in §532, merely stating that “Being desirous to shew that my interpretation of these is fully supported by scriptural authorities, I will only refer to a few texts explanatory of the terms sacrifice, ransom, offering, and the taking away the sins of the world, as ascribed to Jesus.”

of them?—Heb. v. 1. “For every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things pertaining to God that he may offer both gifts and SACRIFICES for sins.” Heb 5:1  
 What did these sacrifices prefigure? Did they not directly point to Him who being come a “high priest,” neither by the blood of bulls and goats, but by *his own blood*, entered once into the holy place having obtained eternal redemption for us? Is this /174 another of his proofs that Christ did NOT *atone* for sins by *his own blood*?—Heb. viii. 3. “For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices, wherefore it was *of necessity that this man have somewhat to offer.*” What had he to offer for sins? Heb 8:3  
 We have been just told; “*himself*”—“*his OWN BLOOD.*”—Heb. ix. 23, 24. “It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with BETTER sacrifices than those.” &c. Heb 9:23f.  
 What *better* sacrifice was there beside CHRIST’S? Then what is there in this against his atonement?—Or in the 14th verse, “How much more shall *the blood of Christ*, who through the eternal Spirit *offered himself* without spot, purge your consciences from dead works to serve the living and true God?”—And is there any thing in Titus, ch. ii. 12–14, beginning with “teaching us that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts,” and ending with “who gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity,” &c.—Or in Heb. xiii. 12, “Wherefore Jesus also that he might sanctify the people with *his own blood*, suffered without the gate?”<sup>1</sup>—And is Rev. i. 5. “Unto him that loved us and *washed us from our sins in his own blood*” a witness against Christ’s atonement?—Or Eph. i. 7. “In whom we have redemption *through his blood* the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of his grace?”—Or Luke i. 77. “To give knowledge of salvation to his people, *by the remission of their sins.*”—Or Matt. xx. 28. “Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and *to give his life a ransom for many?*”—or the same in Mark x. 45? And is the last of these fifteen witnesses, 1 Tim. ii. 6. “Who gave himself *a ransom for all*, to be testified in due time?” Our author certainly acted wisely in making his witnesses stand mute. Had they opened their mouths and spoken /175 their real meaning, they would have ruined his cause for ever; while, standing mute as they do, they may appear something to “*those indifferent about religion*”<sup>2</sup> to whom he appeals, and who may not take the trouble to interrogate them,—and may still less expect that any man would cite witnesses, who if heard, would be death to his cause.

Our author’s cautioning his readers (p. 84.) against understanding “*such words literally and thus founding the salvation attainable by Christianity upon flesh and blood human or divine,*”<sup>3</sup> would not deserve notice, were it not for the manner chosen, after fair argument had been abandoned, to caution us against believing that “the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.” It has been already §924  
 1 Jn 1:7

<sup>1</sup> Rammohan had tried to give explanation on this verse in §481. <sup>2</sup> §445. <sup>3</sup> §533.

shewn that our author has wholly destroyed his own system if ANY sense consistent with truth be put on the numerous passages of scripture examined.

§925 That our author should “leave unnoticed,” the illustrative remarks<sup>1</sup> “added at the close of the evidence for the atonement, shewing that it was *prefigured by sacrifices enjoined of God and publicly approved by him while he had no delight in them, but had prepared a body for his Son, and predicted in Prophecies mentioning the nation, the tribe, the family, and at length the place, the time, and manner of his birth, together with numerous circumstances respecting his life and his death,*”<sup>2</sup> was quite expected after he had declined examining such a multitude of the clearest and most decisive proofs of his atonement selected from the Apostolic Epistles. That “the books which contain these predictions are the Sacred Writings, which nourished the faith and the piety of all in that period who truly worshipped God,” is a fact however, which /176 deserves his closest attention; as it inevitably follows, that “if Jesus did not offer himself a sacrifice for our sins, a double deception was practised on his worshippers by the God of truth himself, as the *sacrifices* were an illusion, and the *predictions*, falsehood, and all the real religion on earth prior to Christ’s coming, was the offspring of deceit.” Nay further, that “as his Apostles have interwoven the doctrine of his *Atonement for sin* into all their Epistles intended to instruct the churches in future ages,—and one of them has represented it as the idea universally prevalent among the redeemed in heaven; if then Jesus Christ did not make a real atonement for sin, all the religion, not only of the patriarchs and prophets, but of the apostles and primitive saints and even of the blessed in heaven, has been built on deception—the Old and the New Testament are full of falsehood,—and there has never been any true revelation given among men.”<sup>3</sup> Such a chain of Scripture evidence was it not incumbent on our author to invalidate?<sup>4</sup>

§926 Through offering nothing in reply to this induction however, he notices our enquiring, “What shall we say to his impugning the doctrine of Christ’s divine and human nature even after having acknowledged it in ch. ii—and his ridiculing his intercession?”<sup>5</sup> and adds (p. 84,) “I shall from the dictates of my own conscience reject absolutely such unaccountable ideas as a mixed nature of God and man as maintained by the Editor, as I have previously rejected the idea of a mixed nature of God, man and lion (নৃসিংহবতর) in which Hindoos profess their faith. I have not the most distant recollection of acknowledging Christ’s Divine and human nature, and shall therefore feel obliged if the Editor will have the goodness to point out in what

<sup>1</sup> §534. <sup>2</sup> §351. <sup>3</sup> §351.

<sup>4</sup> Rammohan had claimed that these conclusions of Marshman had rested “entirely on the arguments previously adduced,” and as he was of the opinion that he already disproved those, there was no need to deal with them again, §534.

<sup>5</sup> §352.



passage of ch. II. /177 of my Appeal I acknowledged this mystery. I have never so far as I am aware ridiculed even in thought the intercession of Jesus for mankind.”<sup>1</sup> By way of reply, we refer our author to the following passage in ch. ii. of his Second Appeal. “It would have been idle to have informed them of a truth of which as Jews they would never have entertained the smallest question, that in his mere *corporeal nature* Jesus was inferior to his Maker; and it must therefore have been his *spiritual nature*, of which he here avowed the inferiority to that of God.”<sup>2</sup> If this does not refer to Christ’s two-fold nature, we confess our ignorance of the meaning of words, and acknowledge ourselves mistaken. On the latter subject we add, that we ourselves should have trembled at the thought of mentioning “a man’s forgiving his horse at a friend’s intercession,”<sup>3</sup> with the most distant allusion to Christ’s performing the office of Mediator between God and man, as savoring, not merely of ridicule, but of blasphemy itself.

Respecting our Author’s equalizing the doctrine that “God sent forth *his Son made of a woman*,” that “*the Word was made flesh* and dwelt among us,” with the Hindoo fable of Vishnoo’s Avatar in the form of a Man-lion, and rejecting the first because he had rejected the last, we would ask him, did he find this Hindoo fable recorded in writings equally authentic as to their Divine origin, which contain an equal number of prophecies confirmed by their exact fulfilment, and which equally tend to abase human pride and promote “righteousness and true holiness,” with those of the Old and New Testament? If he did not, has he not acted the part of the child who hastily rejects a gem of inestimable value because he had been previously cheated with a glass bauble? So hastily has he indeed rejected the doctrine, that he has not yet ascertained what the Scriptures really say /178 on this point. Where do the Scriptures declare that the Divine and the human nature of the Redeemer are “mixed?” Is it not the doctrine of the scriptures, that, though united in one Mediator, they are PERFECTLY DISTINCT?

§927

Ga 4:4f.; Jn 1:14

By way of reply to our affirming that “the blood of no *mere creature* could take away sin,”<sup>4</sup> our author says, (p. 85,) “It is evident from the circumstance of the blood of a creature being unable to take away sin, and the creator having no blood, that the taking away of sin can have no connection with blood or a bloody sacrifice.”<sup>5</sup> This answer, while it flies in the face of the plainest declaration of scriptures, is a complete begging of the question in debate. He cannot be ignorant, that we do not esteem the Son of God “a mere creature,” but “God over all blessed for evermore;” that while the scripture declares, that without shedding of blood there is no remission, it also declares, that “the BLOOD of Jesus Christ his Son CLEANSETH US FROM ALL SIN,” and that the redeemed above, constantly adore Jesus Christ for having “WASHED THEM

§928

1 Jn 1:7

Rv 1:5f.

<sup>1</sup> §534. <sup>2</sup> §117. <sup>3</sup> §180. <sup>4</sup> §353. <sup>5</sup> §535.

FROM THEIR SINS IN HIS OWN BLOOD.” If while unable to invalidate one of them, however, he will fly in the face of so many declarations of scripture, and affirm, that the Son of God *cannot* thus take away sin, he ought to know that he thereby declares, that *he can* “find out the Almighty to perfection,” and equalizes his knowledge with that of God himself; “for, no one knoweth the Son, but the Father.”

Jb 11:7

Mt 11:27

§929

We had observed “No one but Jehovah, the unchangeable God, could atone for sin, purify the sinner, and change his heart. The Father witnesses that it is Jehovah whom he hath appointed to this glorious work. He humbled himself by becoming in our nature the me-/179diator between God and men,”<sup>1</sup> On this our author says, (p. 86,) “he can conceive that nothing but prejudice in favour of the Trinity can prevent the Editor from seeing gross inconsistency between our declaring Jesus to be the unchangeable Jehovah, and also to have been appointed by Jehovah,”<sup>2</sup> &c. Really this shifting of his ground, after he has passed over such a mass of scripture evidence respecting the fact without the least answer, is sufficiently singular. What can our ideas of its consistency or inconsistency, weigh against the *Divine declarations of the FACT*, so often and so variously repeated? After this, our setting up our ideas as the standard of truth respecting what God can or cannot do, is in reality declaring, that we are *better* acquainted with the Divine nature *than* GOD HIMSELF. The God of truth has unanswerably declared certain facts respecting himself and his way of saving men. After this, men come and, having endeavored in vain to disprove the truth of these declarations, affirm, that these facts are inconsistent with the Divine nature! Now we will not ask here, who knoweth “the Almighty (Father) to perfection?” we only ask, who “knoweth the Son but the Father?” After the Father then *has sent Him*, for us to say, “we are certain that for the Father to send him is inconsistent with the Son’s nature;” what is it less than to exalt our knowledge of the Son above that of the Father himself? We merely remark here as we pass, that this one declaration of Christ, proves him to be *equal* IN NATURE with the Father, for no *creature* could declare without infinite impiety, that his nature is *equally inscrutable* with the Almighty Father’s,—and of such impiety the meek and lowly Jesus was incapable.

§930

Our author’s inquiring “how could the unchangeable Jehovah (the Son) be endued with a new honor which /180 he had not prior to his appointment by Jehovah (the Father),”—and “how could the unchangeable God change his condition by assuming a new nature,”<sup>3</sup> is equally idle. Of course we do not profess to say *how*, until we can “find out the Almighty to perfection,” until our knowledge of the Son’s nature shall equal the Father’s. ’Till then, all the concern both of ourselves and our author, is with *what God has been pleased* TO DECLARE respecting himself, and his Son whose nature he alone knows. These declarations we have collected; and what answers our

---

<sup>1</sup> §353. <sup>2</sup> §536. <sup>3</sup> §536.



author has given to the evidence resulting from them, nay how many of them he has declined even to examine, we have already seen.

But whether Christ's "assuming our nature, the acceptance of a new state of honor, or any other change" to which Jesus Christ rendered himself subject, *did really* make any change in *his* NATURE, our author might easily have learned from the Scriptures. Paul in Heb. i. would have told him that, unto the Son God saith, "Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thine hands. They shall perish, but thou remainest—they shall be changed; but thou art the SAME." Nay he would have found this said after Christ had "by himself purged our sins" and in the very act "upheld all things by the word of his power." Had a doubt still remained whether Jesus Christ was not in some degree changed by his becoming man, and suffering, dying, and rising again, Paul would have told him further, Heb. xiii. 8. that he is, "*Jesus Christ, the SAME yesterday, to-day, AND FOR EVER.*" How could our author anew so commit his cause, as thus to fly in the face of these declarations of Scripture?

His asking p. 87, "whether on the same ground, its being impossible for God to impart any one infinite /181 perfection to a finite creature, it is not impossible in its own nature that the whole of the omnipresent God should be brought into a circumference of a small space," &c.<sup>1</sup> is sufficiently weak. Who beside himself has ever said that Christ, after having taken our nature, was present no where but in human body? Has he forgotten his declaring himself while on earth, "the Son of man *who is in heaven?*" has he overlooked his "upholding all things by the word of his power," to effect which he must have been present with all things? Is he ignorant that it is Christ "who searcheth the reins and hearts?" and can he avoid seeing that he must be every where present to search the hearts of all?

To our author's saying, (p. 87,) "that we attempt **to prove the infinite perfection of Jesus, forgetting perhaps the denial made by Jesus himself of omniscience as well of omnipotence, as narrated by the evangelical writings;**"<sup>2</sup> we reply, that to prove the omniscience and omnipotence of Jesus Christ, requires no labor, since it meets us almost in every part of Scripture. The passages just quoted incidentally, prove both. If "he upholds *all things*," he must be *Almighty*,—if he "searches the reins and hearts," he must be *Omnipresent* and *Omniscient*.

Our author says, that "we entirely avoided **noticing what he stated in proof of**" §934

<sup>1</sup> §536: "The Editor says, (page 555,) 'Nor does it' (the scripture) 'give us the least hint that God ever has imparted any one infinite perfection to a finite creature. This, indeed, is impossible in its own nature.' I therefore beg to ask, whether or not, on the same ground, it is not impossible in its own nature that the whole of the omnipresent God should be brought into a circumference of a small space, subjected to all human feelings, and clothed at one time with two opposite natures, human and divine?"

<sup>2</sup> §537.

the finite effects of Christ's appearance in the world,"<sup>1</sup> and now wishing for an answer, thus states it again, "that the effects of Christ's appearance on earth whether with respect to the salvation or condemnation of mankind, were finite, and therefore suitable to the nature of a finite being to accomplish, is evident from the fact that to the present time millions of human beings are daily passing through the world, whom the doctrines he taught have never reach-/182ed and who of course must be considered as excluded from the benefit of his having died for the remission of their sins."<sup>2</sup> To this we reply, that we thought this needed no answer; and that we now wonder how a man of his acuteness of understanding could wish for an answer to so lame an objection. It is founded on the idea that if Christ does not save every man on earth, his salvation must be *finite*, and he be a *finite* Being. But has not our author himself said in effect, that all the man upon earth and all who ever will be on earth, would still form a finite number? The *infinite* nature of Christ's salvation therefore, cannot be sought from the *number* of those whom he saves; since, had his doctrines reached every human being in the world, all men however numerous they be, could form only a finite number.<sup>3</sup>

§935 But is there nothing in the salvation of even one soul which requires power beyond that of a finite creature? Can "any man redeem his brother or give to God a ransom for him?" Can a finite being lead any sinner to glory? Can a finite being "shine into the heart," and "create the soul anew?" Can a finite being dwell in millions of human minds at the same moment, regulate their thoughts, hear their prayers, render his grace sufficient for them in every time of need, and bring them through every snare to his heavenly kingdom and glory? Further, is *eternal* salvation finite as to its END, or rather has it ANY *end* whatever? Is not Christ the author of *eternal* salvation to all those who obey him? What does *in-finite* mean, beyond *end-LESS*?

§936 Our author's two last objections deny sin's needing an *infinite* atonement, with the view of proving Christ a finite being. Did they possess any weight however, they would prove nothing against the Redeemer's infinite or Divine nature; unless it could be shewn that God can-/183not do a *finite* act, which our author himself overthrows, by the acts of a finite nature he has adduced as done by God himself. His first objection is, "that the guilt committed against an infinite being is infinite in its consequences, is entirely unsupported by reason or proof, and is contrary to scriptural authorities."<sup>4</sup> To support this objection, he adduces the Israelites as "afflicted from time to time with finite punishments for the sins they committed against the infinite God," instancing also David's case, when three years' famine, or three

<sup>1</sup> §537. <sup>2</sup> §537, quoting §142.

<sup>3</sup> Here Marshman actually quotes Rammohan's own words in the same paragraph §537. <sup>4</sup> §538.

months' flight before his foes, or three days' pestilence, were propounded to him; and also Judges xiii. in which it is said that "the children of Israel having done evil in the sight of the Lord, the Lord delivered them into the hand of the Philistines *forty years*." How inconclusive this argument is, will appear when we consider that these were *national* punishments, and that nations can be punished only in this life, as in a future state they do not exist *as nations*, but as individuals. The punishment of nations therefore, is regulated by God in this life, as shall best subserve the designs of his wise and holy providence in governing the world. But will our author say that the individuals who composed these nations, the liar, the oppressor, the thief, the adulterer, the murderer, to whom, taken separately, attaches the whole of the guilt of nations, suffered nothing for their crimes after death? Nay, can he truly affirm that even now their punishment is ended? If it be, where are they?

Jg 13:1

Our author's second argument is, that which we have already noticed as involving the soul and essence of Hindooism.<sup>1</sup> It occurs p. 89, "*were we to admit that sin deserves punishment, we must upon the same ground, so far as reason suggests, esteem a good act as done for the honor of the commandment of the infinite /184 God, or a prayer offered to propitiate the divine majesty to be also worthy of infinite reward as its effect.*" He then adds, "Under these circumstances we cannot help observing, that among those that believe in any revelation either true or received as true, there is probably no man that has not performed at least one single righteous act during the whole period of his life; but as he is a mortal and imperfect being, he cannot be supposed to have escaped every sin in this tempting world. Every man therefore must be both guilty of infinite sin and an agent of infinite virtue. If we suppose that this very person is to be punished for eternity, according to the Editor, for the infinite sin he has committed, there will be no opportunity of his enjoying an infinite reward for his good work. But according to the position, he must be either rewarded for his good or punished for his evil actions for eternity, while justice requires that he should experience the consequences of both."<sup>2</sup> We must confess that after reading this we ceased to wonder at our author's opposition to Christ's atonement. This doctrine, that the same person justly deserves both punishment and reward, both heaven and hell, and that hence neither must be endless, is the very essence of Hindooism.

§937

This doctrine however, is diametrically opposed to that of the Sacred Writings. Their doctrine is, that the man is *cursed* who does *one* wicked deed, "Cursed is he who *continueth not* in ALL things, written in the book of the law to do them." It is, that "whosoever shall keep the whole law and yet offended in one point, is guilty of all." Nor is the scripture less decided on the fact that a wicked man *never does*

§938

Ga 3:10

Jm 2:10

<sup>1</sup> §817. <sup>2</sup> §539.

one single righteous act with a view to the glory of God. Even before the flood  
Gn 6:5 God declared, (Gen. vi. 5,) that “the imagination of man’s heart is *only* evil  
*continually*.” More than a thousand years afterwards, God having looked down from  
Ps 14:3 heaven to see if there were any that understood, that sought God, solemnly declares,  
(Psalm xiv.) “They are all gone aside; they are all together become filthy; there is  
none that doeth good, no, not one.” And after Christ had died and had ascended up  
to heaven, the Divine Spirit by the Apostle, repeats the account of man’s complete  
depravity given in the time of David, as a just description of men under the Christian  
Rm 3:9–20 dispensation. “There is none that doeth good, no not one.” “There is no fear of God  
before their eyes;” and hence declares, that “by the deeds of the law there shall no  
flesh be justified in God’s sight, for by the law is the knowledge of sin.” Nay in Rom.  
Rm 8:7 viii. he declares that, “the carnal mind is *enmity* against God, and is not *subject* to the  
law of God, neither indeed *can be*.” Hence of course it will do nothing “for the honor  
of God’s commandment” to which it disdains to be subject; or with “a view to the  
glory of God,”<sup>1</sup> towards whom it is in enmity, thus illustrating our Lord’s declaration,  
Mt 7:18 “a corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit.” Has not our author reason to fear that  
while he thinks himself so well acquainted therewith, his mind is not yet imbued  
with the first principles of the doctrine of Christ, and that he has not yet formed a  
correct view of its first elements? And should he not, is it any wonder that he should  
so awfully mistake respecting his Atonement and his Deity?

§939 We will now however, grant him his own position, that sin and righteousness are  
found in the same person, and that justice requires them both to be rewarded with a  
finite reward,—and whither will it lead us? Full into the Metempsychosis, the funda-  
mental /186 doctrine of Hindooism! The soul suffers its finite punishment; it enjoys  
its finite reward. What becomes of it then? Justice itself forbids its being either re-  
warded or punished farther. It is then absorbed into Bruhma? Is it annihilated? or,  
is it sent again into human life? Thus his doctrine inevitably leads him to *Hindooism*  
or to *annihilation*. We have already observed that the rock on which our author has  
split, is, his not tracing the just consequences of his own assertions. Whether this  
be the case or not, let the reader judge.

§940 To precisely the same conclusion tend all his observations (p. 91) on the words  
rendered “everlasting or eternal.”<sup>2</sup> The same words are applied to the felicity of the  
righteous as to the punishment of the wicked. When the felicity of the righteous  
shall end therefore, what is to become of them? Are they to be punished with hell?  
This would not only be unjust, but useless to his cause; for according to him, this  
punishment also must end. Shall they then re-animate human bodies and enter life  
again? or shall they be annihilated? Here we are again driven to the same issue, HIN-

---

<sup>1</sup> §539. <sup>2</sup> §540.

DOOISM—or DARK ANNIHILATION—O that our author may pause and think, before it be for ever to late.



# 10 Marshman: Second Review of the Final Appeal – The Deity of Christ

## Editorial Introduction

Rammohan did not answer to Marshman's review from December 1823, but Marshman still owed a second review about the divinity of Christ to his readers. In 1824 his time and publication space was consumed by an essay against Abbé Dubois in the *Friend of India*, in which he attacked Dubois' view on the Christian mission in India.<sup>1</sup>

The text basis for this edition is *The Friend of India. Quarterly Series. Vol. III., No. XI.*, pp. 393-592. The title page of this *No. XI.* does not contain a date of publishing. Therefore we can assume it was published together with the whole *Vol. III.*, which bears the date "January 1st, 1825" (p. 3).

In the original print the text contains 200 pages. Marshman wants to disprove every proposition of his opponent and sometimes quotes the whole line of argument. There is not much development in his positions, often he just repeats his old words or claims that Rammohan's arguments are invalid. One new point is the explanation of the Angel of the LORD in §§954-986. Marshman proves the identity of Christ and the Angel of the LORD from the Old Testament.

Marshman planned to write a third review about the Holy Spirit (§1084, §1203), but it never appeared. By this the impression is reinforced, that this theology is completely Christ centred: The interest in the Father and the Spirit is much lower than the interest in the Son, who is creator and omnipresent redeemer of the world.

The quotation marks in the original print are again unreliable and confusing at some positions. In this edition the quotation marks have been tacitly revised and corrected, as there was nowhere essential doubt about the correct usage. The original text does not contain any chapters or sections. Appropriate [headlines] have been added for the reader's orientation.

---

<sup>1</sup> See *FI QS 1825*, 206-222.

§951 [393] ART. I.—Review of Rammohun Roy’s Final Appeal to the “Christian Public,” as far as it impugns the Deity of Christ. Calcutta, 1823.

[Introduction]

§952 IN No. IX. of this work, we examined Rammohun Roy’s Final Appeal to the Christian Public as far as it denied the doctrine of Christ’s Atonement, of “redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins,” and intimated our wish to examine his new objections against the Deity of Christ in our next Number. Before we had written a line on the subject, however, we received from the late Charles Grant, Esq. that steady friend to India for nearly half a century,<sup>1</sup> a copy of the Abbé Dubois’s work, with a request that we would immediately reply thereto; as this was expected of us by the public in Britain from our having been nearly as long a time in India, as the Abbé himself.<sup>2</sup> We were therefore constrained to suspend our further answer to Rammohun Roy, ’till the present number. Having discharged this duty, we now redeem our pledge and without delay enter on the examination of his objections to the proofs we, in our Reply to his former Appeal, adduced from the Scriptures respecting the Deity of “the only wise God our Saviour,” “Jesus Christ the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.”

Jude 1:25; Heb  
13:8

§953 Before we begin we are constrained to express the regret we feel that we should be so long detained by con-/394troversy from those subjects so much more delightful, the manners and customs of our Indian fellow-subjects, and the means of improving their condition and circumstances. Not that we deem the subject in hand unimportant to India: if all that has been done to ameliorate the state of Britain, of Europe, and the whole Christian world, has been effected by those who have depended wholly on Christ’s death for the forgiveness of sins, it is of the first importance to India that every attempt to undervalue his blood as procuring forgiveness of sins, or to impugn his Deity by which he renews our hearts “and delivers us from this present evil world,” should be promptly met by decided evidence from Scripture. Still we regret that our pages should assume so much of a controversial form on account of the task it imposes on the minds of our readers; and while in the present case we feel it unavoidable, we shall study the utmost conciseness, and devote only a part of this Number to the subject, leaving the remainder to a future opportunity.

Ga 1:4

[The Angel of the LORD]

§954 Our author begins this part of his Final Appeal by a remark which he should

<sup>1</sup> Charles Grant (1746-1823), known for his “Observations on the State of Society among the Asiatic Subjects of Great Britain”, which was an important text for the supporters of Christian mission in India in 1813.

<sup>2</sup> The catholic missionary Jean-Antoine Dubois (1765-1848) had pointed out that India would not become a Christian country and the mission would not be successful. Marshman’s review of Dubois’ book *Letters on the State of Christianity in India* filled the whole number in May 1824.



not have suffered to weigh with himself for a moment. “I proceed to examine the doctrine of the Trinity, a term which—is not once found in any part of the sacred books.”<sup>1</sup> The term “Deity” is not found in any part of the sacred books; but are we thence to infer that they do not treat of a Deity? In our Reply to his Second Appeal we observed;

“In adducing evidence for the Deity of Christ, we are not left to infer, that if the blood of bulls and goats *could not* take away sin, Divine justice required a sacrifice through whom God *could be just*, while the justifier of the sinner; and that as there is a certain proportion between *all creatures* rational or irrational, but none between the highest archangel and his Creator, /395 the blood of no mere creature could take away sin; we are *solemnly assured*, that it was Jehovah, the unchangeable God, the Creator of heaven and earth, for whom the Father prepared a body, before whom John Baptist was sent as his messenger, and against whom, as his fellow and consociate, the Father commanded his sword to awake—that it is Jehovah who is our righteousness, and in whom the seed of Israel are justified and glory,—and who, being King of God’s spiritual Israel, rules in their hearts as the omniscient and almighty Saviour. Thus instead of being left to prove, that no one but Jehovah the unchangeable God, COULD atone for sin, justify the sinner, and change his heart, the Father himself witnesses that IT IS *Jehovah* whom he hath appointed to this glorious work. Should any one object that the Father has given Jehovah the Son to do what a *creature* could have accomplished as well, this would not in the least affect the truth of the fact; it would be only a dispute respecting wisdom between Him whose understanding is infinite, and his creature the objector.”<sup>2</sup>—To this our Author makes no reply. We further observed,

“The sole question then is, whether the Son be BY NATURE GOD, bringing omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence to his work, as well as infinite rectitude and mercy—or whether he be *a mere creature*, elevated to a state to which by nature he had not the least right. In other words, did he ‘*humble himself*’ by becoming in our nature the Mediator between God and man, or did he by this act *really exalt himself*, and attain a rank in the universe for which his original nature furnished him with neither pretension nor capacity. The Scriptures know nothing of an intermediate rank between the Creator and the creature, between finite and infinite; nor does it give us the least hint that God ever has imparted any one infinite perfection to a finite creature. This indeed is impossible in its own nature. That the *receiver* must be of equal capacity and extent with the *thing received*, is a self-evident maxim. Be it power or knowledge, when a finite being has received a portion equal to /396 his limited capacity, what is to become of the remainder? It will still fill the capacity of another finite being of ten thousand,—of all in the universe. Will this exhaust it?—Then it was never infinite; for infinite has no end. There must then ever be an *infinite* disproportion between the capacity and power of the Father and the Son, *if he be a creature*, even though ‘he

<sup>1</sup> §541. <sup>2</sup> §353.

be great as the angels of God, or rather greater.”<sup>1</sup> To the whole of this, which involves the life-blood of his cause, no reply whatever is given. We further added;

§957 “As the Son entered on his Mediatorial work as soon as sin entered into the world, we may naturally expect to find him in the Divine Records acting from the beginning distinctly from the Father, though in all things one with him. This we find to have been the case. In Gen 48:15f. xlviii. 16, we have One introduced as an Angel, to the distinctness of whom from the Father, our author bears the strongest testimony, by affirming, p. 70, that *Angels* dispensed pardon and redemption as well as Christ, and quoting Gen. xlviii. 16, ‘The Angel that redeemed me from all evil bless the lads.’ Thus early then does One appear in the scriptures *distinct* from the Father, and *able to redeem*.”<sup>2</sup>

§958 Against this Rammohun Roy objects, that we “never thought of producing a single authority for identifying that Angel with those whom we consider as Jehovah the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.”<sup>3</sup> Did we not indeed? Did we not mention Jacob as declaring this Redeeming Angel to be the God before whom Abraham and Isaac walked? Did we not point him to still farther evidence? Let him review our declaration again;

§959 “This angel it is easy to trace. In Gen. xxxi. 11, we find Jacob telling his family, ‘*The angel of God* spake with me in a dream saying, *I am the God of Bethel*, where thou anointedst the pillar and vowedst a vow unto me.’ On recurring to this transaction in ch. xxviii. we are told, ‘Behold, *Jehovah* stood above the ladder and said, I am Jehovah, the God of Abraham thy Fa-/397ther, and the God of Isaac, the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it and to thy seed.—And Jacob vowed a vow and said, If God will be with me and keep me in this way that I go—then shall *Jehovah* be my God.’ This ‘Angel of God,’ then is here termed both Jehovah and God, and by Jacob chosen as his God, being also the God of Abraham and Isaac. Gn 35:1 God himself recognizes this transaction in ch. xxxv. ‘And *God* said unto Jacob, arise, go up to Bethel, and dwell there, and make there an altar unto *God who appeared unto thee when thou fleddest from the face of Esau thy brother*.’ If this be the Son speaking here, the Holy Spirit again calls him God; if it be the Father, by saying ‘*God who appeared unto thee at Bethel*,’ the Father places this Angel on a perfect equality with himself. Jacob indeed in the very passage quoted by our author to prove that ‘*angels* have dispensed pardon and redemption to men,’ declares the Angel who redeemed him from all evil to be ‘the God before whom Abraham and Isaac had walked.’ How must our author feel when on reviewing the context, he finds that he has been disproving Christ’s Deity, by shewing that the *God of Abraham* dispensed pardon and redemption as well as Christ.”<sup>4</sup> Is it possible that after we had pointed him to these facts he could declare, “The Editor never thinks of producing a single authority for his identifying that Angel with those whom he considers as Jehovah the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob?” Would any Unitarian in England or America, where the

<sup>1</sup> §353, the last words are from *Second Appeal*, §147. <sup>2</sup> §355, quoting from §147. <sup>3</sup> §542. <sup>4</sup> §355.

public expect a man to weigh the testimonies brought against him, have ventured to commit his cause by such an assertion?

As our Author seems so ready to mistake respecting this Angel, whom he himself declares to be distinct from the Father, we will trace this glorious Being upward to the first mention of him in Scripture, and then to the end of the Old Testament and his incarnation in the New. In Gen. xxii. 11, 12, it is said, “And the Angel of Jehovah /398 called unto Abraham out of heaven, saying—Lay not thine hand on the lad, neither do thou any thing unto him: for now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son *from ME*.” But what Angel is this who dares to say, “In offering thy Son to God thou hast offered him *to ME*?” Is it any other than the Angel who redeemed Jacob from all evil, the God before whom Abraham and Isaac walked? If we wish to ascertain before whom it was that Abraham walked, we have only to turn to Gen. xvii. 1, where we find it said; “And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, *Jehovah* appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am the Almighty God, *walk before me*, and be thou perfect.” It is then fully ascertained that this Redeeming Angel, whom our Author declares distinct from the Father, is, *Jehovah*, the Almighty God, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Whether this be the Second Person in the ever-blessed Trinity, in the New Testament termed “the Son,” “the Son of God,” it would be superfluous to attempt even to enquire. §960  
Gn 22:11f.  
Gn 17:1

For his satisfaction however, we will briefly trace this “Angel of Jehovah,” down to the very last book of the Old Testament. In Exodus iii. 2—4, we are informed; that “the angel of the Lord appeared unto him (Moses) in a flame of fire, out of the midst of a bush; and he looked and behold, the bush burned with fire and was not consumed. And Moses said, I will now turn aside and see this great sight, why the bush is not burnt. 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.” &c. Here again we find this Angel of Jehovah styled both Jehovah and God, and in verse 4th, he declares himself to be “the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Ja-/399cob.” But it may not be improper to enquire into the *works* of this uncreated Angel as well as his *Names*. He himself declares in ver. 7th and 8th, “I have surely seen the affliction of my people which are in Egypt, and have heard their cry by reason of their taskmasters; for I know their sorrows; and I am come down to deliver them, and to bring them out of that land into a good land and a large, unto a land flowing with milk and honey;” and in ver. 10th, “Come now therefore and I will send thee unto Pharaoh that thou mayst bring forth my people, the children of Israel out of Egypt.” In addition to this we find the same glorious Being in ver. 14, declaring in answer to Moses’s enquiry respecting his name, “I AM THAT I AM. Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, §961  
Ex 3:1–14

<sup>1</sup> Read: “John viii. 58”.

Jn 8:58 I AM hath sent me unto you.”—And this is precisely what Christ declares himself to be in John x. 58<sup>1</sup>; “Verily verily I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I AM.” Thus we find this Angel of Jehovah declared to be Jehovah, God Almighty, the Eternal I AM, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, even Him who “brought Israel out of Egypt into the land that floweth with milk and honey.”

§962 We may merely mention by the way, that in Joshua v. 13, 15, we find a Being introduced, whom Joshua thus addressed, “Art thou for us or for our adversaries? And he said, nay but as Captain of Jehovah’s host am I now come. And Joshua fell on his feet and did worship and said unto him, what saith my lord unto his servant?” To this his reply was, “Loose thy shoe from off thy foot; for the place whereon thou standest is holy. And Joshua did so.” It is quite immaterial to our present argument whether this was a created angel or the uncreated Angel we are now tracing; but Joshua’s whole behaviour towards him, his own declaring the /400 ground holy on which he stood, and his demanding precisely the same token of reverence which Jehovah had demanded of Moses, render it at least probable that he was the Uncreated Angel who was about to give Israel possession of “that good land flowing with milk and honey,” after having delivered them from Egypt and brought them through the wilderness; and that he thus appeared to encourage Joshua on his work, as he had before encouraged Moses.<sup>2</sup>

§963 But in Judges, ch. ii. we have this “Angel of Jehovah” appearing and declaring himself in all his majesty. See ver. 1–3. “And an Angel of Jehovah came up from Gilgal to Bochim, and said, *I made you to go up out of Egypt, and have brought you unto the land which I swore unto your fathers; and I said I will never break my covenant with you; and ye shall make no league with the inhabitants of this land; ye shall throw down their altars: but ye have not obeyed my vow. Why have ye done this?*” This corroborates all previously declared of this “Angel of Jehovah;” it is he who brought them out of Egypt into that land, and thus accomplished what he appeared in the bush to Moses for the sake of performing;—it is *he* who had sworn to their fathers Abraham and Isaac and Jacob to give them this land, and who in the wilderness commanded them to make no league with these nations. These things completely identify him as “the Angel of Jehovah” who had before appeared, and who as Jehovah, God Almighty, had entered into covenant with Abraham.

§964 More than two hundred years after this, we find the Angel of Jehovah appearing again to deliver Israel in one of the deepest seasons of affliction they ever experienced. In Judges vi. 11, we read that “there came an angel of Jehovah and sat under an oak which in Ophrah”—/401and addressed Gideon. This angel, the Divine Histo-

<sup>2</sup> In §608 Rammohan had noticed this passage as an example for “angels of God” having “received worship from fellow-creatures”.

rian, in the 14th and 16th verses, terms Jehovah, and describes him as declaring to Gideon, "Surely I will be with thee and thou shalt smite Midian as one man." Gideon replies; "If now I have found grace in thy sight, then shew me a sign that thou talkest with me," and intreats him not to depart till he should return, to which the angel graciously consents. When Gideon returns with a kid dressed and unleavened cakes of bread, this Angel manifests that he is indeed Jehovah; for he turns what Gideon intended as a repast into a sacrifice, and causes fire to issue from the rock and consume the whole, as Jehovah caused fire to descend and consume the sacrifices of Israel, of Solomon, and Elijah.

If we examine Isaiah xlii. a chapter which is applied to Christ in the fullest manner by the Spirit of truth in the Evangelists, we shall find Jehovah's Angel or Messenger, (the word in the Hebrew for both being the same,) described as the Messiah. In the 19th verse, God thus speaks; "Who is blind, but my servant? or deaf, as my Messenger (or Angel) that I sent? Who is blind as he that is perfect, and blind as Jehovah's servant?" Here we find Jehovah's Angel identified as the Lord's Servant, the Messiah, about to be given "for a covenant of the people, a light of the Gentiles." §965  
Is 42:18-21

In Isaiah lxiii. 9, this Uncreated Angel is styled "the angel of Jehovah's presence." Speaking of Israel, the Divine Spirit saith, "In all their afflictions Jehovah was afflicted, and the Angel of his Presence saved them; in his love and in his pity he redeemed them and bare them and carried them all the days of old." Here this Uncreated Angel is represented as co-operating with the Father in the same work. In all /402 the afflictions of Israel the Father was afflicted, and the Angel of his Presence saved them; yea "in his love and in his pity he redeemed them and bare them and carried them all the days of the old."<sup>1</sup> This co-operation of Jehovah and the Angel of his Presence, illustrates the meaning of two declarations made by our Lord to the Jews when on earth; the one is, "*I and my Father are ONE*, and the other, What things (John v. 19) soever he (the Father) doeth, these also doeth the Son LIKEWISE," ὁμοίως or in precisely the same manner. Does the Father create? The Son creates likewise. Does the Father uphold and preserve all things after they are created? The Son "upholds all things by the word of his power," even while purging our sins on the accursed tree. Does the Father pity and save? The Son also pities and redeems, both by his precious blood and his almighty power. Does the Father search the heart and try the reigns to give to every man according to his ways? The Son declares, Rev. ii. 23, "I am he which searcheth the hearts and reins, and I will give unto every one of you according to your works." §966  
Is 63:9  
Jn 10:30; 5:19  
Heb 1:3  
Rv 2:23

<sup>1</sup> Rammohan, in §542 had used this verse for illustrating the diversity of "those that are said in the sacred books to have redeemed people at different times", who were unlikely all to be identified with Jesus.

§967 In the last book of Scripture written before the coming of the Messiah, that of the prophet Malachi, ch. iii. we have this declaration; “Behold I will send my messenger and he shall prepare the way before me; and Jehovah whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the Messenger of the Covenant whom ye delight in, behold he shall come, saith Jehovah of hosts.” Our author, although he cannot deny that this Angel or Messenger of the Covenant is Christ, which is all we quote this passage to prove, still to prevent his being called Jehovah here, (a vain attempt when we find him so frequently styled Jehovah elsewhere, to say nothing of his being called the Almighty /403ty God, the I AM, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,) insists that our Translators were wrong two hundred years ago in rendering the Hebrew *Vau* “even,” that it ought to be rendered “and,” and that two persons are described as coming, Jehovah and the Messenger or Angel of the Covenant,<sup>1</sup> although the Divine Spirit only mentions one, as, “HE shall come,—who may abide the day of HIS coming? who shall stand when HE appeareth—HE is like a refiner’s fire—HE shall sit as a refiner—HE shall purify the sons of Levi,” in doing which he makes the prophet guilty of repeated violations of grammar in his own language. As he acknowledges however that this Angel or Messenger of the Covenant, is Christ, we shall leave the further examination of his objection till we meet this passage again.

§968 What a chain of evidence have we here to the Deity of the Second Person in the glorious Trinity, exclusive of that against which Rammohun Roy bends all his force? This evidence is not deduced from Prophecy, it is founded on *plain Narrative*; it is deduced from the Historic Records of the transactions of God with man, penned under the direction of the Spirit of truth. These declare the future Messiah to be Jehovah, God Almighty, the I AM, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the God  
Dt 26:3f. “who brought Israel out of Egypt with a high hand and an outstretched arm, and led him through the wilderness into a land that flowed with milk and honey.” Were it decorous to our Author, we might here take leave of the subject in the language of the High Priest when he deemed the Son guilty of blasphemy for asserting his Deity; Mt 26:65 *what need have we of any further witnesses?*

§969 This chain of facts, drawn from the relation given by /404 the Divine Historians relative to the appearance of the Second Person in the glorious Trinity previously to his incarnation, throws light on various passages in the Evangelists and the Epistles.  
Jn 1:18 We may mention three such in St. John’s gospel. The first is in John i. 18, where speaking of the Father, the Evangelist says, “No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.” The second and third are from the mouth of our Lord himself, who, in John v. 37, Jn 5:37 speaking of the Father, tells the Jews, “Ye have neither heard his voice at any time

---

<sup>1</sup> §603.

nor seen his shape.” Now the Jews of that day did not pretend that they had seen God or heard his voice, and if our Lord under the term “ye” included their fathers as well as they, it will amount to a declaration that the appearances of God under the Old Testament dispensation, were those of God the Son and not of God the Father, which has been the opinion of various eminent divines, and among these, if we mistake not, of the excellent President Edwards. The other is John vi. 46, “Not that any man hath seen the Father, save he who is of God; he hath seen the Father.” These passages, however, we submit to the judgement of our readers without affirming any thing respecting them ourselves; as the chain of facts which declares the “Angel of Jehovah” who appeared to the patriarchs and to Israel, to be Jehovah, God Almighty, the I AM, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, is perfectly independent of these three declarations.<sup>1</sup>

Jn 6:46

It also throws light on those passages which declare that Christ is ONE with the Father, and that they who “have seen him have seen the Father.” It declares that he is ONE with the Father in his Natural as well as his Moral Perfections; in his omniscience, omnipre-405sence, and omnipotence, as well as in infinite wisdom, rectitude, and mercy. Hence no declaration can be more strictly true, taken in its widest signification, than this of our Lord, “I and my Father are ONE.” It no less elucidates Christ’s answer to Philip, John xiv. 9, “Hast thou been so long time with me, and yet hast thou not seen me, Philip? *He that hath seen me hath seen the Father*, and how sayest thou, shew us the Father?” When bodily shape is out of the question, the son who should declare that he who had seen *him*, had so fully seen his father as to render needless any sight of his father, would be guilty of a boast as false as it would be vainglorious, unless he were fully equal to him both in ability and goodness. Yet such is our Lord’s declaration, which these facts, drawn from Scripture narrative, fully substantiate. Abraham, in seeing the grace and omnipotence of the Son displayed in preserving him continually and blessing him, beheld those perfections of the Father so fully, that had the Father himself appeared, nothing could have been added. Jacob, in that display of omnipotence, omniscience, and tender mercy made by “the Angel who redeemed him from all evil,” in delivering him from Esau and Laban, in restraining the Canaanites from destroying him and his family, and in sending Joseph before him into Egypt, saw the Divine character no less fully

§970

Jn 10:30

Jn 14:9

Gn 48:15f.

<sup>1</sup> Marshman uses a traditional Christian interpretation of these Verses in John, which is known already by the church fathers. He expressly refers to Jonathan Edwards (1703-1758), the American Puritan theologian. In his book *History of Redemption* Edwards reflects about the appearances of Jesus in the Time of the Old Testament, and the Angel of the LORD is one of them. He uses Jn 1:18 for this argument, and about Jn 5:37 he writes: “Neither [...] must we understand God the Father himself [by the angel of the Lord], for our Lord expressly tells the Jews, that they had not at any time either ‘heard his voice, or seen his shape’”, Edwards, *History*, 200.

displayed; and Moses and Israel in beholding the wonderful works of “the Angel of Jehovah,” displayed in bringing them out of Egypt, through the wilderness, and into the land of Canaan, beheld all the perfections of the Godhead so fully displayed by the Second Person in the glorious Trinity, that in seeing him they fully saw the Father.

§971 This also furnishes a key to the Apostle’s meaning Heb. i. 3, in which after describing the Son as exercising his omnipresence and omnipotence in upholding all things with the word of his power, he adds, “who is the BRIGHTNESS of the Father’s glory.” Now the Father’s glory consists in his attributes or perfections, and if the Son have one attribute less than the Father, he can be no representation of his Father’s glory, much less can he be the *brightness* of his glory; as in that case were any one to form an idea of the Father from what they saw of the Son, he would be deceived. Further, did the Son possess all the attributes of the Father *in a less degree*, he would not be an *accurate*, much less a *glorious*, representation of his Father; it would be a dishonour to the Father to be supposed no wiser, no holier, no more omnipotent than the Son. But what must it be for the Son not only to possess all those attributes which form the Father’s glory, but to possess them in such a manner as to constitute the BRIGHTNESS of that glory! Yet in his dealings with the patriarchs and with Israel, these were displayed by “The Angel of Jehovah,” who is, Jehovah, God Almighty, the I AM; and unless the Apostle Paul was guilty of blasphemy, the *Deity* and perfect *Equality* of the Son, is indisputably maintained in his declaring him “the BRIGHTNESS of the father’s glory.”

§972 This assemblage of evidence drawn from Divine historic testimony, has a powerful effect on all we have to examine. As it consists partly of testimonies from the prophets that Christ is by them termed Jehovah, if our Author could prove that in all these passages we have been mistaken, still this would avail nothing, when he is so frequently termed Jehovah by the Divine Historians. Could he disprove every testimony adduced from the New Testament to shew that Christ was with Israel in the wilderness, this could avail him nothing, while this “Angel of Jehovah” himself declares, “I brought you /407 out of Egypt into the land I swore unto your fathers.” Could he prove that in saying “My Lord and my God,” Thomas only took the name of God in vain; and that Paul in saying “of whom is Jesus Christ, who is God over all blessed for evermore,”<sup>1</sup> merely uttered an idle exclamation,—yea that the lepers, the blind men healed, the mariners, and Stephen, and Paul, by worshipping Christ, merely intended that civil kind of reverence yielded to a magistrate or a teacher, this could weigh nothing when the “Angel of Jehovah,” the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, was worshipped by the patriarchs—by Moses and Aaron and Israel in the

<sup>1</sup> This is a mixture of Rm 9:5 and 2 Co 11:31.



wilderness—by Samuel, David, Solomon, and all the prophets, as well as by the highest Archangel in heaven. This chain of narrative fact leaves us in reality nothing to do but to examine all our Author’s objections in the most candid and patient manner; since, if we have been mistaken in every one of the instances in which we thought Christ mentioned by the Prophets, this will not in the least affect the Deity of Him who in the simple narrative of the Divine Historians is declared to be Jehovah, God Almighty, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, who brought Israel out of Egypt into the land that floweth with milk and honey.

We may further observe that the Two Natures of our Lord and Saviour, so much the object of Rammohun Roy’s derision, are in this narrative of facts attested beyond a doubt. That this Angel, the Second Person in the glorious Trinity, by the Spirit of truth termed “Jehovah,” “God Almighty,” the “I AM,” possessed a *Divine nature*, no one will doubt; yet he had not then been “*born of a woman* and made under the law to redeem those who were under the law.” And that his Human nature should have changed the Divine nature /408 of the unchangeable Jehovah, is an idea on which we think no one would have ventured whose mind had not from its earliest infancy been familiarized with the doctrine of the Hindoo Metempsychosis, that when a man becomes a frog, a snake, a tree, he loses all the recollection and consciousness which characterize the human soul.

§973

Ga 4:4f.

Let us now examine what our Author attempts to bring forward against this glorious display of Christ’s deity. He says “the only reason the Editor assigns for his first supposition is, that the angel appeared ‘distinct from the Father and able to redeem.’”<sup>1</sup> Our words really are, “thus early does one appear *distinct* from the Father and *able to redeem*.”<sup>2</sup> And such a Being’s appearing “*thus early*,” adds peculiar weight to the subject, for if *He* appears *thus early* in the Scriptures distinct from the Father and able to redeem, he will undoubtedly appear in these characters still more plainly as we proceed in examining the sacred books. The reasoning with which he attempts to oppose this glorious fact, destroys itself. One part of it is, “can the circumstance of the performance of similar acts by two persons identify one with the other? If so, we must on the same ground identify God with the human race, the Scriptures having ascribed to them both such attributes as mercy, wrath, reward, and punishment; and we also on the same principle must maintain the identity of Jesus with all that are said in the sacred books to have redeemed people at different times.”<sup>3</sup> This reply will scarcely bear even to be examined. In the first instance the attribute of *reward* and that of *punishment*, are both entirely new to us; such *attributes* we never before heard ascribed either to God or man. In the second, the performance of similar acts will identify a person /409 even among men, if there be only one in an age capa-

§974

<sup>1</sup> §542. <sup>2</sup> §355. <sup>3</sup> §542.

ble of them. The writing of the Iliad and the Odyssey, were two different acts, yet they are identified as done by the same person, because in that age we know of no other capable of writing both these poems. But when the acts require the exercise of omnipotence, and omniscience, of infinite wisdom and mercy, as we know these belong alone to the Triune God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, if such acts be ascribed to One distinct from the Father and the Holy Spirit, we know that they must have been performed by the Son, far more certainly that we know that the Odyssey was written by Homer; as the one depends on tradition, which yet a man would make himself ridiculous by denying, and the the other on the word of *Him who cannot lie*.

Tt 1:2

§975

Jude 25

As our Author seems so fond of bringing other redeemers as competitors with “the only wise God our Saviour,” let us thoroughly examine the principle on which he does this. To render them capable of competing with Christ, it is necessary that whatever is said of the Saviour, should be said of these, or the competition falls to the ground. Now respecting this Redeeming Angel there are three things declared, Gen. xlviii. 15, 16, that he is, “God before whom Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God who fed Jacob all his life long, and the Angel who redeemed him from all evil.” But are Obed, and Nehemiah and his companions, ever said to be “the God before whom Abraham and Isaac walked?” If not, the reasoning is inapplicable; the same things are not said of these human redeemers which are said of Jacob’s Redeeming Angel. At the ignorance of Scripture which could bring the Angel of Jehovah’s Presence who redeemed Israel, to compete with the Angel who redeemed Jacob from all evil, and brought Israel out of Egypt into the land which he /410 sware unto their fathers, we should be surprized, had we not already seen Rammohun Roy adduce “God before whom Abraham walked” as redeeming equally with Christ, by way of disproving his Deity!<sup>1</sup>

Gn 48:15f.

§976

But let us examine our Author’s bringing others as competitors with Jesus simply as they are termed “redeemers” or said “to have redeemed.” For any one to compete with Christ in redeeming, his deed must be of precisely the same nature with Christ’s redeeming, and must require equal omnipotence and love. Through the limited nature of language, the word “redeem,” is applied to a multitude of acts, from Christ’s redeeming his people from the curse of the Divine law and from all their iniquities, down to a man’s “redeeming the firstling of an ass with a lamb.” In the case then of our Author’s two human redeemers, Obed and Nehemiah,<sup>2</sup> let us substitute for the word “redeem,” the actions described, and see whether they imply the possession of infinite power and love equally with the Angel’s redeeming Jacob from all evil. Obed was a redeemer to Naomi by standing forth the representative of her son’s and her husband’s family, and thus redeeming it from extinction in Israel. His claim

Ex 13:13

Rt 4:14

<sup>1</sup> §147. <sup>2</sup> §542.

to the title of “redeemer” then, consisted in his merely existing! Wherein consisted Nehemiah’s claim? He, as well as his brethren, redeemed according to his ability certain of his countrymen from slavery among the heathen; in other words he advanced a few shekels of money to purchase their freedom. Our Author’s reasoning therefore, duly translated, stands thus; If the Angel who was “God before Abraham and Isaac walked,” “the God who fed Jacob all his life long, and redeemed him from all evil,” be Christ, we must on the same principle maintain the identity of Obed with Christ who redeemed Naomi’s family and /411 name from extinction by his mere existence; and also of Nehemiah who gave a few shekels to redeem certain of his countrymen from heathen slavery, these acts implying equally the possession of infinite power and goodness, with the Angel’s redeeming Jacob from all evil! Is it thus that he attempts to impugn the Deity of Christ? Ne 5:8

But as if mistrusting this objection, our Author provides himself with a second (p. 95,) which is, “Were we to admit for a moment that the Angel who redeemed Jacob was indeed Jesus, it would necessarily follow according to the Editor that there was Christ-man-Jesus, God-Jesus, and Angel-Jesus; that is, that Christ is possessed of a three-fold nature.”<sup>1</sup> On this we beg leave to observe that “Christ-man-Jesus,” is tautology of his own invention. The Messiah (Christ) when clothed in human flesh is called “Jesus,” because he saves his people from their sins; hence he is Christ Jesus, “the same yesterday, to-day and for ever.” This redeeming Angel, Jacob declares to be “God before whom Abraham and Isaac walked.” Incarnate then, he is “God-man.” But who beside our Author ever heard of this *third* or angelic nature! How is it that he did not recollect the Apostle’s declaration, Heb. ii. 16, “For verily he took not on him the NATURE of ANGELS.” While he is termed the Angel of Jehovah, this scripture is fatal to our Author’s idea of his possessing a created angelic nature. Heb 13:8

In Rammohun Roy’s next oblique objection, (p. 96,) “We will in conformity to the spirit of the sacred writings, maintain the opinion that God is the only true Redeemer, and his Christ, his angels, and his prophets are redeemers in a secondary sense; that is, they are the instruments in the hands of God in his works of redemption;”<sup>2</sup> he is merely begging the question. In what part of the Scriptures does he find God the Father said to be /412 the only true Redeemer? Where in them does he find Christ placed on a perfect level with prophets and angels? Beside Jacob’s redeeming angel, “the Angel of God’s presence,” what angel does he find called the Redeemer? His human redeemers we have already weighed and found wanting. And are those whom he adduces as “gods” superior in nature to these? §978

His last objection is, that if Jacob’s Redeeming Angel, be Jesus, he cannot be God, because the angel who appeared to Manoah, “renounces his own deity”<sup>3</sup> by §979

<sup>1</sup> §543. <sup>2</sup> §544. <sup>3</sup> §544.

Jg 13:16 saying, if thou wilt offer a burnt-offering, thou must offer it to God; and the angel  
 2 S 24:16 mentioned 2 Sam. xxiv. 16, destroyed seventy thousand Israelites. But who ever  
 said that God has no angel beside Jacob's redeeming angel? or that no angel besides  
 was ever employed under the Old Testament dispensation? Has not the Son of Man  
*his* angels, in whose glory he will come at last! Has our Author forgotten who said,  
 Rv 22:16 "I Jesus have sent mine angel?" But to which of the angels did the Father ever say,  
 Heb 1:13 "Sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies thy footstool?" Are they not all  
 ministering spirits sent forth to minister unto those who shall be heirs of salvation?  
 And were there no heirs of salvation found under the Old Testament dispensation?

§980

In the hope of invalidating this uncreated Angel's speaking of himself as the  
 Almighty God, our Author now has recourse to a mode which savors strongly of  
 early Hindoo prejudices. It is in reality, that of affirming that the prophets occasion-  
 ally speak of themselves as God! That the ancient Hindoo moonees and sages, if they  
 ever existed, did speak of themselves as even superior to the Hindoo gods, we will  
 allow. But that he should carry this idea into the Sacred Scriptures and imagine that  
 any prophet of Jehovah could be guilty of such blasphem<sup>y</sup> and falsehood, as to  
 speak of himself as if God were speaking, is astonishing indeed. Is he aware what he  
 does if he affirms that Isaiah said of himself, ch. xxix. 2, 3, "Yet will I distress Ariel—  
 and I will camp against thee round about and will lay siege against thee?" And that  
 Mi 4:13 Micah said respecting himself ch. iv. 13, "Arise and thresh, O daughter of Zion; for  
 I will make thine horn iron, and thy hoofs brass; and thou shalt beat in pieces many  
 nations, and *I will consecrate* their gain unto *Jehovah*, and their substance unto the  
 Lord of the whole earth?" And, "but thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little  
 among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall *he come forth* UNTO ME, who is  
 to be ruler in Israel whose goings forth have been of old, even from everlasting?"  
 Now we apply but two rules in our interpretation of the Old or the New Testament:  
 the first is, that no good man speaking by the Divine Spirit, will declare that which  
 is false respecting himself or any other being. The other is, that the Divine Penmen  
 always aim at writing common sense. But if Isaiah said *respecting himself*, "I will  
 distress Jerusalem; I will camp against thee round about, and will lay siege against  
 thee," to say nothing of the blasphemy it involved, he wrote that of himself which  
 was perfectly untrue; for he was dead many years before Jerusalem was besieged  
 and taken by the Chaldees, to which this prophecy refers. And if possible Micah  
 was guilty of still greater falsehood, if he said respecting *himself*; "Out of Bethlehem  
 Ephratah shall he come forth *unto* ME," for he was dead full six hundred years before  
 Christ was born. And as for Micah's making the daughter of Zion beat in pieces  
 many nations, and his consecrating their gain unto Jehovah, it has not been accom-  
 plished unto this day; does our Author then imagine that Micah will descend from  
 /414 heaven to accomplish this? or does he ascribe to him while in heaven that om-

nipresence and omnipotence, which he denies to “the only wise God our Saviour?” Whether he believes that centuries after his death Micah came down from heaven and acted the God of Israel in the days of Herod, and will descend again and so guide the hearts and the affairs of men, as to make Zion break in pieces the nations, and then consecrate their gain to Jehovah;—or that these divine penmen were guilty of blasphemy and falsehood saying that *they* would do this, although they knew that when these things should happen, they should have nought to do with any thing beneath the sun, he has in either case won the palm of credulity from all who have ever believed in the deity of Jesus Christ. If he believes the former, he believes that Isaiah and Micah were capable of governing the affairs of men even after they were dead. If the latter, he makes them guilty of blasphemy and falsehood, destroys the credit of Divine Revelation, and plunges himself at once into deism and infidelity.<sup>1</sup>

Such then is the amount of what our Author has been able to object against Jacob’s Redeeming Angel being the Second Person in the glorious Trinity; and we appeal to our readers whether this examination of the subject has not still more clearly manifested, that the Angel of Jehovah, the future Messiah, is in the divine Historic Records, repeatedly termed JEHOVAH, as well as, God Almighty, I AM, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, who brought Israel out of Egypt and into the land concerning which he swore unto their fathers. §981

Our Author imagines that he has found a “palpable mistake” in our saying, “Christ also, John viii. 58, declares himself to be precisely what Jehovah declares himself to be in Exod. iii.”<sup>2</sup> “Verily verily I say unto you, /415 before Abraham was I AM.” We apprehend however that he will here find himself mistaken. He says that the phrase אֲדֹנָי אֲשֶׁר אֲדֹנָי, translated by him “the being who is being,”<sup>3</sup> and by our English translators, “I AM THAT I AM,” is in the Greek Septuagint translated though not very correctly, εγω ειμι ο ων. Of this sentence our Lord applies to himself the first part εγω ειμι, I AM, in ver. 58, “Before Abraham was, I AM,” and in Exod. iii. 14, Jehovah says, “Thus shalt thou say unto them, I AM hath sent me unto you.” And are not these two phrases precisely the same? But of course we never meant to say that Christ made the same declaration that Jehovah made in answer to Moses’s question, I AM THAT I AM, because Christ was asked no such question; and what was perfect propriety as an answer to Moses’s question, would have been quite improper if Christ had used it when no such question was asked. The fact is, that our Author has not §982

Jn 8:24

Ex 3:14

<sup>1</sup> Marshman seems to misunderstand Rammohan completely. Rammohan, in §545, wrote: “Let us now examine whether or not the prophets, as well as the angels of God, in the delivery of his message and his will, did not often speak in behalf of God, as if God himself had spoken.” Then he quotes the examples from Is and Mi. Rammohan obviously wants to point out: The inspired prophet can speak God’s word using the first person without claiming to be God himself.

