tain what is common to all languages, and neglect what is peculiar to each. It ſhould retain nothing but clearness and precision, by which the mind and ſentiments of the writer are intelligibly conveyed to the reader. This quality is essential, invariably the ſame, and independent of cuſtom and faſhion. It is the conſequence of ſyntax, the very thing in language which is leaſt poſitive, as being formed on the principles of philoſophy and logic : whereas all beſides, from the very power of the elements and ſignification of the terms to the tropes and figures in compoſition, are arbitrary ; and, as deviating from theſe principles, frequently vicious. But this quality of clearneſs and precision eminently diſtinguiſhes the writings of the New Teſtament ; inſomuch that it may be eaſily ſhown, that whatever difficulties occur in the ſa­cred books do not ariſe from any imperfect information cauſed by this local or nominal barbarity of ſtyle ; but either from the ſublime or obſcure nature of the things treated of, or from the intentional conciſeneſs of the writers ; who, in the caſual mention of any thing not essential to the diſpenſation, always obſerve a ſtudied brevity.”

After much ingenious and sound reasoning on the nature of language in general, our author concludes, that the style ef the New Teſtament, even on the ſupposition of the truth of what has been ſaid to its diſcredit, is ſo far from proving the language not to be divinely inſpired, that it bears one certain mark of that original. “ Every language consists of two diſtinct parts, the ſingle terms, and the phraſes and idioms. Suppoſe now a foreign language to be inſtantaneouſly introduced into the minds of illiterate men like the apoſtles ; the impreſſion muſt be made either by fixing in the memory the terms and single words only with their ſigni­fication, as, for inſtance, Greek words correſponding to ſuch or ſuch Syriac or Hebrew words ; or elſe, together with that ſimple impreſſion, by enriching the mind with all the phraſes and idioms of the language ſo inſpired. But to enrich the mind with the peculiar phraſes and idiom of a foreign language, would require a previous impreſſion to be made of the manners, notione, faſhions, and opinions, of the people to whom that language is native ; becauſe the idiom and phraſes ariſe from and are dependent on theſe manners. But this would be a waſte of miracles without ſufficient cauſe or occaſion ; for the Syriac or Hebrew idiom, to which the Jews were of themſelves enabled to adapt the Greek or any other words, abundantly ſerved the uſeful purpoſes of the gift of tongues, which all centered in thoſe tongues, being ſo ſpoken and written as to be clearly understood. Hence it follows, that if the ſtyle of the New Teſtament were indeed derived from that language which was miraculouſly impressed upon the apoſtles on the day of Pentecoſt, it muſt be just ſuch a one as in reality we find it to be ; that is, it muſt conſiſt of Greek words in the Syriac or Hebrew idiom.”

The immediate author of this gift, ſo necessary to the propagation of the goſpel, was the Spirit of truth, or the Comforter, who is the Holy Ghoſt and the third perſon in the blessed Trinity. That there are three persons in the one Godhead, has been ſhown at large in a former ſection of this article ; and that the Holy Ghoſt is one of theſe three, might be ſafely concluded from the form of baptiſm inſtituted by Chriſt himſelf. 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 imparted to the infant church, and of the apoſtles preaching under his influence. 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 ſuppoſed 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 theſe virtues. Thus when St Paul ſays@@\*, 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@@\* 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@@\* 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 as that they could be ſuppoſed 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@@\* 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, 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 what 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 ; that 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 *prospopeia* to ſerve his
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