sages just referred to. But as more plausible objections have been urged against his divinity than any that we have met with against the divinity of Christ, it may not be im­proper to consider these before we proceed to give an ac­count of the graces which he imparts to the church. By the Arians the Holy Ghost is considered as a creature ; by the Socinians and modern Unitarians, as they call themselves, the words *Holy Ghost* are supposcd to express, not a person or spiritual subsistence, but merely an energy or operation, a quality or power, of the Father, whom alone they acknow­ledge to be God. If this doctrine can be confuted, the Arian hypothesis will fall to the ground of itself ; for it is not conceivable that any inspired teacher should command his followers to be baptized in the name of the self-existent God and two creatures.

It is admitted by the Socinians themselves, that in the scriptures many things are spoken of the Holy Ghost which can be properly predicated only of a person ; but the infe­rence drawn from this concession they endeavour to invali­date by observing, that in scripture there are likewise ex­pressions in which things are predicated of abstract virtues, which can be literally true only of such persons as practise those virtues. Thus when St. Paul says, (1 Cor. xiii. 4-8), that “ charity suffereth long and is kind, charity envieth not, charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up," &c., we can­not suppose his meaning to be, that these actions are per­formed by charity in the abstract, but that every’ charitable person, in consequence of that one Christian grace, suffereth long and is kind, envieth not, vaunteth not himself, and is not puffed up, &c. In like manner, say they, personal ac­tions are attributed to the Holy Ghost, which itself is no person, but only the virtue, power, or efficacy, of God the Father ; because God the Father, who is a person, per­forms such actions by that power, virtue, or efficacy, in him­self, which is denominated the Holy Ghost. Thus when we read (Acts x. 19, 20), that “ the Spirit said unto Peter, Behold three men seek thee ; arise therefore and get thee down, and go with them, doubting nothing, for I have sent them we must understand that God the Father was the person who spoke these words and sent the three men ; but because he did so by that virtue in him which is called the *Spirit,* therefore the *Spirit* is said to have spoken the words and sent the men. Again, when “ the Holy Ghost said (Acts xiii. 2) to those at Antioch, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them we are to conceive that it was God the Father who command­ed the two apostles to be separated for the work to which he had called them ; but because he had done all this by that power within him which is called the Holy Ghost, therefore his words and actions are attributed to the Holy Ghost, just as long-suffering in men is attributed to cha­rity.

This reasoning has a plausible appearance, and would be of much force were *all* the actions which in scripture are attributed to the Holy Ghost of such a nature that they could be supposcd to have proceeded from the person of God the Father in consequence of any particular power or virtue in him ; but this is far from being the case. Thus, the Spirit is said (Rom. viii. 26, 27) to make interces­sion for us ; but with whom can we suppose God the Fa­ther, the fountain of divinity, to intercede ? Our Saviour assured his disciples, (John xiv. 26 ; xv. 26 ; xvi. 13, 14, 15), that the Father would, in his name, send to them the Holy Ghost, who is the Comforter ; that he would himself send the Comforter unto them from the Father ; that the Comforter should not speak of himself, but speak only w hat he should hear ; and that he should receive of Christ's, and shew it unto them. But we cannot, without blasphemy and absurdity, suppose that the Father would, in the name of Christ, send himself; that the Son would send the Fa­ther from the Father ; and the Father would not speak of himself, but speak only what he heard ; or that either the Father in person, or a quality of the Father, should receive any thing of Christ to shew unto the apostles.

The sagacity of Socinus perceived the force of such ob­jections as these to his notion of the Holy Ghost being no­thing more than the power of the Father personified ; and therefore he invented another *prosopoppoeia* to serve his pur­pose in the interpretation of those texts to which this one cannot be applied. “ The Spirit of God,” says he, (Faust, Socinus in Resp. ad Wickam, cap. 10), “ may be consider­ed either as a property or power in God, or as the things on which that power is working. When taken in the for­mer sense, the Spirit, where any personal attribute is given to it, means God the Father ; when taken in the latter sense, it means the man on whom the power of the Father is working ; who, as long as he is affected by that power, is therefore called the Spirit of God and he quotes, we think most absurdly, the tenth verse of the second chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians, as a text in which by the Spirit is meant an inspired man who could search all things, yea, even the deep things of God.

How his modern followers, who deny the plenary inspi­ration even of Christ, will relish such a degree of inspira­tion as this, which raises mere men to a temporary equality with God, we know not; but leaving them to settle the dis­pute with their master, we shall produce one or two passa­ges in which personal attributes are given to the Spirit of God, when it is impossible to conceive that Spirit, either as a power inherent in the Divine Father, or as the person on whom that power is operating. We need not bring new texts into view, as some of those already quoted will serve our purpose. When our Saviour promises that the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, the Spirit of truth, should be sent by the Father and the Son to the apostles, we have seen, that by this Spirit he could not mean the Father or a property of the Father ; neither could he possibly mean the apostles themselves, unless we are to suppose that the Father and the Son sent St. Peter to St. Peter, and that St. Peter, so sent, came to St. Peter. Again, when Christ says of the Holy Ghost, “ he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you," he could not, for the reason already assigned, mean by the Holy Ghost the Father or the power of the Father ; and surely his meaning was not, that the apostles, under the influence of the power of the Father, should re­ceive something and shew it each to himself. The Holy Ghost therefore is unquestionably a person ; for though there are many passages of scripture in which the *gifts* of the Holy Ghost are called the *Holy Ghost,* they are so called by a very common figure of speech, in which the effect receives the name of its cause : and since this person is joined with the Father and the Son in the formula of Christian baptism ; since they who lied to the Holy Ghost are said (Acts v. 4) to have lied unto God ; since blasphemy against him is a more heinous offence than the same sin against even the Father or the Son, (Mark iii. 28, 29) ; and since it was by the operation of the Holy Ghost that Jesus Christ was con­ceived of the Virgin Mary, and even on that account called the Son of God (Luke i. 35); it follows that the Holy Ghost is God, of the same substance with the Father and Son.

It was this Divine Spirit which, on the day of Pentecost, inspired the apostles with the knowledge of different lan­guages ; and as these were given only to enable them to preach the gospel to every creature, it can admit of no doubt but that He, who so amply provided the means of preaching, would take care that the gospel should be preach­ed in purity. Our Saviour had told his apostles, that the Comforter would guide them into all the truth, (*ἐις* *πασαν* *τηv ἀληθειav),* and bring all things to their remembrance, whatsoever he had said unto them ; but if they had not com­prehended the meaning of what he said, the bare remem­