<sup>2</sup> §547, quoting §356. <sup>3</sup> §547.

quoted us accurately. Our language really is, “Christ also, John viii. declares himself to be precisely what Jehovah declares himself in Exod. iii.” This he has turned into our asserting, that the *declaration* of Jehovah in Exod. iii. and that of Jesus in John viii. are *precisely the same*. But this “palpable mistake” we *did not* make: for we knew that the two occasions were “not the same,” and that what was strictly proper in the one case, would have been quite the reverse in the other. But we did say and we now repeat it, that as Jehovah said, “I AM hath sent me unto you,” so Christ declared, “Before Abraham was I AM;” and this has not been in the least degree disproved.

§983 Indeed our Author’s attempt at disproving this fact only tends to confirm it. He cannot deny that of the Greek phrase, εγω ειμι ο ων, Christ adopts the first part εγω ειμι (I AM); but to invalidate this follows his criticism on /416 the Seventy: “they have translated this phrase not very correctly by εγω ειμι, I AM,” with this reason assigned, “we find the Seventy render אֱהִיָה by ο ων, ‘the being’ in one instance, and by εγω ειμι, I AM, in another.”<sup>1</sup> It happens however that our Author has annihilated all the value of his criticism, by what he says respecting Lowth in p. 176, “Can the interpretation of the Old Testament given by Jonathan and other celebrated Jewish writers be discredited from the authority of one or one thousand Christian bishops to whom at any rate Hebrew is a foreign language!”<sup>2</sup> and *vice versa* we may reply, Can the rendering of Hebrew phrases into Greek by the Seventy to whom the Hebrew was vernacular and the Greek probably familiar from their infancy, be discredited from the authority of one or one thousand critics like our Author, to whom both Greek and Hebrew are foreign languages? It happens however that in this instance the Seventy have not been thoroughly examined. The first translation they give of אֱהִיָה in Exodus is εγω ειμι, and the second is ο ων. This tells us that they considered these two phrases nearly equivalent in value, and had our Author examined the subject a little more closely, he would have found εγω ειμι given elsewhere *as the true rendering* of אֱהִיָה: In Isaiah xlvi. he will find אֱהִיָה occurring in the language of Babylon, ver. 8, “—that sayest in thine heart *I am*,” in the Septuagint rendered, not by ο ων, but by εγω ειμι. This decidedly proves that in the opinion of the Seventy, εγω ειμι is the correct rendering of אֱהִיָה; and hence that Christ in John viii. 58, declared himself to be precisely, what Jehovah declares himself to be in the latter part of Ex. iii. 14. But what will our Author say should he find that Christ also characterizes himself by ο ων, the other rendering of אֱהִיָה which he himself renders “the being?”

Is 47:8 This however is the case in John /417 iii. 13, “even the Son of man the being in heaven.” Thus by translating ο ων, “the being,” has our Author pledged himself that the true translation of ο ων εν τω ουρανω is, “the being in heaven,”<sup>3</sup> which at once proves Christ’s omnipresence, and destroys his own criticism on John iii. 13, with

Jn 3:13

<sup>1</sup> §547, note. <sup>2</sup> §592. <sup>3</sup> §127.

which he has occupied so many pages.

Apparently with the hope of obscuring the evidence to the Deity of Christ which arises from his saying, “before Abraham was, I AM,” Rammohun Roy says, (p. 100) “the word *χριστος*<sup>1</sup> is of course supplied in comparing it with Matt. xxiv. 5,” many shall say I am Christ; “and with John iv. 25,”<sup>2</sup> “I am he.” We are willing to grant him every thing he can desire from these passages; but what will he gain by thus supplying the passage in John viii. 58, “Before Abraham was I AM Christ?”<sup>3</sup> If by this he means that Christ’s human nature existed before Abraham, this refutes himself, for that was born of Mary, and Mary was not born “before Abraham was.” If he refer to him in another nature, he completely establishes his deity, for Christ took not on him the nature of angels; and if he existed before Abraham neither as man nor angel, he existed as God. Hence had our Lord even said, Before Abraham was, *εγω ην, I was*; he would still have established his deity. But if in preferring the present tense *εγω ειμι, I AM*, he did not intend to convey the same idea of eternal self-existence which is conveyed in Exod. iii. 14, we have a needless solecism in the speech of Him who spake as never man spake; and to suppose that our Lord was unacquainted with the different meaning of I AM, and I WAS, is to suppose him ignorant of the common meaning of words.

§984

Mt 24:5; Jn 4:25f.

Our Author’s saying, (p. 101) “it appears clearly that the indignation of the Jews arose from the idea, that Je-/418sus declared himself not merely the contemporary of Abraham, but even gave out that before Abraham was he was,”<sup>4</sup>—avails nothing. Did the Jews suppose Jesus to say that he existed before Abraham as man? This might have excited their ridicule, when they knew he was not fifty years old, but it could have furnished no reason for their stoning him. Stoning they deemed the proper punishment for blasphemy, as they themselves testified when they said ch. x. 33, “for a good work we stone thee not, but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God.” Before Rammohun Roy had added, relative to their believing that by the expression “before Abraham was I AM,” he made himself God, “it is not the only instance in which Jesus left the Jews to labor under a misconception of his meaning,”<sup>5</sup> he should have proved that he did here leave them under such misconception; but this he has not done. The cases which he adduces are not at all parallel with this. When Christ said, “destroy the temple, and in three days I will raise it up,” they did not even attempt to stone him.<sup>6</sup> Moreover, a man who risks his

§985

Jn 10:33

Jn 2:19-21

<sup>1</sup> Read: *Χριστος*. <sup>2</sup> §547.

<sup>3</sup> Marshman seems to misunderstand. Rammohan talks about Jn 8:24 (*εάν γάρ μη πιστεύσητε ότι εγω ειμι*), and to get this other *εγω ειμι* out of his way, he refers to Mt 24:5 and Jn 4:25 to prove that here “Christ” is meant as object of the verb *ειμι*. He does not want to add “Christ” in Jn 4:58.

<sup>4</sup> §548. <sup>5</sup> §548.

<sup>6</sup> But it became a reason for his crucifixion, Mt 26:61f., and Jesus did not clear up the misconception.

perishing under a *false* charge of blasphemy, by refusing to undeceive his accusers when perfectly able, is guilty both of his own death, and of causing those who kill him to shed innocent blood.

§986 By way of objection to Job’s saying, I know that my Redeemer lived, and that he shall stand in the latter day on the earth, our Author urges, (p. 102,) “I fully coincide in this declaration: not Job alone, but all the other writers of the Sacred Books, testify that the true redeemer is God; and they all expected him to cast his mercy upon them at the last moment of their existence, and at the last period of the world.”<sup>1</sup> But is this any thing more than begging the question? As before asked, where /419 in the Sacred Books is the Father testified to be the true Redeemer as opposed to Jesus Christ? Further, without a Redeemer to die the just for the unjust, can God “cast his mercy,” on any transgressor without violating his justice and truth? And in what passage of scripture is the Father said to be about to stand in the latter day on the earth? Job’s Redeemer then is no other than Jacob’s Redeeming Angel. Still however he is God, and no “inferior deity;” for he is “God before whom Abraham and Isaac walked.” His rendering the Hebrew word אַחֲרָיו “afterwards,” instead of “the latter day,” is of little avail. What will the phrase “he shall *afterwards* stand on the earth,” mean, but the Son’s coming in the flesh to “finish transgression and bring in everlasting righteousness?”

[The Psalms as christological evidence]

§987 Our Author now employs four pages to prove that David alone is meant in the declaration, “Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee.”<sup>2</sup> This prophecy however, if applied to David himself, would be utterly untrue, for it would make David of capable of conversation when only one day old! Nor is it fact that God gave to David “the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession,” for we read nothing of David’s conquests even in Greece, or Persia, or Assyria, or in any part of Europe, and still less in India and China, all of which however were then as really parts of the earth as they are now. Further, is our Author ignorant that this prophecy is applied to Christ in Acts iv. and in Heb. i. 5, by the Spirit of truth himself? If he be, in what manner can he have studied the Scriptures? In adducing Elisha’s wrath and power in smiting Gehazi with the leprosy,<sup>3</sup> as vying with the Son’s wrath and power in causing sinners to “perish from the way,” is he serious? Does he believe that Elisha did this of himself? But it is the /420 Son’s *own wrath* which causes rebellious sinners to perish from the way, and which in Rev. vi. 16, makes the kings of the earth say to the rocks and mountains, “Fall on us and hide us from the wrath of the Lamb, for the great day of *his* wrath is come and who shall be able to stand?”

§988 Our Author’s bringing Prov. xxxi. 11. The heart of her husband doth safely *trust*

<sup>1</sup> §549. <sup>2</sup> §§550-553. <sup>3</sup> §551.



in her, and Isaiah xiv. 32, "The Lord hath founded Zion, and the poor of his people doth safely *trust* in her," against the Deity of the Son from its being said Psalm ii. "blessed are all they that *trust* in him," is sufficiently strange in a theological writer whose work is to examine *things* instead of regarding the mere sound of *words*. Let him only substitute the *thing meant* by the word "blessed" in all three instances and see if in all three it express the same ideas. The blessedness arising from trust in the Son is forgiveness and eternal life. This implies Almighty power; for "who can forgive sins but God only?" The blessedness arising from a man's relying on the faithfulness and care of his wife is, a freedom from fear that she will waste his substance herself, or suffer it to be wasted by others. That arising from trust in the strength of a fortress is, the removal of fear should it be besieged. Are these three kinds of blessedness alike? Do they all three equally imply Almighty power and grace in the bestower? Is not the introduction of them as parallel, degrading as well as surrendering a cause?

Pr 31:11; Is 14:32

Mk 2:7

While he has himself nullified his change of John i. 3, "all things were made by him," for "all things were done by him," (see p. 110) as inadmissible, since it is a Unitarian emendation; (for, can a Unitarian in arguing with one belonging to the orthodox sect, quote with propriety for the refutation of his adversary the authority of /421 a Unitarian translator?) we will shew how groundless his emendation is when we examine his criticism on John i. 1, in its proper place. Meanwhile we beg leave to state, that we have not the least need of that passage to prove that Christ created the world. To that fact we have a rich abundance of evidence besides. As Jacob's Redeeming Angel, the God before whom Abraham and Isaac walked, is so often declared to be *Jehovah*, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the Psalm he quotes (Psalm xxiv.) which contains the following declaration, "The earth is *Jehovah's* and the fulness thereof, for he hath founded it upon the floods," fully proves that creation was the work of this Redeeming Angel, the Second Person in the glorious Trinity. This is fully corroborated by the 136th Psalm, where the Psalmist says ver. 5th, "O give thanks unto him that by wisdom made the heaven;" but who is this? The succeeding verses tell us; "To him that smote Egypt in their first-born;—and brought out Israel from among them, for his mercy endureth for ever." This "the Angel of the Lord" at Bochim declares to be himself. "I made you to go up of Egypt, and have brought you into the land which I swore unto your fathers." Thus even by these testimonies is it indubitably proved, that the Second Person in the glorious Trinity, "created the heavens and stretched out the earth above the waters."

§989

Ps 24:1

Ps 136

Jg 2:1f.

We intend further to examine our Author's criticism on the preposition "by," in another place, but we will here shew him, that, even on his own ground, it can avail nothing. It is essential to the character of a wise man that he chuse fit instruments for his work. This is no less true of the God of wisdom. If he chose Moses to lead

§990

Ps 78:72 Israel through the wilderness, and carry them as a man bears his child in his bosom, it was because he was /422 peculiarly fitted for the work. If he chose David to feed his people Israel, it was because he was eminently fitted for that work by “the integrity of his heart and the skilfulness of his hands.” If he employed Isaiah to deliver the message of his grace to Israel, and an angel to slay the Assyrians, it was because they were both fitted for these respective works. Why did he not employ Isaiah to slay the Assyrians, and the angel to deliver Isaiah’s prophecies? It would have been an impeachment of his wisdom: they were not naturally fitted for these works. In the same manner if he employed the Son to create the world, it was because he knew that he *by nature* possessed that omnipotence and infinite wisdom which were necessary for that work. If he appointed him to be the Judge of quick and dead, it was because he knew him to possess that omniscience, and omnipresence, necessary for the greatest of all works, on the due performance of which are suspended the glory of God’s government and the happiness of all holy beings throughout eternity. If he hath appointed him “Heir of all things” it is because he knew him capable of *filling and inheriting* all things. Would it have availed any thing for God to have appointed Paul—or the angel Gabriel, heir of all things? Could either of them have guided even one part of these “all things,” say only this country,—say only in giving it rain and fruitful seasons? Yet this has He done who is appointed heir of all things and in whose hands is all power in heaven and earth. What would have become of the other parts of the earth while a finite being had been regulating the providential affairs of this small part of his inheritance? The presumption of Phæton in the fable, in attempting to guide the chariot of the sun and setting the world on fire, would have been small /423 compared with that of any created being who should thus undertake the work of omnipotence and omnipresence. Yet Christ declares that all power in heaven and earth is in his hands; and how he has conducted the complicated affairs of Providence, the mighty machine of human affairs, say only for these eighteen centuries past, our Author has seen. Has his conduct in this period impugned or proclaimed his Godhead? Do the state to which the affairs of the world have been brought, after the dark reign of superstition and cruelty, and the mighty changes which in this period have convulsed Europe as well as Asia to its very centre, display omniscience, omnipresence, and omnipotence, or not? Yet during the whole of this period has Christ been in heaven above, and guided all things there as well as throughout the whole universe.<sup>1</sup>

Heb 1:2

<sup>1</sup> Marshman believed that the great changes in the world during the period of imperialism were signs of the coming of Christ’s kingdom, and that Asia will play a central role in this because of her huge population, as he wrote in his article against Dubois: “It will be evident, that Eastern Asia must form the *chief seat* of the Redeemer’s kingdom, the *principal scene* where those predictions which describe the spread of his reign through the nations of the earth, *must necessarily* be fulfilled”, *FI QS 1825*, 208.

Our Author's attempt to ridicule the sacred truth, that in creating power the Son is equal to the Father, by saying, (p. 111,) "Could not Jehovah to whom the Editor ascribes omnipotence, create this world independently of another omnipotent being?"<sup>1</sup> is as lame as it is irrelevant towards the Deity. What Jehovah COULD have done, is one thing; what it hath PLEASSED Him to do, is another. The former we leave our Author to ascertain; for we are unable to find out the Almighty to perfection. The latter we endeavor to ascertain from his Holy Word; and this tells us that the Son and the Father are ONE, and that whatsoever the Father doeth, that doeth the Son likewise, or with precisely the same display of Deity. We are quite willing to say that this world is the result of the united counsels of the Father and the Son, that "the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters," and that "by his Spirit Jehovah garnished the heavens;"<sup>2</sup> nay further, that the /424 unspeakably greater work of the New creation, which will throw the material creation quite out of mind, and fill the universe with praise after the Son shall have folded up the material heavens as a garment and changed them as a vesture, is the work of the Triune Jehovah, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; and we here solemnly challenge our Author and all the Unitarians on earth to disprove it if they be able.

§991

Jn 10:30; Jn 5:19

Gn 1:2; Jb 26:13

Ps 102:25-27;  
Heb 1:10-12

His attempt to ridicule the doctrine of the glorious Trinity by saying, "Can the Editor point out any set of men or any nation professing a grosser polytheism than this?"<sup>3</sup> is a vain attempt to escape from the overwhelming weight of Scripture proof which presses him on every side. What have the opinions of "any set of men or any nation" to do with the question? It is to the Scriptures alone that we must appeal, for "the things of God knoweth no one but the Spirit of God," who dictated the Divine Oracles. But if the nature of the Deity or the number of Persons in the Godhead, be to be regulated by the opinion of men have previously formed, searching the Scriptures becomes a mere farce. Men have already found out the Almighty to perfection; the polytheist and the anti-polytheist, have already measured the Deity, scanned his nature, and decided how many Persons *ought* to exist in the Godhead. But what is the system of the theist or the polytheist to that revealed by God himself? Respecting all human systems God says, "He that hath a dream let him tell a dream; and he that hath my word let him speak my word faithfully, what is the chaff to the wheat saith Jehovah?" Let our Author search among the chaff of his former system, and that of Greece and Rome, and see if he can find one god who would now be tolerated in decent society. "They are all va-/425nity, the work of falsehood;"<sup>4</sup> and are these to regulate what God shall declare of himself in his word? If the Son of God has

§992

1 Co 2:11

Jr 23:28

<sup>1</sup> §554. <sup>2</sup> Rammohan, §554, had observed Marshman's omission of the Spirit in the work of creation.

<sup>3</sup> §554.

<sup>4</sup> Jr 51:7f.: "His molten image is falsehood, and *there is* no breath in them. They *are* vanity, the work of errors: in the time of their visitation they shall perish."

declared that men who believe in him, are to be baptized in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and thus directed them equally to worship and serve the Ever-blessed Three,—if his Apostles have taught men equally to implore and expect the blessing of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, shall the reception of these commands be suspended on their likeness or unlikeness to the various dreams of men respecting the Deity? This would be to annihilate the authority of the Sacred Scriptures and to leave the world to the fables of Hindooism and the reveries of Mahomet.

§993 Our Author (p. 112,) is quite at a loss to discover the ground on which we conclude that the earth is the Lord Jesus Christ's and the fulness thereof.<sup>1</sup> It is simply that the Holy Spirit by the mouth of Paul declares this of the Lord Jesus, in 1 Cor. x. 1 Co 10:21–26; Ps 24:1 And as the Holy Spirit declares the same of Jehovah in Psalm xxiv. we learn from this double declaration that Christ is *One* with Jehovah. Christ himself indeed declares, “all things that the Father hath are mine.” Hence if the earth and the fulness thereof, are Jehovah the Father's, they are Jehovah the Son's, which these two passages corroborate. With us Locke's paraphrase can weigh nothing on our Author's own principle, after he himself has declared him an enemy to the Deity of Christ. But Locke's thus paraphrasing the passage, “the earth and all therein are the good creature of the true God,” militates nothing against this idea. Who is the true God but the ONLY WISE God our Saviour? Our Author himself seems to have little faith in his own objection; for he adds; *If the Editor still persists in defiance of St. Paul's /426 reference, of common sense, and of Locke's paraphrase, that in 1 Cor. x. 26, St. Paul alludes to Jesus, I shall take upon myself to refer him to Heb. i. 2, (the Son) whom he hath appointed heir of all things, and to John iii. 35, “The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand.” These I hope will convince him that all the power and possession of the Son in heaven and earth are derived from the gift of “the Father of the universe.”*<sup>2</sup> This hope however, is vain; for if to create the universe, and this FOR *himself*, constitute a claim to the title of “the Father of the universe” (a title however of which the Scriptures know nothing,) then is Christ himself “the Father of the universe,” for the Spirit of truth testifies by St. Paul, that Col 1:16 “all things were created BY *him* and FOR *him*.” And although it was as the incarnate Mediator that he was “appointed heir of all things,” and that all things were given into his hand, what love to him would this appointment and gift have manifested, had he not possessed by nature that omnipresence and omnipotence which enabled him to fill and guide all things? Even such as was manifested to Phæton in the fable by giving him the guidance of the sun's chariot which ended in his destruction.

§994 To our quoting 1 Cor. x. 22, as proving that the Lord Jesus may be “provoked to

---

<sup>1</sup> §555. <sup>2</sup> §555.

jealousy” as well as the Father, our Author first expresses a slight doubt whether the Lord Jesus be here meant, (a vain doubt, for whose is “the cup of the *Lord*,” but the Lord Jesus Christ’s?) and then adds, “Granting that St. Paul means Jesus by the term ‘Lord’ and by the pronoun ‘he,’ we still find nothing in the passage elevating Jesus to equality with the Father.”<sup>1</sup> What, not in both being *equally said* to be provoked to jealousy by that which is not God? Is it ever /427 said, Do we provoke Israel,—or Elijah,—or David,—or Moses to jealousy? What does his quoting Elijah as very jealous for the Lord of Hosts, avail? Is there not an infinite difference between being jealous for the Lord of Hosts, and being provoked to jealousy by the worship of that which is not God?

1 Co 10:21f.

In reply to our observing that in Psalm xxiv. one is about to enter heaven as the king of Glory, who is also called Jehovah, mighty in battle, and in Ephes. iv. Jesus, elsewhere styled the Lord of Glory, ascends, having led captivity captive which implies both battle and victory, and that hence the Son is described either as equal in might to Jehovah, or as being Jehovah himself,<sup>2</sup> our Author undertakes to repeat the quotations *verbatim* that his reader “may perceive how violently prejudice can operate upon the human mind.”<sup>3</sup> This done, he first objects, that in the whole Psalm there are not such phrases as, “lead captivity captive,” or “ascend on high,” adding in a note, “The term to lead captivity captive is not synonymous to ‘mighty in battle,’ nor equivalent in application. For one may be mighty in battle without leading captive; so one may lead captive, by miraculous or artful means without being ‘mighty in battle.’” This if true, only makes against himself, for the stronger phrase of the two, “lead captivity captive,” is here applied to Jesus Christ. And that he “spoiled principalities and powers and triumphed over them” by his own native omnipotence, and by no “artful means” whatever, our Author may rest fully assured; for he “did no iniquity, neither was guile found in his mouth.”

§995

Ep 4:8

He then objects that the phrase “Lord of Glory” is not found in Ephes. iv. But is it not found and expressly applied to Christ in 1 Cor. ii. 8? “For had they known him /428 they would not have crucified the Lord of Glory.” He thirdly objects, that “Jesus who ascended on high, first *descended into the middle of the grave—a descent which cannot be ascribed to God.*”<sup>4</sup> But this is merely begging the question. If the only wise God our Saviour, the Second Person in the glorious Trinity, whom we have seen termed in the divine records, Jehovah, God Almighty, the God before whom Abraham and Isaac walked, became incarnate, his assertion is groundless. He then seems displeased because we did not refer Ephes. iv. to Psalm lxxviii. instead of Psalm xxiv. and has half a mind to think that it was because we thought “the phrase, ‘thou hast received gifts for men that the Lord God might dwell among them,’ in-

§996

1 Co 2:8

<sup>1</sup> §556. <sup>2</sup> §361. <sup>3</sup> §557. <sup>4</sup> §557.

Ps 68:18 consistent with our purpose as clearly shewing the subordination of the Son to his heavenly Father.”<sup>1</sup> In this however he is altogether mistaken. We never wish to forget throughout eternity that our Divine Mediator clothed in human nature, received gifts for men even for the rebellious, that the Lord God might dwell among them. But what were these gifts? Even Locke, although our Author declares him an enemy to Christ’s Deity, describes them as “a fulness of gifts and graces received by believers immediately from him as their head.” But is he aware that to *apply* these gifts, was as great an exercise of Deity as to *give* them? Had our Author received gifts for rebellious men that the Lord God might dwell among them, to how many could he have applied them so as to subdue that enmity to God which St. Paul declares inherent in the carnal mind, and cause them to welcome Him into their hearts? Not to a single individual. Yet has our Lord created repentance, and faith, and love, in the hearts of numbers at the same moment in every age. Could this have been done without the display of omni-/429science, omnipresence, and omnipotence, by Him who is both “the author and finisher of our faith?”

Heb 12:2

§997

Ps 36:6; Col 1:17;

Heb 1:3

We had compared Psalm xxxvi. 6, “O Jehovah thou preservest man and beast,” with Col. i. 17, “By him all things consist,” and with Heb. i. 3, “Upholding all things by the word of his power,” adding, “the Son then is either equal to Jehovah in *preserving power, or Jehovah himself.*”<sup>2</sup> These few lines create our Author amazing labor. First he tells us (p. 118,) that in some ancient manuscripts, instead of “by him all things consist,” there is the phrase, “all things are united in him.” Permit us to ask him where he found these Greek manuscripts? What a pity that they either escaped the research of Griesbach and other first rate critics, or that to them they appeared totally unworthy of regard!<sup>3</sup> He next urges that by the term “all things” the apostle *could have meant only the things concerning the Christian dispensation.*<sup>4</sup> Of course, for if he meant any thing else, it completely destroys our Author’s system. This he attempts to support by saying that the things enumerated in the preceding verse are *ranks and orders in the religious and moral world.* And did Jesus Christ create *thrones*, and *dominions*, and *principalities* in his church? Did he really establish a Papal *throne*, and cardinals who are esteemed *princes*? We doubt it; and if he did create the popedom, still this was but *one* throne; to make *thrones* he must have established the three popes at once. But this was not done before St. Paul’s time; and we shrewdly suspect that when it was done above ten centuries afterwards, Christ

<sup>1</sup> §557: “But the Editor omits here to compare the passage in *Ephesians* with the last-mentioned *Psalm*, though both contain almost the same words that he dwells upon; perhaps in consideration of the latter phrases of the *Psalm* being inconsistent with his object. ‘Thou *hast received gifts* for men, that *the Lord God might dwell among them*,’ which clearly shews the subordination of the Son to his heavenly Father.”

<sup>2</sup> §361. <sup>3</sup> Marshman is right. See the note to §558. <sup>4</sup> §558.

had far less to do therein than Satan.<sup>1</sup> Moreover Jesus when on earth declared his abhorrence of these things in his church, charging his apostles, “be not ye called Master, for one is your Master who is in heaven; and all ye are *brethren*.” Nay /430 the very night before he suffered, the strong desire evinced by some of his disciples for a throne or a principality, made him declare, “The kings of the gentiles exercise lordship over them,—but YE *shall not be so*; but he that is the greatest among you, let him be as the younger, and he that is chief as he that doth serve,” adding with infinite condescension, “I am among you as he that serveth.” Our Author’s exposition, therefore, directly and flatly declares, that there is no truth in the declarations of Him whose precepts are “the guide to happiness and peace.”

Mt 23:8

Lk 22:24–27

Further, in attempting to evade the fact that Christ created all things in heaven and in earth, our Author makes St. Paul violate both truth and common sense. “By him,” saith the apostle, “were ALL things created that are *in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible*.” But those of Christ’s church who had died when St. Paul wrote this, did not constitute ALL the *things* in heaven. Were the angels who are to accompany Christ to judgement not then created? Nor even upon the earth did the church then include “all things visible.” Of men there were at that time whole nations who formed no part of Christ’s body, the church. Eastern Asia which includes the greater part of the family of man, was then no part of Christ’s church, yet it was visible. We say nothing of the northern nations of Europe, of Tartary and Scythia; of Africa and even Western Asia. Had all these nations no existence in St. Paul’s time? But if they existed they were created by Christ.

§998

Col 1:16

Our Author himself indeed seems to have little faith in this exposition; for he adds, p. 119, “Admitting even the interpretation of the Editor, that all natural substances were created by Christ, (a small thing to admit by the by, when Christ upholds the highest archangel by the /431 word of his power!) we cannot help yielding conviction to the repeated avowals of Jesus, that the support of all things or the things of the new dispensation by Jesus, is entirely owing to the power vested in him by the Father of all things, without which he is totally unable to support them.”<sup>2</sup> This assertion is fatal to itself, to say nothing of its being completely destroyed by Christ’s having created all things FOR HIMSELF, the peculiar prerogative of Jehovah, who, according to the Prophet, “hath made all things for himself, yea even the wicked for the day of evil.” While he declares that he and the Father are ONE, the Apostle’s affirming, that he created all things for himself, proclaims the fact that he created them by his own power; as the turpitude of any one’s receiving power from another to perform

§999

Pr 16:4

<sup>1</sup> Marshman refers to the three Popes Benedict XIII., Gregory XII. and Alexander V. who were antipopes against each other and resigned or were deposed during the Council of Constance (1414-1418).

<sup>2</sup> §558.

some wonderful work, and then basely doing it for his own fame and glory, instead of *his* who supplied him with the ability to perform that of which he was otherwise totally incapable, is such as must remain to all eternity. The deceit practised by the artist who built the tower of Pharos at the expense of the king of Egypt, in writing the name of his royal employer and benefactor on materials quickly perishable, and his own underneath it in brass, is recorded in history; but the turpitude of Christ's creating all things *for himself* after borrowing that omnipotence and infinite wisdom from the Father, of which by nature our Author says, he was wholly void,<sup>1</sup> unspeakable exceeds the deceit of this artist. It is a fact that this artist constructed this tower by his own skill and ability, and that the king with all his wealth could never have constructed this tower of himself. But our Author maintains that the Son could not have created this world, without being supplied with omnipotence /432 and infinite wisdom by the father, and that he has neither of these perfections inherent in his own nature; while the father could have created the whole by his own inherent omnipotence and wisdom. If what our Author says be true, therefore, Christ's creating all things *FOR his own glory* by borrowed aid, exhibits an instance of impiety and ingratitude unparalleled in the annals of the universe.

§1000

But that Christ should create all things by the omnipotence of another, is in its very nature impossible. It has been already shewn that the receiver must be equal to the thing received. If then, according to our Author, Christ be a finite being, we beg leave to ask him, in what way did Christ receive and sustain the omnipotence of the Father, while he employed it in creating the world? He certainly did not receive it into himself. A finite being can only receive a *finite portion* of power or of any other attribute; what then becomes of the rest? The finite being can receive no more; a finite portion has completely filled him, and he can hold no more. But when a thousand, or ten thousand times ten thousand finite beings have all received their utmost portion of infinite power, is it then exhausted? If it be, it IS NOT INFINITE, for that admits neither of exhaustion nor end. It is therefore self-evident, that Christ never could have received the omnipotence of the Father to employ it in the creation of the world, unless he himself had been previously omnipotent. But if he was omnipotent, he needed it not; for omnipotence can need no addition of power. Being also infinitely free in his own agency, he had precisely the same right to concur in work and design with the Father in creation, that our Author has to concur with any friend whose designs he approves, while he feels that in nature and power he and

<sup>1</sup> Here, Marshman insinuates that Rammohan, as a Hindu, follows the teaching that Brahman is "void space". He seems to be, like Schmid, of the opinion that Hinduism is "a specious system of refined and disguised Atheism" (§7). But Rammohan had expressively rejected this in the *Abridgment*: "The *void Space* is not conceived to be the independent cause of the world, [...] for the Veda again declares, 'By the Supreme Being the void space was produced.'", Rammohan, *Abridgment*, 8.



/433 his friend are *perfectly equal*. To deny this, is to degrade the Creator below the creature; it is to say that the creator may do what he chuses, while the sovereign Creator possesses no such right. And that the Son is ONE in will and design with the Father, our Author himself acknowledges.<sup>1</sup> His uniting with the Father in creating the world then, is the natural effect of his own infinite power and goodness; and his doing it for *his own glory*, as well as his Father's, only proves, that he and his Father are ONE in nature; in power, wisdom, and goodness, as well as in will and design.

The two passages our Author has brought to support him, have not the least reference to the subject. That of John xiv. 24, "the *word* which ye hear is not mine but the *Father's*," had no reference to "the word of Christ's power" by which he upholds all things: it referred to the word of instruction which the Jews heard, and which Christ delivered in conformity to the will of the Father. His having "all power in heaven and earth given unto him," only demonstrates his Deity, as we have already shewn that the gift would not have ended in his own destruction and that of the universe, had he not possessed infinite wisdom to guide it, and omniscience and omnipresence to apply it in a manner perfectly consistent with infinite goodness.

In quoting Psalm xlv. "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever;" and Psalm cii. "Thou Lord hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands," we inserted Jehovah through mere oversight; and we feel thankful that among so many hundred passages quoted, and this amidst such a pressure of other business, these two are the *only* quotations in which our Author can detect the least mistake. From the mistake in these two, however, he takes occasion to say, /434 "I should for my part be indeed very sorry and ashamed of my opinions if I found myself compelled to make perversions of scriptural passages to support the doctrines that I may have been persuaded to profess."<sup>2</sup> Now it happens that even this mistake of inserting "Jehovah" for "God" and "Lord," which we freely acknowledge, does not "pervert any scriptural passage;" nor when "Jehovah" is supplied in these passages by the vocatives "O God" and "O Lord," does our Author's cause gain the least by the change; as we shall presently shew. But if he will recollect the course we have pursued with him from the beginning, in relinquishing to him the entire choice of his own method in opposing the doctrines of Christ's Atonement and Deity, and confining ourselves strictly to the Gospels till he himself quoted the Scriptures at large;<sup>3</sup> and then at his own suggestion examining the Old Testament, before entering on the New,<sup>4</sup> instead of chusing our own method of bringing most fully into view the body of evidence furnished by the Scriptures to the Atonement and the Deity of Christ, he may himself perceive, that it was not likely we should endeavour to defeat him by such misquotations as substituting Jehovah for "God" or "Lord," which he

§1001

Jn 14:24

Mt 28:18

§1002

Ps 45:7 (=Heb 1:8); Ps 102:25 (=Heb 1:10)

<sup>1</sup> §119. <sup>2</sup> §559. <sup>3</sup> §62. <sup>4</sup> §283.

could discover and expose at any moment. Such a mode of meeting him indeed we should have rejected with ineffable contempt.

§1003 Nor does the “perversion” when rectified, in the least benefit our Author’s cause. When we read, “thy throne *O God* is for ever and ever;” it is in effect the same as reading “thy throne, *O Jehovah*, is for ever and ever;” for that he whose throne is for ever and ever, is Jehovah, is evident from Psalm cxlvi. 10, “*Jehovah shall reign for ever; even thy God, O Zion, unto all generations.*” Here we not only find that he who “reigns for ever” is Jeho-/435vah; but that “Jehovah” and “God” are used as perfectly synonymous. Nor is it less true that he who “laid the foundations of the earth, and the work of whose hands are the heavens,” is Jehovah. The Divine penman says, 1 Chron. xvi. 26, “*Jehovah made the heavens.*” And Psalm viii. “*O Jehovah, our Lord, when I consider thy heavens the work of thy fingers.*” Such then is “the perversion of Scripture,” with which our Author charges us; and all he gains by its being rectified, is, new evidence that the Son, whose throne is for ever and ever, who laid the foundations of the earth, and of whose hands the heavens are the work, is “Lord,” and “God,” and “Jehovah.”

Ps 146:10  
1 Ch 16:26; Ps 8:3

§1004 We are now constrained to notice an assertion respecting God, at which we almost shudder. It is that “God” is a term which is in the scriptures commonly used not only for the Creator but for other superior substances; (see p. 119.)<sup>1</sup> Had we penned an assertion so completely unfounded in Scripture, we should have felt covered with shame. Some who read the assertion may be too little acquainted with the Scriptures to know that it is unfounded; and these may at once believe our Author—possibly to their eternal ruin. Would such examine the scriptures for themselves, how would they be surprized to find that “God” in the vocative case as it occurs here, which is precisely the question, is *never used* but to denote Him who created heaven and earth, Jehovah, God Almighty.

§1005 We now, to meet his wish, notice our Author’s quotations from his Second Appeal, although we still think them in themselves unworthy of notice. First then it is not fact that Moses, any where in Scripture is ever simply styled “God.” When God had commanded him /436 to work miracles in the sight of Pharoah, he said; “See I have made thee *a God to Pharoah;*” a declaration as far distant from Moses’s being simply and absolutely termed God, as the east is from the west, as falsehood is from truth. To his question, “[On what principle then can any stress be laid in defence of the Deity of the Son on the prophetic expression quoted in Heb. i. from Psalm xlv. ‘Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever,’ especially when we find in the very next verse, words that declare his subordinate nature?](#)”<sup>2</sup> we reply; On the firmest ever known by man, even *that God declares it WHO CANNOT LIE.* The Spirit of truth declares, “But

<sup>1</sup> §569. <sup>2</sup> §121, again quoted by Rammohan in §559.

unto the Son he saith;—Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever.” This declaration is a Divine oracle independently of its being quoted from Psalm xlv. It is probable that it was quoted from that Psalm; but this is *our* gloss, and no declaration of the Divine Spirit. These two declarations remain everlasting testimonies delivered by the Father himself respecting the Son; and in these it is declared, that he is the unchangeable God, the Creator of heaven and earth, as we have seen him before declared to be, Jehovah, God Almighty, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, &c. That when these two declarations were made by St. Paul our Lord possessed a human nature too, is confirmed here by the Holy Spirit. And if the Divine Spirit then declared of him, “Thou art the same,” and further, that “Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever,” it avails nothing for our Author to assert that his human, must have made some change in his Divine nature.

Heb 13:8

That part of Psalm xlv. was intended for Solomon is allowed; but that the whole was not, we have the strongest of all proofs, even that this would render it a *false prophecy*, to say which, is to blaspheme the Divine /437 oracles. Solomon’s “throne” was not for ever and ever;—it could not “remain” after the heavens were changed like a vesture; and we beg our Author to tell us where it is now! Nor is there any very extraordinary proof left on record of his love to righteousness and his hatred of iniquity, for through his iniquity in countenancing idolatry were ten out of the twelve tribes which composed his kingdom, rent from his successor. Nor have we any reason to believe that he ever girded his sword on his thigh unless by way of bravado, nor do we know that he ever saw a battle. “His right hand,” therefore, never taught him “terrible things.” And if it was said to Solomon, “thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever,” the declaration was *totally false*. But the God of truth, “CANNOT LIE.”

§1006

Ps 45

The assertion (p. 123) that Paul, while repeating the Father’s testimony to the Deity of the Son, suddenly invokes the Father himself in the words, “Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundations of the earth,”<sup>1</sup> makes the Spirit of truth guilty of a positive falsehood. The conjunction “and” is equivalent to the repetition of the declaration, “To the Son he saith.” It is precisely as though the Spirit of truth had said, “To the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever,” &c. And “*to the Son he saith*, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundations of the earth and the heaven is the work of thy hands.” If then this be not an address to the Son, the Spirit of truth has declared that which is *untrue*, to affirm which is blasphemy. Further, Christ’s exaltation above his fellows on account of his merit is no more inconsistent with his Divine nature, than his dying on the cross. This is merely the old objection made by the Greeks who sought after wisdom, to whom the cross of

§1007

1 Co 1:23f.

<sup>1</sup> §561.

Christ was foolishness. /438

§1008 Our Author’s metaphor of the lion and the dog overpowered, the first as representing Christ’s creation of the world, and the second his sitting at the right hand of the majesty on high after he had by himself purged our sins,<sup>1</sup> is lame in the extreme. He is quite wrong in his estimation; that which he reckons as much less than the creation of the world as a man’s overpowering a dog is less than his overpowering a lion, even his being seated at God’s right hand, is precisely that proof of his Deity for which the high priests deemed him guilty of blasphemy and condemned him to death! And redemption, of which Christ’s enemies being made his footstool, is the completion, is termed a new creation, and in Isaiah lxx. 17, is represented as so much greater a display of Divine power than the material creation, as to cause the latter “not to be remembered, nor even come into mind.” His attempt therefore to represent the expressions, “He kept him as the apple of his eye”—“I have graven thee on the palms of my hand”—“He shall subdue the people under us and the nations under our feet,” as equivalent to God’s saying to the Son, “Sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies thy footstool,”<sup>2</sup> is directly flying in the face of the apostle’s interrogation, “To which of the Angels hath he at any time said, sit thou on my right hand,” &c. since by this our Author replies, “If he has not said this to the angels, he has said things equivalent in value to Israel, to his church, and to David.”<sup>3</sup> But when the Spirit of truth thus declared the Son’s infinite superiority to Angels, did he intend to add, for he is equal in dignity to Israel and to David?

Heb 1:13

Is 65:17

Dt 32:10; Is 49:16; Ps 47:3

§1009 The Author’s objecting from Matt. xxii. 45, that [no father can consistently call his son Lord](#),<sup>4</sup> is disproved by a multitude of instances even in human history. But if it were not, it could not apply in the least degree to /439 the Eternal Three. When the Second Person is so often in Scripture termed Jehovah, the Lord God Almighty, in addressing him as such the Father declares, not [“his superiority to the Father,”](#)—but his true name; for God who *cannot lie*, cannot but witness the truth. The Messiah is styled “My Lord” by David, in Psalm cx. and by Elizabeth in Luke i. 43; but never by God the Father. We beg to remind our Author, that if the term κυριε in Heb. i. 10, be [not intended as a translation of “Jehovah,”](#)<sup>5</sup> κυριος in Heb. x. 30, “vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense saith the Lord.” And again, “the Lord shall judge his people,” is in both instances substituted for the sacred name *Jehovah*: so that his remark only brings out additional proof that Jesus, so constantly termed κυριος in *the Epistles*, is equal to Jehovah.

Ps 110:1f.; Lk 1:43

Heb 10:30

§1010 To prove “the *changeable* nature of Christ,” the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever, our Author referring us to p. 27 and 133 of his Second Appeal, adds, [“the term,](#)

<sup>1</sup> §561. <sup>2</sup> §561. <sup>3</sup> This is not a quotation, but a mere summary of Rammohan’s argument.

<sup>4</sup> §561. <sup>5</sup> §562.

for ever, or similar terms, when used for a creature or a begotten son, signify in scriptural idiom long duration of time. My reader therefore by referring to those instances will be convinced that neither Solomon to whom Psalm cii. 25, is directly applied, nor Jesus to whom the Apostle applies the said verse in an accommodated sense, can be supposed to be endued with a throne or kingdom that will never cease.”<sup>1</sup>

By this assertion our Author only begs the question again. To declare that David said to Solomon Psalm cii. 24, 25, “O my God, take me not away in the midst of my days; thy years are throughout all generations”—“Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth and the heaven is the work of thy hands;” not only cuts up the roots his former paragraph by making David call Solomon, /440 “his God,” as well as his “Lord,” but it makes the Spirit of truth guilty of falsehood; Solomon’s years were not “throughout all generations,” *nor did he* “of old lay the foundation of the earth.” Secondly, the period for ever and ever, to which our Author will assign no more than “a long duration of time,” is described by the Father as not commencing till *time shall be no more!* It is after the heavens have waxed old like a garment, and have been folded up and changed like a vesture by the Son, that “He REMAINETH,”—and that he is “THE SAME.” But after time, what remains but eternity? To this will he set bounds?<sup>2</sup>

Ps 102:25–27

What could make Rammohun Roy assert that the Apostle in 1 Cor. xv. 28, that “God may be all in all,” excludes the Son and the Holy Ghost? And that “neither Christ nor any one else can in a mediatorial capacity exercise a kingdom,”<sup>3</sup> even in the face of St. Paul’s declaration, He MUST REIGN till he hath put all enemies under his feet? Was the apostle ignorant that Christ had commanded men to be baptized equally in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost? and that he himself had prayed for “the grace of the Lord Jesus, and the communion of the Holy Ghost,” to be granted to believers equally with “the love of the Father?” or that these two acts were perfect idolatry unless the Son and the Holy Ghost, be equal with the Father in the Godhead? And does the apostle declare that the Son shall deliver up the kingdom to the Father, that the FATHER may be all in all? Nothing can be more unfounded; he does not even mention the name of the Father, although he had mentioned it in the preceding verse. It is “that *God* may be all in all;”—and the apostle knew no other *God*, than the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, in whose name he was baptized, and whose /441 favor and blessing he continually sought. Moreover we have seen St. Paul by direction of the Spirit of truth, declare respecting the Son; “Thy throne,

§1011

1 Co 15:28

1 Co 15:24f.

2 Co 13:14

<sup>1</sup> §563.

<sup>2</sup> Rammohan seems to have committed a mistake in writing about Ps 102 being applied to Solomon (see §563, note). Marshman either wants to use this against him, like Rammohan used the missionary’s mistakes, or he already believes that his opponent is capable of the weirdest interpretations.

<sup>3</sup> §563.

O God, is for ever and ever.” Now the apostle knew that when Christ had completed his mediatorial work by saving the last believer from his sins, and had delivered up his Mediatorial kingdom to the Father, he could have not cease to be God. Nay he knew that Christ’s delivering up this kingdom on finishing his mediatorial work, was to take place in the natural course of things *before* he folded up the heavens like a garment; but it is of his existence *after* that period that Paul testifies, “THOU REMAINEST.”—“Thou art THE SAME;” in other words, “Thou remainest on thine eternal Throne.” What is it for him to be “the same,” but to remain the same in omnipotence, in omniscience, in majesty, and goodness? But does God the Son thus remain the same on his eternal throne, after he has changed the heavens like a garment, that he may become *nothing*? The Apostle says merely, that God may be all in all; and our Author may as soon prove that the Apostle means God the Son exclusively of the Father, as that he means God the Father to the exclusion of the Son and the Holy Ghost.

§1012 We had quoted Psalm xxiii. 1, “Jehovah is my Shepherd, I shall not want;” and  
 Ps 23:1; Jn 10:16 Christ’s declaration, John x. 16, “There shall be one fold and one Shepherd,” as proof that Christ is *Jehovah*, although we certainly need no proof from this passage, when we have such a multitude besides. To this our Author replied by saying, “Jesus represents himself as the one Shepherd of the one fold of Christians, some of whom were already attached to him, and others afterwards became converts.”<sup>1</sup> We upon this asked, “Is our Author ignorant that David was also one of Christ’s fold,—and Moses,—and /442 Abraham?”<sup>2</sup> And to his adding, “the term shepherd is applied to others, (Moses, &c.) without conveying the idea of their unity with the Deity;”<sup>3</sup> we replied by asking, Did he never hear of a Chief Shepherd who when he shall appear, shall give the under shepherds a crown of glory?<sup>4</sup> These he (p. 128,) terms “strange questions;”<sup>5</sup> but we beg to ask him, to whom are they strange? Are they strange to any well acquainted with the Scriptures? In reply to his weakly adding, “Although Jesus is styled a Chief Shepherd, yet such accounts of his superiority over other messengers of the Deity, neither places him on a level with Jehovah, nor does it prove his unity with the most high God;” we beg to remind him that Jesus is THE Chief Shepherd. If David then who was one of Christ’s fold, said, “Jehovah is my Shepherd,” Christ must be Jehovah, or ONE *with* Jehovah, since no Shepherd can be above THE *Chief Shepherd*. Moreover his bestowing crowns of unfading glory, proves him to be Jehovah; for Jehovah says, Jer. xvii. 10, “I Jehovah search the heart and try the reins, even to give every man according to his work and according to the fruit of his doings.” And this Chief Shepherd says, Rev. ii. 23, “I am he which searcheth the hearts and reins, and I will give unto every one of you according to his works;” and

<sup>1</sup> §236. <sup>2</sup> §363. <sup>3</sup> §236. <sup>4</sup> §363. <sup>5</sup> §565.

this he does in giving crowns of unfading glory to faithful under-shepherds. There are however, few things clearer, than that he who does that which Jehovah alone can do, is indeed Jehovah.

Our Author had further said, “If they must though without any ground insist upon interpreting this of Jesus, they must still attribute his shepherdship over his flock to Divine commission, and relinquish the idea of unity between God the employer and Messiah his servant.”<sup>1</sup> To this we replied, “Yes, we must relinquish /443 a *unity of nature* between the Divine Father and the Messiah whom he sent, just as much as we do between Cyaxares and Cyrus employed to lead his armies, between Vespasian and Titus, between George the Third and his Son now George the Fourth.”<sup>2</sup> That this illustration was used merely to shew, that one of *precisely the same nature* may be employed by another without implying the least inferiority of nature, is sufficiently evident. Our Author, however, while unable to deny this fact, takes occasion to say, (p. 130,) the we conceive God the Son to be of the name nature with God the Father, “*just as the man George the Third is of precisely the same nature with the man George the Fourth, though of a separate will, inclination and passion, and distinct existence;*”<sup>3</sup> and that we give this as a definition or exposition of the Trinity. A more gross misrepresentation we have seldom seen. The illustration was employed merely to disprove his position, that a person’s being sent or employed by another, necessarily implies *an inferiority of nature*; and this it has done so fully that he does not find a single word to object by way of reply. But when did we ever say, or in the most distant manner hint, that the Son is of a separate will, inclination, and passion from the Father? Have we not invariably maintained that in will and design, as well as in nature, the Son and the Father are ONE? What had he in view in adding, “the orthodox by proving that the passage, I will set one shepherd over them, even David my Shepherd, refers to Christ, *can at most but prove unity between the Messiah and God’s servant David?*”<sup>4</sup> Has he forgotten that the Messiah says, “I and the Father are ONE?” and “He that hath *seen ME* hath *seen the FATHER?*” /444

§1013

Jn 10:30; Jn 14:9

Our Author wonders at our asserting we had adduced “*many other passages in which the Son is called Jehovah.*”<sup>5</sup> He then declares that he finds only two, those in which Jehovah was inserted by oversight, and adds, that we *give out our own perversion of these texts for authority.*<sup>6</sup> While we scorn the most distant idea of such a course, we ask himself whether, except in this instance, which makes nothing for him when rectified, he has found even a single mistake among the hundreds of passages we have quoted. But has he overlooked the cloud of witnesses adduced to prove that Jacob’s Redeeming Angel, the Second Person in the glorious Trinity, is so often termed Jehovah, as well as God Almighty, the I AM, the God of Abraham, Isaac

§1014

<sup>1</sup> §236. <sup>2</sup> §363. <sup>3</sup> §565. <sup>4</sup> §565. <sup>5</sup> §363. <sup>6</sup> §566.



and Jacob? Has he overlooked the closing sentence even of the paragraph he quoted? “Such witness to the Son’s being *by nature* Jehovah God, from Abraham, from Jacob, from Moses, from Paul;—yea from the Son and even from the Father, leaves nothing on this subject to be farther desired.”<sup>1</sup> How much easier is it to overlook than to answer such a paragraph!

§1015 In the hope of disproving the fact that Christ is meant in Psalm lxxviii. 18, “Thou  
Ep 4:8; Ps 68 hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive,” our Author insists that God is addressed throughout this whole Psalm, in the third person as well as in the second, and to support this, he brings quotations from the Quoran and “Jewish prayers by Solomon Hirschell.”<sup>2</sup> How incompetent a pretended revelation written sixteen hundred years, and a set of Jewish prayers compiled nearly three thousand years, after this Psalm was penned, are to determine the style and phraseology used by the Spirit of truth, must be too obvious to need mentioning. But the fact is, that his very assertion only proves more strongly that Christ /445 is Jehovah. If throughout the Psalm, God be addressed whether in the second or the third person, then he who led captivity captive, whom, as we have already seen, St. Paul, Ephes. iii. declares to be Jesus Christ, is, “He who rideth on the heavens by his name JAH,” ver. 4th,—“the *God of Israel* who went forth before his people through the wilderness,” ver. 7th,—“the *Almighty* who scattered kings,” ver. 14th.—*Jehovah* who was amongst Israel in Sinai, ver. 17th; and this latter also confirms the fact already adduced from historic record, that “the Angel of Jehovah,” the Second Person in the glorious Trinity, is Jehovah who brought Israel out of Egypt into the land of Canaan which he swore to give their fathers. Our Author’s Jewish dream that it was Moses who ascended up on high, St. Paul destroys by applying the Psalm to Christ, and shewing that his ascending implied a previous descent, which, according to our Author, means a descent into *the midst of the grave*.<sup>3</sup> But will he say that Moses descended into “the midst of the grave,” prior to his going up into the mount of God? Further, when did Moses lead captivity captive? Are we certain that he ever drew a sword except when he slew the Egyptian? Yet he “confidently appeals to the context to satisfy any unprejudiced person, that the Psalmist in this verse had Moses alone in view!”<sup>4</sup>

§1016 As our Author attempted to impugn Christ’s Deity by quoting John x. 34, “I said  
Jn 10:33–36 ye are gods;” and added, “Jesus shews from this quotation that the term God is figuratively applied to creatures of a superior nature;”<sup>5</sup> we asked him in return, “What creatures of a *superior* nature are here termed Gods? Those that die like men. To whose nature is theirs superior? Only to that of the brutes. What however is the *figurative* to the real application of the term *God*? If other Gods die like men, /446 must Jehovah who made heaven and earth, whose throne is for ever and ever?”<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> §358. <sup>2</sup> §567. <sup>3</sup> §557. <sup>4</sup> §568. <sup>5</sup> §192. <sup>6</sup> §365.



These few lines find our Author employment for seven pages. He first urges, (p. 137,) that if these chiefs of Israel who died like men, had the appearance of man, were endowed with human feelings and were liable to death, such was also the case with Jesus, and cites nearly twenty passages of scripture to prove that Christ possessed a human nature, increased in wisdom and stature, was grieved, was weary, was troubled in spirit, and finally that he yielded up the ghost.<sup>1</sup> This however, as we never denied any of these facts, is all useless labor. So far from denying them, it is our glory that when the fulness of time was come God sent forth his Son made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem those that were under the law. Nor have we the least idea that the *human* nature of Christ was *Divine*, that it was omnipotent or omniscient. Although its immaculate holiness and its union with Christ's Divine Nature, have raised it in knowledge, and wisdom, and love, almost unmeasurably above all his saints, whom however, he with infinite condescension, still terms his brethren, yet we believe it to be Christ's *human* nature still, and hence neither omniscient, nor omnipresent. It is that DIVINE Nature which existed before his human nature was born of Mary, which of old laid the foundation of the earth, and which remains the same after the Son shall have folded up the heavens and changed them like a vesture,—which was with the Father in the beginning before the foundation of the world—which redeemed Jacob out of all evil, brought Israel out of Egypt, into the land which he swore to give their fathers, and was adored by Abraham, by Jacob, by Moses, and all Israel, by David and the prophets, and by the highest archangel, which we adore,—and we can-/447not adore it the less for its assuming our nature, and redeeming us from all iniquity.

Ga 4:4

Heb 1:10

Our Author's attempts to impugn this two-fold nature of Christ, are a miserable begging of the question. After asking, "Are not Moses and the chiefs of Israel in like manner (with Jesus) termed Gods? Did not they perform wonderful miracles, as raising the dead and commanding wind and water, as well as the sun and moon? Did not some of them talk of themselves in a manner suitable to the nature of God alone? Are we from these circumstances to represent them as possessing a two-fold nature human and divine?" he adds (p. 141) "if not, let us give up such an unscriptural and irrational idea as attributing to Jesus or to any human being a double nature of God and man."<sup>2</sup> Now he knows as well as ourselves, that if he could *prove* it *unscriptural*, we should give up this doctrine at once; but totally unable to do this, he presents this supplication, in which there are almost as many points of doctrine and fact assumed or humbly begged as there are sentences. We are constrained however to deny his request; strong as may be our wish to oblige him, in this instance it is not within our power. This truth is not ours but God's, given in his sacred word to mankind; and

§1017

<sup>1</sup> §569. <sup>2</sup> §570.

Rv 22:19 we dare not add to his words lest we be found liars, nor take away a single truth, or even an expression in which it is clothed, lest he take away our part “out of the book of life.” He begins by asserting that we “avoided to answer his question in his Second Appeal whether there was [any authority in the sacred writings for alleging that Jesus was possessed of two natures.](#)”<sup>1</sup> That this assertion is totally unfounded the reader may easily see from what we have just advanced on the subject, which however contains scarcely an idea we had not advanced before. The fact /448 is, that the doctrine shines through all the evidence we have adduced. By what nature was it that Christ upheld by the word of his power even the highest archangel in heaven, while he was expiring on the cross to purge away our sins? Not by his human nature; for that was not in heaven, and where it was not, there it could effect nothing.

Jn 8:58 Respecting what nature was it that Christ said, “before Abraham was I AM?” Not his human nature, for that was born of the seed of Abraham, and at that time Abraham

Jn 17:5 had no seed. In what nature was it that he possessed glory with the Father before the world began? Not in his human nature, for this was before the creation of man. What nature is that which receives all power in heaven and earth, which searches the hearts and reins of all, which ascertains motives, over-rules the passions, and guides the affairs of all men in every part of the earth, at the same moment? Not Christ’s human nature; for that is neither omniscient, omnipotent, nor omnipresent. Now all this was brought forward in our Reply, yet our Author asserts that we adduced no authority from the Sacred Writings, that Christ is possessed both of a Divine and a human nature!

§1018 We now come to our Author’s assertion that the term “God” is applied to superior creatures, which as he so often repeats it, we must intreat our reader’s permission to examine thoroughly. We are well aware that the term rendered by our translators “Gods,” (אלהים *Elohim*) is precisely the same with that rendered “God” in other places. But throughout the whole of the Old Testament this term is never applied simply and without any adjunct by God or by his prophets to ONE *person*, except to express the Father, the Son, or the Holy Spirit. For our reader’s satisfaction we will bring before him every instance in which the term *Elohim* is thus rendered /449 “Gods” throughout the whole of the Old Testament, as far as we have been able to ascertain.

Gn 3:5 These are thirteen; of these the first is Satan’s language to our first parents, “Ye shall be as Gods.” The second is Israel’s to Aaron, Exod. xxxii. “Up, make us Gods.” The third is Exod. xxii. 28, “Thou shalt not revile the Gods, nor curse the ruler of thy people.” The fourth is the language of the witch of Endor; “I saw Gods ascending from the earth.” The fifth is that of Jezebel; “So let the Gods do unto me and more also.” The sixth regards the idolatrous nations transplanted to Palestine, 2 Kings xvii.

<sup>1</sup> §570.

29, "Every nation made Gods." The seventh describes Jerobeam's conduct, 2 Chron. xiii. 8, who "made golden calves for Gods." The eighth is Psalm lxxxii. 6, "I have said, ye are Gods." The ninth is Psalm cxxxviii. 1, "Before the Gods will I sing praise unto thee." The tenth is God's challenge to idols, Isaiah xli. 23, "Do good or do evil—that we may know that ye are Gods." The eleventh is Jer. xvi. 20, "Shall a man make Gods to himself and they are no Gods?" The twelfth is that of the magicians, Dan. ii. "The Gods, whose dwelling is not with flesh," and the last is that of the Queen mother respecting Daniel (Dan. v.) "Whose wisdom is like the wisdom of the Gods." Of these there are only three in which the term is applied by the Divine writers to men; and in these it is applied, not to an individual, but to the Israelitish rulers and judges; and these three alone concern us; for as to the term in the mouth of Satan, the idolatrous Israelites, the witch of Endor, Jezebel, and the Babylonian magicians, &c. we can scarcely expect it to be applied with accuracy. The instances then in which God applies it *figuratively* are three, and in these the term is applied, not to one person but to bodies of men. Moreover that it is used /450 figuratively in the first of these three is ascertained by its coming from the Creator himself; in the second by HIS standing in the midst of these gods; and in the third by David's making HIM the object of praise in their presence.

We may observe further that the term God, (*Elohim*.) united with an adjunct, as "another God," a "strange God," a "God to *Pharoah*," is not the term used simply and absolutely; as in these cases it is limited and qualified by the adjunct with which it is thus united. Thus then, the term *Elohim* is applied simply and absolutely in a *figurative* sense by God himself, only *three times* in the whole of the Old Testament, and then to a body of persons;—and to ONE PERSON in the vocative this term is never simply and absolutely applied by God or his prophets, except in its *real* sense. But to the true God it is simply and absolutely applied above *two hundred times*. Among these are the following: "Who is God save Jehovah;" Psalm xviii. 31. "If Jehovah be God, follow him"—"How doth God know, and is there knowledge with the Most High?" "Thou art God alone"—"I am God and not man"—"Thou art man and not God."—"I am God and there is none else"—"The word was God"—"God is a Spirit." These, to omit a multitude of other instances, sufficiently prove that "God" (i. e. אֱלֹהִים or Θεός) simply and properly applied by a prophet, an evangelist, or an apostle to ONE *person*, invariably expresses Deity. But when it is thus addressed to an individual in the vocative case, so far it is from being applied figuratively, that it is equivalent to the declaration "thou art God." Thus our Author's sheet-anchor is completely gone. "God" used simply and absolutely, IS NOT "a term which is in the Scriptures commonly used not only for the Creator, but for other /451 superior substances."<sup>1</sup> As

§1019

Ps 18:31; 1 K 18:21; Ps 73:11; 86:10  
Ho 11:9; Ezk 28:2; Is 45:22; Jn 1:1; 2:24

<sup>1</sup> §559.

far as we have been able to ascertain, it is applied thus by the inspired penman only *three* times, and in these three instances, in circumstances in which it was impossible to mistake its figurative meaning; while it is applied simply or with the pronouns *my, thy, your*, to denote the Creator of all, far more than three hundred times. In the application of the term *Elohim* or  $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$  to Jesus Christ *in the vocative case*, therefore, we have indisputable proof of his Godhead from the mouth of the Father himself.

Ps 45:6; Heb 1:8

§1020 We beg leave to ask our Author what “divinity,” in other words “deity” he ascribes to these Israelitish rulers or judges termed “gods,” or even to the human soul of Christ? It has been already said that we adore that Divine nature, which of old laid the foundation of the earth, and which will remain the same when it has folded up the heavens like a garment. But where is it said to these Israelitish rulers, or to Moses, or to Enoch, or Elijah, “Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth?” His answering our question, “to whom was the nature of the Israelitish judges superior but to that of the brutes?”<sup>1</sup> by referring us to passages which say that God *dwelt* among the Israelites, *loved* them and *called* them his sons,<sup>2</sup> is weakness itself. Does he even *think* that the Israelites were superior in nature to the rest of mankind?

Heb 1:10

§1021 His answer (p. 143) to our third question, “If other gods die like men, must Jehovah who made heaven and earth, and whose throne is for ever and ever?”<sup>3</sup> we cannot approve. For his saying, “Jehovah is not a man-god that shall die,”<sup>4</sup> if he meant the Saviour of men by that term, we must leave him to answer before Him who being God-man, is ready to judge the quick and /452 the dead, at whose judgment seat he must stand, and whose sentence must fix his eternal doom. And while he was adding, “but that he as the God of all gods and the Lord of lords, must regulate the death and birth of those who are figuratively called Gods,” was he not conscious that he was describing that Saviour whom he terms “a man-god?” Is he aware that Psalm 136, declares Jacob’s Redeeming Angel, who brought Israel out of Egypt to be both Jehovah and the God of all gods? This however, he will see by comparing ver. 1st, 2d, and 11th of that Psalm. “O give thanks unto *Jehovah*;—unto *the God of gods*;—to him that *brought out Israel from among the Egyptians*; for his mercy endureth for ever?”—Lastly, his attempt to shew that Christ disavowed his own deity to the Jews,<sup>5</sup> is wretched indeed. Did the Jews account the *figurative* application of the term “gods” blasphemy? Did they not account Christ’s calling himself the Son of God, a making himself equal with God? And did Christ declare that it was not? Further, did he not afterwards repeat the same declaration, and appeals to his works for its confirmation? And did they not *again* seek to take him? What! for disavowing his deity? Did they first seek to stone him for *asserting*, and then to kill him for *disavowing* his deity?

Ps 136

Jn 10:33–39

<sup>1</sup> §365. <sup>2</sup> §572. <sup>3</sup> §365. <sup>4</sup> §572. <sup>5</sup> §572.

Comparing Psalm lxxviii. 56, "They," the Israelites in the wilderness "tempted and provoked the Most High" with 1 Cor. x. 9, "Neither let us tempt Christ as some of them also tempted and were destroyed of serpents," we added, "the Apostle declares that *Christ was he who was tempted in the wilderness, and hence that he is the Most High God described by the Psalmist as tempted there.*"<sup>1</sup> To this our Author replies, (p. 144,) that he does not find in the verse in question nor in any preceding or following verse, "the Apostle declaring that *Christ /453 was he who was tempted by Israel in the wilderness.*"<sup>2</sup> But is he quite sure that in the sentence, "Neither let us tempt Christ as some of them also tempted;" Paul did not intend to point out Christ as having been tempted by Israel in the wilderness, and to imply that Christ possesses that Divine nature which renders it equally sinful for us to tempt him, as it was for the Israelites to tempt the "Most High" in the wilderness? But that it was "the Angel of Jehovah that had sworn to give the land of Canaan to their fathers," who brought them out of Egypt into the land of Canaan, we have seen indisputably proved. §1022  
Ps 78:56; 1 Co 10:9  
Jg 2:1f.

Respecting Psalm cx. "Sit thou at my right hand till I make thine enemies thy footstool," our Author formerly observed that Christ's victory *over his enemies was entirely owing to the influence of God.*<sup>3</sup> To this we observed in our Reply, that the language of Christ in Isaiah lxiii. was, "Mine own arm hath brought salvation," and that in Rev. i. 8, he declares himself to be "the Almighty," and that *he who is "the Almighty" needs the aid of none in subduing his enemies.*<sup>4</sup> Our Author's attempt to refute the truth contained in these paragraphs costs him six pages, which we will wade through with as little expense of our reader's time as possible. He first observes, (p. 146,) "Is it not most strange that the Son whom the Editor considers *the immutable Almighty God, should be supposed by him to have humbled himself, and to have been appointed by another to a combat in which that other assisted him to gain success.*"<sup>5</sup> To this we reply, that IT IS "most strange;" nay that it is a mystery, and that it is intended to form the theme of wonder and praise to the blessed above throughout eternity itself. The wonder is that he should expect to find nothing strange in that which is to form the ad-/454miration of heaven for ever and ever; and that because he finds it strange, he should, like the Greeks of old, "account it foolishness." §1023  
Ps 110:1f.  
Is 63:1-5  
Rv 1:8  
1 Co 1:23f.

He now embodies in argument the utmost of his strength and declares his belief that "if this fails to convince us that Jesus had no power of *his own, no argument of his or any other human being can be expected to make any impression on us.*"<sup>6</sup> It becomes us then to examine carefully this argument intended to be so completely overwhelming. It is preceded by this query, "Are not these two ideas of Christ's

<sup>1</sup> §366. <sup>2</sup> §573. <sup>3</sup> §191. <sup>4</sup> §367. <sup>5</sup> §574. <sup>6</sup> §574.

*humbling* himself and yet being *immutable* and almighty, quite incompatible with each other?” To this we answer; No. They naturally result from Christ’s Divine and human nature, and form precisely the mystery of the cross of Christ, which to the Greeks formerly was foolishness. The first is inseparable from his taking on him the form of a servant in human nature; the last is inseparable from his Divine nature, through which he upheld all things by the word of his power, even while he hung on the cross a propitiation for sin. Then comes our Author’s argument, “the positive disavowal of his own power by Jesus himself, in the declarations, ‘I can of my own self do nothing,’ and all that the father giveth me shall come to me,” The first of these, “I can of my own self do nothing; as I hear I judge,” while it declares Christ’s perfect impartiality in judging, has no reference to his inherent strength and omnipotence; nay it is accompanied with the actual declaration, that in wisdom and omnipotence HE IS EQUAL TO THE FATHER; “What he seeth the Father do, these also doeth the Son likewise;” and this would be impossible unless he were equally *wise and omnipotent*. The other, “All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise /455 cast out,” instead of proving that he has no strength or might of *his own*, proves *precisely the reverse*. If he saves *every one* that cometh unto him, he is an *Almighty* Saviour. He no where says; “the Father gives me ability to save men.” His saving all that the Father giveth him therefore, proves that he is ONE with the Father in omnipotence, as well as in will and design. It is strange that our Author should ground Christ’s disavowal of his own omnipresence on passages which in their connection and import, so evidently avow his omniscience, his infinite wisdom, and his boundless power to save.

§1025

Is 63:1–6

Our Author is quite unwilling to allow that Isaiah lxiii. 5, “Mine own arm brought salvation,” belongs to Christ; and insists that the passage refers merely to the destruction of Bozrah and Edom by way of avenging Israel.<sup>1</sup> But were it even to be limited to this, we might ask, who is the Preserver and Avenger of Israel, but he who brought them out of Egypt into the land of Canaan and who in his love and his pity bore them and carried them all the days of old? And this we have already seen, is, “the Angel of Jehovah,” the Second Person in the glorious Trinity. The prophecy however contains expressions which never applied to Edom after Isaiah’s days. Such are, “the year of my redeemed is come;” but Edom was never able as a nation to oppress Israel after this period. Indeed they themselves were destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar in about a hundred years after this period. And the expression “I will tread down the people (or nations) in my fury,” shews that the prophecy refers to a far more general destruction than that of Edom. That the infliction of vengeance is “totally inconsistent” with the office and character of the meek and lowly Jesus,<sup>2</sup> is disproved by Rev.

<sup>1</sup> §575. <sup>2</sup> §575.



vi. 15–17, in /456 which the kings of the earth are described as calling on the rocks and mountains to fall on them and hide them from—the wrath of the *Lamb*; “for” it is added, “the great day of his wrath is come and who shall be able to stand?” The Lamb however is “[the meek and lowly Jesus](#).” Rv 6:16f.

Few things give our Author more trouble than that Christ should have said of himself in Rev. i. 8, “I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.” To avoid acknowledging this he insists that in the midst of delivering the Revelation of Jesus Christ, John breaks off and defines the character of God the Father!<sup>1</sup> To this it is sufficient to reply that “the Lord” in this book, is John’s constant phrase for the Lord Jesus Christ; as, I was in the spirit on the “Lord’s” day, and many others;—that this Almighty Being speaks again in the 11th verse, and commands John, “What thou seest write in a book and send it unto the seven churches;”—that in his advice to the churches he declares himself to be “the First and the Last, *who was dead and is alive*,” which is never said of the Father; and lastly, that *our Author himself declares him who is Alpha and Omega to be Jesus Christ*, when he finally speaks in Rev. xxii. 13<sup>2</sup>—by which, while he contradicts himself there, he confirms the fact that Christ is “the Almighty who was, and is, and is to come.” Thus his six pages end in leaving the evidence to the Deity of Christ, even from this passage, far more bright and clear than before. §1026 Rv 1:8 Rv 1:11

After we had in our Reply noticed all the passages on which our Author had made any remark in the Psalms, we adduced a few ourselves tending to corroborate the fact that “the Angel of Jehovah,” the Second Person in the Trinity, who appeared at Bochim declaring that /457 he had “caused Israel to go up out of Egypt into the land he had sworn to give to their fathers,” is equal to the Father; as, “they provoked the *Most High* in the *wilderness*, and they tempted *God* in their hearts by asking meat for their lusts.—They remembered that *God* was their rock, and the *High God* their *Redeemer*.” To this we added St. Paul’s testimony, Heb. iii. “For this man was counted worthy of more honor than Moses, inasmuch as he who hath builded the house, is worthy of more honor than the house.—For every house is builded by some man; *but he who built all things is God*.” We added that Paul here indubitably declares Christ to be God; for if he does not wander from his subject to the creation of the world, these “all things” refer to the house, the Mosaic economy, which Christ perfected in the wilderness, to support the faith and hope of his people for the next fifteen hundred years, and in which Moses was faithful.<sup>3</sup> And even if St. Paul by the declaration “he §1027 Jg 2:1f. Ps 78:13–35 Heb 3:3f.

<sup>1</sup> §576: “Having thus stated what Christ had done, and is to do, John reverts to the declaration of the eternity of God, with which he commenced: ‘I am Alpha and Omega [...]’ All this appears so very plain”.

<sup>2</sup> §608. <sup>3</sup> §368.

that build all things is God,” refers to the creation of the world; since he had before declared in Coloss. i. 16 “All things were created *by him and for him*,” he thereby still declares that Christ is God. To this we added; “it is indeed as easy to prove that there is no God, as that he who brought Israel up out of Egypt and led them through the wilderness into the land he swore to give their fathers, even the Angel of Jehovah, the Second Person in the glorious Trinity, is not God over all, blessed for evermore.”<sup>1</sup> To these testimonies from Scripture, our Author gives no reply.<sup>2</sup>

§1028 We added further relative to the Unity of the Godhead; “who that Angel is that brought Israel out of Egypt we are again told Psalm lxxxii. ‘I am JEHOVAH thy God, who brought thee up out of the land of Egypt; open thy mouth wide and I will fill it.’ But yet /458 that the application of Jehovah to the Son as well as the Father, does not affect the *Unity* of the Godhead we learn from Psalm lxxxiii. 18, ‘that men may know that thou, whose name alone is JEHOVAH, art the Most High over all the earth.’”<sup>3</sup> With this accords our Lord’s declaration, John x. 30, “I and my Father are ONE.” The Psalmist in Psalm xcv. ascribes anew to “him who created all things,” not only the awful name Jehovah, but *worship* and *universal dominion*: “Jehovah is a great God, and a great King above all Gods.—O come let us worship and bow down, let us kneel before JEHOVAH our *Maker*.”<sup>4</sup> In Psalm cxlvi. he identifies anew the *equality* between the Father and the Son, by ascribing to those who trust in Jehovah, the blessedness ascribed in Psalm ii. 12, to those who trust in the Son; “Happy or blessed is he who hath the God of Jacob for his help, whose hope is in Jehovah his God, who made heaven and earth.” “Here if the Father be meant, he is again equalled with the Son; if the Son, he is anew declared to be Jehovah, the God of Jacob, who made heaven and earth.”<sup>5</sup> To this mass of additional evidence to the Son’s Godhead and to his *Unity* and perfect *equality* with the Father, evidence which affects the vitals of his cause, what does our Author reply? In reality NOT A WORD. Nay he does far worse than as though he had observed a profound silence; for then, however unaccountable it would have been, it might have been possibly supposed that he had not read this mass of evidence. But the following paragraph renders that impossible; “the Editor introduces the subject of the Angel of Bochim p. 565, quoting Psalm lxxviii. ‘He divided the sea, and caused them to pass through, and made the waters to stand in a heap.’ Whence he concludes that the Son was with Israel in the wilderness as their God. /459 But what allusion this Psalm has to Christ, situated either in the wilderness or in an inhabited<sup>6</sup> land, my limited understanding is unable to discover. As I have already noticed the argument adduced by the Editor

<sup>1</sup> §368.

<sup>2</sup> Rammohan gave reply in the sense that the house Christ built and the house God built, are different, §581.

<sup>3</sup> §369. <sup>4</sup> §370. <sup>5</sup> §370. <sup>6</sup> Rammonan’s original word was “uninhabited”.



respecting angels, in the beginning of this chapter, I will not renew the subject, but beg my reader's attention to that part of my treatise."<sup>1</sup> Did ever any man more completely surrender his cause? All that he has said in the beginning of this chapter respecting the "Angel of Jehovah," the reader has already seen. But when respecting the *new evidence* adduced from the writings of David and St. Paul, that this Angel of Jehovah is declared the Creator of all things and again styled *Jehovah*, as well as respecting the *equality* and the *unity* of the Father and the Son, he is perfectly silent, he stops his own mouth for ever relative to the silly charge of polytheism he so vainly attempts to fix upon us; and by seeing it proved without attempting a reply, that in worshipping the Father and the Son we worship ONE JEHOVAH, he strips himself completely of the exclusive term Unitarian wherein he so much boasted, and leaves it in the undisturbed possession of those who worship the Triune Jehovah, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

In our Reply we observed respecting the book of Proverbs, that if in that book Christ be represented under the character of Wisdom, as some divines have thought, and as seems implied in Christ's saying, Matt. xi. 19, "But *Wisdom* is justified of her children," and Luke xi. 49, "therefore *said the Wisdom of God*, behold I will send them prophets," fresh proof of the Eternal Deity of Christ is furnished.<sup>2</sup> This our Author denies (p. 157) on the ground that other attributes of God are personified also, as mercy, redemption, (Query, who before ever heard of this attribute?) truth and /460 wrath, adducing Psalm cxxx. 7, "with Jehovah there is mercy and with him is plenteous redemption." Psalm lxxxv. 10, "mercy and truth are *met* together, righteousness and peace have kissed each other." Numb. xvi. 46, "There is wrath gone out from the Lord."<sup>3</sup> To this we reply, that when he can produce these or any other attributes of God, as often personified as Wisdom, and speaking of themselves in the *first* person, thus; "I love them that love me, and they that seek me early shall find me."—"My delights were with the sons of men"—"Blessed are they that keep my ways"—"For whoso findeth me findeth life,"—"but he that sinneth against me, wrongeth his own soul; all they that hate me love death;"—and can adduce Christ himself as sanctioning such personification as he has that of Wisdom in the passages already quoted; we will cheerfully surrender to him this evidence; for we need it not. But until this be done, equity itself requires him to leave it in our undisturbed possession.

[The Prophets as christological evidence]

Our Author now labors to prove that it was not Christ's glory which Isaiah beheld when he saw "Jehovah sitting upon a throne high and lifted up; and one Seraphim cried to another, Holy, holy, holy is Jehovah of Hosts." He first attempts it by making

§1029

Mt 11:19; Lk 11:49

Ps 130:7

Ps 85:10

Nb 16:46

Pr 8:17, 22-36

§1030

Is 6:1-10

<sup>1</sup> §577. <sup>2</sup> §371. <sup>3</sup> §582.

Jn 12:37–44 John, ch. xii. 41, abruptly interrupt the course of his narrative, and introduce the Father as spoken of, as he had before made him in Rev. i. 8, abruptly begin defining the character of the Father, to prevent our understanding the Son as saying of himself, “I am Alpha and Omega,” &c. He has however so little confidence in this attempt, that he (p. 161) provides himself with the following preserve in case it should be exploded; “If it be insisted on in defiance of all the foregoing explanation, that the two last mentioned pronouns in ver. 41, /461 ‘when he saw *his* glory and spake of *him*,’ are applied to Jesus, the passage in the evangelist would be more correctly explained by referring it to— what does the reader think? “to *prophetic anticipation!*”<sup>1</sup> Now we must not only apply the pronouns in ver. 41 to Jesus, but all the five pronouns in the paragraph,—or render a passage in the simplest and clearest of all writers, a perfect mass of confusion. The paragraph begins at ver. 37. But *he* (αυτου) having done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not *on him*, εις αυτον. Then come in the verses from Isaiah, which are followed by John’s observation, ver. 41. “These things said Isaiah when he saw *his* glory, την δοξαν αυτου and spoke of or concerning *him*.” John, or rather the Divine Spirit who dictated the passage in Isaiah, now proceeds to speak of Jesus, retaining the same pronoun. “Nevertheless among the chief rulers also many believed *on him*.” Now for this pronoun to be used twice in the preceding and once in the subsequent verse to express Jesus, and in this middle verse to express abruptly God the Father, would render this passage of John such a mass of confusion, that in our opinion nothing but the most desperate necessity could have urged our Author to start such an idea. Besides, there would have been scarcely any meaning in the Apostle’s saying of the Father, “These things said Isaiah when he saw his glory and spoke of him;” for when is the Father made the subject of prophecy by Isaiah as about to come into the world and make atonement for sin? Is it not of Christ that the prophet saith, “Jehovah hath laid on him the iniquities of us all?” And is not “the spirit (the essence) of prophecy, the testimony concerning Jesus?”

Rv 19:10

§1031 To his suggestion that Isaiah must have meant Christ’s glory as seen by “*prophetic anticipation*,” the passage /462 itself is fatal. It fixes *the time* when Isaiah saw Christ’s glory; it was when “he spoke of him.” The *very thing spoken* of him is also mentioned; and this is found to have been spoken of him when he saw this glorious vision. Our Author’s attempt to place Abraham on a level with Isaiah as to the manner and degree in which he saw the coming of Christ, with the hope of getting rid of Isaiah’s vision,<sup>2</sup> is directly contrary to fact. Abraham saw Christ’s day and rejoiced; but did Isaiah who lived twelve hundred years nearer the event, and so particularly described his coming, see it no more distinctly than Abraham? Whence then his describing

<sup>1</sup> §586. <sup>2</sup> §586.

his sufferings in ch. liii, almost with the minuteness of the Evangelists themselves? Nor is he more successful in attempting to evade the *time* when this vision was seen, by saying (p. 163,) “My limited understanding cannot like the Editor’s discover how Isaiah fixes the time when he thus saw Christ’s glory, even when it was said, ‘he hath blinded their eyes,’ for I find the Jews were from time to time charged by several of the prophets with disobedience and with having been blinded and hardened.”<sup>1</sup> We here ask him, what does it avail to adduce other prophets here, when the Evangelist expressly names *Isaiah* as the prophet to whom he refers? And what his quoting Isaiah lxiii. 17, “O Lord why hast thou made us to err from thy ways,” &c. while John expressly quotes ch. vi.? Even our Author’s “limited understanding,” if duly exercised, might have enabled him to discern, that the passage, “Lord why hast thou made us to err from thy ways?” is not the same with, “He hath blinded their eyes and hardened their hearts,” &c. &c. although spoken by the same prophet.

Is 53

Respecting our Author’s criticism on Isaiah vii. 14, “Behold a virgin shall conceive,” &c. we observed that /463 a slight attention to the chronology of the Scriptures would have convinced him that Hezekiah must at that moment have been six or seven years old; and that it is not the way of Him who rests his claim to Godhead on foretelling *things to come*, to *foretell* things already *past*, like Valmikee in the Ramayuna.<sup>2</sup> So important however does it still appear to our Author that Jesus should not be Immanuel, that he expends twelve pages more in attempting to prove that Hezekiah is Immanuel, and that Jesus Christ is not. He first charges it on us as a grievous error that we have here rendered the term הרה, “shall conceive,” when in Gen. xvi. 11 it is rendered, “thou hast conceived or art with child.”<sup>3</sup> Now we are as well aware as he is that the verb here is the *preterite*, and that although in certain circumstances the preterite is used in a future sense, this is not always the case. But he is mistaken in supposing that the rendering it here by the future “shall conceive,” is ours. It is that of the Seventy; and highly as we may esteem his knowledge of the Hebrew, we can scarcely think it equal to that of the Seventy to whom the language was vernacular. Further we have other authority for this rendering, no less than which is, that of the Divine Spirit who dictated this prophecy to Isaiah, and who in St. Matthew i. 23, renders this passage by εν γαστρι εζει, “shall be with child.” When our Author (p. 167) charged “orthodox authors” with changing this passage into “shall conceive,” that they might apply it *in a direct sense to Mary the mother of Christ*, and with “disregarding the original scriptures, the context, and the historical facts to suit their convenience,”<sup>4</sup> he should have reflected, that the first whom this sweeping charge would include, is, the Spirit of truth himself.

§1032

Is 7:14f.

Gn 16

Mt 1:23

But his rendering this verse, “behold the virgin *is* /464 pregnant” will bring no re-

§1033

<sup>1</sup> §586, quoting §372. <sup>2</sup> §325. <sup>3</sup> §587. <sup>4</sup> §587.

lief to his cause. As Ahaz reigned only sixteen years, if this prophecy were delivered in the first month of his reign, since the Divine Records inform us that Hezekiah was twenty-five years old at his father's death, he must at this time have been at least eight years old. But a virgin's being pregnant with a son eight years old, has no existence in Scripture.

§1034 For applying this prophecy to Christ however, we have the highest authority in the universe, even that of the Spirit of God. It is not that of St. Matthew as a sagacious writer, who from a view of the circumstances of Christ's birth judges that this was a fulfilment of this prediction. The Holy Spirit by the mouth of St. Matthew declares it, and this declaration is a new text of sacred scripture, as binding on us as the original passage in Isaiah. Our Author's endeavour to persuade us therefore, that this passage was not fulfilled in the birth of Christ, is only an attempt to prove, that the Divine Spirit is in this instance unworthy of credit.

§1035 No less unwilling is our Author to allow, that the prophecy, Isa. ix. 6, "For unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God," &c. &c. belongs to Christ. To Hezekiah he insists that it belongs, and to prove that it does not belong to Jesus, he employs nearly twelve pages more. It is on this occasion that he lays down his canon which we already quoted. We had said "to Jonathan's paraphrase on this passage we shall merely oppose that given by bishop Lowth."<sup>1</sup> Upon this he exclaims, (p. 176) "Can the interpretation of the Old Testament given by Jonathan and other celebrated Jewish writers some of whom lived prior to the birth of Jesus, be discredited from the authority of one or one /465 thousand Christian bishops to whom at any rate Hebrew is a foreign language?"<sup>2</sup> This canon alone nullifies his interpretation of the word הרה, "is pregnant" in opposition to that of the Seventy "shall conceive," who lived nearly three hundred years before the birth of Christ, and to whom Hebrew was vernacular. But his second canon, "Can any one in arguing with one not belonging to the orthodox sect, quote with propriety for the refutation of his adversary the authority of a Trinitarian writer,"<sup>3</sup> is fatal to his every attempt at a new translation of any passage of Scripture throughout his work. It not only renders the emendations of himself, a Unitarian, inadmissible, but also those of any of his Unitarian friends; for "Can a Unitarian in arguing with one of the orthodox sect, quote with propriety for the refutation of his adversary, the authority of any new translation of a passage made by himself a Unitarian?" This is the more forcible as a translation of this passage in Isaiah by Lowth, furnishes the occasion for laying down this rule.

§1036 In our Author's remarks on this passage, we have to combat, not reasoning, but ignorance of the Holy Scriptures; which is distressing, because it forms an unrea-

---

<sup>1</sup> §324. <sup>2</sup> §592. <sup>3</sup> §592.

sonable demand on the reader's time. Every writer on points of divinity like these, should be acquainted with the whole of the Sacred Scriptures; and while he has a right to detain his reader to hear his reasoning on them, he has none to waste his reader's or his opponent's time by ignorance of the Scriptures he professes to explain. Yet he enquires (p. 176,) "Is there any authority of the sacred writers of the New Testament authorizing the Editor to apply Isaiah ix. 6, even in an accommodated sense to Jesus? I believe nothing of the kind."<sup>1</sup> We reply, that there is *Divine Authority*, /466 even that of Him who dictated this prophecy itself. In Matt. iv. 13—16, the Divine Spirit declares that Jesus leaving Nazareth came and dwelt in Capernaum by the sea, in the coasts of Zabulon and Nephtholim, "that the thing might be fulfilled spoken by Isaiah the prophet, saying, The people who sat in darkness saw a great light, and upon those sitting in the region and shadow of death, light hath arisen." Now what is the light mentioned in this prophecy of Isaiah? The Divine Spirit informs us in ver. 6th, "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. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom shall he sit, to order it and to establish it with judgment and with justice, *from henceforth even for ever.*" We thus have the infallible testimony of the Holy Spirit who dictated this prophecy to Isaiah, that in Jesus Christ's going to reside in Galilee this prophecy was actually fulfilled, and hence that he is, Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, &c. &c.<sup>2</sup> This is corroborated even by our Author's two critics, Le Clerc, and Campbell, of whom Le Clerc would say with reference to this, "the prophecy may be applied with truth to Jesus's residing in Galilee, and Jesus is with truth called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God," &c.; and Campbell, "this is applied to Christ with much greater energy of signification than to any other person."<sup>3</sup>

Mt 4:13–16; Is 9:1f.

It happens too that this prophecy was never fulfilled in Hezekiah. While its complete fulfillment was found in Jesus Christ, we are scarcely able to trace even

§1037

<sup>1</sup> §592.

<sup>2</sup> Rammohan is mentioning Mt 4:13-16 in §596 as application in an "accommodated sense."

<sup>3</sup> Rammohan's quotation in §590 from Campbell, *Gospels Vol. IV*, 9f., was: "Thus ch. ii. 15, a declaration from the prophet *Hosea* xi. 1, which God made in relation to the people of Israel, whom he had long before called from Egypt, is applied by the historian *allusively* to Jesus Christ, where all that is meant is, that with equal truth, or rather with much greater energy of signification, God might now say, *I have recalled my son out of Egypt.* Indeed, the import of the Greek phrase, as commonly used by the sacred writers, is no more, as Le Clerc has justly observed, than that such words of any of the prophets may be applied with truth to such an event." Campbell, Le Clerc and Rammohan were referring to Mt 2:15/Ho 11:1. I did not find any words from Campbell/Le Clerc closer to Marshman's above citation, but I neither can explain why Marshman should use and corrupt these words here in this way.

a partial fulfillment of it in Hezekiah. Independently of the falsehood involved in making Isaiah call Hezekiah, /467 “the Mighty God,” the circumstances mentioned were never realized in Hezekiah. The scene is by the Holy Spirit laid in “Galilee of the Gentiles;” but what did Hezekiah at any time in Galilee? By our Author’s own acknowledgement the people of Galilee were carried away captive by *Tiglath Pileser*. Did Hezekiah ever bring them back? Certainly not! Then he could do nothing for them; they were in exile during nearly the whole of his reign. Further, is it fact that “of the *increase* of Hezekiah’s government and peace there was no end?” What! not when the following sentence was denounced against him for his own sin? “Behold the days come that all that is in thine house and that which thy fathers have laid up in store until this day, shall be carried to Babylon: nothing shall be left, saith Jehovah. And of thy sons which shall issue from thee shall they take away, and they shall be eunuchs in the palace of the king of Babylon.” Here was certainly an end to the *increase* of his government, if not to his peace from the view before him of the captivity of his family and the destruction of his kingdom. But so far is it from being fact, that he was placed “on the throne of David and on *his kingdom* to order it and establish it with judgement and with justice,” that if he sat upon the *throne* of David, he never possessed his *kingdom*. David’s kingdom comprehended the *twelve* tribes of Israel; but of these Hezekiah’s ancestors had lost ten; and these ten he himself saw the king of Assyria carry away without offering the least resistance. This was widely different from “*establishing* the kingdom of David from thenceforth and for ever.” Nothing can be farther from the truth therefore, than that the circumstances to be realized by this “Son,” were realized by Hezekiah. /468

Is 9:7  
Is 39:6f.

§1038

As our Author asserts (p. 181) that “*human beings and even inanimate objects were designated by such terms as Immanuel, God with us, Wonderful, Counseller, the mighty God,*<sup>1</sup> &c. and (p. 182) that others are *in common with Jesus called by designations compounded with El or God, in the sacred writings,*”<sup>2</sup> let us examine the subject thoroughly. It will be obvious that the names by which even good men have designated their children, or any place or thing, have nothing to do with the subject, as they were liable to mistake like the man after God’s own heart, who termed the son that murdered his brother, drove his father from the throne, and sought to imbrue his hands in his blood, “Absalom,” “the Father or Author of peace.” But to assert that God solemnly names a man in prophecy, by a name signifying that which *he is not*, or designating an event which *it does not express* or designate, is little short of saying that the God of truth declares a falsehood. Such assertion is contradicted by the whole current of Scripture. When God changed the name of “Abram to Abraham” by inserting therein “*ham*,” “many or a multitude,” the reason he assigns is, “a father

2 S 13–15

Gn 17:5

<sup>1</sup> §594. <sup>2</sup> §597.

of many nations have I made thee.” When he called Jacob, *Israel*, or “a prince of God,” he was pleased to add as the reason, “As a prince hast thou power with God.” When he sent by the hand of Nathan, and called Solomon, *Jedidiah*, “beloved,” 2 Sam. xii. 25, it was because “the Lord loved him.” If the prophet Isaiah was directed ch. viii. 3, to call his son *Maher-shalal-hash-baz*, “hasting to the spoil,” the reason was, that “before the child should have knowledge to cry, my father and my mother, the riches of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria should be taken away before the king of Assyria.” If in Isaiah lxii. 4, God’s /469 church is by him termed *Hephzibah*, “my delight in her;” and her land *Beluah*, “married,” it was because the Lord really delighted in her, and her land was about to be married. If David’s Righteous Branch, in whose days Judah was to be saved and Israel to dwell safely, was to be called, *Jehovah our Righteousness*, Jer. xxiii. 6, it was because this Righteous Branch is really, *Jehovah our Righteousness*. If the name which men should affix to his church, the heavenly Jerusalem, ch. xxxiii. 16, be, “*Jehovah our Righteousness*,” it is because he who is *Jehovah our Righteousness*, hath condescended to become her husband, and to permit his name to be thus “called upon her.”

If we trace this subject throughout the Old Testament, we shall perceive the same line of truth and consistency running through every name given by God to men. When the Lord commanded Hosea, ch. i. to call his son’s name *Jezreel*, it was to signify that he was about to avenge the blood of Jezreel upon the house of Jehu. When he, ch. i. 6, commanded him to call his daughter *Lo-ruhamah*, “not pitied,” it was because he would no more have mercy on the house of Israel. When he, ver. 9th, directed him to call another son, *Lo-ammi*, “not my people,” it was because he declared that they were no longer his people. When God declared, Hos. ii. 16, that in a future day Israel should call him *Ishi*, “my husband;” and no more *Baali*, “my Lord,” it was because in that day he was about “to betroth her unto himself for ever in loving kindness and in mercies;” no slight corroboration this, that *Jehovah her Maker*, the Lamb, is the husband of his spiritual Israel, “the Lamb’s wife,” the heavenly Jerusalem. These are the chief instances, in which God is declared to have given a name to an individual or to a body; and we now /470 submit it to every candid mind conversant with the sacred records, whether in fixing names on individuals or public bodies, God does not act strictly according to truth; and hence whether the name *Immanuel* given by the Divine Spirit in St. Matthew to Jesus Christ, be not thus given him because he is really, “*God with us*.”

In the passage in question however, (Isaiah ix. 6,) five names are given to the Son, the child then born and given, of which no one can be so applied to Hezekiah, as to do honor to infinite wisdom. Although a righteous prince, there was little particularly *Wonderful* in him, more than in his son Manasseh who from an impious and bloody persecutor of God’s prophets, became an eminently pious worshipper of the living



2 K 20:12–19

God. Instead of being pre-eminently the *Counsellor*, his last days were marked with such folly as led to the ruin of his family and kingdom. That he was not “*the Mighty God*,” but a sinful man, is self-evident. That he was neither “*the everlasting Father*” nor “*the Father of the everlasting age*,” is plain in that his conduct doomed his family to servitude in the palace of the king of Babylon. And so far was he from being to his people “*the Prince of Peace*,” that after being delivered by a miracle, he by his folly hastened their captivity, and of course destroyed their peace. Of the *increase* of his government and peace then there was an end,—he never possessed the whole kingdom of David his father,—and of the two tribes he did possess, his pride and folly hastened the ruin.

§1041

Our Author now remarks that we denied the truth of his assertion in (p. 139) of his *Second Appeal*, that David is also called the Holy One of Israel, and insisted that Jehovah and the future Messiah alone are in the Psalms styled the HOLY ONE.<sup>1</sup> This we did of course; /471 and we beg to ask how we could have acted otherwise, if we weighed even the meaning of the terms. Can a being defiled with sin be termed THE Holy One? Jehova is styled, The Holy One of Israel, in more than twenty passages; but will he give his glory to another? Further, Jehovah and David are not *one*, they are *two* beings totally different. God is the infinitely Holy Creator; David was a creature born in sin and shapen in iniquity. It is therefore impossible for both Jehovah and David to be THE HOLY ONE. Jehovah and his Messiah indeed, may both be termed THE HOLY ONE, for the Messiah solemnly declares, I and my Father are ONE. But for Jehovah and a creature to be both THE HOLY ONE, is in its own nature impossible. Moreover of Him whom Jehovah terms the HOLY ONE in Psalm lxxxix. he declares, “His throne shall be as the days of heaven.”—“His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established for ever as the moon and as a faithful witness in heaven.” Now we still have the sun, the moon, and the days of heaven; but where is David’s throne? Where are even his seed? Can our Author to a certainty point out one of them as existing at the present moment?

Is 42:8

Jn 10:30

Ps 89:29–37

§1042

On Isaiah xxviii. “Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone,” &c. compared with ch. viii. 14, “Jehovah of hosts himself—shall be for a stumbling stone and for a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel,” we had remarked that it was doubtful whether the house of Israel ever saw this prophecy while in their own land; but that Christ has been a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence to all of every tribe of Israel for nearly eighteen centuries, while he has been a sanctuary to all who have trusted in him. Christ is /472 therefore “Jehovah of Hosts” mentioned in this passage.<sup>2</sup> To oppose this, our Author urges (p. 186) that this prophecy was fulfilled

Is 28:16; 8:13f.; 1

P 2:6–8

<sup>1</sup> §599, quoting §373. Rammohan had given Ps 89 as an example of an application of this title to David.

<sup>2</sup> §374.



long before Christ's death.<sup>1</sup> But we beg to reply that had this been partially the case, still this could not have prevented its complete fulfillment in the Jew's total rejection of Christ, and their entire rejection as a nation ever since. But a little consideration may convince us, that respecting the Ten Tribes it was not even partially fulfilled. If the prophecy ever reached them, which is doubtful, still no new display of mercy was made to them in the few years which afterwards elapsed before their captivity; no new prophet was sent them; things went on among them in precisely the same idolatrous course until they were carried away by the king of Assyria. Hence as it was of course *future*, the prophecy had scarcely a partial fulfillment in the days of Isaiah. But that it was completely fulfilled in Christ, we have our Lord's own testimony and that of the Holy Spirit who dictated the passage. After the scribes had replied, "He will miserably destroy those wicked men and let out his vineyard to others who will render unto him the fruits thereof in their due season;" our Lord asked them, "Did ye never read in the Scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected the same is become the head of the corner?—Therefore I say unto you, the kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given unto a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof; and whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken,—but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder." The Holy Spirit also speaking by Peter, not only confirms this, but declares that it fulfills this prophecy given by himself to Isaiah by adding "unto you (Israelites) who believe, he is precious; but unto those (Israelites) who are disobedient, the stone which the builders /473 rejected is become—a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence." Hence, that the subject of these two prophecies, was Jesus Christ as rejected by the Jews and Israelites throughout the world, and that he is *Jehovah* of Hosts, is confirmed by evidence as immoveable as the Rock of Ages.

Mt 21:41–44

Our Author's further objection that "a stone chosen and made the head of the corner by a maker, must not be esteemed as the maker himself," is perfect weakness. No one supposes that Christ's *human* nature, born of Mary, either created the world or performed any act of Deity, particularly before it was in existence! But what is this to Christ's *Divine* nature, which created the world and will REMAIN THE SAME, after folding up the heavens like a garment? His adding, (p. 188,) "were we to admit that the circumstance of an object being made flesh or matter, which he was not before, does not evince the changeableness of the nature of that object, we must

§1043

<sup>1</sup> §601: "Isaiah delivered this prophecy in the reign of Ahaz; that the captivity of one of the houses of Israel took place in the reign of Hezekiah, his son, and that of the other house, in the reign of Zedekiah, the ninth king of Judah, from the time of Ahaz. [...] The necessary consequence, then, will be, that he will clearly perceive that the above-stated prophecy of Isaiah had been duly fulfilled before Christ's birth".

be at a loss to discover even a single changeable object in the world,”<sup>1</sup> does not even savor of Christianity. Can he find a single Christian who believes that even the human soul ever undergoes any change *in its nature*, or *any* change beside a moral one from holiness to sin, and from sin to holiness? How much less then can *He* of whom the Spirit of truth testifies that He is “the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever?” His adding, “if one’s being made flesh, and his growth and reduction in the progress of time, should not be considered as an evidence of a change in him, every man might claim the honor of an immutable nature, and set up as God made flesh,” proves nothing. Can “every man” say, “Before Abraham was I AM?”—“I am Alpha and Omega the beginning and the ending, the first and the last?”—“I am he who searcheth the /474 hearts and reins, and I will give to every man according as his work shall be?” Or has God said to “every man,” “of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth and the heavens are the work of thy hands. They shall wax old, but *thou remainest*—Thou art *the same*, and thy years shall not fail?”

Jn 8:24; Rv 1:8

Rv 22:12

Heb 1:8–12

§1044

Is 40:3

Jn 1:23

Mal 3:1

That our Author did really evade the consideration of Isaiah xl. 3, “the voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of Jehovah,” we again declare; and if we examine John the Baptist’s answer to those sent from Jerusalem to enquire who he was, we may easily discern the reason. In this answer, John i. 23, “I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, make straight the way of *Jehovah*, as said the prophet Esaias;” the Divine Spirit at once declares that Jehovah whose way John was now preparing, is Christ himself. Fancying that through the copulative, *vau*, by our translators rendered “even” he had found a mode of making Jehovah in Malachi iii 1, who should “suddenly come to his temple,” and the “Messenger or Angel of the Covenant in whom they delighted,” *two* persons, although our translators make them *one*, our Author avoids all notice of Isaiah xl. which so fully declares Christ to be Jehovah, and having by a new translation, (on his own ground inadmissible because made by a Unitarian,) attempted to spread a degree of doubt over Malachi iii. 1, he attempts, contrary to all rules of sound interpretation, to make this the test of that decided passage in Isaiah, which he has so carefully avoided. But his new translation of Malachi iii. 1, will not bear examination. Were two really mentioned, Jehovah and the Angel of the Covenant, as it has been incontestably proved that the Angel of the Covenant, the “Angel of Jehovah, who appeared at Bochim,” is also Jehovah, /475 who brought Israel out of Egypt into the land of Canaan, God Almighty, before whom Abraham and Isaac walked; these two would be Jehovah the Father and Jehovah the Son. But the fact is that Malachi does not mention *two*. It was *Jehovah*, who was suddenly to come into his temple; and Jehovah and the Messenger or Angel of the Covenant, are identified as one by the prophet’s adding, *HE* shall come, not *they*.

<sup>1</sup> §602.

Instead of meeting the evidence adduced that this Angel or Messenger is Jehovah even if there be two, however, our Author, after saying, “how the Editor supposes that Malachi does not mention two, I am unable to guess,” on our pointing him to the prophet’s words, “he shall come,” not *they*, adds, (p. 190,) “how can the mention of the messenger of the covenant in the third person by the Deity, prove the unity of that messenger with the deity?”<sup>1</sup> This is totally beside the question. The very core of our reply is, the mention, not merely of “the third person;” but of the third person *singular*, HE; but had the two phrases “Jehovah whom ye seek” and “the Messenger of the Covenant whom ye delight in,” meant two distinct persons, instead of being two phrases describing one person, the rules of grammar and of common sense would have required the pronoun *they*, instead of *he*. But since the prophet says, “he shall come,”—“his coming;”—“when he appeared”—“he is like a refiner’s fire;”—“he shall sit as a refiner”—“he shall purify the sons of Levi,” our Author by his hypothesis of *two* coming, makes the prophet violate both the rules of grammar and common sense! Indeed he does more; since in ver. 1, God solemnly declares, “JEHOVAH shall suddenly come into his temple,” as the prophet declares that only *one* person shall come, his denying that one person to be Jehovah, falls little short of *impeaching the Divine veracity.* /476

But is our Author aware that his rendering the Hebrew ׀ *vau* by “and,” instead of “even,” will establish the *distinct personality*, and the *equality* of the Second Person in the glorious Trinity, and thus overthrow his whole system? Yet this is really the case. In Isaiah xlv. 11, he will find the following declaration; “Thus saith Jehovah, the Holy One of Israel, and his Maker.” We have here the Hebrew ׀ *vau*; and have it rendered “and” by our English Translators. Will he say that even this designates *two* persons, of which Jehovah the Holy One of Israel is the one, and the Maker of Israel the other? Then unless he says that the maker of Israel is not the Maker of the world, he completely proves the *distinct personality* and the *Deity* of the Second Person, for, “he that made all things is God.” Thus does he establish the Deity of the Redeemer of men on whatever side he turns. §1045  
Is 45:11  
Heb 3:4

Let us ask him further, has he read Zechariah’s description of him “raised up to be a *horn* of salvation?” Is he aware that while Zechariah in Luke i. 76, identifies Christ as Jehovah, before whose face Isaiah declares John about to go that he might prepare his ways, he in the following declaration, terms him the Most High, “and thou child shalt be called, the Prophet of the Highest,” or the Most High? §1046  
Lk 1:67-79

That in comparing Isaiah xl. 10, “Behold Jehovah God will come with strong hand, and his arm shall rule for him: *behold, his reward is with him*, and his work before him,” with Rev. xxii. 12, “Behold, I come quickly; and *my reward is me*, to give §1047  
Is 40:10; Rv 22:12

<sup>1</sup> §603.

to every man according as his work shall be,” the question is not, *by what authority* Christ rewards every man according as his work shall be; but whether he be the *person rewarding*, is perfectly obvious; for if he be the /477 latter, he is declared by Isaiah to be *Jehovah*. But in our Author’s declaring (p. 192) that it is “a subject worthy of question whether Joshua ordered the sun and the moon to stop their motions by the authority of God or by his own power, and whether Elijah raised the widow’s son by the authority of the Most High, or independently of the Almighty power,” and his affirming that it is necessary “to ascertain whether the authority to judge men and to reward them accordingly, as well as the power of performing miracles, were invested in Jesus by the omnipotent God, or exercised by him independently of the Father of the Universe,”<sup>1</sup> he confounds power as used to *signify innate strength or ability* to perform an act, with power as used to *signify authority or permission* to do an act, when the ability is previously *possessed*. The first of these was possessed *neither* by *Joshua nor Elijah*; neither of these possessed innate strength either to raise the dead or to arrest the course of nature. But he whom we have seen declared to be God Almighty, *Jehovah*, the *I AM*;—who “laid the foundation of the earth,” “and brought Israel out of Egypt into the land of Canaan,” possessed *by nature* all power, and might, and wisdom. This rendered him glorious in the eyes of God as his *Servant* in human nature. It is inherent ability indeed which constitutes the value of a servant among men. A man hires a servant and gives him power and authority to transact business in his name; but he does not give him innate strength and skill. This he is expected to bring with him, or he is a worthless servant. It is because he previously possesses this innate skill or strength, that he is *empowered* to transact business; and his receiving power or authority to do any act without previously possessing such inherent ability, would end not only in his dishonor, but /478 in that of him who was so unwise as to chuse so useless a servant.

Heb 1:10; Jg 2:1f.

§1048

On this principle Christ took on himself the form of a *servant* and was made in the likeness of men. Having thus become a servant to his Almighty Father, that he might “suffer the just for the unjust to bring us to God,” create “sinners anew in righteousness and true holiness” and present them “faultless before the throne of his glory,” a work so much transcending the creation of the material world, as to cause the latter “not to be remembered or even to come into mind,” his *infinite merit* lay in perfectly fulfilling the duties of this character; in other words, in having no will of his own different from his heavenly Father’s. Hence his declarations, “I can of mine ownself do nothing;”—“I came down from heaven not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.” But had our Lord undertaken this work without knowing that he possessed by nature that infinite wisdom and omnipotence which

1 P 3:18; Ep 4:24

Jude 1:24

Is 65:17

Jn 5:30

<sup>1</sup> §604.

would enable him to finish it with eternal honor to himself and to the wisdom of his heavenly Father in having laid help on “him who is mighty,” this would have been an act of unfaithfulness and folly which, while it could never have been concealed, would have dishonored both the Son and the Father throughout eternity.

Further, throughout the whole of the New Testament we never find the Son addressing the Father in such language as, “Not unto me, not unto me, O Lord; but unto thy name give glory, for thy mercy and thy truth’s sake,” as we do the saints both in the Old Testament and the New. Yet if the Son had not *by nature* possessed omnipotence and infinite wisdom, but had been dependent on the Father for these, as were Moses, Joshua, and Elijah for power to do all they wrought, his obligations /479 for the assistance he continually received in his work, would have been infinitely greater than theirs, and ought to have been expressed in infinitely higher strains of thankfulness and praise. But this is not the case. Although he did his every work precisely according to his Heavenly Father’s will, as his *servant* in human nature, terming them the “works God had given him to do,” he never said that they were the works “*God gave him omnipotence or wisdom to perform;*” nor gave the least hint that he did not bring his own omnipotence and infinite wisdom to these works. Even in his prayer at the grave of Lazarus we have no petition for strength to perform this miracle; and the language used, “Lazarus come forth,” could not have breathed more of sovereign omnipotence had it been the language of the Father himself. Nor throughout the New Testament are those thanksgivings found for help received in performing any work, moral or miraculous, which are inseparable from the exercise of religion in the hearts of the best of men; and the absence of which in the meek and lowly Jesus, “who did always the things that pleased the Father,” is perfectly unaccountable, if he, like the prophets and apostles, borrowed wisdom and strength from another, instead of deriving them from his own Godhead.

But that which marks the unmeasurable distance between Christ and his saints is, that while his *human* nature needed continual support from the Godhead, he himself claimed an equality in the Godhead with the Father; as, “I and my Father are one”—“What things soever the Father doeth, these things also doeth the Son *likewise,*” or with equal omnipotence and wisdom.—“My Father worketh hitherto and I work”—“He that hath seen me hath seen the Father”—“No man knoweth the Son but the Father”—“that all men /480 should honor the Son even as they honor the Father”—“I am he that searcheth the hearts and reins”—“I am the First and the Last,” with many others. When we consider this, and that in claiming this perfect equality with the Father, Christ did always the things that pleased him; and to this add, that no saint ever presumed thus to intrench in the least degree on the Divine glory; and that God shut out of Canaan even Moses and Aaron, because “they sanctified not Him in the eyes of Israel,” we need no other proof of the *Godhead* of the Son and his *Equality*

§1049

Ps 115:1

Jn 5:36

Jn 11:41-43

Jn 8:29

§1050

Jn 5:19; 10:30

Jn 5:17; 14:9; Mt 11:27

Rv 2:23; 1:8

Dt 32:48-52

with the Father.

§1051 We further ask our Author, Did Elijah possess innate strength and ability to raise the dead? Did Paul, the chief of the apostles, possess at all times the power of working miracles? Even at Lystra he was unable to heal the cripple, 'till he perceived that he had faith to be healed. But could Paul create this faith? He declares, 1 Cor. iii. Ac 14:8–10 1 Co 3:5–9 Heb 12:2 7, that he could not; and that though he might plant and Apollos water, God alone could give the increase. But he declares that Christ is the Author and Finisher of our faith, a declaration tantamount to saying, “Christ is God over all blessed for ever more.”<sup>1</sup>

§1052 That the power or authority Christ received from his Father, is wholly command or direction as God’s *servant*, and not innate omnipotence or wisdom, is indeed evident from the passages our Author brings in hope of disproving the fact. When the Father (John v.) *committed* all judgement to the Son, he knew that he possessed that *omniscience* and *omnipresence*, by which he could search every heart and ascertain every person’s deeds in all ages and in every part of the world, as well as that *infinite wisdom* and *rectitude* which enabled him in every case to make a perfect righteous decision. /481 Jn 5:22 Jn 5:30 Heb 1:10 If as he “*heard he judged*,” did he not possess that *omniscience* which enabled him to ascertain that the words he heard were an accurate report of the deeds they described? To our Author’s sneer (p. 193) at the doctrine of the two-fold nature of Christ, we have already replied. Did the Son whose human nature was born of Mary, exist before Abraham—and lay the foundation of the earth *without a nature*? Did he exist as a *nothing*? Were the worlds created *BY nothing*, as well as *out of nothing*?

§1053 We further ask him relative to Christ’s *personal Obedience or Righteousness*, when do we find such a prayer from Christ to his Father, as that of David, “For thy name’s sake lead me and guide me?” Yet it was of infinitely more importance to Christ that he should be led in the midst of the paths of judgement, than to David. Had Christ loved any man too much or too little, had he been displeased with any sin too much or too little, had he in rebuking charged any man wrongfully in the least degree,—in a word had he been mistaken in one point of fact or opinion, his mission below would have been void; his heavenly Father would have been eternally dishonored, and the whole human race would have perished for ever. But do we throughout the gospels find one petition put up by our Redeemer for such guidance and preservation, or one thanksgiving for such help afforded? But had such help been given him and not acknowledged, such ingratitude would have been a sin of the deepest dye. Yet Christ did always the things that pleased his heavenly Father. But had He who will Is 42:8 not give his glory to another, well pleased, beheld himself thus robbed of the glory of

<sup>1</sup> Compare §972, note.

his preserving power and wisdom, even by the highest and holiest of his creatures, he would have taken pleasure in the most /482 hateful iniquity. The proof that our Lord persevered in his course of perfect rectitude by his own omnipotence, wisdom, and holiness, is therefore complete;—and were no other proof found in the Scripture, this alone would prove, that he is God, unchangeable in power, wisdom, and holiness.

Our Author wishes to be informed, (p. 194) “[what kind of Divine nature it was that could be divested of glory and power even for a season.](#)”<sup>1</sup> And (p. 195) to our saying that the Son’s laying aside his glory and becoming man, in no way changes his original power and godhead; he replies, “[that the Son’s or any other being’s laying aside his glory and becoming a man, must produce at least a temporary change in his nature, is a proposition as obvious, any that can be submitted to the understanding.](#)”<sup>2</sup> Surely he must have been driven to the last extremity before he could have brought this forward instead of Scripture proof. This is simply a question relative to superiority of knowledge between him and his Maker, the only wise God. He has then analysed the Divine Nature; he has found out the Almighty to perfection; he has ascertained that the display of its *brightest* glory every moment, (for John says, “*we beheld his glory,*”) is as essential to its eternal existence, as “[space or gravity is to matter, or light to a sun beam!](#)”<sup>3</sup> Nay he has entered more deeply into the Divine nature than God himself, and ascertained that what God has declared, *cannot be true*. In vain does the Father, who alone knows the Son’s nature, declare of the Son, even after the heavens are laid aside, THOU ART THE SAME. In vain does the Spirit of Truth declare after Christ’s birth, suffering, and resurrection, that he is “the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever;” our Author is certain that the Son’s laying aside his /483 glory and becoming a man, must have produced at least a temporary change in his *nature!* nay that this is a proposition as obvious as any that can be submitted to the human understanding. It is then as obvious as any proposition that can be submitted to the human understanding, that the Father *who cannot lie*, and the Spirit of truth, *have given false testimony respecting the Son*. It follows that all Divine Revelation is annihilated, and that mankind are left to the reveries of Mahomet and the fables of Paganism.

§1054

Jb 11:7

Heb 1:12

Heb 13:8

We also added, “[But why conceal the fact that Christ comes to judgement in his own glory as well as in his Father’s? This is declared Luke ix. 26, ‘The Son of man shall come in his OWN glory and in his Father’s;’ and in Matt. xxv. 31, where he mentions his own glory alone, ‘when the Son of man shall come in HIS glory and all the holy angels with him.’](#)”<sup>4</sup> To these passages so decisive on the subject, what does our Author reply? *Nothing whatever.*

§1055

We further remarked that our Author in quoting John v. 22, “The Father judgeth

§1056

<sup>1</sup> §604. <sup>2</sup> §605. <sup>3</sup> §604. <sup>4</sup> §377.

Jn 5:23 no man, but hath committed all judgement to the Son,” had omitted the clause “*that all men should honor the Son even as they honor the Father.*”<sup>1</sup> To this he merely replies, (p. 195,) “I have of course omitted to quote John v. 23, during this discussion in my Second Appeal, because it has no relation to the subject in hand, and because I noticed it fully in another part of that publication, page 45.”<sup>2</sup> Here it is obvious that the latter reason destroys the former; If it “has no relation to the subject,” why notice it fully? The fact is however, that this clause, so far from having no relation to the subject in hand, involves the existence of our Author’s system. If the Father hath committed all judgement to the Son, “that all men /484 might honor the Son EVEN AS they honor the Father,” that is, as being equally omniscient, omnipotent, wise and holy, it is because the Father knew, that the Son possesses these Divine attributes, and desired that the whole universe should know that he possesses them, and give him the glory due unto them. Now had the Father lent him for a time his omniscience, omnipotence, and infinite wisdom, when he by nature possessed none of these, to say nothing of the absurdity of a finite creature’s receiving and wielding infinite power and wisdom, his being honored as by nature possessing these attributes, would have been an empty farce. And had it escaped the angels that he was honored for perfections he did not by nature possess, it could not have escaped the keen eye of Satan; it must therefore have reflected eternal dishonor both on the Son and the Father. Had this clause then no relation to the subject of Christ’s Deity, which it establishes on an immovable basis?

§1057 But what did our Author object to this clause in p. 45 of his Second Appeal? That the phrase “*even as*,” *καθως*, does not mean the same in degree and quality.<sup>3</sup> To this we replied that it means “precisely the same,” which we supported by adducing among others, Matt. xx. 14, “I will give unto this last *even as* unto thee;” that is, “precisely the same money.”<sup>4</sup> What does he reply to this? *Nothing*; but he avoids the subject! As this clause is so powerful however, we will add two or three other passages to show that such is the exact meaning of *καθως* (“*even as*.”) The first, St. Matt. xxi. 6, refers to the command Christ gave his disciples to bring the ass colt on which he rode into Jerusalem; “and the disciples went and did *even as* Jesus commanded them,” that is, they brought precisely the colt he commanded. /485 The second occurs Luke i. 1, 2, “Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth a declaration of the things which are most surely believed among us, ‘*even as*’ they delivered them unto us who were eye-witnesses.” Here also the meaning is “exactly, precisely.” A third is found Luke v. 14, “Go and shew thyself to the priest, and offer for thy cleansing, ‘according as’ or ‘*even as*’ (*καθως*) Moses commanded.” These passages indubitably prove, that the meaning of this clause is, that the honor given

Mt 20:14

Mt 21:6

Lk 1:1f.

Lk 5:14

<sup>1</sup> §376. <sup>2</sup> §606. <sup>3</sup> §132. <sup>4</sup> §427.



the Son should be as fully equal to that given the Father, as one piece of money is equal to another of the same value; as the obedience faithful servants yield to a command, is to that command; as the narration of faithful writers is intended to be, to things most surely believed; as Christ himself intended that the obedience of the man healed, should be to the command of Moses. Further, if the Father intended that all men should honor the Son “precisely as” they honor the Father, it was because he possessed precisely the same Divine nature and attributes; since, truly to honor a person, is, merely to recognize *what he really is*. But if he commanded men and angels to honor the Son for Divine attributes he did not by nature possess, he commanded them to practice on themselves continual deception. So far then was the Father from committing all judgement to the Son, that he might himself do the work of omniscience and omnipresence for the Son and then give him the reputation of possessing these perfections, that he did it to convince the whole universe that he possesses every perfection of Deity even as the Father himself.

Jn 5:23

It is singular that our Author should add, (p. 196,) “I will also refrain from noticing in this place Heb. i. 12, alluded to by the Editor, as I have already con-/486sidered this passage as fully as possible in the preceding chapter, page 122.”<sup>1</sup> Are our readers aware what passage this is, which he so carefully avoids considering too much? It is the language of the Father to the Son, “As a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed; but THOU ART THE SAME, and thy years shall not fail.” And what is the amount of what he has said respecting this passage at p. 122? That Paul while describing the Son, in a fit of devotion addresses the Father!<sup>2</sup> Never was devotion attended with worse effects however; for we have already shewn that it represents the Spirit of Truth as guilty of falsehood by solemnly declaring that to be said of the Son, which our Author declares to have been said of the Father!

§1058

Heb 1:12

In attempting to disprove that Isa. xlv. 6, “Thus saith *Jehovah* the king of Israel, and his Redeemer *Jehovah* of Hosts, I am the First and I am the Last,” is shewn by the correspondent passages in Rev. i. 8, xxi. 6, and xxii. 13, to belong to Christ, our Author employs nearly thirteen pages. These therefore we will briefly but carefully examine. And the first witness we shall bring to prove that Jesus does in Rev. xxii. 13 declare himself to be, the First and the Last, like *Jehovah* of Hosts in Isa. xlv. 6, is our Author himself! He insists (p. 204) that there is only one agent speaking in Rev. xxii. from ver. 6th to the 20th, and that this agent is Jesus Christ.<sup>3</sup> By his own acknowledgement then it is Jesus Christ who says in Rev. xxii. 13, “I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last.” And yet, he has asserted (p. 150) that in Rev. i. 8, *it is not Christ, but God the Father* who declares, “I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending!”<sup>4</sup> But is he aware what he does

§1059

Is 44:6-8; Rv 1:8; 22:13

<sup>1</sup> §607. <sup>2</sup> §561. <sup>3</sup> §614. <sup>4</sup> §576.

by this assertion? He does nothing less than *establish the perfect EQUALITY of Christ with /487 the Father*. If to avoid this, he should now say, that there are *two* in the book of Revelation who declare themselves the *beginning* and the *ending*, the *first* and the *last*, he will have no way of relieving the venerable Apostle from affirming that which is false both in nature and in fact, namely that there are *two beginnings* and *two endings*, *two* who are *first* and *two* who are *last*, beside his declaring that the Son and the Father are *ONE* in *essence* and *nature*; which will anew establish the *equality* and the *unity* of the Father and the Son. Should he deny that it is Christ who speaks in xxii. 13, he denies that it was Christ who refused the worship of John after all he has written in the subject. If he say that it is Jesus who speaks both in this passage and in Rev. i. 8, (which by the by is the truth,) he will then declare that Jesus is “He who was, and is, and is to come, the Almighty.” And we then leave him to account as he can for “the Almighty’s” forbidding himself to be worshipped by John.

§1060 To his objecting that the word worship sometimes means a [token of civil respect due to superiors, and that in this sense, not only Jesus but angels and prophets used to accept it](#),<sup>1</sup> we merely ask him, Did Abraham and Isaac yield “a token of civil respect” to Jacob’s Redeeming angel, the God before whom they walked? Did Moses and all Israel yield merely civil respect to *Jehovah, the I AM*, the angel of Bochim who “brought them out of Egypt into the land he swore unto their fathers?” Did the Father command the Angels to yield mere civil respect to the Son, who “upheld them by the word of his power?” Does he not perceive that his saying here, “[Not only Jesus but Angels and prophets](#),” is merely begging the question?

Jg 2:1f.  
Heb 1:6, 3

§1061 As he tells us in p. 198 that when the four and /488 twenty elders are described as falling down, the word “worship” is not added, as it is invariably when John is referring to God;<sup>2</sup>—in p. 207, that no mention is made either of the Lamb or of Jesus in ch. iv. when the blessed are represented as crying, Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord God Almighty;—and asks in p. 208, “[Is not the Lamb throughout the whole book of Revelation mentioned distinctly and separately from God?](#)”<sup>3</sup>—and in p. 209, [If a slain lamb be God Almighty, or his true emblem, what must be his worship and what must become of his worshippers?](#)”<sup>4</sup> These assertions and queries we will carefully examine. To his objecting that “worship” is not added by John relative to the Son,

<sup>1</sup> §608.

<sup>2</sup> §608: “The author of the book of Revelation declares himself [...] to have fallen at the feet of Jesus; and he speaks also [...] of the four beasts and four-and-twenty elders having fallen down before the Lamb; avoiding, however, in these places, as well as throughout the whole book of Revelation, the use of the word worship to express the reverence shewn to the Lamb; while to the words ‘fell down,’ when referring to God, he adds invariably, ‘and worshipped him.’”

<sup>3</sup> §618. <sup>4</sup> §619.

it is quite sufficient to reply, that worship to the Son, is enjoined upon Angels by the father in Heb. i. 6, “and when he bringeth in the First begotten into the world he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him.” But if the Father enjoined it on the angels in heaven, our Author may rest assured that he was obeyed, although John may not have been directed to mention it; for there is no disobedience to God in heaven. To his objecting (p. 207,) “that **no mention** is made either of Jesus or the Lamb in ch. iv. when the blessed cry Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord God Almighty,”<sup>1</sup> we reply, that “the Lamb” is not introduced at all in the vision until the next chapter! But he has not disproved the fact that it was Christ before whom the seraphim bowed veiling their faces in Isaiah vi. 3, crying, “Holy, holy, holy, is Jehovah of hosts,”—nor that it is Christ who declares Rev. i. 8, “I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, saith he who was, and is, and is to come, the Almighty;”—nor that Jacob’s Redeeming Angel, the God before whom Abraham walked, said unto him, Gen. xvii. “I am God Almighty, walk before me and be thou perfect.” /489

Heb 1:6

Gn 17:1

But he may find in Rev. v. more decided adoration, if possible, paid the Lamb, than that expressed by the term προσκυνειν “to worship,” which he elsewhere contends, is so doubtful. The four and twenty elders *praise* him in a new song, saying, “Thou hast redeemed us to God by thy blood,” &c. Afterwards the angels, whom God had before commanded to worship him, with a loud voice ascribe to the Lamb *precisely the same praise* they elsewhere ascribed to “Him that sitteth upon the throne.” Nay “every creature” did John hear, equally praising the Lamb and Him upon the throne by saying, “Blessing, glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne *and unto the Lamb* for ever and ever.” But for the Spirit of holiness to describe the Lamb as praised equally with God by every creature in heaven and in earth, is, *to establish for ever the equality of the Son with the Father*. Further, if in ch. iv. the four and twenty elders fell down and worshipped him that *liveth for ever and ever*, in ch. v. all creatures ascribe praise to the *Lamb, who liveth for ever and ever*.<sup>2</sup> The Lamb then whom God commanded the angels to worship, is here described as equal with him both in *praise* and *eternal duration*. In Rev. vi. 16, the Divine Spirit represents the Lamb as equal with God in the *terror of his wrath*, by describing the kings of the earth as saying to the rocks and the mountains, “fall on us and hide us from the face of him that sitteth upon the throne and from the wrath of the Lamb.” And in ch. vii. 10, he describes a great multitude which no man can number as ascribing *salvation* to the Lamb *equally* with “him who sitteth on the throne.” “And (they) cried with a loud voice, Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, *and unto the Lamb*.” Is it

§1062

Rv 5:8–14

Rv 4:10

Rv 6:16f.

Rv 7:10

<sup>1</sup> §611.

<sup>2</sup> Marshman refers to KJV Rv 5:14: “And the four *and* twenty elders fell down and worshipped him that liveth for ever and ever.” The words “that liveth for ever and ever” (ζῶντι εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων) have been excised by Griesbach, *NT Graece Vol. II*, 556, and in modern editions.

the Spirit of truth and holiness which represents the redeemed, the angels in /490 heaven, and every creature in heaven and earth, as thus ascribing praise, power, and salvation equally to Him that sitteth on the throne and to the Lamb? What need then have we of any further witness?

- §1063 The fact is indeed, that we have such an abundance of evidence in this book to the Deity of the Son, as to fear lest our readers should be fatigued by our adducing the whole. In ch. xi. we have him alone adored who “*judgeth the dead and giveth reward unto his servants the prophets,*” and this we have already seen to be the Son, to whom
- Rv 11:18 the Father, hath committed all judgement, that all men might honor the Son even as they honor the Father. How is he addressed by the four and twenty elders? Precisely in his own language, Rev. i. 8, when he declares himself to be Alpha and Omega; “We thank thee, *O Lord God Almighty, which art, and was, and art to come.*” What then becomes of our Author’s asserting that this language, equivalent to Jehovah, is not applied to Jesus in any part of the book of Revelation? Yea, what becomes of his whole system?
- Jn 5:23
- Rv 11:17
- §1064 Further in Rev. xiv. 4, the redeemed are declared to be the first-fruits *unto God and the Lamb*; but where in the sacred scriptures do we hear of any of the redeemed being the first-fruits to *God and Paul*, or to *God and Moses*? In Rev. xvi. 5, another angel addresses Him to whom all judgement is committed, in the language Christ ascribes to himself in Rev. i. 8, “Thou art righteous, O Lord, which art, and wast, and art to come, because *thou hast judged thus.*” But the Father judgeth no man. In ver. 7, a second angel addresses him as *Almighty*; “Even so, Lord God Almighty, true and righteous are *thy judgements.*” In Rev. xx. 6, the Holy Spirit declares him equal in *Godhead* with the Father, by saying, Blessed and holy is he who hath part in the first re-/491surrection—They shall be *priests of God and of Christ*. Are holy men ever represented as “priests of Moses”—“of David”—or “of Paul?” In Rev. xxi. 3, the Divine Spirit declares; “Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men—and *God himself* shall be with them, and be *their God;*” and in ver. 7th, He who declares himself to be Alpha and Omega the beginning and the end, declares his equality with “God himself,” by saying, “He that overcometh shall inherit all things; *and I will be his God.*” As our Author insists that he who, Rev. xxii. 13, declares, “I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last,” is no other than Jesus Christ, he himself declares that Jesus Christ is equal with “God himself.” In Rev. xxi. 22, the Divine Spirit represents the Lamb as the eternal *temple* of the blessed equally with God. “And I saw no temple therein: for the *Lord God Almighty and the Lamb* are the temple of it.” And in verse 23 as equally the eternal *light or glory* of the blessed; “And the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the Light thereof.” Finally, in Rev. xxii. 1, the Holy Spirit describes the Lamb as *equally enthroned in majesty* with God, and equally *the source of eternal felicity*, “And he shewed me a
- Rv 14:4
- Rv 16:5–7
- Rv 20:6
- Rv 21:3–8
- Rv 21:22f.
- Rv 22:1

pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the THRONE of God and OF THE LAMB.” Thus then in this book is the Lamb not only styled “the Lord God Almighty,” “him who was, and is, and is to come,” but he is adored with precisely the same ascriptions of praise as the Father; he is represented as equal to him in the *terror* of his *wrath*,—in *salvation*,—in *Godhead*,—as equally the *light* and *glory* of the redeemed,—*equally enthroned* in majesty, and equally *the eternal source of bliss*. Such then is the “slain Lamb”—/492 such is “his worship”—and such the bliss of “his worshippers” throughout eternity.

Let us now briefly notice our Author’s objections. He says (p. 199) that we neglect §1065 to notice his remark that “the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last, are justly applicable to Jesus in a finite sense.”<sup>1</sup> We beg leave here to ask him what this means. The scriptures say nothing of these being applicable to Jesus in any other sense than to the Father himself. But we are “regardless of the explanation given by John himself respecting these, and by St. Paul, one of his fellow-laborers.”<sup>2</sup> In this our Author is mistaken. We are as fully aware as he is that Christ is the *Amen*, “the Faithful and True Witness,” and that hence all he has witnessed respecting both his *human* and his *Divine* nature, is THE TRUTH;—that his created Human nature from its superior holiness, excels in moral dignity and glory all other created beings, unspeakably more than any “first-born” excels his brethren in dignity, and that it is the “beginning” or “chief” “of the creation of God;”—that his Divine nature is eternal, almighty, omniscient, and omnipresent;—that after he has created anew and led every son to glory, there being no more sin to be forgiven and no more need of intercession, he delivers up his mediatorial kingdom to the Father, and remains THE SAME unchangeable Jehovah, ONE with the Father, and EQUALLY with him the TEMPLE, the LIGHT of the heavenly Jerusalem and the God of every individual saint, sending forth EQUALLY from his Throne a “pure river of the water of life,” the source of everlasting bliss.

The stress we lay on the Lamb’s being “in the midst of the throne,” refers merely §1066 to *position*. If Christ was in the midst of the throne, he could not have been at the /493 same moment shewing John the holy city, without being *omnipresent*, which destroys our Author’s system.<sup>3</sup>—For his sneer at the merits of Christ, (p. 201) by reckoning them “in common with the merits of every righteous Christian,”<sup>4</sup> we leave him to answer at his judgement seat to which he is hastening. We further ask him to point out one “righteous Christian” or righteous man in scripture who claimed “holy perfection and honor” through his own merits, beside the Pharisee in the parable.

He hopes (p. 202) that we could not have intended to identify the speaker in Rev. §1067 xxii. 6, who says, “these sayings are faithful and true,” with him in Rev. xxi. 5, who Rv 21:3–8

<sup>1</sup> §608. <sup>2</sup> §608. <sup>3</sup> §378. <sup>4</sup> §610.

Rv 22:6f. said—“write, for these words are true and faithful,” because he adds ver. 7th, “He that overcometh shall inherit all things; and I will be his God and he shall be my Son.”<sup>1</sup> But is he aware that he has identified these two himself? He insists that he who speaks, Rev. xxii. 6, continues his speech to verse the 20th. Then he of course says in ver. 13th, “I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end;” and this is precisely what he who speaks in Rev. xxi. 6, says of himself in the preceding verse, “I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end.” He himself then identifies these two speakers with each other,—and makes him who “sat upon the throne making all things new,” and who says, “I will be his God,” declare himself to be John’s fellow-servant and refuse worship from him!

§1068 His asserting (p. 206) in the hope of proving Jesus to be the angel who refused John’s worship, that Jesus, *designated as God’s angel*, “shewed John *all things which must shortly come to pass*, and sent his *angel to shew to John these things in the churches respecting the Christian dispensation*,”<sup>2</sup> is without proof. In what /494 passage in the New Testament is Christ after his incarnation termed, “God’s angel?” Many of “God’s angels” are mentioned in the Gospels and Epistles, which of them is Christ?

§1069 Let us now shew our Author whither his referring things said in this book to the nearest agent mentioned, instead of making the things themselves identify the speaker, will inevitably carry him.<sup>3</sup> In Rev. xvi. 15, one says, “Behold, I come as a thief; blessed is he that watcheth,” &c. This, he acknowledges, is Christ speaking, since the expression is used by Christ in five different places. He is right; it is undoubtedly Jesus.<sup>4</sup> But if he will revert to the agent who speaks two verses before, and between whose speech and this declaration there does not intervene so much as, “and he said,” he will find by his saying, ver. 13th, “And I saw three unclean spirits like frogs come out of the mouth of the dragon,” that according to his way of reasoning this is indubitably John! The same reasoning therefore by which he attempts to prove that Jesus is the angel who refused John’s worship, proves that John was Jesus,—and that it was Jesus who *offered* and Jesus who *refused* this worship! Again  
 Rv 1:8 in Rev. i. 8, we find one saying, “I am Alpha and Omega the beginning and the end, saith the Lord which is, and was, and is to come, the Almighty.” This our Author declares to be God the Father. But if he will look back to the last agent mentioned,

<sup>1</sup> §613. <sup>2</sup> §616.

<sup>3</sup> In §612 Rammohan was challenging Marshman’s position that there are spoken words in Rv without introduction of a speaker which shows that God is speaking.

<sup>4</sup> §612, note: “In ch. xvi., 15, the day of the Lord is metaphorically introduced as a speaker.” Rammohan does not acknowledge that Christ is speaking, but the “day of the Lord”, and he refers to 1 Th 5:2 and 2 P 3:10 for this. Marshman doesn’t seem to see this difference. Christ uses “this expression” for himself/for the Son of Man in Mt 24:43, Lk 12:39, Rv 3:3.

in ver. 4th, “John to the seven churches,” he will find this agent to be *John*. The rule then which he employs to make Jesus Christ the angel who refused John’s worship, will make John both Jesus Christ, and God the Father!

Having pointed out the absurdities involved in his attempt to make Christ the angel who refused John’s worship, we will now shew our Author that even on his /495 own hypothesis, this angel is not Jesus. In saying, “[there is not a single instance in which a speech is repeated without the previous introduction of a new speaker](#),”<sup>1</sup> he affirms that the introduction of a new speaker prevents our applying any speech to the speaker preceding. He further acknowledges that it is Christ who says in ver. 7th, “Behold I come quickly,” &c. But in the next verse, the 8th, he may perceive that John introduces a new speaker under the description of “*the angel which shewed me these things*,” whom John attempts to worship and who then says to him, “See thou do it not, for I am thy fellow-servant,” &c. Now had this been the former speaker, Jesus Christ, at whose feet he had fallen down to worship him, it would have been quite sufficient for John to have said, “I fell down at *his* feet;” as he does in a parallel place, Rev. xix. 10, where after he had been conversing with an angel, he adds, “and I fell at *his* feet to worship him.” Why then did he not here say, “I fell at *his* feet to worship him?” Because this would have misled the reader by inevitably pointing him to the preceding speaker, Jesus Christ, who had just said, “behold I come quickly,” and who would then have been understood as forbidding John to worship him. To prevent this however, John, notwithstanding his conciseness, introduces this other speaker under the designation of “the angel who shewed me these things.” For our Author to say then that this is Christ the former speaker, is, not only to violate the laws of composition and common sense, but the rule on which he himself has founded his hypothesis.

§1070

Rv 22:6–16

Rv 19:10

We further find that he considers the expression, “And he said unto me,” as the introduction of a new speaker; for he says (p. 203) “[we find an angel is /496 previously introduced in ver. 6th, as the speaker of ver. 7th](#).”<sup>2</sup> This introduction of a new speaker in ver. 6th however, is no more than, “and he said unto me.” Since then this is the introduction of a new speaker, we may find one thus introduced in verse the 10th, “*And he saith unto me*, Seal not the sayings of this book, for the time is at hand. He that is unjust let him be unjust still,” &c. It is this *new speaker*, and *not* the angel introduced as he that shewed John these things, who says in verse 13th, “I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last;” and in ver. 16th, “I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches.” Thus then our Author’s own rules prove that Christ is introduced at ver. 6th with “and he said;” that another speaker is introduced ver. 8th as “the angel who shewed

§1071

<sup>1</sup> §614. <sup>2</sup> §614.



John these things,” and who in ver. 9th forbids John to worship him; and that in ver. 10th, Christ again introduced with “and he saith,” and continues speaking to the 20th verse. Thus his hypothesis that Jesus was the angel who forbade John to worship him, by the application of his own rule, vanishes in air with all its absurdities; while the book of Revelation from the examination further given it, has furnished such evidence of the Deity of Christ and his eternal Equality with the Father, as is sufficient to establish the doctrine were it found in no other part of scripture.

§1072

It is scarcely needful after this to notice his asking (p. 207,) “Can any man be justified in ascribing Deity to one whose language is this? ‘As I received of *my father*,’—‘I have not found thy works perfect *before God*,’—‘I will *confess his name before my Father* and before his angels,’—‘Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of *my God*,’ &c.”—“Is it consistent with the nature of God to acquire exaltation through merit, saying with a loud voice, ‘Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power and riches and wisdom and strength?’—‘To him that overcometh will I give to sit with me on my throne, *EVEN AS I also overcame and am set down with my father on his throne.*’”<sup>1</sup> These objections include nothing which has not been fully

Heb 1:10

answered already. When He who “laid the foundation of the earth,” “God Almighty, before whom Abraham and Isaac walked,”—Jehovah, the eternal I AM, who “brought Israel out of Egypt into the land concerning which he swore unto their fathers,” condescended of his infinite love to take upon him the form of a *servant*, and to be made under the law, *it became him* to acknowledge his Father as *his God*, as well as “to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day.” And if “*it be not consistent with the nature of God*” to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength why is the Lord God Almighty thus addressed, Rev. iv. “Thou art *worthy*, O Lord, *to receive* glory, and honor, and power?” If it be consistent with the nature of God the Father, surely it must be with the nature of God the Son.

Rv 4:11

§1073

Our Author’s asserting, (p. 208) that “*the Lamb sings to another being*,”<sup>2</sup> is one of those instances of inattention to the Scriptures which we have so often been constrained to notice. This instance is the more to be lamented, as his ascertaining the truth here, might have opened his eyes to the monstrous absurdity and madness of his denying the Deity of the “only wise God our Saviour.” Throughout the whole of this book Christ is never once mentioned as offering praise and thanksgiving to his heavenly Father. In the instance to which he alludes, Rev. xv. 3, 4, the Divine Spirit expressly declares, “*THEY sing* the song of Moses the servant of God, /498 and the song of the Lamb.” Who are they? the redeemed who had gotten the victory over

Jude 1:25

Rv 15:3f.

<sup>1</sup> §618.

<sup>2</sup> §618: “Is it becoming of the nature of God to sing thus, addressing himself to another being: ‘Great and marvellous are *THY* works, Lord God Almighty;’”



the beast; and we are informed ch. xii. 11, that they overcame him *by the blood of the Lamb*, for which they repeatedly praise him in this book. This then is no other than a song to the honor of the Lamb, described here as “the King of saints” as well as the Lord God Almighty, and as having *judged the beast* and his other enemies, for they declare, “*thy judgements are made manifest.*” But, as has been already said, “the Father judgeth no man.” Indeed, the least reflection might have convinced him that the expression, “Thou only art holy,” could not be truth in the mouth of Christ. What would then become of his being *one in will and design* with the Father? What of his doing always the things that please him? What of Daniel’s declaring him the Most Holy, in saying ch. ix. 24, “and to anoint the Most Holy?” If a man will permit himself to be so inattentive to the Sacred Scriptures, as to be thus led away by the mere sound of a word or a phrase, there is no absurdity which he may not believe. Rv 12:11  
Dn 9:24

The fact that Christ never throughout the book of Revelation offers praise to his heavenly Father, is a proof of his Deity which he will never be able to surmount. Had Christ been originally a creature and *made a God*, as Socinus formerly said, all the obligations of the redeemed and the angels above, would have vanished into nothing before His, who from nothing had been exalted so much above them all. And as ingratitude is the vilest of all feelings, for Christ to have been silent or even slow in his thanksgiving to the Divine goodness, while every creature in heaven and earth is represented as united in offering blessing, and honor, and glory, and power to him equally with the Father for ever and ever, Rev. v. 13, would, with reverence be it spoken, /499 have marked him out as the basest of all beings. Those who remember the speed with which the Divine vengeance visited Herod because he gave not the glory to God when the people shouted, “It is the voice of a God and not of a man,” might in this case have expected that a thunderbolt of Divine wrath would instantly have precipitated the Lamb from his throne as the just reward of his guilty silence. Yet instead of the least expression of displeasure from the Divine Father, the Holy Spirit, “who knoweth what is the mind of God,”<sup>1</sup> describes all the holy and the blessed in the universe as equalling the Lamb with the Father to the end of the book, and then pronounces blessing on those who read this book and those who hear the words of this prophecy. §1074  
Rv 5:8–14  
Ac 12:21–23  
Rv 1:3; 22:7

Our Author’s objecting, (p. 209) that [the Apostle John never once declares the Lamb to be “God of gods,”](#)<sup>2</sup> would weigh as much against the Deity of the Father as of the Son, for John never uses it respecting the Father. Indeed it occurs scarcely more than three or four times in the Old Testament; but even in one of these it is applied to the Second Person of the Trinity. In Psalm cxxxvi. 2, the Psalmist says, “O give thanks unto the *God of gods*; for his mercy endureth for ever.” But who is this? In §1075  
Ps 136:2–9

<sup>1</sup> Maybe Marshman refers to Rm 8:27, but is not quoting correctly. <sup>2</sup> §618.

the 5th verse the Psalmist declares it to be “Him that by wisdom made the heavens, and stretched out the earth;” and this the Divine Father in Heb. i. 10, declares to be the Son.

§1076 Respecting Isaiah xlv. 23, compared with Rom. xiv, 10–12, “we shall all stand before the judgement seat of Christ; for it is written, as I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God;” our Author had observed in his Second Appeal, “between the prophet and apostle there is a perfect /500 agreement in substance, since both declare that every knee shall bow and every tongue shall confess *through him* before whose judgement seat we shall all stand.”<sup>1</sup> We here begged leave to ask him where the phrase “*through him*,” is to be found, and added, that it must be in his copy of the prophet and the apostle,—as it was not in ours.<sup>2</sup> Our Author now labors to prove that he had a right to add this clause “through him,” because it is said Rom. v. 1, “we have peace with God *through* our Lord Jesus Christ,” and Paul says, Rom i. 8, “I thank my God *through* Jesus Christ;” and, that God shall judge the secrets of men *by* Jesus Christ—and hath reconciled us to himself *by* Jesus Christ. But these passages while perfectly true, do not touch the point in hand, which is, whether it be in this declaration of the apostle, “so then every one of us shall give an account of himself to God.” In this however it is not; and since the Apostle, who knew that through Christ we have access to the Father, quite as well as our Author, did not insert it in this verse, he had no right to insert it himself. We are well aware that without this supplement, the verse will inevitably imply that Paul declares Christ to be God. But this is no more than he had done Rom. ix. 5, in declaring him “God blessed for evermore.”<sup>3</sup>

§1077 On comparing Isaiah xlv. 23, “unto me (Jehovah) every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear,” with Rom. xiv. 10–12, we observed that as Jesus also swore by himself, he is thereby evinced to be God by the rule that it is God alone who can swear by himself.<sup>4</sup> On this our Author had asked, “how can they evade the context that Jehovah God and not Jesus, swore in this manner;”<sup>5</sup> to which we replied, that the Son was Jehovah before he was Jesus, and that his being Jesus could not make him cease to be Jehovah.<sup>6</sup> Our Author asks /501 (p. 212,) “Is not this a mere begging of the question, inasmuch as one may equally assert that Moses or Joshua were Jehovah, before he was Moses or Joshua.”<sup>7</sup> To this we reply; Not in the least; full evidence of this fact had been given before. But is it true that Joshua “laid the foundation of the earth, and that the heavens are the work of his hands?” Was Moses, “the Angel who redeemed Jacob from all evil, the God before whom Abraham and Isaac walked?”

<sup>1</sup> §234. <sup>2</sup> §380. <sup>3</sup> Compare §972, note.

<sup>4</sup> Marshman is confusing the chronology. Rammohan, in the *Second Appeal*, had referred to William Jones (“they say”, §234), not to Marshman.

<sup>5</sup> §234. <sup>6</sup> §380. <sup>7</sup> §621.

His assertion, (p. 212,) “that previously to Christ’s birth there were many Saviours raised by God to save his servants,”<sup>1</sup> we have fully met already, and shewn our Author that Obed’s merely existing, and Nehemiah’s redeeming some of his brethren by giving a few shekels, are totally different from the Angel’s redeeming Jacob from all evil.<sup>2</sup> And we ask him here, Did Othniel’s saving Israel by defeating the Canaanites, or Jerobeam’s, by defeating the Syrians, require the same almighty power and love with Jesus’s *delivering* his people from the wrath to come, and his *saving* his people from their sins? §1078

In reply to our observing that Isaiah xlv. 24, “surely, shall one say, in Jehovah have I righteousness and strength,” related to the Son, as the righteousness ascribed to the Father is never obedience to a law, the Son alone being made under the law, our Author merely quotes the passage that the reader may judge whether our position had any foundation.<sup>3</sup> This however we had done before him, and it was his to disprove our position if able, but this he does not even attempt; and had he, it would have been in vain, as long as it remains on record that, “God hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made *the righteousness of God in Him*.” He does not wish to bring before the reader, Isaiah xlv. 25, “In Jehovah shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory.” Nor to our adding, “*Jehovah therefore, in whom men have righteousness, is no other than Christ in whose righteousness Paul wished to be found*,”<sup>4</sup> does he make the least reply, although this involves the life of his cause. §1079  
Is 45:23–25  
2 Co 5:21

Relative to Isaiah liv. 5, “thy Maker is thine husband, Jehovah of Hosts in<sup>5</sup> his name,” as compared with John iii. 29, “he that hath the bride is the bridegroom,” our Author had affirmed, that in Isaiah God is represented as the husband of *all his creatures, and in John Christ is declared to be the husband or head of his followers*.<sup>6</sup> This argument our Author says (p. 214) that we only glance over. Let us examine *how* we “glanced over it.”<sup>7</sup> In was by shewing that those whom he terms *all God’s creatures*, were only one branch of Christ’s church, the gentiles, whom God had so long appeared to reject; and that hence if God the Father were meant, the inequality would be entirely in favor of the Son. And we added, “*but the fact is, that Christ is here meant, for he not only addressed this part of his church, as Jehovah its Redeemer in verse 8; but in verse 17, he adds, ‘their righteousness is of me saith Jehovah,’ which we have already shewn to be spoken of Christ*.”<sup>8</sup> This then was our “glancing over” his argument! §1080  
Is 54:5; Jn 3:29

His adducing Christ’s being the vine, as an objection to his Deity,<sup>9</sup> we *did not* think worth notice. Indeed if he will duly reflect on what is implied in the declaration, “as the branch cannot bear fruit of itself except it abide in the vine, no more can §1081  
Jn 15:1–8

<sup>1</sup> §622. <sup>2</sup> §§975-976. <sup>3</sup> §623. <sup>4</sup> §380. <sup>5</sup> Read: “is”. <sup>6</sup> §239. <sup>7</sup> §624. <sup>8</sup> §381. <sup>9</sup> §239.

ye except ye abide in me,” even that Christ in every age and every country is the Author of faith and all its fruits of holiness, as really as the vine affords nourishment to all its branches, he will perceive that without being *omniscient* he could /503 never be acquainted with the mental state of so many millions in every age, that without *omnipotence* and *infinite wisdom* he could never carry them forward in a course of faith and holiness, and, that without *infinite mercy* and *grace*, he could never bear with their mistakes and transgressions. And is this a proof that Christ is not God? Let the reader judge. Had our Author been more attentive to the Scriptures he would not have asserted that in the passage, “my Maker is thine husband” the Jews are more especially included. It is “the barren who did not bear,” that is addressed there, and had he turned to Gal. v.<sup>1</sup> he would have found that St. Paul declares this to be the Gentile church in opposition to the Jews, the married wife, who boasted of God as their Lord and husband, and rejected Christ the Saviour.

Ga 4:21–31

§1082

Jr 23:5f.

Lk 1:32f.

To our observing that David’s Righteous Branch mentioned *Jeremiah* xxiii. 5, 6, whose name is, “Jehovah our Righteousness,” was proved to be Christ by the testimony of the Angel to Mary, “the Lord God shall give him the throne of his father David;”<sup>2</sup> our Author merely says, (p. 215,) “the Editor here again overlooks the force of the phrase, God shall give unto him the throne of his father David, implying that the throne and exaltation which Jesus was possessed of was but the *free gift* of God.”<sup>3</sup> But did we overlook this? Is not our answer to what he has said about Christ’s being *made* unto us righteousness, (to which he replies nothing,) a full answer to this? Let us repeat it that our readers may judge. “Relative to Christ’s being *made of God* righteousness to us, or in other words to his righteousness being imputed to us by the Father, this can of course make no alteration in the Son’s eternal nature. If he was Jehovah before he became in-/504carnate, which has been so fully testified, he must remain Jehovah for ever; for Jehovah changes not.”<sup>4</sup> On the same principle we may now add, if he was Jehovah our Righteousness before he received the throne of David, the Father’s giving him this throne can make no alteration in his Divine nature. And while Jehovah changes not, Jesus Christ is, “the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.” His adding, (p. 216,) “If one’s being made by another any thing whatever that he was not before, does not tend to prove his mutable nature, what nature then can be called mutable?”<sup>5</sup> comes much too late. After the father, with a view to the period in which the heavens shall be folded up like a garment, has declared respecting the Son, THOU ART THE SAME; and the Divine Spirit, that Jesus Christ is, *the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever*, it is too late for our Author to come some two or three thousand years after, and gravely declare, that his nature *must be mutable*.

Heb 13:8

Heb 1:12

§1083

His asserting (p. 217) that Jerusalem to which was to be affixed the name “Jehovah

<sup>1</sup> Read: “Gal. iv.” <sup>2</sup> §382. <sup>3</sup> §625. <sup>4</sup> §382. <sup>5</sup> §626.

our Righteousness,” has [no reference to the church and followers of Christ](#),<sup>1</sup> is wholly gratuitous. Let our readers examine the passage and judge. He afterwards adds, as a last resort, that if the Editor will by that term understand the Church of Christ, and that she bears [“this name to the honor of her glorious Head and Husband, who is indeed Jehovah our Righteousness,”](#)<sup>2</sup> how can he reject the figurative application of the phrase, Jehovah our Righteousness, to Jesus on the same ground and principle, which is, that as Jehovah is the head of Christ, consequently Christ bears this name to the honor of HIS *head*, though in reality different from and subordinate to God, vide 1 Cor. xi. 3,—“**THE HEAD OF CHRIST IS GOD.**”<sup>3</sup> A weaker question we have seldom

1 Co 11:3

/505 seen. God the Father can never stand in the same relation even to Christ’s *human* nature, which Christ bears to his church. He can never become Christ’s *Righteousness*, for Christ needs no Righteousness, when he has sufficient to justify all who trust in him in every age and nation. He *cannot die for Christ’s sins*, as Christ died for the sins of his church, for he was without sin. And what one of all Christ’s saints possesses a Divine Nature? To whom among them has the Father said, “Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth?”

Heb 1:10

§1084

The subject of names given by the Divine direction we have carefully examined already; and no other names belong to the subject.<sup>4</sup> Although we have more in reserve, we presume we have given our Author a sufficient number of instances in which the Second Person in the glorious Trinity is termed *Jehovah*. To the Deity of the *Holy Spirit*, the Third Person in the ever-blessed Trinity, we shall devote a separate article at some future period.<sup>5</sup>

We mentioned that we would quote a few passages tending to illustrate the Divine Nature of the Son. One of these is, Jer. v. 22, “Fear ye not me? saith Jehovah: will ye not tremble at my presence who have placed the sand for the bound of the sea that it cannot pass it?” Our Author says (p. 220) however, that he is quite [unable to discover what this has to do with the Son’s Divine Nature.](#)<sup>6</sup> And is he not aware that this work, described as peculiarly characterizing *Jehovah*, is *a part* of the *Son’s* work in creating the world, as all things were created *by* him and *for* him? and that since it was he who thus fixed the bounds of the sea, this passage proclaims him anew to be *Jehovah*? Of course every passage in the Old Testament which ascribes creation to *Jehovah*, speaks the same language; for the Son “laid the /506 foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of his hands.”

§1085

Jr 5:22

Col 1:16

Heb 1:10

Our Author’s asserting (p. 221) that [“Christ exercised power over wind and water in common with other prophets;”](#) and that [“Elijah and Elisha exercised power over wind and water and other things LIKE JESUS in the name of the Father of the](#)

§1086

<sup>1</sup> §627. <sup>2</sup> §383. <sup>3</sup> §627. <sup>4</sup> §1038. <sup>5</sup> There is no further article published by Marshman. <sup>6</sup> §630.

universe,”<sup>1</sup> scarcely deserves notice. Let him examine Elisha’s “exercising power over wind and water,” 2 Kings ii. 21, “And he went forth unto the spring of the waters, and cast the salt in there, and said, Thus saith Jehovah, I have healed these waters;” and 2 Kings ii. 14, “And he took the mantle of Elijah that fell from him, and smote the waters, and said, ‘Where is Jehovah the God of Elijah?’” and then say where he finds Christ, previously to working a miracle, saying, “Thus saith my heavenly Father,” or, “Where is my heavenly Father?” Compare with this Christ’s rebuking the winds and saying to the sea, “peace, be still.” Where is there a parallel to this in the history of Elijah or Elisha, to substantiate the assertion, “Elijah, Elisha, and the prophets, exercised power over wind and water and other things LIKE JESUS in the name of the Father of the universe?” Compare Elijah’s prayer, 1 Kings xvii. 21, “O Lord my God, I pray thee, let this child’s soul come into him again,” with Christ’s commanding Lazarus to come forth, Jairus’s daughter and the widow’s son, to arise, in language exactly calculated to secure the honor to himself. Is this to be accounted for on any other principle than that of his own omnipotence? It was in reality to Christ that Elijah himself addressed the prayer, “O Lord, I pray thee, let the soul of the child come into him again.” As Christ declares Rev. i. 18, that he has the keys of death and the unseen world; and in ch. iii. 7, that “he openeth and no man shutteth, and shutteth and no man openeth,” had it not pleased him to permit the child’s soul to return to him again, Elijah would have prayed in vain. What then becomes of Jesus’s “exercising power over wind and water and other things in common with other prophets?”

§1087 The fact is, that Elijah and “other prophets” never wrought any miracle *themselves*. They merely prayed to God, or declared that God would effect the work. Thus when Elijah declared to Ahab that there should not be rain for three years and six months but according to his word, it was Ahab’s knowing that he was God’s messenger to declare HIS *will*, which gave this all its weight. Thus also Naaman, from knowing that Elisha merely declared to him the will of God in saying, “Go wash and be clean,” after his cure exclaimed, “Now know I that there is no God on earth but in Israel,” thus ascribing the cure, not to Elisha, but to God. We have already mentioned the fact that when Moses the friend of God, with his bother Aaron, said, Numbers xx. 10, “Ye rebels, must we fetch you water out of this rock?” we find it assigned Deut. xxxii. 51, as the reason why he was forbidden to enter the land,—“ye sanctified *me* not in the midst of Israel.” But we find Jesus ever excluding the mention of his Father’s name in working his stupendous miracles, and yet declaring, “I do always the things that please him.” Such then is Jesus’s working miracles “in common with other prophets!” He might as well have said that he “laid the foundation of the earth in common with

<sup>1</sup> §631.



other prophets,” for both were equally the work of his own omnipotence.

But what will he say to the Apostle’s working miracles in Christ’s name, as the prophets did in the name of God? Such was really the case. When they return-<sup>508</sup>ed saying, “Lord, even the devils are subject to us through thy name;” had Christ been a mere creature, he ought to have rejected this address with unspeakable indignation, as did Joseph and Daniel when thus addressed by the kings. Yet he accepts it without hesitation or explanation, as though he thought it “no robbery to be equal with God.” And did this please the Father who hath declared, I will not give *my* glory to another? Then he knew that this glory was the Son’s *own*, and that men ought to honor the Son even as they honor the Father. To this add the language of the Apostles in the Acts. “In the name of Jesus Christ rise up and walk;”—“Eneas, Jesus Christ maketh thee whole;”—“I command thee in the name of Jesus Christ to come out of her.” Were the Apostles less informed, less pious, less holy than the prophets? Let the reader judge.

§1088

Lk 10:17

Ph 2:6

Is 42:8

Jn 5:23

Ac 2:38; 9:34

Ac 16:18

That our Author can assert (p. 222,) “we do not find Christ once represented in the Scriptures as the Maker of heaven and earth,”<sup>1</sup> in the face of even Heb. i. 10, “Unto the Son God saith, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands,” may well excite astonishment. His adding from Heb. i. 2, “*by whom* also he made the worlds;” and from Ephes. iii. 9, “who *created* all things *by* Jesus Christ,” amounts to nothing. The question is, did Christ really *create* them? and this he is constrained to acknowledge. But if he *created* them, he previously possessed infinite power and wisdom. Against this our Author’s saying that he created them as an instrument,<sup>2</sup> weighs nothing. Who but a fool or a madman chuses a rational instrument *naturally* incapable of the work for which he selects him. But if Christ was *naturally* capable of creation, he is *by nature* God; for creation is <sup>509</sup> described in Scripture as God’s peculiar work. And the apostle witnesses, Coloss. i. 16, that all things were created not only *BY* him but *FOR* him, and hence that he created them for his own glory, as well as his Father’s. His adding (p. 223) that “it is *very strange to our faculties to acknowledge one as the true God, and yet to maintain the idea that he created things by the direction of another being, and was appointed heir of all things by that other,*”<sup>3</sup> can weigh nothing, until we can find out the Almighty to perfection. Our only enquiry ought to be, Hath the Divine Spirit declared this?—and this our Author cannot disprove. Further, if his heavenly Father appointed “him heir of all things,” it was because he knew him to be possessed of that omniscience, omnipotence, and wisdom, which enabled him to *possess* and *govern* all things in heaven and earth at the same moment.—Whether or not he who “was dead and is alive and liveth for evermore,” be included in common

§1089

Heb 1:10

Heb 1:2; Ep 3:9

Col 1:16

Rv 1:18

<sup>1</sup> §632. <sup>2</sup> §632, also §554. <sup>3</sup> §632.

with other perishable Gods, he will know when he stands at his judgement seat to give account of the things done in the body.

§1090

Jr 17:9f.

On Jeremiah xvii. 10, “I Jehovah search the heart, I try the reins, even to give every one according to his ways,” we observed that Jehovah here *deems no one competent to the work of giving to every one according as his ways, who cannot search the heart; and that the Father who alone “knoweth the Son,” did not commit to him all judgement so as to judge no man himself, without previously knowing his infinite fitness for this greatest of all works.*<sup>1</sup> From this argument our Author turns away, saying, “To deify Jesus Christ, the Editor again introduces the circumstance of his being a searcher of hearts to execute judgement: Rev. ii. 23, and also quotes Heb. i. 3. Having examined these arguments /510 in page 119 and 200, I will not return to them here.”<sup>2</sup> And is he so ashamed of his own arguments as not to revert to the subject when new matter is brought forward against them? We will then look back to p. 119, and p. 200, and see if these contain any thing in the shape of an answer to this. In p. 119 he says *nothing* relative to the searcher of hearts; and all he says at p. 200 is, “that the apostles and the prophets also as far as they possessed the gift of prophecy, were able to discover what passed in the hearts of other men, or in other words, were searchers of hearts,”<sup>3</sup> adducing to support this assertion, Peter’s knowing the thoughts of Ananias, and Elisha’s revealing the designs of the king of Syria. His saying this however, is far worse for his cause, than as though he had said nothing. It is at once refuted by the question put by God himself in Jeremiah; “The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicket, *who can know it?*” To this, on our Author’s plan, the answer would have been easy; “Elisha formerly knew it, and Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, and Daniel, know it now!” Thus the peculiar prerogative which *Jehovah* here claims would have been shared by these prophets, and Jehovah must have given his glory unto others. But his answer is, “*I Jehovah search the heart and try the reins.*” Is then our Author wiser than God himself? If he be not, his assertion falls to the ground; no prophet or holy man was ever a searcher of the heart. Elijah knew no more of the Syrian monarch’s heart, than Jehovah was pleased to reveal to him, nor Peter of the heart of Ananias, than Christ his Lord was pleased to shew unto him, who, as St. Paul witnesses 1 Cor. iv. 5, “bringeth to light the hidden things of darkness, and maketh manifest the counsels of the hearts.” He might as well insist that Elisha and Peter possess-/511ed *omnipotence*, from the former’s healing Naaman and the latter’s healing Eneas, as that they were “searchers of he heart,” from their declaring that respecting the Syrian monarch and Ananias which was previously revealed to them.

§1091

His asserting (p. 224,) that “God gave the Son *the power of knowing all the events*

<sup>1</sup> §385. <sup>2</sup> §633. <sup>3</sup> §609.



of this world in order to the distribution of rewards and punishment,”<sup>1</sup> is entirely gratuitous. Such a gift was perfectly superfluous to him who “searcheth the hearts and reins,” and the absurdity of asserting that God did the work of omniscience for him that all men might honor the Son as though naturally possessed of omniscience equally with the Father, has been already shewn. Nor does our Lord’s declaration, “All power is given unto me in heaven and earth,” in the least touch the case. Previously to this he knew that it was he himself who “searcheth the hearts and reins,” which excludes the possibility of his referring to this kind of power. As his Father’s mediatorial servant, his love to his Father and to righteousness, prevented his assuming any power or authority till given him, or his displaying any act of Godhead but in compliance with his will. Our Author’s argument therefore, turns wholly against himself; for “he who is possessed of *omniscience*” as Christ solemnly declares himself to be, “is acknowledged as Supreme God by every sect who believes in revealed religion.”<sup>2</sup>

Mt 28:18

That the Son did not know the day of judgement is no more against the omniscience of his Divine Nature, than his increasing in wisdom, Luke ii. 52. No one believes that his *human* nature was omniscient; but that his Divine Nature is, abundant proof has been given. And that even in the same instance he should speak of his human and his Divine nature without the least previous /512 notice, accords with every day’s experience. When our Author says, “I am *grieved* when I *reflect* that I *must die*,” does he mean that his soul *must die*, or that his body *reflects* or is *grieved*? Yet who mistakes such a sentence because he does not previously give notice what he intends to say of his body and what of his soul?<sup>3</sup>

§1092

Mk 13:32; Lk 2:52

His attempting to get rid of the proof of Christ’s being the All-seeing God, furnished by Heb. iv. 13, “all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do,” by saying, that there is “no inconsistency in ascribing the knowledge of the intents the heart to him through whom Revelation or God’s word is communicated,”<sup>4</sup> confutes itself. A part of God’s word was communicated through *Moses*; another part, the Psalms, through *David*. But were they discerners of the thoughts and intents of the hearts?—His attempt to account for the different language of God to the Prince of Syria and to Jesus, by ascribing it to the former’s general disobedience to God, is rendered nugatory by the prophet Ezekiel himself, who says; “*because thy heart is lifted up and thou hast said, I am a God,—I sit in the seat of God, behold thou shalt die the death of the uncircumcised by the hands of strangers,*” &c. Here the prophet limits his crime to this particular object. But of

§1093

Heb 4:13

Ezk 28:2–10

<sup>1</sup> §634.

<sup>2</sup> §634: “No one destitute of the power of omniscience is ever acknowledged as Supreme God by any sect that believe in revealed religion.”

<sup>3</sup> Marshman takes up this metaphor again in §1117. <sup>4</sup> §635.

Jesus’s claiming equality with the Father, and never referring the glory to God when worshipped, we have abundant proof.

§1094 Our Author’s adding (p. 226,) “as to Heb. i. 8, ‘thy throne O God is for ever and ever;’ God does not peculiarly address Jews<sup>1</sup> with the epithet God; but he also uses for the chiefs of Israel and for Moses the same epithet,”<sup>2</sup> we have already answered by shewing, that God *never* addressed Moses, nor any chief of Israel in the vocative case, “O God,” as the Spirit of truth witnesses that he in Heb. i. 8, addresses the Son.  
/513

§1095 He in vain labors to obscure the testimony to Christ’s Deity furnished by comparing Dan. ii. 22, “God searcheth the deep and the secret *things*, he knoweth what *is in the darkness*,” with Paul’s testimony in 1 Cor. iv. 5, “the Lord when he cometh will bring to light the *hidden things of darkness*, and will make manifest *the counsels of the heart*,” by referring this to the preaching of the gospel.<sup>3</sup> When Paul wrote this, the gospel had been long preached, yet the coming of the Lord was still future; and if it be the peculiar prerogative of God “to reveal the deep and the secret things, and to know what is in the darkness,” the Godhead of Jesus Christ is here confirmed by the united testimony of David and Paul.—His attempt to prove (p. 227,) that Daniel possessed this power, is frustrated by the prophet himself, when he says, “I thank thee and praise thee, O God of my fathers, that *thou hast made known unto me—the king’s matter*.”<sup>4</sup> Nor is the testimony of the woman of Tekoah hired by Joab to deceive king David by telling him, “My Lord is wise according to the wisdom of an angel of God, to know all things that are in the earth,” more to our Author’s purpose; for it was absolutely false. David did not know even the heart of Absalom his own son!—And does he suppose that the saints’ judging the world will give them omniscience? Has he forgotten that the dead, Rev. xx. 12, are judged out of those things which are written in the books according to their works? Of these works the spirits of just men made perfect are quite capable of judging, when they are read to them. But *omniscience* belongs alone to Him who having “searched the hearts and reins,” made a just record of every act, desire and motive.—His further urging that “a knowledge of future events is by no means less wonderful than that of past things  
/514 or present secrets of the heart,”<sup>5</sup> is totally useless to him, since all these were equally matter of revelation to his prophets, by Him who was, and is, and is to come.

§1096 We had cited *Daniel*, ch. i. and ch. vii. to shew that Christ’s kingdom *breaks in pieces all other kingdoms, while itself is an everlasting dominion that shall not pass away*, and added, that “as in this kingdom *he is adored and worshipped by every one*

<sup>1</sup> Read: “Jesus”. <sup>2</sup> §636. <sup>3</sup> §637.

<sup>4</sup> Rammohan did not claim that Daniel was in possession of this power, but that he received it from God, like Jesus and other prophets, §638.

<sup>5</sup> §638.

of his subjects, if he were not God BY NATURE God, the Creator of heaven and earth, he and his kingdom must perish from under the heaven.”<sup>1</sup> What is our Author’s reply? an attempt to disprove this? No; but an attempt to prove that Jesus Christ will perish, because he laid down his life that he might take it again,<sup>2</sup>—and this in the face of his declaring, “Behold I am alive for evermore.” But, “the son 1 Cor. xv. 24, delivers up his mediatorial kingdom to the Father.”<sup>3</sup> Granted, but is it not after he has folded up the heavens like a garment, that he REMAINS THE SAME, that his *throne is FOR EVER AND EVER*? Does not a pure river of the water of life proceed equally “from the THRONE of God and of THE LAMB” throughout eternity? Is it “sophistry that attributes the death and subjugation of Jesus only to his human capacity?”<sup>4</sup> Did his Divine nature then, which was with God before the world began, expire on the cross while “upholding all things by the word of his power?” And may it then be alleged “that every human individual, being the children of Adam the son of God, is possessed of a Divine Nature?” That they all possessed a Divine nature before they were created? and that the heavens were the work of men’s hands before one of them existed?

1 Co 15:24–28;  
Heb 1:10–12

Rv 22:1

Heb 1:3

His attempt to invalidate the proof of Christ’s Deity given by *Daniel* in terming him “the Most Holy,”<sup>5</sup> is not more successful. If the term was applied to the sanctuary in which God dwelt and to his altar; still when it is applied to a Being, unless there be many beings MOST *Holy*, which is forbidden by the laws of grammar and common sense, it marks the Supreme, as really as the Most High. When our Author hesitates (p. 230,) to allow that Jesus was “God’s proper son of the same nature with his father, as is every proper son,” and doubts whether the Jews were not also the *begotten* sons of God,<sup>6</sup> he must have forgotten John iii. 16, “God so loved the world that he gave his ONLY begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have everlasting life.”

§1097

Dn 9:24–27

Jn 3:16

On *Hosea* iii. 5, “Afterward shall Israel return and seek Jehovah their God and *David their king*,” we had observed, that as David had then been in his grave for more than two centuries, he could be sought only in heaven in the same manner as God himself; but as departed saints are unable to search the heart and judge of the sincerity of prayers offered them,<sup>7</sup> if we allow this prophecy any meaning, we are constrained to apply it to the Son of David, who searches the heart and is equally

§1098

Ho 3:5

<sup>1</sup> §387. <sup>2</sup> §639.

<sup>3</sup> This is not a quotation of Rammohan, but rather Marshman’s version of him writing: “To this my reply is, that we find Jesus subjected to the death of the cross while on earth, and, after the general resurrection, to Him that put all things under him. (1 Cor. xv. 28.)”, §639.

<sup>4</sup> §639. <sup>5</sup> §640. <sup>6</sup> §641, quoting Marshman §388.

<sup>7</sup> Originally, Marshman wrote in §388, that “our author does not allow of praying to deceased saints, who, unable to search the heart, cannot judge of the sincerity of prayers offered them”.

omnipotent to bless those who seek him, with Jehovah himself.<sup>1</sup> To this what is our Author’s reply? First, regret that we “like the Jews, try to refer to Jesus any passages that can possibly bear the least allusion to our notion of the Messiah, however distant in fact they may be from such a notion.”<sup>2</sup> What a pity that this had not been substantiated by some kind of proof? Secondly, the following query, (p. 231,) “Does not the poetical language of the prophet determine to the satisfaction of every unbiassed man, that after long sufferings, Israel will repent of their disobedience, and seek the protection of their God and the happiness which their fathers enjoyed under the reign of David, as it is /516 very natural for a nation or tribe when oppressed by foreign conquerors to remember their own ancient kings under whose government their fathers were prosperous, and to wish a return of their reign if possible?”<sup>3</sup> We ask him here, what is the *poetical* to the *real* language of the prophecy? This prophecy *must be actually fulfilled*, for no word of God can fail; and “David their king” must be as really sought as Jehovah their God. But David is dead; and the Being sought must be one living, even he who is “alive and liveth for evermore.” This our Author seems to suspect; for he adds, “If the Editor insist upon referring this prophecy to Jesus, he must wait its fulfilment, as Israel has not as yet sought Jesus as the son of David, the Messiah who was promised to them.”<sup>4</sup> And is this all he has to urge against this prophecy’s referring to Christ? Does he think that its being yet future, weighs any thing against the truth of a declaration from the mouth of Him that cannot lie?

§1099 Against *Joel* ii. 32, “And it shall come to pass that whosoever shall call on the name of *Jehovah* shall be saved,” as referred to Christ by Peter, Acts ii. 21, and hence as proving that Christ is Jehovah, our Author quotes Locke as saying, that he thinks “all that call on our Lord Jesus Christ,” means **all that are open professed Christians**; adding as his own comment, that by this he interprets the words of *Joel*.<sup>5</sup> And did *Joel*, or the Spirit of God by him, intend to say that all who are open professed Christians, “shall be saved?” And is Paul so close a reasoner as to affirm this? He adds however (p. 233,) “If the meaning of the prophet *Joel* from whom these words are taken, be urged, I shall only say that it will be an ill rule for interpreting St. Paul to tie up his use of any text he brings out of he Old Testament to that which is taken for the meaning of it there.”<sup>6</sup> /517 This is perfectly true; it will be an ill rule for our Author’s case, for it will be its death. But must we make St. Paul contradict the Spirit of truth speaking in the Old Testament, in order to preserve it alive? And is it impossible for it to live if St. Paul give the true and exact meaning of passages he cites from the Old Testament? Then our Author himself has given it its death blow.

<sup>1</sup> §388. <sup>2</sup> §641. <sup>3</sup> §641. <sup>4</sup> §641. <sup>5</sup> §642.

<sup>6</sup> This was quoted by Rammohan from Locke, *Works III, Romans*, 316-317.

But if we “still insist on the accuracy of the translation of the phrase ‘call upon the name of Jesus,’ he hopes we shall refer to Matt. x. 40–42, ‘he that receiveth you receiveth *me*, and he that receiveth *me* receiveth *him that sent me*,’ &c. by which we shall perceive that calling on the name of Jesus as being the Messiah sent by God is an indirect call on the name of God; in the same manner as yielding to a general sent by a king amounts to his submission to the king himself, and secures for him the same favor as if he had yielded to the sovereign.”<sup>1</sup> But it has been already shewn that the Saviour himself is the King of his saints, equally to be *trusted in* and *feared* as the Father, and on whom every one saved, like Stephen, *calls* to his life’s end. It happens too that the Father never hears a single prayer but as presented to him by Jesus Christ and seconded by his intercession; and that to receive these prayers in every age and country, Christ must be *omnipresent*, and to judge of their sincerity, he must be *omniscient*; and this by our Author’s own acknowledgement, is to be “the Supreme God.”<sup>2</sup>

We had quoted *Amos* iv. 13, “For lo he that formeth the mountains and createth the wind, and *declareth unto man what is his thought*, Jehovah of Hosts is his name;” and added, that *as these characters all unite in Jesus, we need no other testimony to his Godhead.*<sup>3</sup> To this what does our Author (p. 234) reply? “The Editor then /518 quotes *Amos* iv. 13, perhaps on account of its containing the phrase, *declaring unto man what is his thought. As I have noticed the subject already oftener than once, p. 200 and 227, I will not return to it here.*”<sup>4</sup> And what has he said before at p. 200 and 227? That Elisha and Daniel and Peter were searchers of hearts too! And does he thus shun arguments which involve the very life of his cause?

§1100

Am 4:13

From *Zechariah* we had quoted ch. iii. 2, “Jehovah said unto Satan, Jehovah rebuke thee, O Satan. Is not this a brand plucked out of the fire?” and ch. ii. 8, “Thus saith Jehovah of Hosts, after the glory hath he sent *me*;”—and ch. xiii. 7, “Awake, O sword, against the man who is my fellow,” as distinctly mentioning Jehovah the Father and Jehovah the Son, and describing the Father as terming the Son his fellow or equal, and consequently as *forming another threefold testimony to the distinct personality of the Son, and his Equality with the Father.*<sup>5</sup> To these testimonies what does our Author object? After confessing himself (p. 235,) *unable to discover exactly what the two first mean*, he attempts to meet the first, “Jehovah said unto Satan, Jehovah rebuke thee,” by saying “*that God speaks of himself very frequently throughout the sacred books in the third person instead of the first, as Isaiah li. 1, ‘Hearken to me, ye that follow after righteousness, ye that seek the Lord,’ &c. ver. 15, ‘But I am the Lord thy God, that divided the sea whose waves roar, The Lord of hosts is his name,’*”<sup>6</sup> &c. But Jehovah here uses the imperative mood, saying, “*Jehovah rebuke thee, Satan,*”

§1101

Zc 3:2; 2:8; 13:7

Is 51:1; 15

<sup>1</sup> §642. <sup>2</sup> See §1092. <sup>3</sup> §389. <sup>4</sup> §643. <sup>5</sup> §389. <sup>6</sup> §644.

thus distinctly mentioning *another* as Jehovah beside himself, a case totally different from either of the passages adduced by our Author.

§1102        “But,” adds he, (p. 225,) “the fact is, that Zechariah /519 prophesies in the second year of Darius king of Persia of the Lord’s will to build the second temple of Jerusalem, by Joshua, Zerubbabel, and *Semuh*; and to rebuke Satan who would discourage Joshua from the undertaking.”<sup>1</sup> And who is this *Semuh*, the coadjutor of  
 Zc 6:11–13 Joshua and Zerubbabel? He is the man described Zech. vi. 12, as “the man whose name is THE BRANCH,” of whom God declares; “he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the temple of the Lord; even he shall build the temple of Jehovah, and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne, and he shall be a priest upon his throne, and the counsel of peace shall be between them both.” The pains our Author takes here lest the Messiah should be understood by the BRANCH, are sufficient to move pity. As he insists on understanding *semuh* the Hebrew word for branch as a proper name, we ask him who then was *Semuh*’s father? He was to be “a priest and to sit and rule on his throne,” and this, according to our Author, was to be accomplished within four years; for this prophecy was delivered the latter end of Darius’s *second year*, and the temple was finished in the *sixth year* of his reign. But in these four years “he was to grow up out of his place.” It is not quite certain therefore, that this *Semuh* was born when the prophecy was delivered, and he must have been a wonderful child to take a part in building the temple before he was four years old. What a helper must this infant have been in counsel and action, to the two veterans Joshua and Zerubbabel!<sup>2</sup> But why does not Ezra mention this “prince ruling on his throne.” Surely the establishment of such a throne must have been important to the Jews in their state of distress and affliction. Why then is it overlooked by the Divine historian? To what straits is our Author driven /520 to keep out of sight the union and equality of the Father and the Son.

§1103        To the second testimony he replies “that it is the prophet Zechariah who is sent,”<sup>3</sup>  
 Zc 2:8 in direct contradiction to the text, which says, “For thus saith *Jehovah of Hosts*, after the glory hath he sent *me*.” The person sent therefore is unquestionably *Jehovah*. The third testimony, “Awake, O sword, against the man who is my fellow,” he dismisses with a promise to notice it in a subsequent chapter. Thus two of these proofs he leaves in all their force, and the third he dismisses elsewhere. After having thus examined all our Author’s objections, we added;

§1104        “We have now met our author on his own ground, and in compliance with his own suggestion examined the books of the Old Testament in their order respecting the *Deity*, as well

<sup>1</sup> §644.

<sup>2</sup> Marshman interprets **יְמִתְּהוּתִי יְמִתְּהוּתִי** as a birth prophecy, and uses the same pattern of attacking Rammohan as with the Immanuel.

<sup>3</sup> §645.

as the Atonement of the Son of God. And although this has deprived us of those advantages which arise from selecting and condensing evidence, even this method has poured such a flood of light on the Deity of the Son and his Equality with the Father as leaves nothing to be further desired. It is not the voice of one writer merely, it is the uniform language of the Divine Writers through a period of nearly sixteen hundred years. This body of evidence adduced, is not founded on one or two passages which criticism might hope to shake; it is founded on nearly Two Hundred different Testimonies, which nourished the faith and piety of the true worshippers of God age after age. All hope of shaking it therefore, is totally vain. Could one or two of these testimonies be invalidated—or ten—or even twenty, this doctrine would still remain immovable. This however is only one of the five sources of evidence mentioned, that furnished by the Old Testament; for the testimony of Jesus—of the Evangelists,—of the Apostles—of the Blessed above in the book of Revelation, have been examined no farther than as confirming and illustrating this.”<sup>1</sup> /521

[Against the Natural Inferiority of the Son (Final Appeal Chapter IV)]

We have now examined our Author’s objections to these Two Hundred Testimonies, and we submit it to our readers whether he has succeeded in invalidating, not twenty—nor ten,—but even *one* of the testimonies to the Deity of Christ furnished by the Old Testament alone; and whether, although the subject is far from being exhausted, the examination has not led to an accumulation of evidence sufficient of itself to establish the doctrine on an immovable basis. We now proceed to examine his objections to the arguments contained in our Second Chapter, which, as they have been in substance answered already, will occupy little of our reader’s time.

§1105

Our Author had thus objected in his Second Appeal, “admitting for a moment that the positions of the Editor were well founded, and that the Saviour was in possession of attributes and powers ascribed to God, have we not his express and often repeated avowal, that all the powers he manifested, were committed to him as the Son by the Father of the Universe?”<sup>2</sup> We answered: “No. That he was appointed by the Father to act as Mediator between him and sinners, we have already seen; for without this he could have been no mediator between his Father and his offending creatures, without acting as his Father’s *Lord*, instead of his Equal or Consociate.”<sup>3</sup> To this our Author merely replies, (p. 239,) “Every unbiassed man may easily pronounce whether it is consistent with any rational idea of the nature of the Deity that God should be appointed by God to act the part of a mediator by laying aside his glory and taking upon himself the form of a *servant*, and and may discern whether it is not most foreign to the nature of the immutable God that circumstances could produce such /522 a change in the condition of the Deity as that he should not only have been

§1106

---

<sup>1</sup> §390. <sup>2</sup> §114. <sup>3</sup> §392.



1 Co 1:23f. **divested of his glory for more than thirty years, but even subjected to servitude.**<sup>1</sup> Is this his deciding the question by Scripture? Is it not again realizing the case described by Paul above seventeen hundred years ago? “the cross of Christ is to the Jews a stumbling block, and to the Greeks, *foolishness?*” Let us examine this reasoning. How are men to know *any thing* respecting God’s way of saving men? By setting aside what he has revealed on the subject? This would be in fact saying, “we know more respecting God’s way of saving sinners than he does.” Is it then by carefully examining what he has revealed? If it be, to what does this reasoning of our Author amount? To just nothing. One testimony from scripture would outweigh a thousand pages of such reasoning, until it be fact that we have found out the Almighty to perfection, and are better acquainted with his nature and his ways, than even God himself. In points of Scripture doctrine, the only rule is, that given Isaiah viii. 20, “To the law and the testimony; if they speak not according to this, it is because there is no light in them.” And “he that walketh in darkness, knoweth not whither he goeth,” whether it be to Deism,—to Hinduism,—or to Atheism and annihilation.

Is 8:20  
Jn 12:35  
§1107  
Dn 9:9  
Jn 3:16  
Rm 5:8  
1 P 3:18  
Our Author’s assertions (p. 240) that we “**ascribe to the Father vengeance alone, and to the Son unbounded mercy and forgiveness,**” and (p. 241) that “**according to the system of Trinitarians the Son had a greater portion of mercy than the Father to oppose to his justice, in having his sinful creatures pardoned, without suffering them to experience individual punishment;**”<sup>2</sup> are wholly gratuitous. Had he duly examined the Scriptures; he could not have made them. Of whom does Daniel /532 speak ch. ix. 9, “To Jehovah our God belongs mercies and forgiveness?” Will he say that he speaks of the Son? Then he himself declares the Son to be “Jehovah our God.” Will he say with us that Daniel speaks of the Father? Then he refutes his own assertion. Has he forgotten that we maintain, “*GOD so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son;*”—and that God commendeth his love towards us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us? Indeed if we grant that “the Father *loveth* the Son,” the greatness of the Father’s mercy will demonstrate itself to our own hearts. In giving up his only Son whom he loved, to the malice of Satan, the insults and cruelty of wicked men, and finally to die in torments on the cross, “the just for the unjust,” to bring us to God, the Father must have felt more than the Son did in enduring these torments for the sake of saving sinners.

§1108  
On the other hand, no one who believes that the Son and the Father are one even *in will and desire*, will believe that “Jesus Christ the Righteous” is less just than the Father, since he chose to magnify his Father’s law and make in honourable by being made under it himself, that he might shew men and angels how holy and just and good he esteemed it, in fulfilling all its commands, in loving the Lord his God with

<sup>1</sup> §646. <sup>2</sup> §647.



all his mind and strength, and his guilty neighbour better than himself by dying “the just for the unjust.” And could Christ shew *his love to justice* more, than by giving himself up to bear the righteous curse of God’s law, rather than suffer justice to be violated in men’s being forgiven? Surely they who believe this, never believe that the Son “suffered his mercy to overcome justice,”<sup>1</sup> nor that he abhors sin less than his heavenly Father. They believe that in the salvation of men, righteousness and mercy shine equally in the Father and the Son.

We had asked our Author to point out “one attribute or perfection in the Father, which from scripture testimony the Son has not been already shewn to possess.”<sup>2</sup> To this he merely objects, (p. 243) that he is neither called the Most High, nor the Almighty.<sup>3</sup> This places his cause in the utmost peril, as it is a tacit acknowledgment that all the other names and attributes of the Father are applied to the Son. Nor would this objection avail him in the least, were it well founded, since the possession of ONE *Divine attribute*, inevitably implies the presence of all the rest, and the ascription of ONE Name peculiar to God, infallibly proves the Son’s Deity, since the omission of the rest may be mere accident. But it is only our Author’s inattention to the Scriptures which has made him venture on this assertion. In Deut. xxxii. 10, it is said that the Most High found “Israel in a desert land and in the waste howling wilderness; that he led him about, he instructed him, he kept him as the apple of his eye.” The “Most High” then is the Angel of Jehovah, the Second Person in the Trinity who at Bochim declared, “I made Israel to go up out of Egypt into the land I swore unto their fathers.” In Psalm lxxviii. 17, David says, “They sinned yet more against him by provoking the ‘Most High’ in the wilderness.” But it was Christ who led them through the wilderness. In Daniel ch. vii. “the saints of the Most High” are mentioned no less than four times. Paul declares, however, Acts xxvi. 10, and 2 Thess. i. 10, that these are CHRIST’S saints; as, “many of *thy* saints did I shut up in prison;”<sup>4</sup> and, “when he shall come to be glorified in HIS saints.” In the New Testament the phrase occurs only twice, and in /525 both instances it is applied to Christ; by Stephen, Acts vii. “Howbeit the Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands, as saith the prophet—Hath not my hands *made all these things?*” But of whom does St. Paul declare, that, all things were made by him and *for* him, but of Christ? And we have already seen Zechariah address his son, Luke i. 76, “And thou child, shalt be called the prophet of the Highest (Most High) for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his way.”—And need we repeat again the instances already adduced in which Christ declares himself “the Almighty?”

§1109

Dt 32:8–10

Jg 2:1f.

Ps 78:17

Dn 7:15–28

Ac 26:10; 2 Th 1:10

Ac 7:48–50

Col 1:16

Lk 1:76

<sup>1</sup> §647. <sup>2</sup> §647. <sup>3</sup> §650.

<sup>4</sup> Marshman errs here. Paul is speaking to Agrippa in his defence and says, reporting about his life: “and many of the saints did I shut up in prison”.

§1110 His adducing Matt. xx. 23, “To sit on my right hand and on my left is not mine  
Mt 20:23 to give, but (or except) to them for whom it is prepared of my Father,” as a denial of Christ’s almighty power,<sup>1</sup> is wonderful indeed! Did it not *become him* to FULFIL *his Father’s will*? Must he RESIST *his Father’s will to prove himself Almighty*? Is he not ONE with his Father? and was not the Father’s appointment, his own, when the Father sheweth him all things that he doeth,—and the Son doeth them LIKEWISE? No one believes that his *human nature* was omniscient; but does not he by his Divine Nature search the hearts and reins? Is not “the God before whom Abraham and Isaac walked,” the “I AM,” “the Almighty, who was and is, and is to come,” supreme, omnipotent, and omniscient? If he be not, let our Author bring forth his *proofs*, instead of his *assertions*. His asserting that Christ’s proceeding forth from the Father destroys his self-existence,<sup>2</sup> is perfectly gratuitous. If he proceeded forth from the Father when he came into the world, we have his own testimony, John xvii. that he was *with the Father before the world was*, that is, in eternity, the beginning of which we leave our Author to fix. Further, it is witnessed by the Fa-/526ther, that he is THE SAME; and by the Divine Spirit, that he is THE SAME YESTERDAY, TO-DAY, AND FOR EVER.

Jn 17:5  
Heb 1:12; 13:8

§1111 To our question, “What is the sun to his Maker?”<sup>3</sup> his replying, p. 245, “I wish he had also added, but that which a son and creature is to his father and maker,”<sup>4</sup> carries him into worse than *materialism*. Every son is necessarily of the same nature with his father; but does our Author assert *that the sun is of the same nature with his Creator*? Can we wonder then that he should add, “neither the sun nor Jesus has ever arrogated to himself Godhead; it is their worshippers that have ascribed Godhead and infinite perfection to these finite objects.” The self-contradiction which denies worship to objects of the same nature with their Creator, we overlook, as well as his begging of the question in debate, after failing in all his alleged proofs; but of what nature his coupling the searcher of hearts, the Judge of quick and dead, with an inanimate object, is, we leave him to realize when he shall appear at his bar.

§1112 Our Author’s saying (p. 246,) that “Jesus was not at all peculiar in the power of effecting changes without physical means, and of bestowing on others the same gift,” and asking, “were not the miracles performed by Joshua and Elijah as wonderful as these done by Jesus?”<sup>5</sup> are merely the language of one driven to extremity. The difference between the few miracles wrought by Elijah and Elisha, and those wrought by Christ, we have already shewn.<sup>6</sup> In reality Joshua never wrought any

<sup>1</sup> §650.

<sup>2</sup> §650: “Besides, in the creed which the generality of Trinitarians profess, God is described as self-existent, having proceeded from none; but the Son, on the contrary, is represented as proceeding from the Father.”

<sup>3</sup> §392. <sup>4</sup> §651. <sup>5</sup> §652. <sup>6</sup> §1047.

miracle; “the Lord hearkened unto the voice of a man.” Elijah never wrought any. Jos 10:14  
 As God’s prophet, he predicted a drought for three years and six months; and he  
 prayed respecting the widow’s son; “O God, let the soul of this child come into him  
 again.” And /527 as to Elisha’s receiving a double portion of Elijah’s spirit, did Elisha  
 afterwards do any miracle in Elijah’s name, as Peter, John, and Paul did in Christ’s?  
 Is he even certain that this double portion of Elijah’s spirit referred at all to miracles,  
 and not rather to the fearless and faithful discharge of prophetic duties? 1 K 17:21

But our Author adds, (p. 247,) “notwithstanding the power of performing miracles §1113  
 given by Jesus to his apostles, they could not avail themselves of such a gift until their  
 faith in God was become firm and complete.”<sup>1</sup> Granted; but is he aware that he by  
 this proves inevitably that Christ is God? By faith in whom was the miracle wrought  
 on the impotent man? Peter will tell him, Acts iii. 16, “And his name *through faith*  
*in his name*, (i. e. Christ’s name,) hath made this man strong.” Thus he himself Ac 3:16  
 declares that Christ is God. We will give him another instance of Christ’s Godhead  
 acknowledged by himself. Says he, “to effect a material change without the aid of  
 physical means is, a power peculiar to God.”<sup>2</sup> And says Peter, Acts ix. “Eneas, *Jesus*  
*Christ maketh thee whole*.” Here Christ effects a material change in Eneas without  
 physical means, and while he himself is in heaven. Ac 9:34

Our Author now asks, (p. 248,) “If we acknowledge that God by *creating man in his* §1114  
*own likeness, and giving him dominion over the creatures, did not make him cease*  
*to be a creature, are we not on the same principle obliged to admit, that although*  
*God raised Jesus above all, and bestowed on him a portion of his peculiar power and*  
*influence, yet he did not make him cease to be a creature.*”<sup>3</sup> In reply to this we ask,  
 In what part of scripture is it written that God *created the Son* in his own likeness?  
 And where does the Father say to Adam, “Thou, Lord, in the beginning, has laid the  
 founda-/528tion of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands?”

He further asks (p. 247,) whether such passages as the following, “As the father §1115  
 gave me commandment, even so I do.”—“I can of mine own self do nothing, as I hear  
 I judge.”—“As my father hath sent me I do these things.”—“To my Father and your  
 Father, to my God and your God,” &c. &c. fall short of shewing Christ’s human  
 nature?<sup>4</sup> To this we reply, Certainly not;—nor do they disprove the existence of his  
 Divine Nature, which REMAINS THE SAME, when the heavens are folded up like a  
 garment. He just ventures to ask further, (p. 250,) “after he had become incarnate  
 according to the Editor, was he not made of a mixed nature of God and man, pos-  
 sessing at one time both opposite sorts of consciousness and capacity? Was there  
 not a CHANGE of a pure nature into a mixed one?”<sup>5</sup> To this we have replied, “His Di-  
 vine nature is THE SAME; it changes not;” but his adding, “I will not however pursue

<sup>1</sup> §652. <sup>2</sup> §114. <sup>3</sup> §653. <sup>4</sup> §654. <sup>5</sup> §654.

the subject further now, as I have already fully noticed it in another place,” scarcely renders any answer necessary.

§1116 Our Author would have acted candidly had he mentioned the whole verse we  
 Heb 1:8 quoted, (“Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever;”) when we observed, “to say that  
 in the mouth of the Father for ever and ever, means only a limited time, is, to destroy  
 the existence of God himself.”<sup>1</sup> It was obvious that we meant, “in this address of  
 Heb 1:10–12 the Father to the Son.”<sup>2</sup> The Father had been declaring that the Son should fold up  
 the heavens like a garment and with reference to this period had added, but “THOU  
 REMAINEST THOU ART THE SAME;” and respecting this we add again, that “he who  
 penetrates eternity and fixes the time when Jehovah the Son was /529 not, may by  
 the same arguments prove, that there was a time when Jehovah the Father was not,  
 and when there was no God in the universe.”<sup>3</sup> His saying again, that the terms “for  
 ever” and “everlasting,” mean a limited time when applied to any one except God,<sup>4</sup> is  
 only begging the question in debate. Has he proved that the Son is not God?<sup>5</sup>

§1117 His intreating us, (p. 250,) “to shew him any authority in the Scriptures distin-  
 guishing one class of the sayings of Jesus Christ as man, from another of the same  
 author as God,”<sup>6</sup> is merely trifling. As already said,<sup>7</sup> let him first give us some au-  
 thority for distinguishing in his own conversation, these sayings which relate to his  
 mind or *soul*, from those which relate only to his *body*, to prevent our understand-  
 ing in a sentence like the following, “I yesterday dined heartily, and highly enjoyed  
 the conversation at the table; to-day I feel grieved and dejected, I can neither eat  
 nor sleep, I fear I shall soon die,” that his Body enjoyed conversation, is *grieved* and  
*dejected*, and *fears* lest it should die; or that his Soul *dined heartily* one day, could  
 neither *eat* nor *sleep* another, and would soon *die*.

§1118 Our Author now devotes nearly six pages to a new rendering of Phil. ii. 6,  
 Ph 2:5–11 “Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God,” not  
 reflecting that we have not the least need of this passage, and that the Deity of Christ  
 is already established on an immoveable foundation, even if this verse be precisely as  
 he asserts. We have however seldom seen weaker criticism or more unsatisfactory  
 reasoning than these six pages exhibit. Let us first examine by parallel passages in  
 the New Testament the word  $\iota\sigma\alpha$ , which he (p. 252) would fain render, “as, like.”<sup>8</sup>  
 It occurs only three times, although the singular  $\iota\sigma\omicron\varsigma$  occurs often; and /530 our

<sup>1</sup> §393.

<sup>2</sup> Rammohan, §655, had shown some verses where “for ever” from the mouth of the Father was not meant literally.

<sup>3</sup> §397. <sup>4</sup> §655.

<sup>5</sup> Rammohan, in §696, has agreed that the question of eternity does not lead to a conclusion between the opponents.

<sup>6</sup> §654. <sup>7</sup> §1092. <sup>8</sup> §659.

Author's auxiliary Parkhurst, declares that "the proper Greek phrase for, *equal to God is*," ἴσον τῷ Θεῷ John v. 18.<sup>1</sup> Had he examined it as occurring elsewhere, he would have found that this adjective has the same meaning in all its numbers and cases. This is its meaning in Luke vi. 34, "for sinners also lend to sinners that they may receive (τα ἴσα) equal things again." Here ἴσα indisputably conveys the idea of *perfect equality*, for what sinner lends to another with the hope of receiving *less* in return? In Rev. xxi. 16, it is said of the heavenly Jerusalem, "the length and breadth and height thereof are equal," (ἴσα ἐστὶ<sup>2</sup>); here ἴσα is rendered "equal" even by our translators. In Phil. ii. 6, therefore, ἴσα Θεῷ as unavoidably means "*equal to or with God*," as the length of a perfect square is equal to its breadth.

Lk 6:34

The following passages will shew that ἡγεομαι means, "to think, count, or deem;" 2 Cor. ix. 5, "Therefore I thought (or deemed) it necessary ἡγησαμην to exhort the brethren." Heb. xi. 26, "esteeming (ἡγησαμενος) the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt." James i. 2, "My brethren, count or deem it, (ἡγησασθε) all joy when ye fall into divers temptations." And in this very chapter, Phil. ii. 3, "esteeming (or deeming) others (ἡγουμενοι) better than themselves." This verb then clearly means "to esteem, to deem, to count." The verse in question then stands thus, "who,

§1119

2 Co 9:5

Heb 11:26

Jm 1:2

Ph 2:3

—οὐχ ἀρπαγμον ἡγησατο το εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ

"did not robbery deem the being equal to God."

But if Christ did not deem being equal to God, robbery, what did he deem it? Of course, *his own natural right*. Indeed with this agrees the rendering our Author has quoted from *Schleusner, non habuit præ loco*.<sup>3</sup> And what is a prey? That to which a person has *no natural right*; none but that of force. But if Christ did not /531 account equality to God a prey, he deemed it his *natural right*. Such then is the meaning of this clause on our Author's own principle. But his changing "think" given as the meaning of ἡγεομαι even in the "Improved Version," for "think of," and then prefixing the article "the," to "robbery,"<sup>4</sup> which totally alters the meaning, we are persuaded has arisen from inattention; for nothing beside can shield him from a charge of a more serious nature. This alteration completely frustrates the Apostle's design in adducing the example of Christ, which was, that of inculcating humility; for what wonderful proof of humility could it be for a creature not to think of the robbery of being like God? The Philippians might have answered, "We are quite as humble as this already. We are creatures, and we do not think of the robbery of being like God; no one of us is guilty of such impious arrogance."

§1120

<sup>1</sup> As quoted by Rammohan, §658. About the complexity of this quotation see §658, note <sup>2</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> Read: ἴσα ἐστὶ. <sup>3</sup> §660.

<sup>4</sup> Rammohan's translation, in §661: "Who being in the form of God, did not think of the robbery the being like God."

§1121 Further, our Author’s rendering this passage, “he did not think of the robbery of being *like* God,” completely destroys the character of Christ for holiness. To illustrate the meaning of “being like God,” he quotes 1 John iii. 2, “but we know that when he shall appear we shall be *like him*,”<sup>1</sup> which means, being like him in holiness. But so far would it have been from being commendable in Christ not to think of being thus like God, that it would have been the highest sin. For a good man not to “think of” and aim at this, would be sin, how much more then would it have been so in Christ himself. This passage therefore contains the most decisive testimony to the equality of Christ with the Father, even though we overlook the evidence arising from the clause, “who being in the form of God.” And this, Parkhurst, whom our Author quotes p. 256, refers to Christ’s glorious appearance as God before and under the Mosaic dispensation,<sup>2</sup> /532 and thus confirms all we have adduced respecting Christ’s appearing to the Israelites at Bochim, to Moses in the bush, to Jacob at Bethel, and to Abraham, which establishes his Godhead independently of this passage; for if he who declares himself, “God Almighty,” “Jehovah,” the “I AM,” be not God, there is no God in the universe.

§1122 Had Parkhurst however, duly weighed the clause, “being in the form of God,” he might have seen that this alone declares the reality of Christ’s Godhead. No one denies that μορφη “form,” has precisely the same force in both members of the sentence.<sup>3</sup> If then Christ’s “being in the form of God” mean, his having the *form* without the *reality* of the Godhead, the other clause will mean his taking on himself the form, without the reality of a servant. But so really was Christ a *servant*, that his heavenly Father glories in him as such, saying, “Behold my *servant* whom I uphold,” &c. And that he was as really God, as he was a servant in human nature, is self-evident, for the expressions in both clauses are precisely the same. It was indeed to his thus humbling himself in becoming *man*, when he was *God* equal with the Father, that the Apostle called the attention of the Philippians. But his “not thinking of the robbery” of taking that to which by nature he had not the least right, instead of being a proof of stupendous humility, would have been barely an example of common honesty.

§1123 To “reconcile real Godhead with real servitude,”<sup>4</sup> we beg to refer our Author, not

<sup>1</sup> §659. <sup>2</sup> §662, quoting Parkhurst, *Greek*, Art. “Μορφη”, 367.

<sup>3</sup> Against Rammohan, §663: “Should any one, in defiance of the common acceptance of the word ‘form,’ and of every authority, insist upon its implying real essence in the phrase, ‘being in the form of God,’ he must receive it in the same sense in the following verse, ‘took upon himself the form of a servant;’ and he must then admit and believe that Christ was possessed of the real essence of God and the real essence of a servant. How can we reconcile real Godhead with real servitude, even for a moment?”

<sup>4</sup> §663.

to the Greeks of old to whom “the cross of Christ was foolishness,” but to St. Paul, to whom it was, “Christ, the wisdom of God.” 1 Co 1:23f.

Our Author’s attempt (p. 257) to meet Dr. Owen’s observation on πρωτοτοκος “first-born,” in Col. i. 15, that “it is not πρωτοκτιστος ‘first created,’ but ‘first-born,’ and that Christ is so the first-born as to be the only be-<sup>533</sup>gotten Son of God, so the first of every creature, that he is before them all, above them all, heir to them all, and so no one of them,”<sup>1</sup> is feebleness itself. It is, that Israel is termed God’s “*first-born*,” Ephraim his “first-born,” and according to him, David in Psalm lxxxviii; after which he adds, “and now I will take upon myself to ask the Editor whether Israel as well as David, was so the first-born, as to be the ‘only begotten son of God,’ and was also before all the creatures, above them all, heir to them all, and so no one of them?”<sup>2</sup> This is answered by asking him, Is Israel, or Ephraim, or David, ever called, God’s ONLY begotten Son? Has the Spirit of truth any where said of David, “all things were made *by him* and *for him*, and *by him* all things consist?” Did Israel ever say any where, “before Abraham was I AM?” Was Ephraim, “the Angel who redeemed Jacob from all evil, the God before whom Abraham and Isaac did walk?” Does our Author suppose that we consider Christ’s being termed “the first-born,” “the first begotten from the dead,” proofs of his Deity? We consider them as descriptive of his *human nature*, preeminent in wisdom, love and holiness; but whether his Divine Nature has not been triumphantly proved already, we submit to the judgement of our readers. §1124 Col 1:15–18

His adducing (p. 259) Christ’s being the “FIRST-BORN among many BRETHREN,” against his Deity,<sup>3</sup> arises from his not duly weighing scripture. It is Christ who *creates* these “brethren” anew in his own image, being the *Author* and *Finisher* of their faith, and therein exercising *omnipotence* (as well as *infinite mercy*,) so much more gloriously than in the creation of the world, that the latter “shall not be remembered” with it, nor even “come into mind.” Can our Author be so weak as to think of disproving Christ’s Divine Nature in which he was with <sup>534</sup>the Father before the world was, by proving that “in his Human Nature he had *brethren*, and condescended to call his people *his brethren*?”<sup>4</sup> Do we believe in the Deity of Christ’s *human nature*? §1125 Rm 8:29 Is 65:17

We had added almost in Dr. Owen’s words relative to Coloss. i. “In this chapter Christ’s *creation of all things simply and absolutely, is most emphatically expressed; first, in general, ‘by him were all things created.’ Then a distribution is made of these ‘all things’ into all things that ‘are in heaven’ and that ‘are in earth.’ Then two terms are used which include all creatures whatever, ‘visible and invisible;’ and as things ‘invisible,’ being of the greatest eminence and dignity, might seem exempted from being created by Jesus Christ, an enumeration is made of these, ‘whether they be* §1126

<sup>1</sup> Not exactly quoted by Marshman in §394, see §394, note <sup>3</sup>. <sup>2</sup> §665. <sup>3</sup> §665.

<sup>4</sup> Marshman summarising Rammohan’s argument in §§665-666 from his point of view.



Rm 11:36 thrones, or dominations, or principalities, or powers.’ This done, the general fact is again repeated, ‘all things were created by him,’ whether expressed in the enumeration or not; and it is added ‘all things were *created for him*,’ as is said of the Father, Rom. xi. 36. The whole is confirmed by a declaration completely fatal to the idea of Christ’s being a *creature*, ‘And he is BEFORE all things, and BY HIM *all things consist*.’”<sup>1</sup> To this overwhelming display of Christ’s Deity, what does our Author reply? Nothing: he retires from it and takes refuge in what he has said, p. 110, in these words. “As for the Editor’s reliance on the subsequent verses to shew that the creation of things was effected by Christ, I refer my readers to page 110 of this essay, where I observe, that the apostle Paul means in all these passages only the creation of all the things in the Christian dispensation, as is explained in Ephes. i. 21, 22, which represent Jesus as head over all things belonging to the church.”<sup>2</sup> Would not our readers sup-<sup>5</sup>pose from this, that at p. 110 he had fully considered this passage in Colossians? He has not himself even mentioned it there. He has merely quoted the “Improved Version” as saying relative to it, “All things in the Christian dispensation were done by Christ, i. e. by his authority and according to his direction; and in the ministry committed to his apostles, nothing has been done without his consent.”<sup>3</sup> How was it that when our Author could employ twelve pages in attempting to shew that Hezekiah was Immanuel, he could pass by a proof of Christ’s Deity, which destroys his cause at once, without finding a reply sufficient to fill a single page, and then refer the reader for satisfaction to a place in which he himself has not even mentioned the passage in question? Is this *defending* a cause?— Further, when we added, Rv 1:5 “so also when John terms Christ ‘the first begotten from the dead,’ he describes him as equally omnipotent to bless the churches with ‘grace and peace,’ as the Father himself,—as ‘the Searcher of hearts’—‘the Almighty;’”<sup>4</sup> our Author merely replies, “I need not renew the subject of Revelation repeated by the Editor, as I have already examined it in page 200 and 223.”<sup>5</sup> Can any one misunderstand this shunning of passages which vitally affect his cause?

§1127 But we have something more strange in the next paragraph, p. 261. “The assertion of the Editor (that ‘certain powers were conferred on Jesus, not as a man but as the Messiah Christ, the anointed Son of God’) is I presume one of the mysteries of the Trinity.”<sup>6</sup> Now would not any one suppose that this passage thus quoted, is our own? Yet the fact is that our declaration is *quite the reverse*! Let us quote the whole passage. “That certain powers therefore were conferred on Je-<sup>5</sup>36sus not as a man but as the Messiah Christ, the anointed Son of God, is *wholly groundless*; for on Jehovah God, ever ‘THE SAME,’ no new powers could be conferred; and he was never

<sup>1</sup> §394, compare Owen, *Vindiciæ*, 268, §7. <sup>2</sup> §667. <sup>3</sup> §708, quoting NTIV, *Ed.* 5, 185. <sup>4</sup> §394.

<sup>5</sup> §667. <sup>6</sup> §668.



man but as the Messiah. Of ‘powers,’ therefore distinct from authority; in other words, natural attributes and perfections, he received none; they necessarily existed in himself from eternity, otherwise God who cannot lie, could not have said of him, ‘THOU ART THE SAME,’ since the least addition of the least quality, either before or after that period, must have dishonored the Divine veracity for ever.”<sup>1</sup> The reader may now see, that instead of saying what he affirms and combats, we declared that idea to be *wholly groundless*. We hope this has arisen from carelessness; but even carelessness is blameable on a subject so important.—The argument drawn from Heb. i. 12, that Christ, from being “the same,” can have no new powers or attributes added to him, he passes over with merely saying (p. 262), “The Editor next quotes a part of Heb. i. 12, ‘thou art the same.’ This I have fully noticed in page 122.”<sup>2</sup> That is, by saying that Paul here addressed the Father, and making the Spirit of Truth witness a direct falsehood.

Heb 1:12

He (p. 261) quotes from his Second Appeal Christ’s address to the Father, John xvii. 5, “And now, O Father, glorify thou me with the glory which I had with thee before the world was;” and adds, “Is not this petition to God for glory by the same person who says he was with God before the world was?”<sup>3</sup> We answer, Yes. Christ’s Human and Divine Nature were both his own; but does he ever say that the former was co-eval with the latter, or that it existed before Mary?—We beg also to inform him that Christ never “lost” the glory of his Divine Nature; he emptied himself of it for a sea-/537son (Phil. ii. 7) and took upon himself the form of a servant, that he might perform his heavenly Father’s will in saving men. To his question, (p. 212,) “Do we not know that Christ’s coming into the world was not according to his own will?”<sup>4</sup> We answer, that *we do not*. How could he overlook Psalm xl. quoted Heb. x. “I delight to do thy will, O my God,” so far as even to ask the question? For an answer to his query, “Was he not at the disposal of the Most High even before his coming into the world?”<sup>5</sup> we refer him to the proofs already adduced that *Christ* is God Most High; and beg to ask him, whether, when the Son is *one* in *will* with the Father as well as in *nature*, he must, like Satan, *oppose* his Heavenly Father’s will, in order to prove his Godhead? Whether if he delighted in his Father’s design of saving sinners, he had not as much right *freely* to co-operate therein, and permit himself to be sent by his Father to accomplish the work, as our Author has to permit himself to be sent by a friend whom he loves, on some important business of his the nature and design of which he wholly approves? Must the Son cease to be a *free agent*, because

§1128

Jn 17:5

Ph 2:5–11

<sup>1</sup> §395. <sup>2</sup> §671. <sup>3</sup> §669.

<sup>4</sup> §670: “In *John* viii. 42, Jesus declares, that he came not of himself, but that God sent him. Does not he avow here, that his coming to this world was not owing to his own will, but to the will of another being?”

<sup>5</sup> §670.

he is God equal with the Father, and *one* with him both in *nature* and *will*?

§1129 We certainly do “disapprove highly,” of his asserting in his Second Appeal, that, “Jesus spoke of himself as vested with high glory *from the beginning of the world*,” instead of “*from before the foundation of the world*,”<sup>1</sup> because it is not a just representation of Christ’s words, the latter expression differing from the former as much as *eternity* differs from *time*.

§1130 His asserting (p. 243) that Christ “*lived in the divine purpose and decree before time was*,”<sup>2</sup> only shews the desperate state of his cause. It contradicts Christ’s declaration, John xvii. “The glory that I *had with thee* before the foundation of the world,” as no one can really *have* a thing before he himself *exists*. He might as well have said that Christ was crucified before the foundation of the world, or that he himself wrote this his Final Appeal before time began.—His supposing (p. 263) that “Christ like Adam lived with God before the foundation of the world, and then came into the world as Jesus, as John the Baptist was esteemed Elijah,”<sup>3</sup> only degrades his cause. Did Adam *live* with God before he was *created*?<sup>4</sup> Was John Baptist really Elijah?

§1131 His saying (p. 264) that he finds it “inconsistent with any idea he can admit of the eternal and unchangeable Almighty that he should empty himself of his glory though for a season and should afterwards offer supplications for the same glory to himself as if another being, addressing that other self as his own father;”<sup>5</sup> only assimilates him with those Greeks, who formerly, while seeking after wisdom, “esteemed the cross of Christ foolishness.” But when did we say that the Almighty Father is *the Son himself*? And, whether glory be understood of grandeur or praise, we ask him again, what is it but the just indication of a glorious Nature? If the Father gave the Son glory when no being existed beside the Sacred Three, it was the Father’s testimony to the Son’s Godhead. When the Psalmist says, Psalm xxix. 2, “Give unto Jehovah the glory due unto his name,” does he exhort men *to give* God his eternal Godhead? or *to acknowledge its existence*? And in giving the Son the glory due to him before the world was, what did the Father, but testify that he from eternity possessed that Godhead to which this glory was due?

Ps 29:2  
§1132 He upon this affirms (p. 265) “if it was *deserved* glory of which his nature was worthy, that the Father gave the Son, and this should be acknowledged as *a-*mounting to his attestation to the Son’s Godhead, we must be under the necessity of admitting the attestation of Jesus to the eternal Deity of his apostles from the circumstance of his having given them *the same deserved glory*.”<sup>6</sup> This is wholly mistake. That Christ

---

<sup>1</sup> §672. <sup>2</sup> §673. <sup>3</sup> §673.

<sup>4</sup> Rammohan claimed that “some Christians” maintained this doctrine, without really taking it up for his own, §673.

<sup>5</sup> §674. <sup>6</sup> §675, quoting §396.

did not give his disciples the glory he had with his Father before the world was, our Author himself declares by saying, that he *now supplicates* for that glory, which of course he then had not. The glory he gave his disciples, Christ terms, “the glory *which THOU HAST given me,*” which evidently shews that it was not the glory which he was then requesting.

Our Author takes great pains to prove (p. 266) that *Micah* v. 2, “whose goings forth have been of old, from everlasting,” points only to the times of David and Abraham.<sup>1</sup> Could he prove this however, it would avail him nothing, for we have shewn that the eternity of Christ’s Deity is abundantly testified by other passages of scripture. In attempting this he produces many passages to prove, that עַלְמִים is used for time hidden from man, as well indefinite and eternal as future, of which we never had any doubt, although we do not quite understand his “time eternal.” He then says, that Parkhurst translates this term “from of old, from the days of antiquity.”<sup>2</sup> This happens to prove little or nothing. Did Parkhurst intend to limit the goings forth of the Messiah to the days of David or Abraham? It is evident that he did not, for he declares in a passage already quoted by our Author, that the Messiah appeared *under* and *before* the Mosaic dispensation;<sup>3</sup> and as the Angel of Jehovah who then appeared, redeeming Jacob from all evil, was “God Almighty before whom Abraham walked,” it is plain that if Parkhurst thought at all on the subject, he did not intend to limit “the goings forth,” or “the origin” of the /540 God of Abraham, to Abraham’s days. He well knew that Abraham’s God existed before Abraham; and if he did not put his own ideas together on the subject, he is unworthy of our notice.

§1133  
Mi 5:2

He then asks, (p. 267,) *Can the phrases “his God,” “in the strength of his God,” and “his brethren,” be consistently used for one who is the everlasting God?*<sup>4</sup> Certainly they can be used with consistency of his *human nature*, born of Mary, while the Divine nature “is ever THE SAME.” His enquiry (p. 208,) “*If a body of men distinguished for their talents, learning and situation in life, (and he might have added, for their love to God and their concern for the salvation of men) from time to time be determined to support their long established inventions in defiance of scripture, reason, and common sense, how can truth make its appearance when so violently resisted?*”<sup>5</sup> is a complete begging of the question. He may rest assured that the *truth of God* will surmount obstacles far greater than these.

§1134

His asserting (p. 267) that “Son” used metaphorically, “*signifies a distinguished creature,*”<sup>6</sup> does not refute the fact that every real son is of the *same nature* with his father; nor the unavoidable inference, that if Christ’s being called God’s *own* Son,

§1135

<sup>1</sup> §677. <sup>2</sup> About the usage of Parkhurst by Rammohan, see §677. <sup>3</sup> §1121. <sup>4</sup> §677. <sup>5</sup> §677.

<sup>6</sup> §678: “The Editor advances, that ‘even son’ implies an equality of nature with the Father: certainly it does so, when referred to one carnally begotten, but otherwise, it signifies a distinguished creature.”

his “ONLY *begotten* Son,” was not intended to convey this idea, the terms were used by the Spirit of Truth to mislead the mind.—His adducing Solomon, and the angels, as the sons of God, proves nothing. And his attempt to confound Christ’s birth with the conversion of sinners by calling it “a spiritual birth,”<sup>1</sup> (p. 270,) only manifests his ignorance of the subject on which he writes. “A spiritual birth,” is a man’s dying to his former sins and living to God through Jesus Christ. But when did Christ die to his former sins! His quoting Deut. xxxii. 18, “of the rock /541 that *begat* thee thou art unmindful;” and Exod. iv. 22, “*Israel is my son, even my first-born,*” is still more remote from the subject: these passages do not describe even “a spiritual birth,” for all Israel did not forsake sin. Respecting all these metaphorical sons, the angels, Adam, Israel, it is sufficient to ask, But to which of those said the Father at any time; “sit thou on my right hand ’till I make thine enemies thy footstool?”

§1136 His asking, (p. 270,) “If a king having several sons, sent one of them to repel his enemies who did it with the loss of his life, and one of his subjects declared that his sovereign had sent his *own* Son even the most beloved to repel the enemies at the hazard of his life; whether this would confine the royal birth to that son or degrade other sons of the king from the same dignity,”<sup>2</sup> shews to what straits he is reduced for scripture proof. A thousand such similes weigh nothing against one passage adduced from scripture, and this one is completely answered by Christ’s saying, “God so loved the world that he gave his ONLY *begotten* son.” His adding, (p. 271,) “Besides, we find in the original Hebrew that God created man in *his* image, in the English version rendered *his own* image,”<sup>3</sup> with the hope of proving that Christ cannot be God’s ONLY BEGOTTEN Son, is quite useless. We find *Christ* “*creating men* anew in *the image of God* in righteousness and true holiness.” This shews us wherein consists the image of God; and since the *new creation* so much surpasses the old as to cause it not to be remembered, this furnishes new proof that Christ its author, is “God blessed for ever.”—His attempt (p. 273) to invalidate the term “only begotten,” by asserting that, it does not mean “*only* son,”<sup>4</sup> is no less vain. Israel was Abraham’s *only* son by *Sarah*, to whose seed alone the promise was made, and to whom the Apostle /542 alluded, the children of Hagar and Keturah being wholly excluded from the promise. Moreover his assertion that “*were we to take the word ‘only-begotten’ in its literal sense, we must discredit the express word of God declaring Israel and David his begotten and first born sons,*”<sup>5</sup> is entirely unfounded. Do the Scriptures declare Israel or David to be God’s ONLY begotten sons?

§1137 That the Apostle in Hebrews i. 5, *does not* apply the term “begotten Son” to Christ in “an accommodated,” but in a *real* sense, is confirmed by the Apostle’s interrogation already quoted, “For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son

<sup>1</sup> §678. <sup>2</sup> §679. <sup>3</sup> §679. <sup>4</sup> §681. <sup>5</sup> §681.

this day have I begotten thee?" And that it never did apply *really* and *literally* to David is no less evident. Was David capable of conversing with God the day he was born? We have moreover already shewn that the Spirit of Truth applies it to Christ in Acts xiii. 33.

Ac 13:33  
§1138

We had in our Reply observed, "The Son's nature is as fully defined in the Old Testament as that of Moses or Abraham. It is there declared, as we have already seen, that 'the Son' whenever mentioned, designates a Being as tremendous in his wrath, and as omnipotent to bless as the Father;—a Being who is Jehovah God, whose throne is for ever and ever, who is ever 'the same.'"<sup>1</sup> To this what does our Author reply? that which is far worse than nothing. Avoiding the argument itself he merely says, "As to his frequent repetition of such phrases as 'Jesus is Jehovah God'—'a tremendous being in his wrath,' &c., I only say they are best calculated to work upon the minds of those who are brought up in the notion of the Trinity, but do not carry any weight with them in an argument subject to the decision of an enlightened public."<sup>2</sup> We upon this /543 ask him, But do not the various passages of scripture on which "such phrases," are founded, and which he has in vain attempted to disprove, carry any weight with them with an enlightened public? Does he hope that he has so enlightened the public as to make them despise these Scripture Testimonies, which he has been unable to refute?

Respecting John xvii. 22<sup>3</sup>, "That they may be one," our Author expresses himself very much astonished, (p. 274,) at what he terms "our laying down a new rule, that no explanation of a passage or phrase by the author of it can have any weight if made or given at a subsequent period, in the course of a solemn prayer to God, or before a body of new hearers without an express declaration of their doubts of the meaning of it."<sup>4</sup> This is a little strange, for we have laid down no such rule. There is no intimation given us by John, that doubts had arisen in the minds of the disciples about the meaning of Christ's declaration, "I and my Father are ONE;" although in other cases it is recorded that doubts arose, and that Jesus solved them when alone with them. But the fact is, that this second declaration "that they may be one even as we are," *actually proves* that *Oneness of Nature* between the Father and the Son which he labors to disprove! If what he affirms be true, that the unity Christ prayed his disciples might have, was, "a unity of will and design,"<sup>5</sup> this itself proves it; for since he allows that the disciples previously possessed a union of *nature*, when to this was added a unity of *will* and *design*, that between the disciples would have been *more perfect and complete*, than that between the Son and the Father, had that not been also a unity of *nature*, as well as of will and design. This however, the expression "that they may be one AS we are," completely /544 forbids; for it shews

§1139  
Jn 17:21  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
Jn 10:30

<sup>1</sup> §398. <sup>2</sup> §683. <sup>3</sup> Read: "John xvii. 21". <sup>4</sup> §685. <sup>5</sup> §684.

that when they had the most perfect union of will and design, they would be merely one AS ARE Christ and his heavenly Father. Christ’s prayer proves, therefore, that there is as complete a ONENESS of NATURE subsisting between the Father and the Son, as between any two of Christ’s disciples. Indeed the very expression, “as we are,” if taken alone, implies this in the fullest manner. Is there any proof in scripture that the holiest saint or the highest archangel ever dared to equal God with himself by saying WE? and yet declared, “I do always the things that please him!” Were such impiety and effrontery ever united in any righteous creature?

Jn 8:29

§1140

Can any thing be less to the purpose than our Author’s asking (p. 275,) that if unity of nature subsist between God and Jesus Christ, “would it not be quite idle for Jesus to have declared this unity by saying, ‘I and my Father are one,’ rather than that he was of the same mind with his Father,”<sup>1</sup>—and this because human sons differ in mind from their father? What are the feelings of corrupt and wicked men whether fathers or sons, to those of Christ and his heavenly Father? And it is no less so for him to say, that “if Christ’s calling God his Father,” which the Divine Spirit, John v. 18, declares to be “making himself equal with God,” proves his unity in nature with the Deity; David, and Israel, and all Christians are one in nature with the Father of the universe, because they are taught to say in prayer, “our Father.”<sup>2</sup> Is not this exposing his cause to contempt?

Jn 5:18

§1141

But as though this were not sufficient, he adds, (p. 278,) “Both in the Scriptures and in ordinary conversation, unity when referred to two substances, implies invariably concord of will or some other qualities, and by no means oneness of nature.”<sup>3</sup> To this we reply, what are /545 animate ore inanimate substances to their Creator? It happens also, that every instance he has adduced in support of his assertion, includes a oneness of nature! Thus a man and his wife are one flesh and of one nature. The stick of Joseph and the stick of Judah, are of one nature, as are Joseph and Judah themselves. Paul and other believers who are one bread, are of one nature, both carnal and spiritual. Is this his proving that where “oneness” is mentioned, “oneness of nature” is excluded?

§1142

Jn 17:21; 6:56

2 P 1:4

We beg to inform our Author, that we never attempt to prove the Deity of Christ from such passages as “he dwelleth in God and God in him;” “he that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him;” or, “that ye might be made partakers of the Divine nature.”<sup>4</sup>—Instead of expressing ourselves displeas’d at his having declined to submit indiscriminately to his countryman the whole doctrine of the New Testament, we merely asked, “Did he then who gave the whole of the Scriptures to men, possess less benevolence or less wisdom than our Author? When he penned this declaration, could he have been aware of its unavoidable import?”<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> §687. <sup>2</sup> §687. <sup>3</sup> §687. <sup>4</sup> §688 <sup>5</sup> §401.



His asking (p. 280,) how we “justify the idea that one who was in the human shape possessed of human feelings and subject to the calls of nature, was the very God whom we define as existing for ever, immortal, invisible, and above all mortal causes or effects,”<sup>1</sup> is merely asking, how we justify God’s “sending forth his Son made of a woman, made under the law.” We reply, that we dare not *presume to justify* what God has done; we leave that to God himself. We only bring proofs of its truth and reality, which our Author hitherto has been quite unable to gainsay. §1143  
Ga 4:4

In our Reply we observed, that “nothing could be more /546 incorrect than our Author’s assertion that Jesus in John v.<sup>2</sup> disavowed the charge of making himself God; and that if he did, the credit of the Precepts of Jesus is gone for ever; for, with reverence it be spoken, their author, after having in ch. v. and viii. borne the fullest testimony to his equality with God, at length prevaricates and retracts for fear of death. Such however was not the Jews’ opinion, the confession which our author terms a *disavowal*, was the very confession for which they still thought he *made himself God*.”<sup>3</sup> In reply to this, he, collecting a number of passages which speak of Christ as the Father’s mediatorial servant in *human nature*, asks (p. 281,) “Do these testimonies amount to the equality of Jesus with the Father?”<sup>4</sup> And does our Author imagine that we bring passages describing the *human nature* of Christ, to prove his Deity? He then adds, “I intreat the Editor to point out a single passage in either of these two chapters containing a proof of the equality of Jesus with the Father.” To this we reply, that if there be none in these two chapters, this can prove nothing while such a multitude are found in other parts of the Scriptures. From these very chapters however, we will select more than one, and the first shall be one of those he quotes against Christ’s Deity. It occurs ch. v. 20, “The Father loveth the Son and *sheweth him ALL THINGS* that himself doeth.” But if the Father sheweth him ALL things that himself doeth, the Son must have been present with the Father from the first moment he *began* to act or do, that is, from eternity. Moreover the declaration *implies a mind equally infinite with the Father’s*. Secondly, “the Father hath committed all judgement to the Son, that all men should honor the Son *EVEN AS* they honor the Father,” which, as has already been shewn, would have been the greatest /547 deception ever practised on creatures, had not the Father known that the Son was equally omniscient, omnipotent, wise, and righteous, with himself. Thirdly, Christ declares, “My Father worketh hitherto and I work,” which the Jews deemed “making himself *equal with God*.” These testimonies selected from those very chapters, we §1144  
Jn 5:20  
Jn 5:22  
Jn 5:17

<sup>1</sup> §690.

<sup>2</sup> Original text in §402: “John x.” Marshman had referred to *Second Appeal*, §121. Possibly he is not aware of this context anymore, or he (or the typesetter) confused it with the following text where John v. is mentioned.

<sup>3</sup> §402. <sup>4</sup> §691.

beg him to disprove,—and then we will soon surround him with more.

§1145 Further, in attempting to shew that Christ disavowed his Deity, our Author flatly  
 Jn 10:32–39 contradicts the Evangelist. To support his assertion he quotes John x. 36, “Say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God?”<sup>1</sup> And is this Christ’s disavowal of his Deity? If he will turn to ch. v. 17, 18, he will find this to be precisely the ground on which the Jews sought to kill him, deeming this to be MAKING HIMSELF EQUAL WITH GOD. And so far was Jesus from “justifying the use of the phrase ‘Son of God’ for himself, in the same metaphorical sense that the term ‘God’ was used for the magistrates and prophets among Israel,”<sup>2</sup> as our Author asserts, (p. 283,) that the position Christ maintained was precisely the reverse, even that he was the *true* and *real* Son of God, insisting on his claim to Deity by again saying, “My Father;” the phrase which the Jews understood to be making himself equal with God. He further shews, that this was no “metaphorical” sense, but one fully substantiated by his doing those works which were peculiar to God, and declaring that those *works* were sufficient to prove him the real Son of God, though he himself should say nothing. The Jews thus understood him *and sought again to take him*, but he escaped out of their hands. What then becomes of our Author’s assertion that Christ disavowed his being /548 the Son of God. And what of his lame metaphor (p. 266) of the commoner who “holding a high situation, suffers himself to be called ‘honorable,’ and justifies himself from the charge of presumption by saying, ‘you call all the judges Lords in their official capacity, though not noblemen by birth, yet you charge me who hold a more dignified situation than the judges, with arrogance, because I suffer myself to be addressed as ‘honorable,’ a title which the children of noblemen enjoy.”<sup>3</sup> Is he aware that Christ does not hold his Deity by *situation*? Has he overlooked St. Paul’s declaration, Heb. i. 3, 4, “Who, *upholding all things by the word of his power*, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the majesty on high, being made so much better than the angels *as he hath BY INHERITANCE obtained a more excellent name than they.*” Christ is not made a God by situation as Socinus formerly affirmed. He sits down on the right hand of the majesty on high *by inheritance*, it being as much his right *by nature*, as the estate or inheritance is the right of the true heir.

Heb 1:3f.

§1146 We said in our Reply, that “had Christ died through refusing to rectify a mistake respecting his nature into which he himself had led the Jews, he who came into the world ‘to witness to the truth,’ would have perished pertinaciously witnessing a gross falsehood.”<sup>4</sup> To this our Author objects, (p. 267,) that “the Jews had such an inveterate hatred against Jesus that they not only charged him with what they found

<sup>1</sup> §692. <sup>2</sup> §692. <sup>3</sup> §692. <sup>4</sup> §402.



in him contrary to their law, but even with wilful exaggerations.”<sup>1</sup> This although true, is still nothing to the purpose. Our position is still unanswered, and we will add here, that though Christ came into the world to be a witness to the truth, had he thus died, he would have perished through refusing to fulfil the mission for the sake of which he /549 came into the world. Thus our Author’s charge makes Christ an actual transgressor against God and man.

Jn 18:37

But in asserting that the Jews would of course have accused Jesus to Pilate of making himself God, “had they ever heard him declare himself God, or say any thing that amounted to his claim to the Godhead,”<sup>2</sup> he discovers an ignorance of the Scriptures totally unworthy of a man who professes to enlighten the mind of the Christian public respecting Christ. He (p. 262) brought Parkhurst to prove that “the proper Greek phrase for equal to God, is ἴσον τῷ Θεῷ.”<sup>3</sup> And this is the very phrase used John v. 18, when the Jews sought to kill Jesus, because he not only had broken the Sabbath, but said that “God was his Father, making himself EQUAL WITH GOD.” In John x. 33, “the Jews answered Jesus saying, for a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy; and because thou being a man, *makest thyself God.*” Can he say then that they never heard Jesus assert any thing that in their opinion amounted to his claim to the Godhead? When a man, even through inattention, so fully contradicts the Sacred Scriptures, what does he not say respecting the cause?

§1147

Jn 5:18

Jn 10:33

To our observing in our Reply, that “the principle on which we lay stress upon Heb. i. 8, ‘Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever,’ is, that it is spoken by God who cannot lie,”<sup>4</sup> our Author merely says, “Are not these words ‘Ye are Gods,’ spoken by him who cannot lie?”<sup>5</sup> We answer, “Yes;” and the words (ver. 5) “they know not, neither will they understand;” and (ver. 7) “ye shall die like men,” said of these ignorant and wilful Gods. And further the words “THOU ART THE SAME and thy years shall not fail,” are also spoken of Christ by him who cannot lie. Does God say the same of these ignorant and unjust gods, and of the Son? If he does not, what does our Author’s query avail him? /550 But to his asking, “Is not the very verse of Hebrews, ‘thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever,’ applied originally to Solomon by Him who cannot lie?”<sup>6</sup> we answer, No; because it is spoken by him who cannot lie; for Solomon’s throne has long been destroyed; and had this verse been said of Solomon, it would have been a falsehood. But our Author’s adding, “I will not introduce the subject again, it having been noticed in p. 120,” shews how little he wishes for any reply.

§1148

Ps 82

Heb 1:8–12

We are sorry to see that he misquotes us in p. 283. “The reason the Editor assigns for his surprise is, How could I take the phrase ‘for ever’ in a finite sense when applied to Jesus the eternal Jehovah.”<sup>7</sup> Our words really are, “But we are astonished

§1149

<sup>1</sup> §693. <sup>2</sup> §694. <sup>3</sup> §658. <sup>4</sup> §403. <sup>5</sup> §695. <sup>6</sup> §695, explained by Rammohan in §557. <sup>7</sup> §695.

at the reasoning which because the phrase ‘for ever’ must mean a limited time when applied to the throne of an earthly king or the days of people, can attach ‘little weight’ thereto when spoken by the everlasting God of Him who REMAINETH THE SAME when the heavens are folded up and laid aside as a vesture;—and we are shocked at the mind which could even distantly hint, that much weight could not be allowed to the declaration of the only Being our author professes to worship.”<sup>1</sup> Was this “arguing in a circle?” What phrase have we here used respecting the Son, which has not been previously applied to him by the Father himself? *Does He not* place this “for ever” after the heavens are folded up like a garment? Whence this misquoting us, and then using the misquotation to prove that we “argue in a circle?”<sup>2</sup> If “for ever” necessarily implies a limited period when applied to the days of a king or of a nation, does it when spoken of that period which commences not until the heavens be laid aside like a garment? If it does, let our Author /551 point out its limits,—and in doing this, he will point out the limits fixed to the existence of the Father of the universe.

§1150 Our Author’s wish expressed in p. 289, on occasion of our saying, “the direction of Jesus to Mary, ‘Go to my brethren,’ &c. only proves that he who upholds all things by the word of his power, condescended when he had taken on himself our nature, to call his faithful followers his brethren,”<sup>3</sup> that we had furnished him with a list enumerating those expressions that Jesus made in his human and his divine capacity,<sup>4</sup> is the *third* of the kind he has expressed. And we have already twice requested him to furnish us with means of distinguishing between the expressions he uses respecting his own body and his soul or spirit;<sup>5</sup> so that more on that subject would be superfluous.

§1151 Then our Author thinks, (see p. 291,) that Thomas made the exclamation, “My Lord and my God,” according to “invariable practice of Jews, Arabs, and almost all other Asiatic nations, who, when struck with wonder, often make exclamations in the name of the Deity;”<sup>6</sup> and that Thomas was a man who could take the name of God in vain with as little feeling of reverence as the Arabs and Asiatics around us!  
Jn 20:24–29  
Mt 5:37 And is he ignorant, that in saying, “let your communication be yea yea, nay nay,” Christ forbid all such use of the sacred name of God,—and that good men of every denomination, deem such habits of irreverence towards the Deity, incompatible with the character of a minister of Christ, and much more of an Apostle? And he thinks then that Christ pronounced Thomas blessed in the very act of violating his sayings,

<sup>1</sup> §403.

<sup>2</sup> Rammohan did not use the expression “argue in a circle”, but suggests it with the words: “As he admits that ‘for ever,’ when referred to a creature, implies a limited time only; he, therefore, must spare this phrase, and try to quote some other term peculiar to God, in his endeavour to establish the deity of Jesus”, §696.

<sup>3</sup> §404. <sup>4</sup> §697. <sup>5</sup> §1092, §1117. <sup>6</sup> §698.

although he had previously likened the man who “heareth his sayings *and doeth them not*, to a foolish man who built his house on /553 the sand?” Can he after this profess the least reverence for the sayings, or the character of Christ? Mt 7:24–27

As if reduced to the last extremity, our Author now adduces Socinus’s cavils against the received translation of John i. 1, which have been exploded for ages. These, although by his own canons, (p. 176) inadmissable here,<sup>1</sup>—we will here examine. Says he (p. 292) “the whole verse thus stands, ‘From the beginning the word of God, or Revelation manifesting his will and commandment, existed with him as God himself;’” adding to support his rendering, “and by the same word God made and established all things as the Jewish and *Mohommudan* as well as Hindoo theologians believe, on the authority of the works respectively acknowledged by them.”<sup>2</sup> §1152  
Jn 1:1–18  
 And is our Author constrained to seek support for his cause from Mohommudan and Hindoo fables even in explaining the Holy Scriptures? It is evident moreover that in attempting to make a new *translation*, he has made a *new Text*. Instead of “From the beginning,” John’s text is, εν αρχη, “in the beginning.” Instead of “Revelation manifesting his will and commandment,” John’s text is λογος ην προς τον Θεον “the word was with God;” and instead of, “revelation existed with him as God himself,” John has, και Θεος ην ο λογος, “and the word was God.” Now these are alterations in the TEXT, instead of a new *translation*; and if he can alter it in these instances, he may in a thousand others. In addition to this, what he further adds, is quite untenable. So far was Jesus from being the bearer of Revelation to the world, that three-fourths of it were given to men before his birth; and of the rest he himself never gave man a single book.<sup>3</sup> But let us try his new translation further on the 14th verse, “And revelation was made flesh (or was flesh) and dwelt among us, /553 and we behold his glory, the glory as of the only begotten Son of God.” Here we ask, *when* was Revelation made flesh? After the greater part of it had been on parchment for ages? Let us try the 10th verse by this translation; “Revelation was in the world, and the world was made by it,” i. e. two thousand years before a line of it existed! Again, “John bare witness of revelation, saying, he that cometh *after me* is preferred before me.” Is this a sober investigation of truth? Let the reader judge.

Let us now examine what he brings (p. 294) against the common exposition of the verse as it stands in the English translation. He objects in the first place that “as long as a passage can be consistently taken and understood in its literal sense, there can be no apology for taking it in a figurative sense.”<sup>4</sup> §1153  
 But is not his new translation *figurative*? And is there no authority even in this chapter for identifying Jesus as

<sup>1</sup> Marshman refers to §592, according to his own comment about using translations from the own sect in §989.

<sup>2</sup> §700. <sup>3</sup> It is remarkable that Marshman only counts written biblical text as “revelation”. <sup>4</sup> §701.

the “word?” Of whom (ver. 7,) did John come to bear witness but of Christ, termed there the Light? Who but Christ (ver. 11,) “came to his own and his own received him not?” Who but Christ, (ver. 12,) gave those that received him power to become the sons of God? Who was the ONLY begotten Son of God, full of grace and truth, but Jesus Christ? But our Author adds, (p. 295,) “the Evangelist John uses the word ‘beginning’ in a finite sense and generally implying the beginning of the Christian dispensation, and not once for ‘all eternity.’”<sup>1</sup> To this we reply, that the question is not about the word “beginning,” which is of course applied to many things, but respecting the phrase “IN the beginning,” (εν αρχη) which, although John does not use elsewhere, Paul does in Heb. i. 10, “thou, Lord, *in the beginning* hast laid the /554 foundation of the earth:” and unless our Author can render that passage, “thou, Lord, in the beginning of the Christian dispensation, hast laid the foundation of the earth,” all his labor on John i. 1 is entirely lost; as it is certain that *the world was made* by the “only begotten Son” when he laid the foundation of the earth.

Heb 1:10

§1154

He further objects, “were we to take the word ‘beginning’ in Genesis in an infinite sense, (i. e. ‘from eternity God created the earth and heavens,’) we should be compelled to profess the eternity of the world and become materialists.”<sup>2</sup> This is as though he had said, “Were we to change the text itself, and instead of IN *the beginning*, read FROM *the beginning*, we should have a sense different from that we now have.” What a discovery! This however seems to have completely exhausted his stock of objections, for his last is lighter than air. It is, “to acknowledge the Son to be the true God and to have lived with the true God, destroys at once the unity of God and proves beyond every question the plurality of the Deity.”<sup>3</sup> This is in reality saying, “To acknowledge the Son to be the true God, is to acknowledge that Christ really commands men to *devote themselves* in baptism EQUALLY to *the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost*.” And who shall say whether the Godhead contains *One* person or *Three*, but God himself? Shall man? “No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father he hath declared him.” And after Christ hath said, “that they may be one *in us*,” and hath commanded men to be baptized in the name of the Sacred Three, we need no other proof, as we can have no higher, of the *Plurality* or the *Number* of Persons in the *One* Godhead. But after his failing to refute even one of the numerous testimonies to the distinct Personality and Equality of the /555 Son, given by the Holy Spirit, his adducing *men’s* opinion of God as more correct, is only sinking his cause.

Jn 1:18

Jn 17:21

§1155

Dt 32:37–39

He now quotes Deut. xxxii. 39, “I am he, and there is no God with me,” and says (p. 296,) “Here Jehovah himself expressly denies having another real God with him, for he is often said to have had fictitious Gods with him, and therefore Jehovah’s denial

<sup>1</sup> §701. <sup>2</sup> §701. <sup>3</sup> §701.

must in this cause be referred and confined to real Gods.”<sup>1</sup> Would any one suppose that the *direct contrary* of this assertion, is the real fact? This however ver. 37 will shew; “And he shall say, where are *their gods*, their rock in whom they trusted, which did eat of the fat of their sacrifices and drink the wine of their drink offerings? Let *them* rise up and help you, and be your protection.” Now that our Author should say, God speaks here of “another real God” when *fictional gods* form the *only* subject of the passage, is marvellous indeed, and shews how little we can rely on his attention to the Scriptures.

His finding fault with our translators for not rendering John i. 1, “and the word §1156 was a God,” that is, one out of many, and thus plunging us into polytheism, is quite of a piece with the objections just considered. Can he be ignorant that this would be as contrary to the Greek text, which has no article before Θεός, as it would be to scriptural theology? His quoting, “I have made thee a God to Pharaoh,” helps Ex 7:1 him nothing. Had our translators rendered that, “I have made thee God to Pharaoh,” it would neither have violated the text, nor the Divine Unity—when it is elsewhere said, “thou shalt be to Pharaoh *instead of* God.”<sup>2</sup> But did the Father ever say to Moses as he did to the Son, “Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever?”

Our Author now quotes the interpretation of this passage by “searchers after §1157 truth,”<sup>3</sup> that is, Newcome, Cappe, Crellius, and Socinus. We are of course, searchers *after falsehood*. What a pity that he should have found it so difficult to expose our falsehood! The comment of these “searchers after truth” we will now examine. *The word*] “Jesus is so called.”<sup>4</sup> This at once nullifies our Author’s own comment, (p. 292,) “To understand Jesus literally and so abruptly by the term ‘word,’ against the established doctrine of the Jews and the rest of the oriental nations,—is entirely inadmissible.”<sup>5</sup> The first thing then that those “searchers after truth” do, is to prove our Author’s comment *false*! Whom shall we believe? Him or them? If we believe him we must give up “these searchers after truth.” If we believe them, we must give up himself. We proceed, “*The word.*” “Jesus is called the word, because God revealed himself or his word by him. Newcome.”<sup>6</sup> That is, God revealed his word by him, although the greater part of it was given before he was born! “For the same reason he is called the word of life, John i. 1<sup>7</sup>, which passage is so clear and useful a comment upon the proem to this gospel that it may be proper to cite the whole of it, “That which was from the beginning,”<sup>8</sup> &c. Now it is clear that Christ is in that passage declared to be the object of fellowship *equally with the Father* to John and all the pious of the earth. But fellowship with the Father is inseparable from adoration,

<sup>1</sup> §701.

<sup>2</sup> Ex 4:16 KJV, “thou shalt be to him instead of God”, speaks about Moses’ relationship to his brother Aaron.

<sup>3</sup> §702. <sup>4</sup> §703. <sup>5</sup> §701. <sup>6</sup> §703. <sup>7</sup> Read: “1 John i. 1”. <sup>8</sup> §703.

prayer, and trust. Thus then, in the very passage chosen with the hope of impugning Christ's Deity, is he declared to be equally the object of adoration and trust, with the Father himself!

§1158 *In the beginning.*] “or from the commencement of the gospel dispensation, or of the ministry of Christ.”<sup>1</sup> That is, the visible material world, according to Newcome,<sup>2</sup> /557 was made in the beginning of the Christian dispensation! But this is a sense which the word εγενετο will not admit.—All things in the Christian dispensation were *done* by Christ. Hence, “the world knew him not,” necessarily means, the *Christian dispensation* knew him not: and the only place in which this phrase “in the beginning” occurs besides, Heb, i. 10, must, according to this, be read, “Thou Lord in the beginning of the Christian dispensation hast laid the foundation of the earth.”

Heb 1:10

§1159 *The Word was God.*<sup>3</sup>] “He withdrew from the world to converse with God, and to receive divine instructions and qualifications previously to his public ministry. As Moses was with God in the mount, &c. See Cappe.”<sup>4</sup> Then this *made* Jesus God, as it made Moses! But is Moses ever addressed as God after his being thus in the mount? Further, as we have ascertained that “in the beginning,” means, “before the foundation of the world,” Christ withdrew from the world to converse with God before the foundation of the world. This interpretation however, being too wretched, our Author subjoins another; “*And the Word was a God.*”<sup>5</sup> That is, he was *one* out of *many* Gods. This carries John himself into polytheism! This not being quite satisfactory, another comment of these “searchers after truth” is brought forward. “Some translate the passage, ‘God was the word,’ q. d. it was not so properly he that spoke to men, as God that spake to them by him. *Cappe ibid.*”<sup>6</sup> Still a third is adduced. How troublesome this sentence! We have heard that truth is *one*; these searchers after truth, however, make it *many*. But to the third rendering (p. 299) “*Crellius conjectured, that the true rendering was ‘the word was God’s,’ q. d. ‘the first preacher<sup>7</sup> of the gospel derived his commission from God.’”* This is certainly the clearest of the three, as it removes all doubt. /558 But alas for poor Crellius, “this correction rests upon no authority.”<sup>8</sup>

§1160 *All things were done by him.*] “All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made;’ *Newcome*, who explains it of the creation of the visible material world by Christ, as the agent and instrument of God.”<sup>9</sup> But it seems that Newcome’s search for truth has not been sufficiently deep; “this is a sense which the word will not admit, γινομαι occurs upwards of seven hundred times in

<sup>1</sup> §704.

<sup>2</sup> This is not Newcome’s commentary, but written by the Unitarian Editors of the *NTIV*. It seems that Marshman is not really acquainted with the usage of Newcome’s translation by the Unitarians.

<sup>3</sup> Original: “The Word was with God”, §705. <sup>4</sup> §705. <sup>5</sup> §706. <sup>6</sup> §706. <sup>7</sup> Original: “teacher”.

<sup>8</sup> §706. <sup>9</sup> §708.



the New Testament, but never in the sense of 'create.'" "All things were *done* by him," however, makes ver. 14th read thus; "And the word was *done* flesh, and dwelt among us;" of which let the reader judge. While it simply expresses existence, and "the world was made by him," really means, "was brought into existence by him," does *γινωμαι* never occur in the sense of "*made*" as well as "*done*?" Whence then Matt. iv. 3, "command that these stones be *made* bread;" Matt. ix. 16, "the rent is *made* worse;" and Matt. xxiii. 15, "and when he is *made*, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than before?" Would these passages be improved by being read, "Command these stones to be *done* bread;" "the rent is *done* worse;" "and when the proselyte is *done*?" Further, if our Author wish to see "create" (*κτιζω*) applied to Christ, he may find it thus applied in Col. i. 16, "By him were all things *created*;" and all his attempts here against Christ's Deity are useless, unless he can also render *κτιζω* "create" by "*done*," and thus apply it to all things in heaven and earth;—and should he even do this, he will establish Christ's *omnipotence and omnipresence*.

Mt 4:3; 9:16;  
23:15

Col 1:16

Ver. 14, *Nevertheless, the word was flesh.*] "Though the first preacher of the gospel was honoured with such /559 signal tokens of divine confidence and favor, though he was invested with so high an office, he was, nevertheless, a *mortal man*.' Cappe."<sup>1</sup> Then he, whose glory was that of the ONLY begotten Son of God, who while on earth was in the bosom of the Father, who laid the foundation of the earth, and who is "over all, God blessed for ever"<sup>2</sup> was a mere "*mortal man*." The rear is brought up by that "searcher of truth," *Socinus*: and our Author adds (p. 301,) "Now my readers may judge which of these interpretations of John i. 1 is consistent with scriptural authority and conformable to the human understanding."<sup>3</sup> Such then are the various and contradictory interpretations which these "searchers after truth," give in the vain hope of getting rid of this glorious testimony of Christ's Deity; the evidence to which, as has been already said, would not be shaken, were they as clear and uniform, as they are the reverse.

§1161

Our Author now wishes to know (p. 301) what we should say to a Hindoo who would deny Polytheism on the principle, that "if *three separate persons be admitted to make one God, and those that adore them be esteemed as worshippers of one God, what objection could be advanced justly to the oneness of three hundred and thirty-three millions of persons in the Deity, and to their worship in different emblems.*"<sup>4</sup> We reply, that we should first request this Hindoo to produce a Revelation as fully authenticated and as holy in its effects, as the Sacred Scriptures, testifying that *there are three hundred and thirty-three millions of persons in the Godhead*; and we should then examine whether it testified that all these were omnipotent, omniscient, perfectly pure and holy, one in nature, in will, and design. And until all this be fully

§1162

<sup>1</sup> §709. <sup>2</sup> Compare §972, note. <sup>3</sup> §710. <sup>4</sup> §711.

substantiated, which will not be effected /560 until the heavens be no more, no wise Hindoo will propose such a question.

§1163 Against the omniscience of Christ our Author urges (p. 302) that the “all things”  
 Jn 16:30 mentioned by his disciples, John xvi. 30, “Now we are sure that thou knowest ‘all things,’” exclude all things that bear no relation “to his ministry and the execution of final judgement.”<sup>1</sup> It happens however, that he had now nearly finished his ministry, and that in the whole of this discourse he had not introduced the final judgement.  
 Jn 2:24 He should also have recollected, that Christ also knew “*all men*,” which is divinely declared of no prophet or righteous man; and further that he himself testifies, “I am he that searcheth the hearts and reins.” But beside him who ever declared this, but *Jehovah*?

§1164 To the evidence of Christ’s deity drawn from Paul’s repeatedly terming him “God our Saviour,” Peter “God and our Saviour,” and Jude’s saying “To the only wise God our Saviour be glory, majesty, dominion, and power,” a threefold testimony sufficiently decisive were no other found in the Scriptures,<sup>2</sup> our Author merely replies, (p. 303,) “the Editor intends perhaps to shew, that as both God and Jesus are styled Saviours, consequently Jesus is God.”<sup>3</sup> We however, intended nothing of the kind; we brought this threefold testimony to shew him that Peter, Paul and Jude, unite in declaring Jesus Christ to be God, and that Jude in his declaration *adores* him as “the only wise God.”

§1165 To our Author’s wondering (p. 304) “how it could escape our notice that the doctrine of plurality in unity maintained by us and that professed by Hindoos, stand on the same footing;”<sup>4</sup> we reply by asking him, how any man acquainted with Scripture, can venture on an assertion *so totally unfounded*, when he knows that the /561 Hindoo’s doctrine rests on the most absurd fables, and ours on proofs from the Sacred Scriptures which he has been unable to gainsay. His intimating that the Son and the Holy Ghost shall perish from the earth and from under these heavens, we leave with him and his awful Judge, “the Son” who “liveth for evermore.” While there is a perfect ONENESS of *nature* between the Father and the Son, is there not also a oneness of *will* and *design*? But does he find a oneness of will, and design among men? Further, if as he affirms, the will of the Father was “sometimes at variance with the will of the Son,”<sup>5</sup> what becomes of his own declaration, that “I and my Father are ONE,” means, oneness of *will* and *design*?<sup>6</sup> Indeed the passages which he adduces to prove that “the Father’s will is at variance with the Son’s,” prove *just the reverse*. Can any thing manifest a greater submission of will to God, than the Son’s declaring amidst the most tremendous sufferings, “Abba, Father, if it *be possible*, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, not as I will, but AS THOU WILT.”

Mt 26:39

<sup>1</sup> §712. <sup>2</sup> §405. <sup>3</sup> §713. <sup>4</sup> §714. <sup>5</sup> §716. <sup>6</sup> §119.



In our Reply we had observed; “Common sense sees around her every day that one man equal to another in nature, is yet subordinate in office.”<sup>1</sup> To this our Author replies, (p. 305,) “But when she sees one man equal to another in office, she reckons them *two men*, whether one is subordinate in office or not.”<sup>2</sup> And is this an answer to the question in hand? Is it any thing more than evading the subject? And to what “genus” or “species” will he liken the Son and the Father?<sup>3</sup> §1166

That all Christ did and said as his Father’s mediatorial Servant in human nature, was in his name and by his command, we have already said. But that the aid which supported Christ’s *human* nature, came from his own, as well as the Father’s Deity, is evident from his /562 declaring, John v. 19, “what things soever the Father doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise.”—How strange is it that if Elijah bestowed on Elisha the power of working miracles, (to which we have already replied,) he never did a single miracle in Elijah his master’s name, while Christ’s chief Apostles Peter and Paul, passing by the Father entirely, say, “Eneas, Jesus Christ maketh thee whole.”—“In the name of Jesus Christ, rise up and walk.” How is it that John, Peter, and Paul loved God so much less than Elisha add? We had said in our Reply, §1167

“If it be declared in Scripture that the Father created all things by and FOR the Son, it only proves anew that the Son is equal to the Father in Supreme Dominion, as well as in Almighty power, since he FOR *whom* all things are created, is necessarily the Supreme God. This is clear from Rev. iv. 11. ‘Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honor, and power: for thou hast created all things, and FOR *thy pleasure* they are and were created.’ Our author therefore closes this chapter on the ‘Natural Inferiority of the Son,’ by directing us to a passage which places his Equality with the Father beyond dispute.”<sup>4</sup> §1168

Against this what does our Author now bring? Nothing. He leaves it unanswered; and assuming what we never said, that “if a creature’s being endowed with life by or employed as an instrument on the part of another, puts them both on a footing of equality,” adds, (p. 308,) “Then we must esteem the clay equal to the potter, the rod of Moses equal to himself, and Moses equal to the Deity.”<sup>5</sup> This, applied to Christ, is a perfect begging of the question in debate. Has he then *proved* that Christ is a *creature*? All things being created, not only “*by* him, but FOR him,” proves his Deity and Supreme Dominion, it being the very language as-/563cribed to the Father, Rev. iv. 11, “FOR thy pleasure they are and were created.”<sup>6</sup> And to prove that the clay is as fully equal to the potter, Moses’s rod to Moses, and Moses to God, as Christ is equal to the Father, he must shew that the works God did by Moses he did FOR §1169

<sup>1</sup> §406. <sup>2</sup> §717.

<sup>3</sup> §717: “It is indeed astonishing, that in all his illustrations the Editor brings the Godhead to a level with any genus, including various species under it, but feels offended if any one should observe this fact to him.”

<sup>4</sup> §411. <sup>5</sup> §719. <sup>6</sup> KJV translates διὰ τὸ θεέλημα with “for thy pleasure.”

Moses's pleasure and glory; that Moses did his works FOR the pleasure and glory of *his rod*; and that in making one piece to honor and another to dishonor, the potter has entirely in view, not his own, *but the glory and pleasure of the clay*.

[The "Seven Positions" again reviewed.]

§1170 [1. Jesus' ubiquity.] We now come to the *Seven Positions* we formerly advanced from the Gospels alone, in proof of the Deity of Christ. In our Reply we had asked our Author respecting the First of these, *that Christ is possessed of Ubiquity, why must the declaration, "before Abraham was I AM," be taken in a preterite sense? Because if it be not, our Author's cause dies. Did the Jews however understand it thus? So far from it that they esteemed it a decided declaration of Jesus's equality with the Father, and "took up stones to stone him."*<sup>1</sup> What answer does our Author now give to this? "There is nothing in the context that can convey the least idea of the Jews having esteemed the phrase 'Before Abraham was, I am,' a decided declaration of Christ's equality with the Father, or of their having in consequence taken up stones to stone him."<sup>2</sup> No! What not their actually taking up stones to stone him? Let us anew examine the passage. "Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily I say unto you, 'Before Abraham was, I AM.' Then took they up stones to stone him; but Jesus hid himself and went out of the temple going through the midst of them, and so went his way." And has our Author no other means left of impugning Christ's *omni-/564presence*, but that of directly contradicting the Holy Scriptures? It is vain for him to object here that they once sought to stone Christ for healing on the Sabbath; here there is no man healed, and no breach of the Sabbath even pretended.

§1171 We had further said in our Reply, "Jesus, meek and lowly as he was, although he knew precisely in what sense they understood him, rather chose to work a miracle for his own safety, than to deny his own Divinity or even to hint that they had mistaken his meaning."<sup>3</sup> Respecting this our Author asserts, (p. 311,) "It obviously appears that neither the Jews understood his Deity from the assertion, before Abraham was I AM; nor was it usual with Jesus to correct them whenever they mistook his meaning,"—adding that when the Jews charged him with having a demon, John vii. 20, he "omitted to correct fully their mistaken notion;"<sup>4</sup> The first of these assertions we have just answered. There was no other reason for their taking up stones to stone him: he had not here healed a man on the Sabbath day. And if Jesus did not clear himself fully from the charge of having a demon, we wish to know what the following words mean, "I have not a demon?" But when did Jesus say, *I do not make myself equal to God? or I do not make myself God?*

§1172 We beg to inform our Author that we never had the least doubt of the force of our arguments respecting the declaration, "Before Abraham was I AM:" we referred

<sup>1</sup> §412. <sup>2</sup> §720. <sup>3</sup> §412. <sup>4</sup> §721.

to “the body of evidence we had previously adduced,”<sup>1</sup> because we knew that it was of itself sufficient to prove Christ’s *ubiquity* though it had only testified that “he searcheth the hearts and reins,” and “upholdeth all things by the word of his power,” to do both which he must necessarily be *omnipresent*.

Respecting John iii. 13, “even the Son of man *which /565 is in heaven,*” which, to destroy the proof it affords of Christ’s *ubiquity*, our Author wishes to render, “who was in heaven,” we had observed, that *in poetry and sometimes in lively narrative, the present is with strict propriety used for the past, because the transaction is narrated as passing before the reader’s eyes.*<sup>2</sup> In reply to this, he quoting, “his disciples say unto him;” “Jesus *cometh* to the grave;” “then *cometh* he to Simon Peter,” asks, *Do these come under the denomination of poetry or lively narrative?*<sup>3</sup> We certainly think they come under the latter description; and that they are almost inimitable in their kind. He then asks, “*how can we be prevented from taking, ‘the Son of man who is in heaven,’ also for a lively narration?*”<sup>4</sup> We reply, because it is part of “a didactic discourse, on the clearness and accuracy of which depended the salvation of a man who had hazarded much in coming to Christ for instruction.”<sup>5</sup> In reply he affirms, (p. 313) that Christ “*instructed him in a language far from being clear and comprehensible to him,*” instancing “Except a man *be born again.*” “So is every one that is born of the Spirit.” “No man *hath ascended up to heaven* but he that came down from heaven.” “As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man *be lifted up.*” But if these do not appear “comprehensible” to our Author, is he sure that they did not, to Nicodemus? This will best appear from the *result*, which is wholly against him; for after this we find Nicodemus daring to defend Christ openly in the council before his enraged enemies; and assisting Joseph in taking him down from the cross, when all his disciples had fled. Yet we do not read of his having any further interview with Christ.—“With the Jews and the multitude” Christ himself declares that he spoke in parables. /566

§1173

Jn 3:13

Jn 3:1–21

Jn 7:50f.; 19:39f.

We had further said in our Reply, that “*if our Author would only tell us how Christ was regarded in the realms of light before he left them, he would himself settle the point respecting his Deity; and that in this we could assist him,*” adding, “The Father had given commandment, ‘Let all the angels of God worship him;’ and that hence down to the moment of his *leaving* them, he was worshipped by the highest archangel.”<sup>6</sup> Unable to deny this, he (p. 344) refers us “*to such authority as no Christian can ever deny,*” 1 Peter i. 20, “who verily was *foreordained before the foundation of the world*, but was *manifest* in these last times for you:” and 2 Tim. i. 9, “according to his own purpose and grace, *which was given* us in Christ Jesus *before the world began,*” adding, “*if this plain explanation fall short of convincing the Editor*

§1174

Heb 1:6

1 P 1:20

2 Tm 1:9

<sup>1</sup> §412, against Rammohan’s assumption in §722. <sup>2</sup> §412. <sup>3</sup> §723. <sup>4</sup> §723. <sup>5</sup> §412. <sup>6</sup> §413.

of the real sense in which the pre-existence of Jesus and his followers was meant, my endeavour to correct his notion on this head must be of no use.”<sup>1</sup> Melancholy as it may appear, however, his endeavour does fall short of convincing us; for these passages have not the least to do with God’s command, “Let all the angels of God worship him.”

§1175 Did we, as he affirms (p. 315) “overlook or think it judicious to avoid the real point of our Author’s argument that the attribute of omnipresence is inconsistent with the human notions of the ascent and descent effected by *the Son of man*?”<sup>2</sup> Did we not reply, “The inconsistency of the attribute of omnipresence with the human notion of the ascent and descent effected by *the Son of man*, we leave with our author who has these notions. We have them not; and to believe that he who ‘upholdeth all things by the word of his power,’ is every where at the same moment, *we not only find easy, but* /567 *we find it IMPOSSIBLE TO BELIEVE THE ONE WITHOUT THE OTHER. He who upholds all things, must necessarily be PRESENT WITH all things.*”<sup>3</sup> Was this, “overlooking the real point of his argument?”

§1176 If Jesus, as he affirms p. 316, “took every precaution in wording his discourse with Nicodemus by the use of the term *man*, to establish his humanity,”<sup>4</sup> does this in the least degree affect the mass of proof already adduced respecting his Deity? Our Author however will not recur to the examination of such passages as, “who made all things,” “who upholds all things by the word of his power,” &c.<sup>5</sup> He acts wisely; he knows how he has succeeded already.

§1177 He adds, (p. 316,) “Let us now come to the real point, whether or not, ὁ ὢν in the original Greek, which is rendered ‘is’ in the English version, (rather “he who is”) actually signifies the present tense, as a candid enquiry into this very point will bring us to a satisfactory decision at once.”<sup>6</sup> In coming to this point, however, we shall find that his criticism has completely failed. What indeed of sound criticism in Greek can we expect from one so little acquainted with the language, as to deny the existence of a future participle in the verb εἶμι. See p. 323, “I only beg to remind him that in the Greek language there is no past or future participle for the verb εἶμι to be, and consequently the present participle is used for these under the specific rules.”<sup>7</sup> And has the verb εἶμι no future participle? What then is εσομενος “about to be?” Was it wise in him to set up his knowledge in Greek, against that of the fifty excellent Greek scholars in Britain, who, two hundred years ago, examined and fixed the English translation?

§1178 He now adds, that all he said in his Second Appeal /568 may be compressed into three remarks. The first is, “that the time of the participle is referred to the time of the verb found in the sentence.”<sup>8</sup> This does not assist his cause at all; for were

<sup>1</sup> §725. <sup>2</sup> §726. <sup>3</sup> §415. <sup>4</sup> §727. <sup>5</sup> §728. <sup>6</sup> §729. <sup>7</sup> §736. <sup>8</sup> §729.

ὁ ὢν, “he being,” the nominative to the verb ἀναβαίνω, “hath ascended,” Christ’s *being in heaven* while in the act of *ascending* thither, at once proves his *ubiquity* or *omnipresence*, as we quoted that accurate Greek scholar Bishop Middleton, to shew that both acts were *simultaneous*. This quotation he is “[perfectly willing to leave to the discerning reader;](#)”—and to shew the reader that it substantiates our idea, we will submit it to him again. “The example which the Bishop gives of the use of the participle is ‘*accessit amans pretium pollicens*,’ respecting which the Bishop adds ‘surely in *pollicens* (promising) there is an adsignification of time, and that too *present* time in respect of the act implied in *accessit*, (he came,) that act indeed is spoken of as being past, yet as having once been present; and the meaning is, that the two acts, viz. *accedendo* and *pollicendo*, were *simultaneous*.”<sup>1</sup> This completely frustrates our Author’s object. If the two actions of “being in heaven,” and “ascending thither,” were simultaneous, Christ’s omnipresence is proved beyond dispute. Indeed no *time* affixed to this *present* participle, will suit our Author’s purpose, unless the *present time* be excluded, and the participle be made to change its very nature.

His *second* remark p. 318, that “[present participles are referred to a time present with respect to the verbs connected with them, but future with respect to the command of God;](#)”<sup>2</sup> does not touch the present case, for ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, “who is in heaven,” is connected with no command of God. Hence his examples from Leviticus, “the offering person, for him shall be the right /569 shoulder;” and “the eating person shall wash his clothes,” are quite irrelevant.

§1179

Nor is his *third* remark more to the point; “[moreover we frequently find the present participle used in a past time even without reference to the time of the verb;](#)”<sup>3</sup> for we have already shewn, that with the participle in question there is no verb connected; it is merely added to describe “the Son of man;” the example he brings to support it therefore, τυφλὸς ὢν ἀρτι βλέπω “being blind, I now see,” differs wholly in construction from that in question, in which we have neither adverb nor verb added. In support of this remark, however, he insists (p. 318,) that “he being in heaven” is *not* precisely the same as “he who is in heaven.”<sup>4</sup> This we submit to the judgement of those acquainted with the force of English words. If the verb “is” generally affirms an act or a state of being at the time present when spoken, the participle “being” must do the same when used simply to characterize a person, as this is to characterize “the Son of man,” or it would cease to be the *present* participle. In rendering Lev. xiv. 47, “*the eating person*,” by “he that eateth,” our translators evinced that they understood both the original text and the idiom of the English language. As Bishop Middleton justly observes, “there is surely an adsignification of time in the *present* participle, and that the *present time* in respect of the act implied,” whether that be

§1180

<sup>1</sup> §416, quoting Middleton, *Doctrine*, 23, note. <sup>2</sup> §730. <sup>3</sup> §730. <sup>4</sup> §731.

present or future.

§1181 In the further hope of proving that this *present* participle means the *past*, and ought to be read, “the Son of man who *was* in heaven and now *is not* there,” our Author refers us (p. 320,) to John iii. 4, “How can a man be born when he is old,” literally, “being old?”<sup>1</sup> But may we read this, “*having been* old and now ceasing to be so?” Or John iii. 17, “that no man believing in him, should pe-/570rish,” may we read, “no man *having believed* in him and now *not* believing?” Or, does, “he not believing is condemned already,” mean, “he not *having believed* and now *believing*?” Or does Jn 5:3–5 John v. 3, “in these lay a multitude of impotent folk,” mean, “those *having been* impotent, and now *ceasing to be so*?” If these passages cannot be thus read, however, they are useless to our Author; for if Christ while he thus spoke to Nicodemus, had not *ceased* to be in heaven, his *Ubiquity* follows of course.

§1182 He also refers us (p. 321) to Campbell’s translation of the passage; “For none ascendeth into heaven but he who descended from heaven, the Son of man whose abode is in heaven.”<sup>2</sup> Neither this, however, nor our Author’s adding that “a person whose abode is London may have his temporary residence at Paris,” helps him at all. Though a *mere man* who has his temporary residence at Paris cannot be in his abode in London at the same moment; did Campbell mean to say that “he who upholdeth all things by the word of his power,” had *ceased to be* in heaven while he sojourned on earth? Nor will Parkhurst’s rendering John i. 18, ὁ ὢν, “who is or *was*,”<sup>3</sup> prove his point. Did Parkhurst intend to read “he who was in heaven and not is not;” for, “he being in heaven,” after declaring (in a passage quoted by our Author) that it was Christ who appeared *under* and *before* the Mosaic dispensation, and hence that he was “God Almighty before whom Abraham and Isaac walked?” But as already said, without this, he is useless to our Author, as any thing short of this, still leaves Christ *omnipresent*. Indeed to all his objections, his own rendering ὁ ὢν in Exod. iii. 14, “the being,”<sup>4</sup> is a complete reply, particularly as that passage is exactly similar to this, ὁ ὢν being there an adjunct to Jehovah, /571 as it is here to “the Son of man.” Would he render that passage, “I AM HE WHO WAS and not IS NOT?” His having already rendered ὁ ὢν “he being,” and thereby declared that the meaning of ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ is, “he being in heaven,” destroys all he has been attempting to establish in all these pages.

§1183 What he objects to Matt. xviii. 20, “where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them,” is singular indeed. It is, that this is to be understood in the sense of Luke xvi. 29, “They have Moses and the Prophets,” i. e. their writings,<sup>5</sup> which would render the passage thus, “where two or three are gathered together in my name, there *are my writings* in the midst of you.” This

<sup>1</sup> §732. <sup>2</sup> §733, quoting Campbell, *Gospels Vol. III*, 348. <sup>3</sup> §734. <sup>4</sup> §547. <sup>5</sup> §127.



rendering however refutes itself. No man would have been likely to say, “there are *my writings in the midst of you*” Of his own writings no wise man would speak thus, before he had ever written a page, as Jesus had not; and surely not he who spake “as never man spake.” We in our Reply had asked, “If there were only two such companies searching for the truth at the same moment, must not Jesus have been possessed of *ubiquity* to guide them both?”<sup>1</sup> To this our Author, again mentioning “Moses and the Prophets,” now replies; “After Elijah went up to heaven, 2 Kings ii. 11, and his spirit was seen resting on Elisha who remained on earth (15) does the circumstance of Elijah’s being in heaven and being with his servant Elisha on earth at the same time, prove the ubiquity of Elijah?”<sup>2</sup> And does he believe that Elijah’s spirit or soul was given to Elisha instead of his temper and disposition, and was afterwards seen resting on him? Does he believe that Elijah’s spirit or soul was in heaven and with his servant Elisha at the same moment? We hope then that he will no more complain of the /572 faith of “the orthodox sect.”—Further, has the Divine Spirit’s declaring that Jesus Christ “is the same yesterday, to-day and for ever,” no more to do with eternity, than David’s “keeping the law for ever and ever?”<sup>3</sup> Is not objection here drained to its very dregs? And is he ignorant why we asked him, “Where were the writings of Jesus at that time?”<sup>4</sup> Then to press him further on this subject, is quite needless.

2 K 2:9–15

[2. Jesus’ knowledge of God.] Our Second Position that Christ declares himself *equal to the Father* in *knowledge* and *incomprehensibility of nature*, was founded on Matt. xi. 27, “No man knoweth the Son, but the Father, neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son,” &c. And does Christ mean that the nature of the Father is no more incomprehensible than that of a common leaf or a visible star? And does our Author make the Son thus degrade his Father’s nature? Yet his chief objection (p. 327,) to this position is, that we *made no direct answer to that question!*<sup>5</sup> Further, does the “Scripture’s declaring positively that the nature of God is incomprehensible to *men*,”<sup>6</sup> prove that it is incomprehensible to *the Son*? Is not this begging the question in debate? And is any thing more done by his quoting the “Improved Version” (p. 320,) as saying, “it is impossible that Jesus can be speaking here of the person and nature of the Father; for this he did not and could not reveal, being essentially

§1184

Mt 11:27

<sup>1</sup> §420. <sup>2</sup> §738.

<sup>3</sup> §738: “My reply is, he has been the same in like manner as David has been, in ‘keeping the law continually for ever and ever.’ (Psalm cxix. 44.)”

<sup>4</sup> Rammohan’s answer on this was clear: “I said not a word of his writings in my Second Appeal. Why the Editor puts this question to me, I know not. It is, however, evident, that Jesus himself, while on earth, like other prophets of God, never omitted to express his doctrines and precepts, which have been handed down in writings up to this day”, §738.

<sup>5</sup> §739. <sup>6</sup> §739.

incomprehensible?”<sup>1</sup> If Christ did not mean “the person and nature of the Father,” when he said, “no man knoweth the Father but the Son,” what did he mean? Did he mean his Father’s *will*? But Moses, and David, and the Prophets revealed God’s will. Christ then ought to have said, “No man knoweth the Father but Moses, David, the Prophets, and the Son.” Further, as Christ while he declares himself equally incomprehensible in nature /573 with the Father, ascribes to the Father a knowledge of himself only equal to his own knowledge of the Father; should our Author insist that the Father knew not “the person and nature” of the Son, but only “the nature and extent of his commission,” in what an awful manner will he degrade the Father!

§1185 [3. Jesus forgives sins.] To the Third Position that “*Jesus exercised in an independent manner the power of forgiving sins,*”—our Author had objected, that “*Jesus was as much dependent on God in exercising this prerogative as the other prophets who came from God before him,*” because “*the multitudes glorified God who had given such power to men.*”<sup>2</sup> To this we replied, that this was only in the opinion of “the multitudes,” who “knew him not;” upon which our Author now insists, (p. 330.) that it is the Holy Spirit speaking by the Evangelist Matthew who says, that God “had given such power to *men.*”<sup>3</sup> But if he will examine the construction of the passage in Greek, he will see that the clause “who had given such power ‘to men,’” is not a separate proposition or fact added by the Divine penman, but the adjunct to “God,” describing the character under which the multitudes glorified him, which literally is, “they glorified God *giving such power to men.*” This therefore is still the idea of the multitude.—We do not recollect having ever said that “*the Apostles and primitive Christians possessed the power of pardoning sins through the influence of Jesus.*”<sup>4</sup> But had we, our meaning would have been, that they pardoned sins in Christ’s name. The Scribes were right in their question, “who can pardon sins but God only?” and they would have acted rightly in charging Christ with blasphemy for saying, “thy sins are forgiven thee,” had he not been God. But this forbearing to repel this charge, and his confounding them by two /574 further displays of his Deity, of his *omniscience* in answering the hidden thoughts of their hearts, and of his *omnipotence* in healing the paralytic without the least reference to the Father, proclaimed his Godhead in a manner they could neither gainsay nor resist.

§1186 His being exalted as Mediator in *human nature*, “to be a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance to Israel and the forgiveness of sins;”<sup>5</sup> only proves that *by nature* he has both these to give, the prerogative of God alone. That as God, he of his *own will* forgives every sin the Father forgives, and that the Father never forgives one sin but in accordance with the Son’s *will* and intercession, is fully testified in scripture, and agrees with his praying for his murderers, Luke xxiii. 34.<sup>6</sup> It is indeed the doctrine

<sup>1</sup> §739, quoting NTIV, *Ed. 5*, 23, note c.   <sup>2</sup> §130.   <sup>3</sup> §741.   <sup>4</sup> §742.   <sup>5</sup> §745.   <sup>6</sup> §746.



which pervades the whole of the New Testament.

[4. Jesus is almighty.] In attempting to impugn the Fourth Position, *that Almighty power is claimed by Christ in the most unequivocal manner*, our Author occupies nearly eight pages. Besides that this Position has been so fully confirmed by what we have already adduced, in attempting to impugn it our Author contradicts himself. He has already adduced Parkhurst as saying, “The proper Greek phrase for *equal to God*, is ἴσος τῷ Θεῷ;”<sup>1</sup> but in opposing this position he says respecting this very phrase, that *it would have been a correct translation of it had we rendered it “making himself equal with or like God.”*<sup>2</sup> In his further comment he uses “equality or likeness,” till he at length drops “equality” altogether; saying (p. 334,) “*Jesus declares that his likeness consisted in doing what he saw the Father do.*”<sup>3</sup> Is this examining a subject? Is it not degrading both his cause and himself?

§1187

Jn 5:18

He further asks (p. 335) respecting Christ’s declaration, “my Father worketh hitherto, and I work.” “*If the /575 Father and the Son be equally Almighty, why should the Son wait until the Father acts and then imitate him?*” adding, “*if a subordinate officer having been accused of equalizing himself with his superior, thus declares, ‘I cannot march a single step myself, but where I see him march, there I do march,’ would this be considered as an avowal of his equality with his superior?*”<sup>4</sup> This is quite foreign to the question in debate, which wholly regards an *equality of nature* between the Son and the Father; for as to that of *authority*, we have often said that the Son was then acting as his Father’s mediatorial *servant in human nature*. And this *equality of nature*, even his simile serves to establish. What subordinate officer is there who is not of *precisely the same nature* with is superior officer, though for a time under his command? Our question therefore, “*How could the Son do whatsoever the Father doeth, where he not equally infinite in power and wisdom, in truth and mercy?*”<sup>5</sup> still remains unanswered. And is there any ground for our Author’s assertion that *by his Father’s shewing* him all things that he doeth, *the Son is enabled to do what he seeth the Father do?*<sup>6</sup> Could he do the works of Almighty power when he saw them, unless he were Almighty himself? Did “the Lord’s *revealing* his secret unto his servants the prophets,” enable Amos and Hosea to bring destruction upon Israel and root them up out of their own land? Does God’s *shewing* those who fear him *his covenant*, Psalm xxv. 14, enable them also to act with Almighty power and grace?

§1188

Jn 5:17f.

Am 3:7

Ps 25:14

Our Author’s asserting (p. 336) that “*the Son’s power ‘to quicken whom he will,’ is derived entirely from the commission given him by the Father to judge all men,*”<sup>7</sup>

§1189

<sup>1</sup> §658: “The proper Greek phrase for equal to God is ἴσον [sic!] τῷ Θεῷ”, quoting Parkhurst, *Greek*, Art. “ἴσος”, 266.

<sup>2</sup> §747. <sup>3</sup> §747. <sup>4</sup> §748. <sup>5</sup> §426. <sup>6</sup> §748. <sup>7</sup> §749.

is wholly gratuitous. We have already shewn that no wise man ever gives another a commission to perform /576 what he is BY NATURE *incapable of doing*; and so far is the Father from thus imparting Almighty power to the Son by this commission to judge men, that Christ himself declares, “the Father hath committed all judgement to him, THAT ALL MEN MIGHT HONOR the Son EVEN AS *they honor the Father*,” which, we have already seen, is, as possessing *by nature*, omniscience, omnipotence, wisdom, and rectitude. Further, had the Father either done the work for him, or lent him these perfections which he does not possess *by nature*, that men might thus honor him, this would have been an act of deception practised on the whole creation.

Jn 5:23

§1190

His asserting (p. 337) that the work of judging the world “does not belong by nature to the Father and the Son, because the Apostles are invested with the power of judging the twelve tribes of Israel, and righteous men with that of judging the world,”<sup>1</sup> is no less gratuitous. Do these judge the world of themselves alone? Do they any thing more than examine and approve God’s righteous sentence?—Of the same nature is his objecting that to “honor God” is not “to adore him.”<sup>2</sup> Does the Supreme Jehovah, the Creator of all things, permit himself to be honored in any other way than as he really is? Would not all honor short of this, be an insult?—And his adding that “even as” in Matt. xx. 14, “I will give unto this last ‘even as’ unto thee,” will not prove the Son’s honor to be equal to the Father’s, “because the same sum may be given in different kinds of currency;”<sup>3</sup> shews that objection has now exhausted itself. Even this is cut off by the passage in question; which says “he gave to every man a penny,” (δηναριον.) His adducing certain passages in which “as” occurs, against the rendering of “even as,”<sup>4</sup> is quite irrelevant to the question. Had he examined these, he would have found that in /577 all of them, the Greek word rendered “as” differs as much from καθως, as the term “as” differs in English from “even as.”—If it seem “very extraordinary to our Author that he who declares himself the Searcher of hearts, the Almighty, took upon him the form of a servant for the suffering of death,”<sup>5</sup> this is nothing against its truth. It appeared equally extraordinary to those Greeks formerly, who, seeking after wisdom, deemed the cross of Christ *foolishness*.—Surely it could not be necessary that Christ should *rescind* the decrees and appointments once made by his Almighty Father and himself, in order to prove that he himself is Almighty.

Mt 20:14

1 Co 1:23f.

§1191

[5. Jesus is omniscient judge.] To our Fifth Position that *Christ’s having all judgement committed to him, proves his Omniscience*, our Author now merely replies; “I have only to say that the arguments adduced by the Editor having been previously noticed, it is therefore left to my readers to examine them and to come to a determination whether they prove the Omniscience of the Son or not.”<sup>6</sup> Against the position that

<sup>1</sup> §750. <sup>2</sup> §751. <sup>3</sup> §751. <sup>4</sup> §751. <sup>5</sup> §752. <sup>6</sup> §756.

omniscience is essential to the act of judging mankind, he (p. 342) brings his previous objections in pages 136 and 191, that the Son’s knowledge of the events of the world extends no further than to the office of judging mankind;—that others are declared to be vested with the power of judging the world—and that the Son denies his omniscience in Mark xiii. 32; all of which have been so fully met already, that to enter on them again would be a waste of the reader’s time. We had said in our Reply, “the Father’s giving the Son to have life in himself, refers to his being Mediator in Human nature; for that his Divine Nature is the fountain of life we have the fullest proof from John i. 4, ‘in him was life;’ ch. xi. 25, ‘I am the resurrection and the life;’ and 1 John v. 20, ‘This is the eternal life.’”<sup>1</sup> /578 These passages our Author does not attempt to answer; but merely says, “it settles the question at once that whenever and in whatever capacity Jesus is declared to have had life, he had it as a gift of the Father,”<sup>2</sup> the very thing that these proofs destroy which he so carefully avoids.

Jn 5:26

Jn 1:4; 11:25

1 Jn 5:20

[6. Jesus accepts worship.] To our Sixth Position, that “*Jesus accepted worship due to God alone*,” our Author in reality objects nothing. We had said in our reply; “Granting that worship in English and προσκυνειν in Greek, sometimes denote civil respect, still the position is not touched in the least degree. Whether the blind men, the lepers, the mariners, and others, knew what they did in worshipping Jesus, is not so much the question, as whether *Jesus knew*; for if he suffered them even through ignorance to yield him Divine worship, when Peter did not suffer it in Cornelius for a moment, unless he were God he must have had less discernment, or less piety and concern for the Divine honor than his own disciple.”<sup>3</sup> What our Author brings against this (p. 344,) only sinks his cause. It is, that “Peter’s rejection of the worship offered by Cornelius may be easily accounted for, since, as Jesus was endued with the power of knowing things connected with his divine commission, so Peter had the knowledge of secret events concerning his apostolic duty. From the language of the blind man and others, and from his knowledge of their thoughts, the Saviour like other ancient prophets, gave a tacit consent to the worship or more properly civil reverence offered by them, while Peter rejected the worship offered him by Cornelius knowing that he meant it as an external mark of religious reverence which was due to God alone, as is evident from the language of Peter.”<sup>4</sup> We here ask him, whence does he learn that Peter had the /579 knowledge of secret events concerning his apostolic duty? On this scripture is silent. Who told him that the blind man did not mean to yield the same religious reverence by the same action as Cornelius? Not the Divine penmen; for they in both cases use precisely the same word. Further, how came Peter to discern that Cornelius meant this as an act of religious reverence, and Jesus not to discern this when the mariners, the blind men, and others, offered it to him after having seen

§1192

Ac 10:25f.

<sup>1</sup> §429. <sup>2</sup> §756. <sup>3</sup> §430. <sup>4</sup> §758.

him do works which belong to God alone? This is advancing Peter even *above* his Lord, as “a searcher of hearts!”<sup>1</sup> And is it on proofs like these that our Author has built his cause?

§1193 His assertion relative to Stephen is of precisely the same stamp. We had asked in our Reply, “Was Stephen ignorant of Christ’s Deity when he committed to him his departing soul in language similar to that in which Christ committed his to the Father?”<sup>2</sup> To this he replies; “Stephen’s exclamation, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit, was merely an application to Jesus in preference to the Angels of death whom he expected to receive his soul and convey it to the bosom of the Divinity.”<sup>3</sup> And does he build his cause on the notion of the Angels of death entertained by the Jews in common with other Eastern nations? Does Solomon affirm the existence of these “Angels of death” in Prov. xvi. 14, “the wrath of a king is as messengers of death?” Do the other Divine penmen ever mention them? And is this all that he has to offer against a Scripture fact which so deeply affects his cause?

§1194 We had observed in our Reply, that “in the state of humiliation in which Christ’s love for sinners had placed him, he should pray to himself or formally prescribe this to his disciples, was scarcely to be expected. To glorify him was the proper work of the Holy Spirit, respecting whom Jesus had declared that he should lead them into all truth. But he immediately led them to deem Christ, ‘God their Saviour,’ ‘God blessed for ever;’ ‘the only wise God,’—to pray to him, to trust in him, and seek from him grace and peace, and all those blessings which God alone can bestow. If therefore Christ be not God equal with the Father, the Holy Spirit, instead of leading them into *all truth*, led them into the most complete system of falsehood and idolatry the world had ever beheld.”<sup>4</sup> Our Author attempts to elude this by saying, that “if Jesus offered up prayers to God the Father in his human capacity, is it not incumbent on us also in following his pattern to thank, pray to, and worship the Father alone?”<sup>5</sup> Is this coming to the subject in hand? Are we perfectly sinless as was Christ? Has he forgotten Christ’s declaration; “No man cometh to the Father but *by me*?” Further, did we ever attribute Christ’s devotion while on earth wholly to his *human nature*? Did we ever say that while his human nature *loved* the Father, his Divine nature *hated* him?

§1195 We had asked in our Reply, “Were those who ‘first trusted in Christ’ and those who ‘in every place called on his name,’ ignorant of Christ’s Deity? Were Paul, and Peter, and John, when they sought grace and peace for the churches from Christ equally as from the Father? Was the Father himself when he addressed the Son as God ever

<sup>1</sup> That the apostles and prophets could read people’s hearts is one of Rammohan’s important points, see §609.

<sup>2</sup> §430. <sup>3</sup> §760. <sup>4</sup> §431. <sup>5</sup> §761.

THE SAME, and said, ‘let all the angels of God worship him?’ If this were not the case, ignorant as might be the lepers and others, Christ is God infinitely worthy of worship,—or the apostles, the primitive saints, and the angels in heaven were guilty of idolatry; and with reverence be it spoken, its grand encourager was the Eternal Father, who will not give his glory to /581 another.”<sup>1</sup> This does our Author attempt to refute? He merely quotes Christ’s answer to Satan. “Him only shalt thou *serve*,”

Mt 4:10; Dt 6:13

and refers to Deut. vi. “Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God,” not reflecting, that in the original, that passage stands, “Jehovah thy Elohim” in the plural number, which can in no way *exclude* the Son and the Holy Spirit, while so many passages attest that the Son is also Jehovah.

His asserting (p. 347) that the apostles avoided using the word λατρευω “to serve” respecting Christ, that they *might not* honor him even as they honored the Father,<sup>2</sup> is wholly gratuitous. If they did, they directly disobeyed their Lord. But the fact is, that λατρευω is not the word generally used for worship in the New Testament. It occurs far more in describing the tabernacle service, which was then abrogated; and is indeed used by the Divine penmen to denote the service yielded to idols. It thus occurs Acts vii. 42, “Then God turned and gave them up to *worship* the host of heaven;” and Rom. i. 25, “who *served* the creature more than the Creator.” When Christ was with Israel in the wilderness however, and was served in a visible tabernacle, it was then often applied to his service. It is thus used by St. Paul, Heb. viii. 5, “who *serve* unto the example and shadow of heavenly things;” and Heb. x. 2, “because the worshippers (*servers*) once purged should have had no conscience of sins.” But in Heb. xiii. 10, “we have an *altar* whereof they have no right to eat who *serve* tabernacles,” the Apostle, instead of supporting our Author’s idea, shews us that Christ’s spiritual service was so far above that which was then yielded in the temple, and which he expressed by λατρευω, that the latter must be forsaken to obtain the privilege of uniting in the former.

§1196

Ac 7:42

Rm 1:25

Heb 8:5

Heb 10:2

Heb 13:10

[7. The trinitarian formula.] The objections brought by our Author against the Se-/582venth and last Position, that *Christ has associated his own name with that of the Father in the rite of Baptism intended to remain in force till the end of time*, in reality amount to nothing. We had said in our Reply, that “Christ’s prescribing this rite himself, and his declaring, ‘Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world,’ fully prove that he deemed himself equal to the Father; and that if, being a creature, Christ left this baptismal formulary ambiguous even for want of thought, never was there so fatal an ambiguity, for it involves the ruin to the end of time of the sincerest of mankind, who, if Christ be a mere creature, must have renounced the worship of those ‘by nature no gods,’ for that of one also *by nature no God*;—and that if he left

§1197

Mt 28:16–20

<sup>1</sup> §430. <sup>2</sup> §763.

this ambiguous with a perfect knowledge of all circumstances, in thus associating his name with that of the Father, the meek and lowly Jesus, in whom dwells all truth, if a mere creature, has exhibited an instance of falsehood, arrogance, and blasphemy unparalleled in the history of men.”<sup>1</sup> From this our Author retires, leaving it unanswered, and merely complaining that we keep his arguments out of view! What, by advancing facts from which he thus retires! And did he expect an answer to his asserting, (p. 349) that “men should be baptized in the name of that *influence* by which spiritual blessings are conveyed to mankind?” Or that “*Fire-worshippers* might refer to Matt. iii. ‘he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire,’ and contend, that if being baptized in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, prove their divinity, it is clear that Fire being associated with the Holy Ghost in the same rite, might likewise be considered a part of the Godhead.”<sup>2</sup> Do not such assertions degrade the cause which needs them? /683

§1198 We had said in our Reply, that “the Angel who redeemed Jacob from all evil, the God before Abraham and Isaac walked, the Angel who rebuked the people at Bochim after having brought them out of Egypt into the land he had sworn to give their fathers, Jehovah, who instituted circumcision and whom the patriarchs and prophets solemnly chose for their God, was the Being who in baptism associated his own name with that of the Father and the Holy Ghost.”<sup>3</sup> What is his answer to this? He merely replies (p. 350) that we according to our usual mode of reasoning repeat again in our reply what we think the purport of Heb. i. 10, and Rev. iv. 29, (passages we do not even mention there,) and have recourse again to the angel of Bochim &c. “which” adds he, “having no relation to the subject in question, and having been often examined in the preceding pages, I shall pass by here.”<sup>4</sup> Can the reader misunderstand this?

§1199 And does our Author think that the expression, 2. Chron. xx. 20, “Believe in the Lord your God, so shall ye be established; believe his prophets, so shall ye prosper,” represents the prophets as equal with God, as really as the Father and the Son are represented as equal in the Baptismal command?<sup>5</sup> Is it even said in this passage, “believe IN his prophets,” as it is, “believe *in* the Lord your God?” Yet the language of Christ, John xiv. is, “Ye believe IN God, believe *also* IN me.”

§1200 In our Reply we had further observed; “Never was there a more humble begging of the question than the assertion that the ‘Son’ ought to be understood and admitted by every one as expressing the created nature of Christ.”<sup>6</sup> To this our Author now replies, (p. 352,) “Common sense tells us that a Son or a servant must /584 be acknowledged to be inferior to his Father or Master.”<sup>7</sup> If this were so among men, would it weigh a moment against the mass of evidence already adduced respecting

<sup>1</sup> §432. <sup>2</sup> §764. <sup>3</sup> §433. <sup>4</sup> §764. <sup>5</sup> §764. <sup>6</sup> §434. <sup>7</sup> §765.



Christ's Deity? But *does* common senses tell us that a Son is inferior *in nature* to his Father? Does it not tell us *precisely the reverse*? And are God's metaphorical, but mortal sons, Solomon, David, and Adam, any thing to the ONLY begotten Son of God? Does the Father's being greater in *authority* than the Son, affect his being equal *in nature* to the Father? In reply to our query, "Can he even prove that among men a Son must be inferior in nature to his Father?"<sup>1</sup> he is constrained to allow, that "among men a Son is of *the same nature* with his Father;" what then avails his adding, (p. 353,) "that when creation is not effected in the ordinary course of nature, there need not to be, and is not an identity of nature between one who is called Father and another called Son?"<sup>2</sup> Has he yet proved that the Son is a *created* Being?

His concluding remark on Christ's declaration, "Io, I am with you always, even to the end of the world," discovers such inattention to Scripture as we were scarcely prepared to expect. It is, that the last clause, "always even unto the end of the world,' so far from evincing Christ's eternal existence, implies that his influence over his disciples extends only to the end of the world when he shall himself be subject to the Father of the universe."<sup>3</sup> Has he then forgotten the Father's declaration respecting the Son after the heavens are folded up as a garment? "THOU REMAINEST. THOU ART THE SAME;" that Paul declares, "Then shall we ever be *with the Lord*," and John, that the LAMB is the Light of the Heavenly Jerusalem EQUALLY with the Father, and that "a pure river of the water of life proceedeth equally from the /585 Throne of God and the LAMB," when the heavens are no more?

§1201

Heb 1:10-12; 1  
Th 4:17; Rv  
21:22f.

Rv 22:1

We have now examined our Author's objections to these Seven Positions adduced from the gospels, proving the Deity of Christ, namely that he declared himself *omnipresent*,—that in *knowledge* and *inscrutability of nature* he declared himself equal to the Father,—that he exercised in an independent manner *the power of forgiving sins*, a power peculiar to God alone,—that he claimed *omnipotence* in the most unequivocal manner,—that his having all judgement committed to him, demonstrates his *omniscience*,—that he *accepted worship due to God alone*,—and that he united his own name with that of the Father in baptism, by which those who forsake sin devote themselves to God to the end of time. And we now submit it to our readers, whether, after having failed to invalidate even one of the two hundred testimonies to the Deity of Christ before adduced, he has subverted any one of these seven positions; and indeed, whether his attempting it, has not issued in their fuller illustration.

§1202

[Other Subjects and Conclusion]

As we propose, at some future period, to make the Personality of the Holy Spirit the subject of a separate article, a few remarks on our Author's concluding pages

§1203

<sup>1</sup> §434. <sup>2</sup> §766. <sup>3</sup> §767.

shall finish this Review.<sup>1</sup>

§1204 To prevent Zech. xii. 10, “they shall look upon *me* whom they have pierced,” from being understood of Christ, our Author affirms, (p. 364,) that the passage should indisputably be thus read in consistence with its context, “**And they shall look towards me for (or on account of) him whom they have pierced,**”<sup>2</sup> to effect which he renders the Hebrew particule **אֵת** *eth*, “*for or on account of*.” Respecting this particule we said in our Reply that it is found **almost times without number prefixed to the accusative case, nearly seventy, thus /586 prefixed to *asher* “whom or which,” as in this passage, and about twenty-six times in the sense of “with.”**<sup>3</sup> This our Author does not attempt to disprove; and the only passage he quotes as rendering this particule “*for*” or “on account of,” is Deut. vii. 8, rendered by our translators, “because the Lord loved you,” which he renders “on account of the love of God *for* you.”<sup>4</sup> In this however, the Seventy do not support him, for they render the passage “because of the Lord’s *loving you*,” *παρα το αγαπαν υμας*, rendering the pronoun preceded by the particule *eth*, in the accusative, like our English translators.

§1205 On Zech. xiii. 7, “Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, against the man who is my fellow saith Jehovah,” we quoted Parkhurst to shew that the Hebrew word **עִמִּית** *gnmith*, means “a neighbour, a member of the same society.”<sup>5</sup> Respecting this our Author asks, (p. 368,) “**Is not this quotation, defining the Hebrew word *gnmith* as a neighbour, directly against the object of the Editor?**”<sup>6</sup> We think not. Can we desire a more perfect expression of *equality* between the Father and the Son, than the Father’s describing the Son by a word expressing “a neighbour, a member of the same society?”

§1206 His objections (p. 36<sup>7</sup>,) to the received rendering of Rom. ix. 5, “who is over all, God blessed for ever,” are weak in the extreme. The first is, that Locke renders it otherwise.<sup>8</sup> But even Locke, in saying, “of them as to his *fleshly extraction* Christ is come,”<sup>9</sup> admits the Divine Nature of Christ; and although he makes the last clause a separate sentence, “God be blessed for ever,” not a syllable is given in support of the alteration! Much therefore as we esteem Locke, until we are certain that he was divinely inspired, we dare not alter the Sacred Text on his mere *ipse dixit*. His se-/587cond objection, that “**it was customary with Jewish writers to address abrupt exclamations to God while treating of some other subjects,**”<sup>10</sup> if applied to the Divine writers is perfectly gratuitous. Is the last verse of Palm lxxxix. “Blessed be the Lord for evermore,” any prove of this? It is the conclusion of a psalm of praise. Is the last clause of Psalm civ. “Bless the Lord, O my soul?” It is the conclusion of another,

<sup>1</sup> Rammohan had dealt with the Holy Spirit in §§768-773. A separate article by Marshman, as he promises here, never appeared.

<sup>2</sup> §776. <sup>3</sup> §343. <sup>4</sup> §777. <sup>5</sup> §345. <sup>6</sup> §779. <sup>7</sup> Read: “369”. <sup>8</sup> §780.

<sup>9</sup> §780, quoting Locke, *Works III, Romans*, 310. <sup>10</sup> §780.



which begins almost in the same words. But is this verse in Rom. ix. the conclusion of a psalm of praise? Is the chapter itself a psalm of praise?

If as our Author asserts (p. 370,) “Paul declares positively that the Father is the only Being who has the right to the epithet God under the Christian dispensation,”<sup>1</sup> how is it that he says, Titus i. 3, “according to the commandment of God our Saviour;” and ch. ii. 10, “the doctrine of God our Saviour?” as we have already mentioned. §1207  
Tt 1:3; 2:10

The rule our Author (p. 271) quotes from Bishop Middleton, that “when two or more attributes joined by a copulative or copulatives, are affirmed of the same person or thing, before the first attributive the article is inserted, before the remaining ones it is omitted,”<sup>2</sup> is a perfectly just one. It was previously laid down by Granville Sharp, who added, that in this case the conjunction καὶ “and” ought to be read “even.”<sup>3</sup> The Bishop’s rule however, confirms various testimonies to the Deity of Christ. The first is 1 Tim. v. 21, “I charge thee before God *even* the Lord Jesus Christ;”<sup>4</sup> in which the article placed before “God” and omitted before “the Lord Jesus Christ,” proves that “God” and “the Lord Jesus Christ” describe the same person. The second is, Titus ii. 13, “Looking for the glorious appearing of the Great God *even* our Lord Jesus Christ.”<sup>5</sup> Here /588 the article placed in precisely the same manner, shews that the same person is meant by both attributives. The third is Jude ver. 4, “Denying the only Lord God *even* our Lord Jesus Christ;”<sup>6</sup> in which the construction is precisely the same. §1208  
1 Tm 5:21  
Tt 2:13  
Jude 4

We greatly doubt whether this rule will, however, enable our Author to prove that 1 John v. 20, “this is the true God and eternal life,” the first attributive “the true God” refers to the Father, and the last “the eternal life,” belongs to Jesus Christ. The pronoun οὗτος “this” forbids our understanding more than one person mentioned here. Had the passage been “*these* (οὗτοι) are the true God and eternal life,” we might with our Author have understood, “the true God” as referring to the Father, and “eternal life,” to the Son, although this would have been quite an unusual construction. But now were we to supply the ellipsis, and to read the passage, “this is the true God, and (*this is*) eternal life,” for doing which we have no warrant, still both would refer to Jesus Christ. Nay were we to supply the ellipsis thus; “*This* is the true God and (*that is*) eternal life;” as “*this*” refers to the nearest antecedent, which is Jesus Christ, “the true God” would unavoidably refer to Jesus Christ, and thus completely frustrate our §1209  
1 Jn 5:20

<sup>1</sup> §781. <sup>2</sup> §782, quoting Middleton, *Doctrine*, 44.

<sup>3</sup> This is the so called “Sharp’s Rule”, after Granville Sharp’s (1735-1813) *Remarks on the Definite Article*, see Wallace, *Semantic Range*, 62.

<sup>4</sup> KJV: “I charge *thee* before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels”.

<sup>5</sup> KJV: “appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ”.

<sup>6</sup> KJV: “denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.”

Author’s design. The rule applied to this passage therefore, only adds another to the testimonies adduced already that Jesus Christ is, “the true God.”

§1210 In asserting (p. 371) that “finding the practice of the primitive Christians during the three first centuries unfavorable to our sentiments, we prudently keep it out of view altogether,”<sup>1</sup> our Author has, we hope through mistake, completely misrepresented us. It is well known that we, above all other bodies of Christians, refuse to lay stress on any thing as authority for doctrine or practice, beside the Sacred Scriptures. The next generation after the Apostles, might be right, or they might be wrong; but they were not like the Apostles under the infallible guidance of the Holy Spirit, of which we need no farther proof than that furnished by the Epistle to the Corinthians written by Clemens of Rome, supposed by some to be the Clemens mentioned by St. Paul, which epistle, among many good things, contains a story respecting the Phoenix, of which a child would now be ashamed. Of the opinions held by Socinus and our Author respecting Christ indeed, nothing appeared in these centuries, except among those who, detected as “the Antichrists” he mentions, were “excluded from the fellowship of true Christians.”<sup>2</sup> While even in John’s days however, there were “many antichrists gone out into the world,” the mystery of iniquity had already begun to work *in* the church, in which it remained until “the man of sin,” who “as God sat in the temple of God,” was fully revealed by the development of Popery in succeeding centuries. Below the Apostles therefore, we dare not go a single step either for doctrine or practice, unless as supported by the Apostolic writings.

1 Jn 2:18

2 Th 2:3f.

§1211 But respecting the Deity of Christ, we *know* that “the opinions of the first three centuries” were not “unfavourable to our sentiments.” If they were, why did Pliny at the end of the *first* century describe the Christians as singing hymns of praise to Christ as to God? Whence the Apostles’ Creed and other formularies so generally used in the three first centuries, and which so fully express the doctrine of the Trinity? Whence the Three Hundred Bishops the growth of the *third* century at the Counsel of Nice, who condemned the Arian system? Has any one ever contradicted /590 the following testimony respecting the Christians of the three first centuries, given by Du Pin above a hundred years ago? “They acknowledged the Trinity of the Three Persons in one only God, the Divinity and Eternity of the Word, and of the Holy Ghost.”<sup>3</sup>

§1212 Does our Author mean to say that when Mosheim describes the primitive Christians as making “a solemn profession of confidence in Christ” in baptism,<sup>4</sup> he meant

<sup>1</sup> §783.    <sup>2</sup> §783.

<sup>3</sup> Du Pin, *New History*, 179. Du Pin writes about “the Doctrine of the Church, as it is delivered by the Authors of the Three first Centuries”, stating that it “was always the same”, Du Pin, *New History*, 179.

<sup>4</sup> §784.

that *they did not* confide in him for redemption through his blood even the forgiveness of sins? If this be Mosheim's meaning, he either misrepresents them, or they had already forsaken the apostles' doctrine. Does our Author mean to say that himself and other Unitarians, by professing "solemn confidence in Christ," trust in him for the forgiveness of sins through his blood? If he does, why this work against his Deity and Atonement? If he does not, what is "solemn confidence in Christ" without this trust?

Respecting Locke, and Newton, and all others, we have already said, "[their opinions in divinity are nothing to us](#),"<sup>1</sup> since they must derive all their value from their agreement with the Scriptures. Locke, our Author has already declared an enemy to Christ's Deity. He does not venture to say the same of Newton; and indeed after a writer so accurate and "circumspect," has declared that "Christians of all ages are represented as *worshipping* God and the *Lamb*," such an attempt would be vain. Our Author's adding that the worship of the Lamb in heaven is "[a manifestation of civil reverence](#)"<sup>2</sup> is wholly gratuitous. He might as well have said, that the worship of the Father in heaven is merely "civil reverence," for it is expressed in precisely the same language. While the Scriptures declare the work of *creation* to be Christ's also, our Author's placing *redemption* /591 by the *death of Christ* below the work of *creation*,<sup>3</sup> directly contradicts them. The God of truth, speaking of the effects of *redemption*, Isaiah lxx. 17, saith, "Behold I create new heavens, and a new earth; and the former *shall not be remembered nor come into mind*." Is 65:17

In our Reply we had declared that "[as to those modes of defending the doctrine of the Trinity with which he so amuses himself, we leave them with their respective authors; we need them not](#)."<sup>4</sup> His asserting from hence that we have [avowedly relinquished reason in support of the Trinity](#)<sup>5</sup>, is quite gratuitous. Respecting every doctrine of Scripture, as already said, our rule is, "to the law and the testimony; if they speak not according to this, it is because there is no light in them." But that in examining the Scriptures, we have not employed both reason and common sense, we leave him to prove if he be able. His wish that we would "[point out a single scriptural authority treating of God of Three Persons and of a Messiah one of those three, possessing a two-fold nature, Divine and Human](#),"<sup>6</sup> he will find fully gratified on ex- Is 8:20

<sup>1</sup> §439. <sup>2</sup> §786.

<sup>3</sup> Rammohan, in §786, quoted Newton, *Observations, Observations*, 455: "God for his benefaction in *creating all things*, and the Lamb for his benefaction in *redeeming* with his blood; God as sitting upon the throne and living *for ever*, and the Lamb exalted above all *by the merits of his death*."

<sup>4</sup> §440. <sup>5</sup> §788.

<sup>6</sup> §788. Marshman corrects Rammohan's expressions. The original text: "a single scriptural authority, treating of a *compound* God in three persons, and of a *compound* Messiah, one of these three persons, *constituted* of a two-fold nature, divine and human." (Italics not in the original.)

amining these pages. And should he prove that these testimonies are not sufficient, we will gratify him with more. The subject is by no means exhausted. From our desire to follow him in his mode of treating it, the New Testament, its chief repository, has as yet been little more than touched.

§1215 Our Author's last assertion (p. 377) discovers an inattention to the Scriptures  
1 Jn 4:2f. which fills us with surprize. He mistakes the *literal* meaning of 1 John iv. 3, "every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God, and this is that spirit of antichrist," in saying, "We accordingly rejoice to confess that Jesus Christ who came in the flesh, is of God."<sup>1</sup> John means to say, "Every spirit is not of God which con-/592fesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh." The confession which shews a person not to be of antichrist, is not, that Jesus Christ, come in the flesh, is of God, but that Jesus Christ is actually *come in the flesh*; and to that spirit of antichrist which *denies this*, pertains the phrase, "is not of God." How he could thus mistake the plain meaning of the words, we can scarcely conceive.

§1216 But we fear that his system has a deeper interest in this declaration than he imagines. That "Jesus Christ is *come in the flesh*" indicates so plainly that the venerable Evangelist or the Holy Spirit speaking by him, had his eye on his Divine Nature, which Christ declares he had "before the world was," and respecting which he so solemnly testified to the Jews, "Before Abraham was, I AM," that had he heard our Author deny the very existence of Christ's Divine Nature, we fear he would have ranked his opinion among those proceeding from "that spirit of antichrist which should come into the world." May our Author duly weigh these things, before they be for ever hid from his eyes.

Jn 17:5  
Jn 8:58f.

---

<sup>1</sup> §789.

# Bibliography

The Friend of India. Monthly Series. Vol. III, Serampore 1820.

The Friend of India. Monthly Series. Vol. IV, Serampore 1821 (cited: FI MS 1821).

The Friend of India. Quarterly Series. Vol. I, Serampore 1821.

The Friend of India. Quarterly Series. Vol. III, Serampore 1825 (cited: FI QS 1825).

**Baptist Missionary Society**, editor, Periodical Accounts relative to the Baptist Missionary Society, No. XXXII. November 1815 to June 1816, Vol. VI, Bristol 1817.

**Belsham, Thomas**, A Calm Inquiry into the Scripture Doctrine Concerning the Person of Christ, London <sup>2</sup>1817.

**Belsham, Thomas** et al., editors, The New Testament, in an Improved Version, upon the basis of Archbishop Newcome's New Translation: with a corrected text, and notes critical and explanatory, London <sup>5</sup>1819 (cited: NTIV, Ed. 5).

**Bovon, François**, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50), EKK III/I, Zürich-Neukirchen-Vluyn 1989.

**Brown, John**, The Self-Interpreting Bible, Containing the Old and New Testaments; to Which Are Annexed an Extensive Introduction; Marginal References and Illustrations; an Exact Summary of the Several Books; a Paraphrase on the Most Obscure or Important Parts; an Analysis of the Contents of Each Chapter, Explanatory Notes, Evangelical Reflections, etc. etc. [1778], Edinburgh 1831.

**Burnet, Gilbert**, Some Passages of the Life and Death of the Right Honourable John Earl of Rochester, Who Died the 26th of July, 1680, London 1680.

**Campbell, George**, The Four Gospels, Translated from the Greek. With Preliminary Dissertations, and Notes Critical and Explanatory, Vol. IV, Boston 1811.

**Campbell, George**, The Four Gospels, Translated from the Greek. With Preliminary Dissertations, and Notes Critical and Explanatory, Vol. III, Boston 1811.

**Carpenter, Lant**, Unitarianism the Doctrine of the Gospel. A View of the Scriptural Grounds of Unitarianism, London <sup>2</sup>1811.

**Church of England**, editor, Common Worship. Services and Prayers for the Church of England, London 2000.

**Collet, Sophia Dobson; Biswas, Dilip Kumar and Ganguli, Prabhat Chandra**, editors, The Life and Letters of Raja Rammohun Roy, Kalkutta 1962.

**Cruden, Alexander and Jones, Alfred**, Cruden's Complete Concordance to the Old and New Testament, London o. J.

**du Pin, Louis Ellies**, A New History of Ecclesiastical Writers. Containing an Account of the several Books of the Old and New Testament; of the Lives and Writings of the Primitive Fathers, Vol. I, London <sup>2</sup>1693.

**Edwards, Jonathan**, History of Redemption, on a Plan Entirely Original, London <sup>2</sup>1791.

**Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland**, editor, Die Bibel. Nach Martin Luthers Übersetzung. Revidiert 2017. Mit Apokryphen, Stuttgart 2017.

**Gill, John**, Exposition of the Old and New Testament, Kindle edition, Washington 2012.

**Griesbach, Johann Jacob**, editor, Novum Testamentum Graece. Textum ad Fidem Codicum, Versionum et Patrum Recensuit et Lectionis Varietatem, Vol. II. Acta es Epistolas Apostolorum cum Apocalypsi, London <sup>2</sup>1818.

**Jacob, Benno**, Das erste Buch der Tora. Genesis, Berlin 1934.

**Jacob, Benno; Mayer, Shlomo**, editor, Das Buch Exodus, Stuttgart 1997.

**Jones of Nayland, William**, The Catholic Doctrine of a Trinity Proved by Above an Hundred Short and Clear Arguments, Expressed in the Terms of the Holy Scripture, Compared After a Manner Entirely New, etc. with a Few Reflections, Occasionally Interspersed Upon Some of the Arian Writers, Particularly Dr. S. Clarke: to Which is Added, a Letter to the Common People, in Answer to Some Popular Arguments Against the Trinity [1767], London <sup>8</sup>1812.

**Joseph, Barnet and Justins**, editors, The form of daily prayers. According to the custom of the German and Polish Jews, as read in their synagogues, and used in their families, London 1808.

**Locke, John; Churchill, John**, editor, *The Works of John Locke, Esq.* Vol. III, London 1714.

**Locke, John; Churchill, Awnsham**, editor, *The Works of John Locke, Esq.* Vol. II, London <sup>2</sup>1722.

**Lowth, Robert**, *Isaiah. A New Translation; with a Preliminary Dissertation, and Notes, Critical, Philological, and Explanatory*, Perth <sup>3</sup>1793.

**Luz, Ulrich**, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 1-7)*, EKK I/1, Zürich-Neukirchen-Vluyn <sup>5</sup>2002 (cited: Mt Bd. 1).

**Macchi, Jean-Daniel**, Haggai, in: **Römer, Thomas, Macchi, Jean-Daniel** and **Nihan, Christophe**, editors, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, Zürich 2013, 503–507.

**Macknight, James**, *A New Literal Translation From the Original Greek, of All the Apostolical Epistles. With a Commentary, and Notes, Philological, Critical, Explanatory, and Practical. To Which Is Added, a History of the Life of the Apostle Paul*, Vol. III, London <sup>2</sup>1806.

**Majumdar, Jatindra Kumar**, editor, *Raja Rammohun Roy and Progressive Movements in India*, Kalkutta 1898.

**Marshman, Joshua**, *Defence of the deity and atonement of Jesus Christ in reply to Ram-Mohan Roy of Calcutta*, London 1822.

**Marshman, Joshua**, *Reply to Rammohun Roy on The Atonement of Christ*; originally published in *The "Friend of India"*, Serampore 1823.

**Michaelis, Johann David; Marsh, Herbert**, editor, *Introduction to the New Testament. Translated from the Forth Edition of the German, and Considerably Augmented with Notes, and a Dissertation on the Origin and Composition of the Three First Gospels*, Vol. I-III, London <sup>2</sup>1802.

**Middleton, Thomas Fanshaw**, *The Doctrine of the Greek Article; Applied to the Criticism and the Illustration of The New Testament* [1808], New York 1813.

**Mosheim, Johannes Lorenz; Maclaine, Archibald**, editor, *An Ecclesiastical History, Ancient and Modern, from the Birth of Christ, to the Beginning of the Present Century; in which the Rise, Progress, and Variations of Church Power, are Considered in Their Connexion with the State of Learning and Philosophy, and the Political History of Europe, During that Period*, Vol. I, New York <sup>2</sup>1824.

**Nelson, Thomas**, editor, *The Holy Bible. The New Revised Standard Version. Catholic Edition for India*, Bangalore 1999.

**Nestle, Eberhard** et al., editors, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Stuttgart <sup>27</sup>1995.

**Newcome, William**, *An Attempt Toward Revising our English Translation of the Greek Scriptures, or the New Covenant of Jesus Christ; and Toward Illustrating the Sense by Philo. Logical and Explanatory Notes, Vol. I*, Dublin 1796.

**Newcome, William**, *An Attempt Towards an Improved Version, a Metrical Arrangement and an Explanation of the Twelve Minor Prophets. New enlarged and improved with additional Notes and a Comparison of the Chief Various Renderings of Dr. Horsley, on Hosea, and Dr. Blayney, on Zechariah [1809]*, London 1819.

**Newton, Isaac**, *Observations upon the Prophecies of Holy Writ; particularly the Prophecies of Daniel and the Apocalypse of St. John*, in: **Horsley, Samuel**, editor, *Isaaci Newtoni Opera quae exstant omnia. Commentariis illustrabat Samuel Horsley, LL. D. R. S. S.* Vol. V, London 1785, 292–491.

**Owen, John**, *Vindiciæ Evangelicæ or The Mystery of the Gospell vindicated, and Socianisme Examined*, Oxford 1655.

**Parkhurst, John**, *An Hebrew and English Lexicon, Without Points*, London <sup>5</sup>1807.

**Parkhurst, John**, *A Greek and English Lexicon to the New Testament: in Which the Words and Phrases Occuring in Those Sacred Books Are Distinctly Explained; and the Meanings Assigned to Each Authorized by References to Passages of Scripture, and Frequently Illustrated and Confirmed by Citations from the Old Testament and from the Greek Writers*, London <sup>7</sup>1826.

**Potts, E. Daniel**, *British Baptist Missionaries in India 1793-1837. The History of Serampore and its Missions*, Cambridge 1967.

**Prideaux, Humphrey**, *The Old and New Testament Connected, in the History of the Jews, and Neighbouring Nations, from the Declension of the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah, to the Time of Christ [1715-1717]*, Vol. II, New York <sup>2</sup>1836.

**Rahlfs, Alfred** and **Hanhart, Robert**, editors, *Septuaginta. Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*, Stuttgart <sup>4</sup>2014.

**Rammohan Roy; Rees, Thomas**, editor, *Final Appeal to the Christian Public, in Defence of the "Precepts of Jesus"*, London 1823.



**Rammohan Roy; Rees, Thomas**, editor, *The Precepts of Jesus. The Guide to Peace and Happiness. Extracted from the Books of the New Testament Ascribed to the Four Evangelists. To which are added, the First and Second Appeal to the Christian Public in Reply to the Observations of Dr. Marshman, of Serampore*, London 1823.

**Rammohan Roy**, *The Brahmucal Magazine, or, The Missionary and the Brahmun, Being a Vindication of the Hindoo Religion Against the Attacks of Christian Missionaries (1821/1823)*, in: **Ghose, Jogendra Chunder**, editor, *The English Works of Raja Rammohun Roy*, Vol. I, New Delhi 1906, 143–169.

**Rammohan Roy; Ghose, Jogendra Chunder**, editor, *The English Works of Raja Rammohun Roy*, Vol. III, New Delhi 1906.

**Rammohan Roy**, *A Second Defence of The Monotheistical System of The Veds; in Reply to an Apology for the Present State of Hindoo Worship (1817)*, in: **Ghose, Jogendra Chunder**, editor, *The English Works of Raja Rammohun Roy*, Vol. I, New Delhi 1906, 101–126 (cited: Second Defence).

**Rammohan Roy**, *Translation of an Abridgment of The Vedant or The Resolution of All the Veds. The most celebrated and Revered Work of Brahmucal Theology; Established the Unity of the Supreme Being; and that He Alone is the Object of Propitiation and Worship (1816)*, in: **Ghose, Jogendra Chunder**, editor, *The English Works of Raja Rammohun Roy*, Vol. I, New Delhi 1906, 1–17 (cited: Abridgment).

**Rammohan Roy**, *Translation of the Cena Upanishad. One of the Chapters of the Sama Veda; according to the Gloss of the Celebrated Shancaracharya; Establishing the Unity and the Sole Omnipotence of the Supreme Being and that He Alone is the Object of Worship (1823)*, in: **Ghose, Jogendra Chunder**, editor, *The English Works of Raja Rammohun Roy*, Vol. I, New Delhi 1906, 33–42 (cited: Cena).

**Rammohan Roy**, *Translation of the Ishopanishad. One of the Chapters of the Yajur Ved: According to the Commentary of the Celebrated Shankar-Acharya. Establishing the Unity and Incomprehensibility of the Supreme Being; and that His Worship Alone Can Lead to Eternal Beatitude (1816)*, in: **Ghose, Jogendra Chunder**, editor, *The English Works of Raja Rammohun Roy*, Vol. I, New Delhi 1906, 61–77 (cited: Ishopanishad).

**Rammohan Roy**, *Translation of the Moonduk Opunishud of the Uthurvu-Ved, According to the Gloss of the Celebrated Shunkuracharyu (1819)*, in: **Ghose, Jogendra Chunder**, editor, *The English Works of Raja Rammohun Roy*, Vol. I, New Delhi 1906, 19–31 (cited: Moonduk).

**Rammohan Roy**, Translation of the Uth-Opunishud of the Ujoor-Ved, According to the Gloss of the Celebrated Shunkuracharyu (1819), in: **Ghose, Jogendra Chunder**, editor, *The English Works of Raja Rammohun Roy*, Vol. I, New Delhi 1906, 43–60 (cited: Uth).

**Rammohan Roy; Nag, Kalidas and Burman, Debajyoty**, editors, *The English Works of Raja Rammohun Roy*. Parts I to VII in one volume. Reprint 1995, Kalkutta 1995.

**Randolph, Thomas**, *The Prophecies, and Other Texts, Cited in the New Testament, Compared with the Hebrew Original, and with the Septuagint Versions*, Oxford 1782.

**Rycroft, Thomas**, editor, *Biblia sacra polyglotta*, Vol. III, London 1656.

**Ryland, John**, *The Law not against the Promises of God. A Sermon, Delivered at the Annual Association of the Baptist Ministers and Churches, Assembled at Leicester, May 30, 1787*, London 1787.

**Sale, George**, *The Koran; commonly called The Alcoran of Mohammed. Translated from the original Arabic. With Explanatory Notes, taken from the Most Approved Commentators. To which is prefixed, a Preliminary Discourse*. Vol. I, London 1801.

**Schleusner, Johann Friederich; Smith, Jacob**, editor, *Novum Lexicon Græco-Latinum congestit variis observationibus philologicis*, Vol. I, Glasgow <sup>5</sup>1817.

**Serle, Ambrose**, *Horæ Solitariæ; or Essays Upon Some Remarkable Names and Titles of Jesus Christ, Occuring in The Old Testament and declarative of his essential Divinity and Gracious Offices in the Redemption of Man: to Which is Annexed, an Essay, Chiefly Historical, Upon the Doctrine of the Trinity*, Vol. I, London <sup>2</sup>1787.

**Wallace, Daniel B.**, *The Semantic Range of the Article-Noun-Kai'-Noun Plural Construction in the New Testament*, in: *Grace Theological Journal*, 4.1 (1983), 59–84.

**Ware, Henry, Adam, William and Rammohan Roy**, *Correspondence Relative to the Prospects of Christianity, and the Means of Promoting its Reception in India*, Cambridge 1824.

**Watts, Isaac; Baynes, William**, editor, *Hymns and Spiritual Songs, in Three Books*, London 1811.

**Wiles, Maurice**, *Archetypal Heresy: Arianism Through the Centuries*, Oxford–New York 1996.

**Wilson, Horace Hayman**, *A Dictionary, Sanscrit and English*, Kalkutta 1819.

**Wohlmuth, Josef, Sunnus, Gabriel and Uphus, Johannes**, editors, *Conciliorum Oecumenicum Decreta. Band 1. Konzilien des ersten Jahrtausends. Vom Konzil von Nizäa (325) bis zum vierten Konzil von Konstantinopel (869/70)*, Paderborn u. a. 1998 (cited: COD I).

**Yates, William and Scott, Thomas; Baptist Missiories, Calcutta**, editor, *A Defence of Some Important Scripture Doctrines, Being a Reply to Certain Objections Urged Against them in Two Appeals, Lately Made to the Christian Public. In Twelve Essays*, Kalkutta 1822.

**Yūsuf 'Alī, 'Abdullah**, editor, *The Holy Qur'an. Text, Translation and Commentary*, Neu Delhi o. J.

**Zastoupil, Lynn**, *Rammohun Roy and the Making of Victorian Britain*, *Palgrave Studies in Culture and Intellectual History*, New York 2010 (cited: *Victorian Britain*).



# Index of Scriptural References

In this index are listed all the verses and passages of holy scriptures used by Marshman and Rammohan. It covers Old and New Testament, Quran and Upaniṣads. The exact position of the usage can easily be seen in the margins on the listed page. Whenever there is no margin corresponding, the reference is in a footnote on that page.

## Old Testament

### Gn

1, 453

1:1, 264

1:2, 579

1:26, 435

1:26f., 94, 181

1:27, 444

2:23, 196

2:24, 447

3:5, 594

3:14–19, 243, 337

3:15, 512

3:22, 473

4:1, 486

4:4, 244, 339

5:24, 386

6:2, 140

6:4, 442

6:5, 502, 556

8:20f., 245, 524

9:24, 264

11:5, 305, 462

12:1–3, 246, 345

12:2, 394

13:6, 228

16, 397, 444, 603

16:14, 209

17, 316

17:1, 563, 619

17:5, 606

17:8, 365, 434

18:25, 533

18:32, 193

18:33, 305, 462

22:1, 211

22:7f., 347

22:9–13, 272, 344, 366

22:11f., 563

22:14, 288, 420

22:18, 387

25:26, 209

25:30, 389

28:12–21, 271, 562

28:13, 316

30:27, 167

31:11–13, 271, 365, 562

32:24–30, 404

32:28, 206, 280, 607

35:1, 271, 562

INDEX OF SCRIPTURAL REFERENCES

- 35:13, 305, 462  
38:24f., 397  
43:6, 420  
44:4, 486  
46:17, 405  
48:15f., 167, 271, 272, 316, 365,  
562, 567, 570  
49:10, 246, 399  
49:24, 218  
49:26, 228, 365, 404
- Ex
- 1:1, 486  
3:1–6, 365  
3:1–14, 272, 563  
3:6, 196  
3:14, 368, 573, 670  
4:16, 143, 661  
4:22, 385, 387, 425, 438, 443,  
652  
6:6, 361  
7:1, 143, 188, 386, 454, 586, 661  
10:3f., 302  
10:12–16, 196  
10:15, 387  
11:4f., 302  
12:1–14, 247  
12:5, 526  
13:13, 570  
14:1, 387  
14:31, 158, 315, 478, 479  
15:11, 116  
15:15, 405  
16:4, 302  
17:6, 302  
17:15, 207, 288  
19:5f., 385, 387  
20:5, 342  
20:12, 195  
21, 182
- 21:4, 357  
21:22, 397  
21:30, 536  
22:2, 356  
22:8, 405  
22:28, 143, 594  
23:20f., 167  
23:21, 372, 420  
28:38, 348  
29, 248  
29:37, 425  
32:1, 594  
32:30, 192  
34:5, 369
- Lv
- 6:2, 487  
7:33, 149, 464  
9:7–24, 248  
9:8, 539  
14:47, 149, 464  
16:1–30, 248, 347, 526  
16:11, 539  
16:17, 244  
17:24, 539  
19:17, 487  
19:18, 195  
25:14f., 487
- Nb
- 11:1f., 192  
14:3f., 370  
14:19f., 192, 342  
16:46, 394, 481, 601  
18:10, 425  
20:9–13, 302  
20:10, 630  
21:5, 211  
21:7, 192  
22:6, 264  
22:21–35, 337, 512

- 22:31, 411  
27:4, 356  
31:53, 539
- Dt
- 4:4, 182  
4:40, 144  
5:5, 193  
6:5, 196  
6:13, 196, 198, 477, 677  
6:16f., 195  
7:8, 361, 486, 680  
8:3, 194  
10:17, 143, 387  
15:12, 361  
18:15–18, 153, 165, 312, 474  
24:18, 361  
26:8f., 566  
27:1, 386  
27:26, 236, 504  
28:28, 396  
28:37, 394  
29:4, 396  
30:15, 218  
32:1, 188, 386  
32:1f., 467  
32:7, 442  
32:8–10, 641  
32:10, 379, 588  
32:12, 272, 274  
32:16, 272  
32:18, 425, 443, 652  
32:21, 143  
32:37–39, 660  
32:39, 144, 301, 454  
32:47, 188  
32:48–52, 613, 630  
33:1, 188, 386  
33:21, 539
- Jos
- 1:17, 457  
5:13–15, 411, 564  
10:12, 386  
10:12f., 409  
10:14, 643  
22:22, 143
- Jg
- 2:1f., 272, 316, 366, 564, 568,  
577, 597, 599, 612, 618, 641  
2:3, 312  
6:11–24, 564  
9:13, 228  
13:1, 364, 555  
13:16, 367, 572  
13:21f., 367  
16:7, 437
- Rt
- 4:14, 366, 570
- 1 S
- 2:10, 227  
2:30, 473  
4:8, 228  
8:2, 405  
12:3, 226  
15:22, 341  
27:8, 442  
28:13, 405, 594
- 2 S
- 2:16, 209  
7:14, 443  
11:5, 397  
12:25, 607  
13–15, 606  
14:19f., 424, 634  
14:20, 457  
22, 383  
22:51, 226  
23:1, 226  
24:16, 367, 572

INDEX OF SCRIPTURAL REFERENCES

1 K

17:1, 386, 422, 630  
17:1-7, 337, 512  
17:21, 630, 643  
18:21, 595  
18:37, 396  
18:44f., 422  
18:45, 386  
19:2, 594  
19:4, 540  
19:10, 374  
20:22, 425

2 K

2:9-15, 432, 467, 671  
2:10f., 386, 422, 459  
2:14, 630  
2:21, 422, 630  
2:22, 386  
4:34f., 386, 409  
5, 422  
5:9-15, 630  
5:26f., 372, 459  
6:32, 412, 632  
8:12, 397  
13:5, 164, 210  
13:21, 386  
15:29, 402  
16:2, 256  
16:5-9, 400  
16:7f., 403  
17:29, 595  
18, 203  
18:3-7, 403  
18:3-12, 402  
18:13-35, 403  
19, 204  
19:21, 200  
19:34-36, 402, 403  
20:12-19, 608

20:19, 226

24:20, 176

1 Ch

12:22, 435  
14:8-17, 370  
15:18-20, 405  
16:26, 586  
18:1-8, 370  
20:2f., 371  
21:1, 212  
21:11-15, 364, 554  
27:23, 435  
28:6, 443  
29:20, 218

2 Ch

2:9, 227  
13:8, 595  
20:20, 175, 478, 678  
24:18, 177  
29:1, 256  
30:18-20, 342  
30:24-27, 205  
31:20f., 205  
32:21, 403  
32:23, 205  
32:26, 226  
32:33, 205  
33:1-20, 607

Ne

5:8, 366, 571  
9:27, 164, 210, 357

Jb

1:6, 140, 367, 443  
11:7, 252, 273, 511, 552, 615  
12:2, 501  
13:3, 273  
19:24-26, 346  
19:25f., 246, 273, 345, 369, 525,  
576



- 26:13, 579  
33:4, 484  
35:7, 547  
36:26, 94, 219  
37:23, 94, 219  
42:6, 525  
46:26, 468
- Ps
- 2, 370, 576  
2:1, 250  
2:7, 444  
2:12, 273, 370, 392  
3:3–5, 383  
4:1f., 385  
4:3, 540  
6:4, 176  
8:1f., 198  
8:3, 586  
9:5–11, 385  
11:3, 233  
14:3, 504, 506, 556  
16:8–11, 250  
16:13f., 385  
17:23, 260  
18:31, 595  
18:32, 291  
20:6, 227  
21:7, 176  
22:22, 251  
23, 381  
23:1, 210, 275, 590  
23:6, 484  
24, 274, 372, 375  
24:1, 373, 577, 580  
25:14, 472, 673  
29:2, 650  
31:3, 614  
31:6, 251  
32:5, 343  
33:22, 176  
36:5, 176, 481  
36:6, 274, 376, 582  
40:6, 348  
40:7–9, 251, 529  
40:8–10, 349, 530  
41:10, 197  
45, 378, 587  
45:6, 596  
45:6–8, 144, 207, 252, 299, 377,  
451  
45:7, 263, 293, 387, 585  
47:3, 379, 588  
47:7, 367  
49:7, 554  
50:8–15, 340, 518  
51:17, 336, 510  
53:3, 504  
57:3, 176, 481  
62:6, 444  
66:15f., 385  
68, 276, 384, 592  
68:7, 277  
68:18, 214, 253, 375, 382, 582  
68:28, 385  
69:1–3, 253  
69:9f., 253  
72, 253  
72:12, 356  
73:11, 595  
77:5, 442  
78:13, 391  
78:13–35, 277, 599  
78:17, 641  
78:56, 211, 277, 597  
78:72, 578  
81:9f., 278, 392, 600  
82, 143, 195, 276, 454, 657  
82:6, 385, 387, 450, 595

*INDEX OF SCRIPTURAL REFERENCES*

- 83:18, 278, 392, 600  
85:10, 176, 394, 481, 601  
86:10, 595  
89:14, 481  
89:17, 438  
89:18, 280  
89:18–27, 206, 405  
89:19, 253  
89:26, 446  
89:27, 370  
89:29–37, 608  
89:36f., 253  
89:51f., 487, 680  
90:2, 261  
90:7, 176  
94:18, 481  
95:3–7, 278, 391, 600  
97:7, 143  
100:5, 176  
102, 254  
102:25, 380, 585  
102:25–27, 378, 579, 589  
102:27, 293  
104:35, 487, 680  
105:15, 339  
106:23, 343  
106:32f., 212  
108:4, 176  
109:2f., 197  
110:1, 254  
110:1f., 195, 277, 388, 588, 597  
110:4, 254  
115:1, 613  
118:22, 254  
118:22f., 195  
119, 467  
130:2, 143  
130:7, 394, 601  
136, 577, 596  
136:2–9, 625  
138:1, 595  
141:2, 343  
145:3, 219  
145:17, 533  
146:5f., 279, 600  
146:10, 294, 434, 586
- Pr  
7:4, 393  
8:1, 392  
8:17, 601  
8:22–36, 279, 392, 601  
15:8, 510  
16:4, 583  
16:6, 336  
16:14, 476, 676  
21:3, 341  
22:11, 484  
28:5, 457  
29:14, 144  
29:17, 150  
31:11, 372, 577
- Qo  
5:1, 341  
7:20, 504
- Is  
1:11, 340  
1:16–18, 340, 517  
1:18, 336, 510  
4:1, 288  
6:1–10, 279, 394, 601  
6:3, 183, 224  
6:5, 208  
6:8, 182  
6:9, 196  
7, 399  
7:1–17, 201  
7:11, 198  
7:14–16, 280

7:14f., 255, 396, 534, 603  
8, 399  
8:3f., 607  
8:5–8, 202  
8:13f., 217, 281, 406, 608  
8:20, 319, 640, 683  
9, 402  
9:1–7, 202  
9:1f., 404, 605  
9:5f., 255, 534  
9:6, 402, 604, 607  
9:6f., 200, 226, 280  
9:7, 606  
10, 203, 403  
10:4–7, 367  
10:32, 200  
11:1, 387  
11:1–9, 257, 353, 535  
14:32, 372, 577  
19:19f., 210, 257, 353, 354, 535  
19:25, 257  
23:12, 200, 398  
26:17, 397  
28:16, 217, 281, 406, 608  
29:1–3, 368, 572  
29:13, 198  
35:5f., 257  
35:10, 257, 354, 536  
39:6f., 606  
40:3, 207, 281, 407, 610  
40:10, 214, 282, 408, 611  
40:11, 282  
40:13, 262  
40:22, 282  
40:28, 312  
41:23, 143, 595  
42:1, 138, 434, 646  
42:2, 258, 354  
42:6, 565  
42:8, 266, 314, 500, 608, 614,  
631  
42:18–21, 258, 565  
42:21, 354, 536  
43:3, 210, 281  
43:11, 210  
43:28, 228  
44:6–8, 212, 266, 284, 410, 483,  
617  
44:24, 286  
44:28, 483  
45:1, 227  
45:11, 611  
45:22, 595  
45:23, 209, 285, 417, 626  
45:23–25, 286, 627  
46:11, 483  
47:1, 200  
47:8, 574  
48:1, 420  
48:13, 318, 482  
48:16, 318, 482  
49:1, 483  
49:16, 379, 588  
50:3f., 483  
51:1, 428, 637  
51:15, 428, 637  
52:3, 398  
52:13–53:12, 115  
53, 258, 355, 509, 510, 514, 518,  
522, 533, 537, 540, 545, 603  
54, 287  
54:1, 398  
54:5, 212, 286, 418, 627  
54:13, 197  
55:7, 343  
56:7, 198  
59:15–17, 390  
59:16, 484

INDEX OF SCRIPTURAL REFERENCES

- 60:16, 346, 525  
61:1f., 199  
62:4, 607  
63:1–5, 597  
63:1–6, 277, 389, 598  
63:6f., 483  
63:9, 366, 565  
63:11, 211, 381, 442  
63:16, 346, 525  
63:17, 395, 396  
64:7, 459  
65:17, 588, 612, 647, 683
- Jr  
1:5, 483  
3:4, 446  
5:22, 289, 421, 629  
7:7, 434  
7:21–23, 343  
10:11, 289, 302, 422, 458  
11:19, 347  
14:17, 200  
16:20, 595  
17:5–8, 273, 372  
17:9f., 289, 632  
17:10, 313, 590  
18:13, 200  
21:8, 218  
23:4, 211, 381  
23:5f., 208, 259, 287, 355, 419,  
538, 607, 628  
23:24, 290  
23:28, 301, 315, 579  
27:18, 167, 193  
31, 201  
31:8, 397  
31:9, 438  
31:31–34, 259, 355, 538  
33:6, 208, 419, 607  
33:16, 207, 208, 287, 288, 420
- 49:7–13, 389  
51:7f., 579
- Lm  
1:15, 201  
2:13, 201
- Ezk  
7:3, 177  
16:35, 398  
18:4, 516, 523  
18:30, 84, 135, 336, 510  
28:2, 595  
28:2–10, 290, 423, 633  
31:11, 405  
34:23, 259, 356, 539  
34:23f., 211, 275, 381  
34:29, 259  
34:31, 386  
37:19, 447  
48:35, 289
- Dn  
2:11, 595  
2:22f., 290, 424, 634  
2:34, 290  
2:34f., 259  
2:46, 155, 411  
5:11, 595  
7:9, 390  
7:11f., 290  
7:15–28, 641  
7:18, 434  
8:16, 405  
9:9, 640  
9:24, 625  
9:24–26, 114  
9:24–27, 260, 290, 356, 425, 539,  
635  
11:45, 356
- Ho  
1:3–8, 607

- 1:10, 140  
 2:15–19, 383  
 2:16, 607  
 3:4f., 425  
 3:5, 260, 291, 356, 540, 635  
 6:5f., 195  
 6:6, 340, 517  
 11:1, 400  
 11:1–3, 194, 291, 401  
 11:8f., 420  
 11:9, 595  
 13:14, 536
- Jl  
 2:28, 260, 356, 540  
 2:32, 291, 426, 636
- Am  
 1:13, 397  
 3:7, 472, 673  
 4:13, 291, 637  
 5:2, 201  
 9:11, 356, 540  
 9:11f., 260
- Ob  
 8–11, 390  
 21, 164, 210, 260, 357, 540
- Mi  
 1:5, 261, 265, 357, 541  
 4:9, 228  
 4:10, 398  
 4:13, 368, 572  
 5:1, 368  
 5:2, 295, 296, 441, 572, 651  
 5:2–4, 442  
 6:7f., 340, 517
- Na  
 1:15, 261, 358, 541
- Hab  
 1:12, 261  
 1:13, 500
- 2:4, 261, 358, 542  
 2:14, 261  
 3:6, 365
- Zp  
 2:11, 143  
 3:15, 261
- Hg  
 2:2f., 542  
 2:6–9, 262, 358, 542
- Zc  
 1:7, 428  
 2:2, 428  
 2:5, 394  
 2:8, 291, 429, 637, 638  
 2:8f., 265  
 2:11, 543  
 3:2, 291, 427, 637  
 3:8, 428  
 3:8f., 262, 358, 542  
 4:9, 428  
 6:11–13, 262, 428, 638  
 6:12f., 358  
 7:8, 428  
 8:13, 394  
 9:9, 262  
 12:8, 435  
 12:10, 215, 262, 484, 680  
 13:7, 197, 198, 264, 291, 296,  
 486, 509, 518, 533, 540, 545,  
 637, 680  
 14:3f., 369
- Ml  
 1:6, 473  
 3:1, 198, 207, 265, 281, 312, 407,  
 566, 610
- New Testament
- Mt  
 1:18–21, 177  
 1:22f., 255, 396, 404

*INDEX OF SCRIPTURAL REFERENCES*

1:23, 400, 603  
1:23f., 206  
2:15, 147, 194, 206, 291, 400  
2:18, 147  
3:2, 135  
3:9, 154  
3:11, 176, 177, 478  
3:17, 524  
4:3, 663  
4:4, 194  
4:7, 195  
4:10, 111, 155, 196, 477, 677  
4:13–16, 404, 605  
5:3, 506, 514  
5:3–11, 346  
5:7, 165  
5:8, 370  
5:17f., 83, 506, 508, 545  
5:21–45, 165  
5:25, 506  
5:37, 300, 658  
5:48, 154  
6, 446  
6:5–15, 157  
6:14, 151  
7:7–11, 84  
7:10, 245  
7:12, 83, 132, 133  
7:15–19, 118  
7:18, 502, 506, 556  
7:21–26, 85, 132  
7:24–27, 334, 335, 659  
8:2–4, 111, 157  
9:2, 469  
9:8, 151, 309, 354, 430, 469  
9:12, 503  
9:13, 84, 135, 195, 238, 341  
9:16, 663  
10:1, 433  
10:5f., 170  
10:25, 473  
10:34–39, 122, 170  
10:40, 154, 482  
10:40–42, 427  
11:2–6, 123, 172  
11:10, 198  
11:19, 279, 392, 601  
11:25, 150, 240  
11:27, 108, 140, 149, 308, 320,  
468, 552, 613, 671  
11:28–30, 108, 125, 150  
11:29, 385  
12:7, 341  
12:18, 138, 415, 434  
12:19, 258  
12:22–32, 177, 178  
12:24–26, 500  
12:28, 163  
12:33, 118  
12:36, 108  
12:39, 172  
12:50, 86  
13:14, 196  
14:17, 155  
14:27, 409  
14:32–33, 111, 156  
15:7–9, 198  
15:16–20, 118  
15:21–28, 156  
16:2, 147  
16:13–23, 114, 115  
16:27, 214, 282  
17:1–9, 466, 474  
17:11, 457  
17:14–21, 433  
17:22, 266, 359  
18:8, 342  
18:10, 94

- 18:11, 84  
18:19, 541  
18:20, 108, 148, 307, 466, 480,  
670  
18:26, 155, 313, 411, 475  
19:5, 196  
19:18f., 196  
19:19, 195, 473  
19:20, 239  
19:28, 472  
20:14, 312, 473, 616, 674  
20:23, 153, 431, 474, 642  
20:28, 71, 266, 359, 362, 503,  
529, 544, 549  
21:6, 616  
21:13, 198  
21:16, 198  
21:41–44, 609  
21:42, 195  
22:32, 196  
22:37–40, 82, 113, 132, 196  
22:39, 195  
22:40, 133  
22:43, 180  
22:44, 195  
22:45, 379  
23:2f., 165  
23:8, 583  
23:15, 663  
23:37, 351  
23:37–39, 119  
24:5, 368, 575  
25:31, 283  
25:31–46, 85, 334, 507  
25:40, 438  
26:28, 266, 359, 544  
26:31, 197, 198, 264  
26:36–46, 163  
26:37–42, 350  
26:39, 458, 664  
26:39.42, 153  
26:52–56, 115  
26:53, 157, 431  
26:53f., 164  
26:65, 566  
27:37, 143  
27:43, 143, 471  
27:46, 157, 183  
27:50, 386  
28:9–10, 111, 415, 438  
28:16–20, 111, 112, 158, 176,  
315, 318, 477, 480, 677  
28:18, 138, 159, 377, 423, 430,  
474, 585, 633  
28:19, 140, 335
- Mk  
1:2f., 407  
2:1–12, 151  
2:5, 469  
2:7, 310, 577  
2:17, 238  
3:5, 385  
3:23–30, 178  
4:39, 630  
5:6f., 156  
5:41, 630  
7:27, 451  
8:6, 458  
8:29, 156  
9:4f., 474  
9:40, 81  
10:45, 71, 115, 161, 362, 549  
11:22, 433  
12:1–9, 162  
12:10, 195  
12:28–34, 334  
12:29–31, 334, 508  
12:29–34, 82, 132

*INDEX OF SCRIPTURAL REFERENCES*

- 12:30, 196  
12:36, 180, 195  
13:23, 457  
13:32, 150, 155, 423, 431, 633  
14:34, 385  
14:35f., 157  
14:36, 163, 350, 458
- Lk
- 1:1f., 616  
1:2, 455  
1:15, 180  
1:16f., 207  
1:26–38, 177  
1:32, 138, 430  
1:32f., 287, 419, 628  
1:37, 154  
1:41, 180  
1:43, 588  
1:67, 180  
1:67–79, 611  
1:69, 408  
1:76, 641  
1:77, 362, 549  
2, 385  
2:25f., 180  
2:46–50, 399  
2:47–49, 161, 349, 360  
2:52, 633  
3:16, 176, 177, 478  
3:22, 178  
3:38, 425  
4:1, 177, 180  
4:4, 194  
4:8, 198  
4:18f., 199  
4:43, 161, 349, 360  
5:14, 616  
5:18–26, 109  
5:20–25, 672
- 5:32, 84, 238, 336  
6:12, 157  
6:34, 645  
6:43, 502  
7:14, 630  
8:17, 125  
8:21, 86  
9:26, 283  
9:31, 266, 359  
10:3, 347  
10:16, 217  
10:17, 631  
10:21, 157  
10:25–28, 83, 132, 238, 334, 507  
10:27, 196  
11:4, 151  
11:9–13, 84, 120  
11:27f., 86, 133, 346  
11:49, 279, 392, 601  
12:12, 176  
12:49, 122  
13:3, 84, 135, 336, 510  
14:11, 125  
15:7, 84, 135  
15:10, 84  
15:11–32, 84, 336  
16:29, 149, 308, 466, 480, 670  
16:31, 87  
17:15f., 156  
18:21, 239  
20:17, 195  
20:42, 195  
22:22, 115  
22:24, 385  
22:24–27, 583  
22:29f., 472  
22:32, 153  
22:41f., 157  
22:42, 424



22:42–44, 163, 350  
 23:34, 151, 672  
 23:46, 251, 314, 476, 676  
 24:13–27, 521  
 24:19, 157  
 24:25–27, 544  
 24:26f., 162  
 24:36–49, 116  
 24:44, 249, 527  
 24:44–47, 267, 359  
 24:46, 521  
 24:47, 135, 336

Jn

1:1, 90, 144, 265, 394, 595  
 1:1–3, 279  
 1:1–18, 301, 452, 659  
 1:2, 300  
 1:3, 274, 278, 372, 391  
 1:4, 313, 675  
 1:14, 200, 297, 444, 551  
 1:18, 297, 304, 566, 660  
 1:23, 610  
 1:29, 247, 526  
 1:29–37, 113  
 1:29f., 408  
 1:34, 139  
 1:48, 149  
 1:49, 114, 261  
 2:11, 454  
 2:13, 440  
 2:17, 253  
 2:18–22, 449  
 2:19–21, 369, 435, 575  
 2:24, 595, 664  
 3, 307, 465  
 3:1–21, 118, 462, 667  
 3:13, 108, 147, 283, 303, 460,  
 553, 574, 667  
 3:16, 297, 534, 635, 640, 652

3:24, 467  
 3:29, 212, 286, 418, 627  
 3:35, 138, 374, 430  
 4, 114  
 4:6, 385  
 4:22, 158  
 4:24, 142, 155  
 4:25f., 368, 575  
 5:3–5, 307, 465, 670  
 5:11, 307  
 5:15–19, 450  
 5:16, 470  
 5:17, 302, 613, 655  
 5:17f., 311, 471, 673  
 5:18, 435, 654, 657, 673  
 5:19, 138, 259, 309, 565, 579,  
 598, 613, 665  
 5:19–23, 109, 151, 311  
 5:19–30, 448  
 5:19–36, 152, 471  
 5:20, 655  
 5:22, 152, 214, 282, 313, 409,  
 417, 614, 655  
 5:22f., 451  
 5:23, 154, 312, 613, 616, 617,  
 620, 631, 674  
 5:24, 165, 354, 536  
 5:26, 138, 145, 313, 430, 475,  
 675  
 5:26–30, 155  
 5:30, 214, 282, 377, 389, 409,  
 434, 598, 612, 614  
 5:32–38, 123  
 5:36, 448, 613  
 5:36–44, 119  
 5:37, 566  
 5:43, 448  
 5:45, 478  
 5:46, 153

*INDEX OF SCRIPTURAL REFERENCES*

- 6:11, 302  
6:14; 10:21, 145  
6:22–58, 115, 161  
6:28, 529  
6:29, 145  
6:31f., 271  
6:37, 389, 434, 598  
6:37f., 138  
6:41–46, 119  
6:41–65, 435  
6:45, 197  
6:46, 567  
6:51, 266, 341, 359, 518  
6:51–58, 345, 524  
6:53, 369  
6:56, 141, 142, 447, 654  
6:57, 138  
6:62, 147, 304, 462  
6:63, 120, 165, 354  
6:64, 454  
6:66, 369  
6:69, 157  
7:17, 240  
7:20, 461, 666  
7:22, 316  
7:28, 448  
7:29f., 461  
7:45, 71  
7:50, 306  
7:50f., 667  
8:24, 116, 125, 272, 368, 573,  
575, 610  
8:25, 454  
8:26f., 369  
8:28, 138, 409, 434, 448  
8:29, 525, 532, 613, 630, 654  
8:31, 307  
8:40, 448  
8:41, 450  
8:42, 139, 439, 448  
8:44, 454, 513  
8:48f., 461  
8:49, 666  
8:50, 138, 448  
8:54, 314  
8:55, 448  
8:56, 208, 280, 339, 395, 460  
8:58, 147, 564, 594  
8:58f., 272, 303, 310, 368, 460,  
666, 684  
9:3, 162  
9:25, 149, 464  
9:30–33, 156  
9:35–38, 110, 139, 156  
10:3–36, 276  
10:11, 266, 359  
10:14–18, 115, 161  
10:16, 210, 275, 381, 590  
10:17f., 138, 164, 251, 350, 424,  
518, 519, 525, 529  
10:22–38, 142, 299  
10:25, 86, 421, 459  
10:26f., 166  
10:27–28, 120  
10:30, 140, 278, 297, 445, 565,  
567, 579, 591, 600, 608, 613,  
653  
10:32–39, 448, 656  
10:33, 575, 657  
10:33–36, 143, 195, 218, 385,  
387, 592  
10:33–38, 123  
10:33–39, 596  
10:35, 75  
10:37f., 86, 106, 145, 172, 302  
10:38, 141  
10:39, 299  
10:40–43, 459

- 11:8, 147, 461  
11:25, 313, 675  
11:38, 147, 461  
11:41, 145, 157  
11:41–43, 372, 613, 630  
11:41f., 421, 431, 458, 459  
11:42, 302  
11:47–53, 461  
12:10f., 470  
12:27, 153, 164, 385  
12:31, 547  
12:35, 640  
12:37–44, 395, 602  
12:41, 208, 280, 394  
12:49, 138  
13:1, 148  
13:5, 385  
13:6, 147, 461  
13:18, 197  
13:21, 385  
13:33–35, 133  
13:36, 148  
14:1, 142  
14:1–13, 176, 478  
14:6, 117, 125, 320, 516, 676  
14:8–11, 123, 172  
14:9, 142, 567, 591, 613  
14:9–11, 142  
14:12, 145  
14:13, 317, 481  
14:15, 83, 134  
14:16f., 150, 468  
14:20, 141, 447  
14:21, 134  
14:24, 83, 138, 377, 585  
14:26, 176, 317, 481  
14:28, 139, 437, 479  
14:31, 138, 434  
15:1,5, 418  
15:1–8, 212, 627  
15:3, 165, 354  
15:9–17, 134  
15:10, 86, 334  
15:12, 133  
15:13, 531  
15:14, 334  
15:17, 133  
15:21–24, 123, 162  
15:25, 197  
15:26, 181  
15:27, 454  
16:4, 454  
16:5, 147  
16:7, 147  
16:8, 317, 481  
16:12, 90, 328  
16:14, 317, 481  
16:15, 580  
16:23–26, 117  
16:26, 157  
16:28, 148, 304  
16:30, 300, 457, 664  
16:32, 147  
17, 446  
17:1f., 138, 139, 409  
17:2, 377  
17:3, 141, 192  
17:4–8, 161, 349, 360, 528  
17:5, 139, 295, 309, 410, 439,  
470, 594, 642, 649, 684  
17:6–26, 140, 141  
17:11, 142, 445  
17:21, 447, 653, 654, 660  
17:22, 297, 410, 430, 441, 445  
17:24, 139, 295  
17:25, 468  
18:37, 272, 299, 657  
19:7, 143, 299, 450

INDEX OF SCRIPTURAL REFERENCES

- 19:17, 142  
19:37, 215, 262, 484  
19:39f., 667  
20:17, 138, 144, 300, 387, 415,  
424, 434, 438, 446, 451  
20:21, 138  
20:24–29, 452, 568, 658  
20:28, 144, 300, 314  
20:29, 173  
20:31, 144, 157, 488  
21:15, 347  
21:15–17, 166  
21:17, 300  
21:25, 86
- Ac  
1:8, 176  
2:17, 260, 540  
2:21, 291  
2:21f., 426, 636  
2:22–36, 184  
2:23, 533  
2:25–27, 250  
2:38, 631, 665  
3:16, 643  
3:22, 153, 474  
3:22f, 184  
4:8–12, 184  
4:12, 504  
4:24–27, 250  
4:24–30, 184  
4:25f., 576  
5:1–11, 412, 632  
5:3f., 180, 317, 482  
5:29–32, 184  
5:31, 470, 510, 672  
5:31f., 151  
7:37, 153  
7:42, 477, 677  
7:48–50, 641
- 7:56, 184  
7:59, 314, 476, 676  
8:36f, 184  
9:34, 631, 643, 665  
10:17–20, 317, 482  
10:25f., 313, 412, 475, 675  
10:34–43, 184  
10:34f., 326  
10:38, 177, 410, 481  
11:2, 12  
12:21–23, 625  
13:2, 317, 481  
13:33, 653  
13:38, 151, 184, 470  
14:8–10, 614  
14:11, 187  
15:2, 12  
15:7, 12  
15:8, 290  
15:11, 509  
15:16f., 260, 540  
16:18, 631  
17:3, 185  
17:31, 409  
26:10, 641  
26:22f., 521  
28:6, 187
- Rm  
1:8, 417, 626  
1:17, 236, 261, 358  
1:25, 477, 677  
2:16, 417, 626  
3:4, 258, 297  
3:8, 534  
3:9–20, 556  
3:10–18, 238  
3:12, 502, 504  
3:19f., 237, 507, 545  
3:20, 504, 519

- 3:23, 531  
 3:24, 267  
 3:24–26, 360, 361, 516, 519, 522,  
     547  
 3:25f., 534  
 3:26, 73  
 3:29, 444  
 4:5, 73  
 4:25, 267  
 5:1, 417, 626  
 5:6–11, 267  
 5:8, 534, 640  
 5:10, 362, 548  
 5:19, 424  
 7:12, 505  
 7:18, 523  
 8:7, 502, 556  
 8:15–18, 360  
 8:29, 438, 647  
 8:31f., 443  
 8:32, 297, 360  
 9:5, 97, 487, 501, 568, 680  
 10:5, 507  
 10:13, 426, 636  
 11:6, 509, 515  
 11:7f., 395  
 11:36, 294, 648  
 12:1, 523  
 14:10–12, 209, 285, 417, 626  
 15:3, 253  
 16:27, 417
- 1 Co
- 1:1, 270  
 1:2, 291, 426  
 1:12, 12  
 1:22–25, 505  
 1:23f., 587, 597, 640, 647, 674  
 1:24, 394
- 1:30, 208, 259, 287, 355, 394,  
     419, 538  
 2:8, 581  
 2:11, 579  
 3:5–9, 614  
 4:5, 290, 424, 632, 634  
 5:7, 247, 526  
 6:2, 473  
 6:2f., 424, 634  
 8:5, 143  
 8:6, 192, 487  
 8:12, 482  
 9:5, 438  
 10:9, 211, 277, 388, 597  
 10:17, 447  
 10:21–26, 274, 373, 580  
 10:21f., 374, 581  
 11:3, 420, 629  
 11:24, 266, 359  
 15:3, 528, 534  
 15:24, 192, 275, 412, 435  
 15:24–28, 138, 293, 425, 635  
 15:24f., 380, 589  
 15:28, 214, 380, 412, 435, 480,  
     589
- 2 Co
- 1:3, 446  
 2:2, 320  
 4:6, 262  
 5:18, 417, 626  
 5:19, 267  
 5:21, 208, 258, 355, 394, 419,  
     536, 627  
 9:5, 645  
 11:3, 513  
 11:13, 520  
 11:31, 97, 568  
 12:8, 314  
 13:4, 312

INDEX OF SCRIPTURAL REFERENCES

- 13:13f., 318, 484  
13:14, 589
- Ga  
1:3f., 528  
1:4, 267, 560  
2:11–13, 12  
2:16–21, 267  
2:21, 105, 133, 335, 504, 505,  
519  
3:10, 236, 502, 504, 519, 555  
3:11, 261, 358, 542  
3:13f., 244, 246, 267, 506, 516,  
523, 528, 533, 540, 541, 545  
4:4, 259, 593, 655  
4:4f., 528, 534, 541, 551, 569  
4:8–11, 273  
4:14, 473  
4:21–31, 628  
4:27, 287  
5:3, 509  
5:6, 507  
6:14, 520
- Ep  
1:7, 267, 361, 362, 514, 546, 549  
1:8–10, 515  
1:12, 274  
1:17, 487  
2:3, 532  
3:9, 373, 422, 631  
4:5f., 192, 487  
4:6, 326  
4:8, 214, 253, 274, 276, 375, 382,  
581, 592  
4:9f., 375  
4:24, 499, 612, 652  
5:2, 362, 548  
5:23, 212, 286, 418  
6:21, 457
- Ph  
1:17, 484  
2:3, 645  
2:5–11, 209, 283, 293, 423, 435,  
644, 649  
2:6, 631  
2:8, 386  
3:8, 503, 514  
3:9, 267
- Col  
1:14, 361, 539  
1:15, 139, 146, 214, 412  
1:15–18, 294, 437, 647  
1:16, 312, 580, 583, 600, 629,  
631, 641, 663, 665  
1:17, 274, 376, 582  
2:15, 547
- 1 Th  
1:10, 267, 513  
2:10, 100  
4:17, 679  
5:3, 413
- 2 Th  
1:10, 641  
2:3f., 682  
2:4, 228  
2:7, 318, 488
- 1 Tm  
1:2, 444  
2:6, 362, 549  
3:16, 522  
5:21, 681  
6:16, 142  
6:17, 274
- 2 Tm  
1:9, 462, 667  
2:7, 457
- Tt  
1:2, 570  
1:3, 681

- 2:10, 681  
 2:12–14, 362, 549  
 2:13, 681  
 2:14, 267, 361  
 3:5, 267
- Heb**  
 1:1–4, 522  
 1:2, 373, 374, 422, 578, 631  
 1:3, 274, 290, 376, 553, 565, 568,  
 582, 618, 635  
 1:3f., 656  
 1:5, 444, 576, 652  
 1:5–14, 296  
 1:6, 284, 295, 304, 411, 618, 619,  
 667  
 1:8, 262, 290, 293, 377, 423, 585,  
 596, 644  
 1:8–12, 252, 274, 553, 610, 657  
 1:8f., 144, 207, 299, 377, 410,  
 451  
 1:10, 254, 379, 585, 593, 596,  
 612, 614, 624, 626, 629–631,  
 660, 662  
 1:10–12, 378, 579, 635, 644, 679  
 1:12, 293, 295, 296, 615, 617,  
 628, 642, 649  
 1:13, 379, 388, 572, 588, 652  
 2:9, 519  
 2:11f., 251, 438  
 2:16, 571  
 2:17, 362, 548  
 3:3f., 278, 312, 392, 474, 599  
 3:4, 611  
 3:6, 392, 404  
 3:13, 339  
 4:12–13, 117  
 4:13, 290, 423, 633  
 4:15, 211, 265, 312  
 5:1, 362, 549
- 8:3, 362, 549  
 8:5, 677  
 8:8–12, 259, 355  
 9:7–15, 249  
 9:12, 267  
 9:14, 549  
 9:22, 503, 521, 538, 547  
 9:23f., 362, 549  
 9:25–28, 248, 249, 503, 520, 525,  
 543, 548  
 9:26, 245, 341  
 10:2, 677  
 10:4, 244, 247  
 10:4–6, 343  
 10:4–7, 251, 349, 514, 522, 528,  
 537, 547  
 10:5, 349  
 10:5–7, 439  
 10:5f., 245  
 10:7, 350  
 10:9, 350  
 10:10, 528, 529  
 10:12, 341, 522, 523, 529  
 10:17–19, 538  
 10:26, 524  
 10:30, 588  
 11:4, 244, 245, 339, 515  
 11:6, 339, 515  
 11:17, 297, 438, 444  
 11:26, 113, 245, 339, 645  
 11:33, 245  
 12:2, 530, 582, 614  
 13:8, 283, 307, 553, 560, 571,  
 587, 615, 628, 642  
 13:10, 677  
 13:12, 341, 362, 549
- Jm**  
 1:2, 645  
 2:10, 502, 555

INDEX OF SCRIPTURAL REFERENCES

- 3:2, 504  
3:12, 502
- 1 P  
1:12, 522  
1:18f., 247, 267  
1:19, 526  
1:20, 462, 667  
2:4f., 345  
2:5, 345  
2:6–8, 216, 281, 406, 608  
2:22, 532  
2:24, 267  
3:18, 267, 312, 507, 511, 521,  
523, 530, 612, 640  
5:4, 275, 381, 590
- 2 P  
1:1, 300, 457  
1:4, 447, 654  
2:4, 240, 532  
3:9, 436  
3:10, 413  
3:18, 210
- 1 Jn, 268  
1:1, 453  
1:7, 268, 501, 521, 549, 551  
1:8, 504, 505  
2:1–2, 117  
2:18, 318, 488, 682  
2:23, 320  
3:1, 468  
3:2, 436, 495, 520, 646  
3:8, 243  
3:20, 300  
4:2f., 490, 684  
4:6, 490  
4:7, 438  
4:7–16, 453  
4:8, 394  
4:9, 297  
4:10, 536  
4:12, 142  
4:15, 141, 447  
5:7, 183  
5:19, 490  
5:20, 313, 487, 675, 681
- 2 Jn  
9, 268, 320
- Jude  
1:24, 612  
1:25, 560, 624  
4, 681  
6, 532  
21, 268  
25, 300, 457, 570
- Rv  
1:1, 285, 414  
1:1–5, 416  
1:3, 625  
1:4–8, 390, 412  
1:5, 294, 648  
1:5f., 268, 362, 507, 514, 524,  
546, 549, 551  
1:6, 345  
1:7, 520  
1:8, 222, 277, 284, 296, 300, 389,  
410, 597, 599, 610, 613, 617,  
622  
1:9, 416  
1:11, 599  
1:17, 411  
1:18, 630, 631  
2:5, 415  
2:16, 415  
2:23, 284, 290, 300, 313, 412,  
553, 565, 590  
2:27, 415  
3:2, 415  
3:5, 415



- 3:7, 630  
 3:11, 415  
 3:12, 415  
 3:14, 412, 440  
 3:21, 413, 416  
 4:8, 413  
 4:8–11, 303  
 4:10, 619  
 4:11, 624, 665  
 5:5, 284  
 5:6, 526  
 5:6–14, 247, 320  
 5:8, 411  
 5:8–14, 619, 625  
 5:9, 268, 361, 495, 503, 520, 526  
 5:9f., 416  
 5:12, 416  
 5:13, 316  
 5:14, 412  
 6:15–17, 273, 520  
 6:16f., 576, 599, 619  
 7:10, 619  
 7:11, 412  
 7:13, 284  
 7:14, 268  
 7:17, 412  
 10:9, 284  
 11:15, 416  
 11:16, 412  
 11:17, 620  
 11:18, 620  
 12:9, 513  
 12:11, 625  
 12:17, 416  
 14:4, 620  
 14:12, 416  
 15:3f., 416, 624  
 16:5–7, 620  
 16:14, 413  
 16:14f., 622  
 17:14, 416  
 19:4, 412  
 19:10, 110, 284, 602, 623  
 19:13, 453  
 19:16, 416  
 20:6, 345, 620  
 20:11, 413  
 20:12, 634  
 21:3–8, 620, 621  
 21:5f., 285, 413  
 21:6f., 300  
 21:9, 607  
 21:22f., 620, 679  
 21:23, 416  
 22:1, 620, 635, 679  
 22:6, 414  
 22:6–16, 110, 212, 284, 414, 623  
 22:6f., 285, 413, 622  
 22:7, 625  
 22:12, 214, 282, 408, 415, 610,  
     611, 613  
 22:13, 410, 617  
 22:16, 415, 572  
 22:19, 594  
 22:20, 415
- Upaniṣads
- Kena
- 1:3, 94
- 3:1, 93
- Isho
- 8, 93
- Moonduk
- 1:1.9, 93
- 2:1.4, 94
- Kuthu
- 2:2.13, 93
- Qur'an
- Surah

*INDEX OF SCRIPTURAL REFERENCES*

1, 383

2:22f., 383

4:80, 160

21:107, 159

50:16, 182

54:49, 182

# Index of Quoted Authors

This index lists authors who are quoted and used by Marshman and Rammohan. Either they are expressly mentioned by them or sometimes I could reconstruct their use of these authors. Details will be found in the footnotes on the listed page.

- Belsham, Thomas, 436  
Brown, John, 208, 375, 437  
Campbell, George, 401, 465, 605, 670  
Du Pin, Louis Ellies, 682  
Edwards, John, 567  
Griesbach, Johann Jakob, 183  
Hillel, 227  
Hirschel, Solomon, 383  
Jones, William, 181, 207–212, 214,  
215, 217, 375, 382, 388, 418  
Locke, John, 220–221, 319, 355,  
360–361, 374–376, 424,  
426–427, 487–490, 537, 546,  
580, 582, 636  
Macknight, James, 435  
Michaelis, Johann David, 183  
Middleton, Thomas F., 256, 306, 463,  
487, 669  
Mosheim, Johannes Lorenz, 168–170,  
185–187, 190, 318, 488  
Newcome, William, 485, 486  
Newton, Isaac, 220–221, 319, 488–490  
NTIV (*Improved Version*), 339, 373,  
376, 377, 436, 440, 446,  
455–456, 466, 469, 648,  
661–663, 671  
Owen, John, 294, 437, 647–648  
Parkhurst, John, 265, 393, 405, 435,  
437, 441, 465, 485, 486, 645,  
651, 670  
Prideaux, Humphrey, 226  
Randolph, Thomas, 194–199  
Sale, George, 383  
Schleusner, Johann Friedrich, 436  
Serle, Ambrose, 222–225  
Talmud, 227  
Targum Jonathan, 226  
Watts, Isaac, 296



# Paragraphs Referred to in Later Contributions

Whenever a paragraph of Rammohan Roy's or Marshman's text is quoted by the opponent or by himself in a later text, it is listed in this index. If we want to know whether there is a follow-up reaction to a certain statement, we can look it up here.

§1, 74, 80, 83	§68, 137, 151
§2, 72, 73, 75, 76, 80, 82, 87, 105, 106, 131, 173, 327	§69, 154
§7, 584	§§70-71, 155
§§7-8, 92	§72, 159
§11, 82	§73, 158
§20, 79, 324	§74, 159, 175
§21, 79	§75, 163-165
§22, 96	§76, 166, 347
§24, 328	§80, 161
§25, 96	§81, 162
§26, 106	§84, 167
§29, 124, 173	§91, 134, 332
§31, 98-100, 168	§92, 168, 170
§32, 168, 328	§93, 170, 171
§34, 328	§§94-95, 172
§35, 328	§95, 172
§37, 171	§§97-99, 173
§59, 133	§103, 233
§61, 133	§§103-113, 236
§62, 585	§108, 238
§64, 137, 337	§109, 237, 241, 298, 308, 316, 335
§65, 147, 283	§110, 235
§66, 149, 150	§111, 250, 333
§67, 151	§112, 235, 237, 238, 336
	§114, 293, 429, 432, 433, 639, 643

PARAGRAPHS REFERRED TO IN LATER CONTRIBUTIONS

§115, 293, 433	§165, 261, 357
§117, 269, 295, 439, 440, 551	§171, 318
§118, 297	§172, 234
§119, 284, 311, 392, 585, 664	§173, 269, 295, 386
§§119-120, 278	§174, 393
§120, 297, 298, 447	§180, 269, 295, 551
§121, 180, 253, 289, 294, 298, 299, 378, 380, 385, 422, 586	§181, 269
§122, 300	§184, 291, 401
§123, 301	§191, 277, 389, 597
§124, 302	§192, 276, 592
§125, 303	§194, 280
§126, 303-305, 461, 463	§199, 264
§§126-127, 303	§200, 264
§127, 306, 308, 464, 466, 480, 574, 670	§211, 255, 397
§128, 256, 468	§§211-225, 255
§§128-129, 308	§215, 365, 380, 404
§129, 308	§218, 397
§130, 308, 309, 469, 470, 672	§223, 255, 280, 405
§131, 310	§§223-226, 404
§§131-132, 310	§224, 256
§132, 249, 312, 410, 474, 616	§225, 255, 256, 288, 400
§133, 312	§226, 253, 378
§134, 313	§227, 281
§§134-135, 313, 475	§§227-228, 266
§135, 313	§228, 276, 282, 408
§136, 314-316, 478	§229, 280, 396
§§136-139, 314	§230, 259, 287, 419
§138, 153, 317, 480	§231, 287
§140, 239, 251, 267, 349, 360, 528, 544	§234, 285, 286, 417, 418, 626
§142, 239, 240, 251, 252, 258, 295, 353, 364, 530, 531, 538, 554	§235, 257, 260, 354, 357
§143, 239, 260, 353	§236, 275, 381, 590, 591
§144, 239	§237, 277, 388
§147, 239, 247, 270, 271, 347, 562, 570	§§237-238, 274
§157, 480	§239, 286, 418, 627
§158, 478, 479	§§240-242, 284, 410
§159, 478	§242, 412
§163, 481, 482	§243, 282, 409
	§244, 253, 274, 276, 375, 382, 384
	§§245-248, 262, 485

- §248, 263
- §250, 281
- §255, 234, 243, 249, 331, 511
- §257, 319, 489
- §258, 319
- §270, 255
- §274, 404
- §§274-275, 404, 406
- §278, 278, 284
- §279, 233
- §281, 328
- §282, 332
- §283, 329–331, 498, 499, 585
- §284, 327, 328, 331, 497
- §286, 337, 352, 511
- §287, 311
- §288, 335
- §291, 334–336
- §§294-299, 511
- §300, 337, 339, 512
- §301, 339, 343
- §303, 339
- §304, 343
- §305, 345, 524
- §306, 346
- §307, 345
- §308, 347
- §310, 347
- §314, 348
- §315, 348
- §316, 348
- §317, 348–352, 528, 530, 531
- §318, 274, 348
- §319, 348
- §320, 348
- §321, 348
- §322, 345, 348, 349
- §323, 348
- §324, 353, 396, 398, 402, 604
- §325, 397, 401, 534, 603
- §326, 353, 399, 535
- §327, 354, 357, 535
- §328, 354
- §329, 354, 536
- §330, 355, 538
- §331, 355
- §332, 356
- §333, 291
- §334, 356
- §335, 356
- §336, 356
- §337, 357, 540, 541
- §338, 358
- §339, 358
- §341, 358
- §343, 377, 485, 680
- §345, 486, 680
- §348, 543
- §349, 359, 544, 548
- §350, 360, 361, 548
- §351, 550
- §352, 362, 550
- §353, 363, 551, 552, 561, 562
- §355, 365, 562, 569
- §§355-358, 366
- §356, 365, 368, 369, 573
- §358, 592
- §359, 369
- §360, 370, 372
- §361, 372–376, 581, 582
- §362, 377, 380, 445
- §363, 381, 382, 590, 591
- §364, 382, 384
- §365, 385, 387, 592, 596
- §366, 388, 597
- §367, 389, 597
- §368, 391, 392, 599, 600
- §369, 392, 600

PARAGRAPHS REFERRED TO IN LATER CONTRIBUTIONS

§370, 391, 600	§409, 458
§371, 392-394, 601	§410, 458, 459
§372, 394, 396, 603	§411, 459, 665
§373, 406	§412, 460, 462, 666, 667
§374, 406, 407, 608	§§412-420, 460
§375, 407, 408	§413, 462, 667
§376, 342, 409, 410, 616	§414, 463
§377, 378, 409, 410, 615	§415, 668
§378, 411-413, 415, 416, 621	§416, 464, 466, 669
§378:, 412	§418, 465
§379, 413-415	§419, 466
§380, 417, 418, 626, 627	§420, 467, 671
§381, 418, 627	§421, 467
§382, 419, 628	§422, 469, 470
§383, 420, 629	§§422-424, 469
§384, 405, 420, 421	§424, 470
§385, 421-423, 632	§§425-428, 471
§386, 423	§426, 471, 673
§387, 424, 425, 635	§427, 472, 473, 616
§388, 425, 635, 636	§428, 474
§389, 426, 427, 637	§429, 474, 675
§390, 639	§430, 476, 477, 675-677
§392, 429, 431-433, 639, 642	§§430-431, 475
§393, 433, 434, 644	§431, 476, 676
§394, 437, 647, 648	§432, 479, 678
§395, 429, 439, 649	§§432-435, 477
§396, 440, 441, 650	§433, 678
§397, 441, 644	§434, 479, 678, 679
§398, 445, 653	§435, 480
§399, 443	§436, 481
§400, 445-447	§437, 482
§401, 447, 654	§438, 488
§402, 448, 450, 655, 656	§439, 488, 490, 537, 546, 683
§403, 451, 657, 658	§440, 490, 683
§404, 451, 452, 658	§445, 499, 549
§405, 457, 664	§447, 496
§406, 458, 665	§452, 496
§407, 452	§454, 496
§408, 454	§455, 497



- §456, 497
- §457, 498
- §458, 498
- §459, 498, 499
- §460, 499, 500
- §464, 504
- §465, 505
- §466, 506
- §467, 506, 507
- §468, 508
- §470, 504, 508, 509
- §471, 355, 509
- §473, 511
- §475, 512
- §476, 513
- §477, 513
- §478, 514, 515
- §479, 515
- §480, 517, 518
- §481, 518–520
- §482, 520
- §483, 520
- §484, 521
- §485, 521
- §486, 521
- §487, 522
- §488, 522
- §489, 523
- §490, 523
- §491, 524
- §492, 525
- §494, 525
- §495, 370, 525
- §496, 526
- §497, 526
- §498, 526, 527
- §499, 527, 528
- §500, 530
- §503, 529
- §505, 530, 531
- §510, 534
- §511, 535
- §512, 418, 535, 536
- §513, 536
- §514, 536
- §515, 537
- §516, 537
- §517, 538
- §519, 538, 539
- §520, 539, 540
- §521, 540
- §522, 541
- §§522-523, 418
- §523, 541
- §524, 541
- §525, 541
- §526, 542
- §527, 539, 543
- §529, 528, 529, 544, 546
- §530, 546, 547
- §531, 547
- §532, 548
- §533, 549
- §534, 550, 551
- §535, 551
- §536, 552, 553
- §537, 553, 554
- §538, 554
- §539, 502, 503, 555, 556
- §540, 556
- §541, 561
- §542, 562, 565, 569, 570
- §543, 571
- §544, 571
- §545, 573
- §547, 573–575, 670
- §548, 575
- §549, 576

PARAGRAPHS REFERRED TO IN LATER CONTRIBUTIONS

§550, 392	§606, 616
§§550-553, 576	§607, 617
§551, 576	§608, 564, 599, 618, 621
§554, 439, 579, 631	§609, 423, 632
§555, 580	§610, 621
§556, 581	§611, 619
§557, 581, 582, 592	§612, 622
§558, 422, 582, 583	§613, 622
§559, 451, 585, 586, 595	§614, 617, 623
§561, 410, 422, 587, 588, 617	§616, 622
§562, 588	§618, 618, 624, 625
§563, 589	§619, 618
§565, 590, 591	§621, 626
§566, 591	§622, 627
§567, 592	§623, 627
§568, 592	§624, 627
§569, 586, 593	§625, 628
§570, 593, 594	§626, 628
§572, 596	§627, 629
§573, 597	§630, 629
§574, 597	§631, 630
§575, 598	§632, 631
§576, 412, 599, 617	§633, 632
§577, 601	§634, 633
§581, 600	§635, 633
§582, 601	§636, 634
§586, 602, 603	§637, 634
§587, 603	§638, 634
§590, 605	§639, 635
§592, 574, 604, 605, 659	§640, 635
§594, 606	§641, 635, 636
§596, 605	§642, 636, 637
§597, 606	§643, 637
§599, 608	§644, 637, 638
§601, 609	§645, 638
§602, 610	§646, 640
§603, 566, 611	§647, 640, 641
§604, 612, 615	§650, 641, 642
§605, 615	§651, 642

§652, 642, 643	§703, 661
§653, 643	§704, 662
§654, 643, 644	§705, 662
§655, 644	§706, 662
§658, 657, 673	§708, 648, 662
§659, 644, 646	§709, 663
§660, 645	§710, 663
§661, 645	§711, 663
§662, 646	§712, 664
§663, 646	§713, 664
§665, 647	§714, 664
§§665-666, 647	§716, 664
§667, 648	§717, 665
§668, 648	§719, 665
§669, 649	§720, 666
§670, 649	§721, 666
§671, 649	§722, 667
§672, 650	§723, 667
§673, 650	§725, 668
§674, 650	§726, 668
§677, 651	§727, 668
§678, 651, 652	§728, 668
§679, 652	§729, 668
§681, 652	§730, 669
§683, 653	§731, 669
§684, 653	§732, 670
§685, 653	§733, 670
§687, 654	§734, 670
§690, 655	§736, 668
§691, 655	§738, 671
§692, 656	§739, 671, 672
§693, 657	§741, 672
§694, 657	§742, 672
§695, 657	§745, 672
§697, 658	§746, 672
§698, 658	§747, 673
§700, 659	§748, 673
§701, 659-661	§749, 673
§702, 661	§750, 674

*PARAGRAPHS REFERRED TO IN LATER CONTRIBUTIONS*

§751, 674	§780, 680
§752, 674	§781, 681
§756, 674, 675	§782, 681
§758, 675	§783, 682
§760, 676	§784, 682
§761, 676	§786, 683
§763, 677	§788, 683
§764, 678	§789, 684
§765, 678	§817, 555
§766, 679	§877, 537
§767, 679	§898, 546
§776, 680	§§975-976, 627
§777, 680	§1038, 629
§779, 680	395, 440

# Passages in the *Precepts* by Name

Every passage contained in the *Precepts* is listed with keywords in alphabetical order, the gospel source and the page in this edition. With this we have an overview over the parallel synoptic versions of the biblical passages used by Rammohan Roy.

## Adultery and Divorce

Mt, 15

## Almsgiving

Mt, 16

## Anger

Mt, 15

## Another Exorcist

Lk, 49

Mk, 40

## Ask, Search, Knock

Lk, 51

Mt, 17

## Authority of Jesus

Mt, 30

## Beatitudes

Lk, 46

Mt, 14

## Bread from Heaven

Jn, 66

## Children Blessed

Lk, 62

## Children blessed

Mk, 41

Mt, 28

## Closed Door

Lk, 56

## Cost of Discipleship

Lk, 58

## Cross and Self-Denial

Mk, 40

Mt, 25

## Denouncing Pharisees and Lawyers

Lk, 52

Mt, 33

## Divorce (Question of the Pharisees)

Mt, 27

## Faithful and Evil Servant

Lk, 53

Mt, 34

## Fasting

Mt, 16

## Friends and Enemies

Mt, 21

## Golden Rule

Mt, 17

## Good Samaritan

Lk, 50

## Greatest Commandment

Lk, 50

Mk, 43

Mt, 32

- Healing of a Crippled Woman  
Lk, 56
- Healing of the Man with Dropsy  
Lk, 57
- Hearers and Doers  
Lk, 46  
Mt, 18
- Jesus Fortelling his fate  
Mt, 25
- Jesus thanks his Father  
Mt, 20
- Journey to Jerusalem  
Lk, 49
- Judgement of the Nations  
Mt, 35
- Judging Others  
Lk, 46
- Judging others  
Mt, 17
- Labourers in the Vineyard  
Mt, 29
- Lament over Jerusalem  
Lk, 57  
Mt, 33
- Law and Kingdom  
Lk, 60
- Law and Prophets  
Mt, 15
- Lord's Prayer  
Lk, 51  
Mt, 16
- Love for Enemies  
Lk, 46  
Mt, 15
- Man with a Withered Hand  
Lk, 45  
Mt, 21
- Martha and Mary  
Lk, 51
- Meat Which Endureth (Bread from Heaven)  
Jn, 66
- Mission of Seventy Disciples  
Lk, 50
- Narrow Gate  
Mt, 18
- Nicodemus Visits Jesus  
Jn, 65
- Parable of the Barren Fig Tree  
Lk, 55
- Parable of the Dishonest Steward  
Lk, 60
- Parable of the Lost Coin  
Lk, 58
- Parable of the Lost Sheep  
Lk, 58  
Mt, 26
- Parable of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven  
Lk, 56  
Mk, 38  
Mt, 22
- Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican  
Lk, 62
- Parable of the Prodigal  
Lk, 58
- Parable of the Sower  
Lk, 48  
Mk, 38  
Mt, 22
- Parable of the Talents  
Lk, 63  
Mt, 35

- Parable of the Widow and the Unjust Judge  
Lk, 62
- Parables about the Kingdom  
Mk, 38  
Mt, 22
- Persecutions  
Lk, 53  
Mt, 19
- Peter about Jesus  
Mt, 25
- Plucking Grain on the Sabbath  
Lk, 45  
Mk, 37  
Mt, 20
- Prayer for Forgiveness  
Mt, 43
- Purity and Fasting  
Lk, 45  
Mk, 36  
Mt, 19
- Question about David's Son, 44  
Mt, 32
- Question about Paying Taxes  
Lk, 64  
Mk, 43  
Mt, 31
- Question about Resurrection  
Lk, 64  
Mk, 43  
Mt, 32
- Rejection of Jesus at Nazareth  
Lk, 44
- Repent or Perish  
Lk, 55
- Rich Man and Lazarus  
Lk, 60
- Rich Young Man  
Lk, 62  
Mk, 41  
Mt, 28
- Salt and Light  
Mt, 14
- Samaritan Village Rejects Jesus  
Lk, 49
- Self-Deception  
Mt, 18
- Serving Two Masters  
Mt, 17
- Seventy Times Seven  
Mt, 27
- Sound Eye  
Lk, 52  
Mt, 17
- Spiritual Blindness  
Jn, 66
- Temptations to Sin  
Mk, 40  
Mt, 26
- Ten Bridesmaids  
Mt, 35
- Things that Defile  
Mk, 39  
Mt, 24
- Tradition of the Elders  
Mk, 39  
Mt, 24
- Treasure in Heaven  
Mt, 17
- Tree and Fruit  
Lk, 46  
Mt, 18, 21
- True Greatness  
Lk, 49

*PASSAGES IN THE PRECEPTS BY NAME*

Mk, 40	Lk, 50
Mt, 26	Woman Anointing Jesus
True Kindred of Jesus	Lk, 47
Lk, 49	Woman Caught in Adultery
Mk, 37	Jn, 66
Mt, 22	Woman Praising Jesus' Mother
True Vine	Lk, 52
Jn, 67	Worrying
Two Sons	Mt, 17
Mt, 30	Worship in Spirit and Truth
	Jn, 66
Wedding Banquet/Great Dinner	Would-Be Followers of Jesus
Lk, 57	Lk, 49
Mt, 31	
Wicked Tenants	Yeast of Pharisees
Mt, 30	Lk, 53
Widow's Offering	Mt, 25
Lk, 64	
Mk, 44	Zebedee's Request
Woes to Unrepentant Cities	Mk, 42
	Mt, 29



# Index of Topics

## Abel

- Marshman Dec 1821, 244
- Final Appeal*, 339–340
- Marshman Dec 1823, 514–515

## Abraham

- Marshman Dec 1821, 246, 272
- Final Appeal*, 344, 345, 347, 366, 368
- Marshman Dec 1823, 522

## Almighty power of Christ

- Marshman Sept 1820, 109, 111–112, 112
- Second Appeal*, 151–154
- Marshman Dec 1821, 310–312
- Final Appeal*, 471–474
- Marshman Jan 1825, 583–585, 673–674

## Alpha and Omega (Rv)

- Marshman Sept 1820, 110–111
- Second Appeal*, 212–214
- Marshman Dec 1821, 277, 284–285, 296
- Final Appeal*, 390–391, 410–417
- Marshman Jan 1825, 599, 617–626

## Amos, 291

- Marshman Dec 1821, 260
- Marshman Dec 1823, 540
- Marshman Jan 1825, 637

## Angel of JHWH

- Marshman Dec 1821, 271–273

## *Final Appeal*, 365–367

Angel of the LORD, 562–576

## Angels and Christ

### *Second Appeal*, 167

Angels, “the highest archangel” and the Creator, 270  
bears no guilt, 238

## Apostles and Atonement/Trinity

### *Second Appeal*, 183–185

Marshman Dec 1821, 267–268

### *Final Appeal*, 360–362

Marshman Dec 1823, 547–550

## Ascension in Ps 68

### *Second Appeal*, 214–215

Marshman Dec 1821, 253

### *Final Appeal*, 374–376, 382–385

Marshman Jan 1825, 592

## Atonement through Jesus’ suffering

Marshman Sept 1820, 112–117

### *Second Appeal*, 161–167

Marshman Dec 1821, 243–269

### *Final Appeal*, 337–365

Marshman Dec 1823, 511, 557

## Bible, hermeneutical principles

### *Second Appeal*, 219–220, 228

Marshman Dec 1821, 239–243

Marshman Jan 1825, 585–586

## Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit

(Mt 12), 178–180

## Blasphemy, Jesus accused by Jews (Jn

- 8; 10)  
*Second Appeal*, 142–143, 152–153  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 272, 299  
*Final Appeal*, 447–451
- “The Branch”  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 262  
*Final Appeal*, 427–428  
 Marshman Jan 1825, 638
- British rule in India, 491
- Christ  
 compared to biblical holy men,  
 611–615, 629–631
- Christian Mission in India  
*Appeal*, 87–89  
 Marshman May 1820, 98–100
- Christianity, different types  
*Precepts*, 11  
 Marshman May 1820, 96
- Comma Johanneum (1 Jn 5:7), 183
- Corner-stone/Stone of stumbling  
*Second Appeal*, 216–218  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 281  
*Final Appeal*, 406–407  
 Marshman Jan 1825, 608–610
- Council of Nicaea, 682
- Creation and Christ  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 274,  
 278–279, 302  
*Final Appeal*, 372–374, 391,  
 452–457, 459  
 Marshman Jan 1825, 577–579,  
 582–585, 631–632
- Crucifixion as act of injustice  
*Second Appeal*, 163–164  
*Final Appeal*, 342  
 Marshman Dec 1823, 530–534,  
 545
- Crucifixion, not in vain (Ga 2:21),  
 505–509
- Crucifixion, Rammohan’s  
 explanations  
*Second Appeal*, 162–163  
*Final Appeal*, 341–342, 344
- Crucifixion, voluntariness  
*Second Appeal*, 163–164  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 251–252  
*Final Appeal*, 350–351, 458  
 Marshman Dec 1823, 529–530
- Daniel  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 259,  
 290–291  
*Final Appeal*, 356, 425  
 Marshman Dec 1823, 539  
 Marshman Jan 1825, 634–635
- David  
*Final Appeal*, 370–372
- Deity/Subordination of Christ  
 Marshman Sept 1820, 107  
*Second Appeal*, 137–146  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 269–317  
*Final Appeal*, 429–460
- Delight in self-sacrifice, *see*  
 Crucifixion, voluntariness
- Dogmatics, causing controversies  
*Precepts*, 12  
*Appeal*, 87  
 Marshman Sept 1820, 121–122  
*Second Appeal*, 168–173
- Dogmatics, conserved by prejudice  
*Second Appeal*, 140, 154, 181
- Elijah, 337, 386, 409, 422, 432, 512
- Elisha, 372, 386, 412, 422, 432
- Emmanuel (Is 9)  
*Second Appeal*, 200–206, 226–228

- Marshman Dec 1821, 254–281  
*Final Appeal*, 396–406  
 Marshman Dec 1823, 534  
 Marshman Jan 1825, 603–608
- Ethics of Jesus as centre of his teachings  
*Precepts*, 11–12  
*Appeal*, 81–83, 85–87  
*Second Appeal*, 132
- Ezekiel  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 259  
*Final Appeal*, 356  
 Marshman Dec 1823, 539
- Faith  
 given by God, 515–516
- Final judgment by Christ  
 Marshman Sept 1820, 109–110  
*Second Appeal*, 154–155, 214  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 282–284, 312  
*Final Appeal*, 408–410, 424–425, 474–475  
 Marshman Jan 1825, 674
- First-born (Col 1:15)  
*Second Appeal*, 139, 140, 145, 154, 176, 179, 214  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 294  
*Final Appeal*, 437–439, 477  
 Marshman Jan 1825, 647–648
- “God” used for created beings  
*Second Appeal*, 143–145, 206–207  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 289–290  
*Final Appeal*, 385–388, 404–405  
 Marshman Jan 1825, 586–587, 594–596
- God’s Existence  
*Precepts*, 11
- Schmid Feb 1820, 72  
*Appeal*, 92–94  
 Marshman Sept 1820, 122  
*Second Appeal*, 171–172
- Gospels and Atonement, 544–547
- Greatest Commandment  
*Appeal*, 82–83  
*Second Appeal*, 132  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 238–239  
*Final Appeal*, 334–335
- Habakkuk  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 261  
*Final Appeal*, 358  
 Marshman Dec 1823, 541
- Haggai  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 261  
*Final Appeal*, 358  
 Marshman Dec 1823, 542
- “Heathen” as insult  
 Marshman Feb 1820, 75, 76  
*Appeal*, 79–81  
 Marshman May 1820, 96
- Hezekiah, *see* Emmanuel
- Hinduism  
 Karma system, 501–503, 555–557  
 miraculous Traditions, *see* Ugusti  
 polytheistic H., 92–93  
 Polytheists confess the unity of God, 145, 181  
 Vedānta, 93–94
- “Holy One” as divine title  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 250, 280–281  
*Final Appeal*, 405–406  
 Marshman Jan 1825, 608
- Holy Spirit  
 Marshman Sept 1820, 119–120  
*Second Appeal*, 175–181

- Marshman Dec 1821, 260, 317  
*Final Appeal*, 480–484  
 Marshman Jan 1825, 629, 679
- Hosea  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 260, 291  
*Final Appeal*, 425–426  
 Marshman Dec 1823, 540  
 Marshman Jan 1825, 635–636
- Human depravity  
 Marshman Sept 1820, 117–121  
*Second Appeal*, 133–135  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 238–239, 246  
 Marshman Dec 1823, 504–505, 555–556
- “Husband”, as title  
*Second Appeal*, 212, 419  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 286–287  
*Final Appeal*, 418  
 Marshman Jan 1825, 627–628
- Hypostatic union, *see* Two natures of Christ
- “I am”, as divine title  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 272, 303  
*Final Appeal*, 368–369, 460–461  
 Marshman Jan 1825, 563–564, 573–576
- Incomprehensibility of Christ  
 Marshman Sept 1820, 108  
*Second Appeal*, 149–150  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 308  
*Final Appeal*, 467–469  
 Marshman Jan 1825, 671–672
- Isaiah  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 254–259  
*Final Appeal*, 353–355, 394–419  
 Marshman Dec 1823, 534–538  
 Marshman Jan 1825, 601–628
- Isaiah’s vision (Isa 6)  
*Second Appeal*, 182–183, 208, 224  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 279–280  
*Final Appeal*, 394–396  
 Marshman Jan 1825, 601–603
- Islam  
 conserved purer Monotheism, 160  
 cruelty against non-Muslims, 142  
 is Unitarianism, 503  
 its origin is the trinity, 89  
 Muhammad as false prophet, 315, 580  
 Muhammad compared with Christ, 75, 111, 112, 159–160  
 Muhammad confessed as founder, *see* Trinitarian Formula  
 Muhammad’s language, 383  
 Muhammad’s miracles, 174  
 Muslims returning to I. after becoming Christians, 88
- Jehovah, use by Marshman  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 252, 254, 262, 274  
*Final Appeal*, 377, 379–380, 382  
 Marshman Jan 1825, 585–586
- Jeremiah  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 259  
*Final Appeal*, 355, 419–422  
 Marshman Dec 1823, 538–539  
 Marshman Jan 1825, 628–634
- Jesus’ own words on the atonement  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 266–267  
*Final Appeal*, 359–360
- Job  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 246, 273  
*Final Appeal*, 346–347, 369

- Marshman Dec 1823, 525  
Marshman Jan 1825, 576
- Joel  
Marshman Dec 1821, 260, 291  
*Final Appeal*, 426  
Marshman Dec 1823, 540  
Marshman Jan 1825, 636–637
- John (Apostle)  
reliable witness, 242
- Judaism  
and Trinity, 222–227  
biblical interpretations, 197,  
214–215, 222–226  
founder, *see* Moses  
hellenistic influence, 223–224  
Jews misinterpret passages about  
the Messiah, 425  
Jews persecuted early  
Christians., 358, 543  
Jews punished for the murder of  
Christ, 358  
Sephiret, 223–224
- Justification, Reconciliation with God  
Schmid Feb 1820, 72–73  
*Appeal*, 83–84
- Lamb of God, as title  
Marshman Sept 1820, 113–114  
*Second Appeal*, 166–167, 167  
Marshman Dec 1821, 246–247  
*Final Appeal*, 347  
Marshman Dec 1823, 526
- Law of God  
Schmid Feb 1820, 73  
*Appeal*, 81–83  
Marshman Sept 1820, 120–121  
Marshman Dec 1821, 236–238  
*Final Appeal*, 335
- Mercy, *see* Repentance and mercy  
Messenger of the covenant (Ml 3)  
*Second Appeal*, 207–208  
Marshman Dec 1821, 281–282  
*Final Appeal*, 407–408  
Marshman Jan 1825, 610–611
- Messiah is Jesus  
Marshman Sept 1820, 112–115  
*Second Appeal*, 167
- Metaphors  
common among Orientals, 160,  
206–218  
illustrating the Trinity, 189–192  
in the scriptures, 141, 144, 176,  
189, 218
- Micah  
Marshman Dec 1821, 261  
*Final Appeal*, 357  
Marshman Dec 1823, 541
- Miracles of Jesus  
*Appeal*, 86–87  
Marshman Sept 1820, 122–125  
*Second Appeal*, 145, 172–174  
Marshman Dec 1821, 302  
*Final Appeal*, 372, 458–459  
Marshman Jan 1825, 611–612,  
629–631
- Moses, *see* Ascension in Ps 68, 272  
compared to Christ, 113, 165–166  
confessed as founder of Judaism,  
*see* Trinitarian Formula  
declared a God, 144, 386, 454, 586
- Mosheim, Johannes Lorenz, 488, 682
- Muhammad, *see* Islam
- Nahum  
Marshman Dec 1821, 261  
*Final Appeal*, 358  
Marshman Dec 1823, 541

- Name of God in compound names,  
288–289, 404–405, 421
- Nicene Creed, 431
- Noah’s sacrifice  
Marshman Dec 1821, 245  
*Final Appeal*, 345  
Marshman Dec 1823, 524
- Obadiah  
Marshman Dec 1821, 260  
*Final Appeal*, 357  
Marshman Dec 1823, 540–541
- Old Testament, priority, *see* Bible,  
hermeneutical principles
- Omnipotence of Christ, *see* Almighty  
power of Christ
- Omnipresence/ubiquity of Christ  
Marshman Sept 1820, 108, 112  
*Second Appeal*, 147–149  
Marshman Dec 1821, 303–308  
*Final Appeal*, 460–467  
Marshman Jan 1825, 666–671
- Omniscience of Christ, *see* Final  
judgment by Christ
- Passover  
Marshman Dec 1821, 246  
Marshman Dec 1823, 526
- Pentateuch and Atonement  
Marshman Dec 1821, 243–249  
*Final Appeal*, 337–348  
Marshman Dec 1823, 511
- Pentateuch and Trinity  
Marshman Dec 1821, 271–273  
*Final Appeal*, 365–367
- Philippian Hymn  
*Second Appeal*, 209  
Marshman Dec 1821, 293  
*Final Appeal*, 423, 435–437
- Marshman Jan 1825, 644–647  
“The pierced one” (Zc 12:10)  
*Second Appeal*, 215–216  
Marshman Dec 1821, 262–264  
*Final Appeal*, 484–486  
Marshman Jan 1825, 680
- Polytheism in Christianity  
*Second Appeal*, 140, 145, 169,  
187–188  
*Final Appeal*, 373, 382, 386, 458
- Precepts*, criteria of selection  
*Precepts*, 12–13  
Schmid Feb 1820, 72–74  
*Appeal*, 81–83
- Precepts*, identity of the compiler  
Schmid Feb 1820, 71  
*Appeal*, 80–81
- Prejudices, hermeneutical  
Marshman Feb 1820, 75–76  
*Second Appeal*, 218–220  
Marshman Dec 1821, 234–235  
*Final Appeal*, 329–331  
Marshman Dec 1823, 498–503
- Prologue to John, 659–663  
Marshman Dec 1821, 300–301  
*Final Appeal*, 452–457
- Prophet’s books  
Marshman Dec 1821, 254–266,  
279–291  
*Final Appeal*, 353–359, 392–429  
Marshman Dec 1823, 534–543  
Marshman Jan 1825, 601–639
- Prophets as God’s messengers  
*Second Appeal*, 150  
*Final Appeal*, 367–368  
Marshman Jan 1825, 572–573
- Protevangelium (Gn 3:15)  
Marshman Dec 1821, 243–244  
*Final Appeal*, 337

- Marshman Dec 1823, 512–514
- Proverbs  
*Final Appeal*, 392–394
- Psalms  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 249–254,  
 273–279  
*Final Appeal*, 348–352, 370–392  
 Marshman Dec 1823, 527–530  
 Marshman Jan 1825, 576–601
- Rammohan Roy  
 is a Unitarian, 604  
 prejudiced by his Hindu origin,  
 498–503, 541, 555–557, 569,  
 572, 584  
 threatened by eternal damnation,  
 125, 247, 252, 320, 503, 513,  
 520, 556, 596, 621, 632, 642,  
 664, 684
- Rammohan Roy, biographical  
 information  
*Appeal*, 80–81  
*Second Appeal*, 142  
*Final Appeal*, 327–329
- Rammohan Roy, personal  
 motivations, 173, 218–219
- Repentance and mercy  
*Second Appeal*, 135  
*Final Appeal*, 335–337  
 Marshman Dec 1823, 509–511
- Sabellius, 190, 393
- Sacrifice  
 ended after Christ, 523–524  
 root of genuine religion, 246,  
 266, 268
- Sacrifice and Atonement  
*Final Appeal*, 340–345
- Marshman Dec 1823, 514–515,  
 524–527
- Sacrifice in the Mosaic ritual  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 247–249
- Sacrifice in the New Testament  
*Final Appeal*, 341  
 Marshman Dec 1823, 518–520
- Salvation history, 254–255, 266, 268
- “Saviour” as title  
*Second Appeal*, 164–165, 210  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 257,  
 260–261  
*Final Appeal*, 353  
 Marshman Dec 1823, 535–536
- Scape Goat  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 248  
*Final Appeal*, 347–348  
 Marshman Dec 1823, 526, 537
- “Searcher of hearts” as title  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 284, 289,  
 291, 300, 303, 310, 313, 316  
*Final Appeal*, 412, 422  
 Marshman Jan 1825, 632–634
- Semuh, *see* “The Branch”
- Septuagint, 206, 216, 263, 368–369,  
 484–485, 574–575, 603, 604
- Servant of God, suffering (Is  
 52:13–53:12)  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 258–259  
*Final Appeal*, 354  
 Marshman Dec 1823, 537
- “Seven positions” of Marshman  
*Second Appeal*, 147–160  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 303–317  
*Final Appeal*, 460–480
- “Shepherd” as title  
*Second Appeal*, 210–211  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 259,  
 275–276

- Final Appeal*, 381–382  
 Marshman Jan 1825, 590–591  
 Shepherd, smitten (Zc 13)  
*Second Appeal*, 197  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 264–265
- Sins forgiven by Christ  
 Marshman Sept 1820, 108  
*Second Appeal*, 151  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 308–310  
*Final Appeal*, 469–470  
 Marshman Jan 1825, 672–673
- Socinus, Faustus (Sozzini, Fausto),  
 625, 656, 659, 663, 682
- Solomon, addressed in Ps 45, 378, 587
- “The Son” of God  
*Second Appeal*, 138–140
- Suffering Servant of God (Is 52f.)  
 Marshman Sept 1820, 115–116
- Trinitarian formula (Mt 28:19)  
 Marshman Sept 1820, 112  
*Second Appeal*, 158–160, 175–176,  
 176  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 314–317  
*Final Appeal*, 477–480  
 Marshman Jan 1825, 677–679
- Trinitarian understanding of God  
*Appeal*, 89  
*Second Appeal*, 145, 181–188,  
 221–222  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 318  
*Final Appeal*, 365–429
- Trinity (historical development)  
*Second Appeal*, 183–189, 222–227
- Two natures of Christ  
*Second Appeal*, 140, 163, 165,  
 188–189, 192–193, 228  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 250–251,  
 255–265, 268–269
- Final Appeal*, 362–363, 386–387  
 Marshman Dec 1823, 520–521,  
 550–554  
 Marshman Jan 1825, 569, 587,  
 592–594, 597–598, 644
- Ugusti  
*Precepts*, 12  
 Marshman Feb 1820, 76  
 Schmid Feb 1820, 72  
*Appeal*, 87  
*Second Appeal*, 173–174
- Unitarianism, 577, 579  
 as delusion, 545–546  
 as grand sect of Christianity, 142  
 as Rammohan’s ally, 305, 683  
 in Islam and Vedānta, 503  
 Trinitarianism is the real U., 601
- Unity of God  
*Final Appeal*, 457–458
- Unity with God  
*Second Appeal*, 140–142, 188–189  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 297–298  
*Final Appeal*, 445–447
- Vedānta  
 and Unitarianism, 503  
 fighting Polytheism, 330, 500
- Virgin birth of Jesus, 177
- Wisdom of God (Pr 8)  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 279  
*Final Appeal*, 392–394  
 Marshman Jan 1825, 601
- Worshipping Christ  
 Marshman Sept 1820, 110–111  
*Second Appeal*, 155–158  
 Marshman Dec 1821, 313  
*Final Appeal*, 410–412, 475–477  
 Marshman Jan 1825, 675–677



Wrath of Christ

Marshman Dec 1821, 273

*Final Appeal*, 370–372

Marshman Jan 1825, 598–599

Zechariah

Marshman Dec 1821, 262–265,

291

*Final Appeal*, 358–429

Marshman Dec 1823, 542–543

Marshman Jan 1825, 637–638

Zephaniah

Marshman Dec 1821, 261

Zoroastrianism, 182

The debate between Rammohan Roy and Joshua Marshman which took place between 1820 and 1825 in Calcutta, is a classical example of an interreligious discussion in colonial India. An Indian philosopher from Hindu tradition and a Baptist missionary fought for five years over the understanding of the Bible, Jesus Christ and the Christian tradition.

In this edition, for the first time all the texts written by both opponents are chronologically collected: *The Precepts of Jesus, the Appeals to the Christian Public and Marshman's reviews of Rammohan's texts*. Their hypertextuality and mutual entanglement is fully referenced and made transparent.

This edition is a supplement to *Die Debatte zwischen Rammohan Roy und Joshua Marshman von 1820-1825. Ein Streit um die Auslegung der Bibel zwischen interreligiöser Begegnung und Unversöhnlichkeit*, the doctoral thesis of Armin Pöhlmann.

Armin Pöhlmann, born in 1975, is a German Lutheran pastor working in Eisenach. After several study visits in Hyderabad, India he started to work on the field of transreligious Bible interpretation – especially examining the view of believers of non-Christian religions onto the Bible.

Logos Verlag Berlin

ISBN 978-3-8325-5387-6

---