

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 06182309 6







( Sparks )

ZFB





1871

1871

1871

1871

1871

1871

1871

1871

1871

1871

1871



A  
COLLECTION  
OF  
ESSAYS AND TRACTS  
IN  
THEOLOGY,  
FROM VARIOUS AUTHORS,  
WITH  
BIOGRAPHICAL AND CRITICAL NOTICES.

---

BY JARED SPARKS.

---

VOL. II.



BOSTON,

PUBLISHED BY OLIVER EVERETT, 13 CORNHILL.

PRINTED BY HILLIARD AND METCALF,

UNIVERSITY PRESS, CAMBRIDGE.

1823.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

PHYSICS DEPARTMENT

5720 S. UNIVERSITY AVE.

# CONTENTS

OF

## THE SECOND VOLUME.

DANIEL WHITBY.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTICE. - - - 3

### LAST THOUGHTS.

*Preface* - - - - - 27

### SECT. I.

*Proofs from Scripture, that the Nature and Powers of  
Christ were derived from the Father* - - 33

### SECT. II.

*The Scriptures teach that Christ is a distinct Being  
from the Father, and subordinate to him* - 39

### SECT. III.

*In what Sense Christ may be called God* - - 53

### SECT. IV.

*On the Faith necessary for Salvation* - - 63

## SECT. V.

- Strange Consequences of the Doctrine that the Father,  
Son, and Holy Spirit are one and the same Being* 85

## SECT. VI.

- Explanation of certain Texts in the Gospel, which  
have been supposed to prove the Identity of the  
Father and Son* - - - - 94

## SECT. VII.

- Texts in the Epistles considered* - - - 112

## FRANCIS HARE.

- BIOGRAPHICAL NOTICE** - - - 123
- ON THE DIFFICULTIES AND DISCOURAGEMENTS  
WHICH ATTEND THE STUDY OF THE SCRIP-  
TURES** - - - - 143

## SIR ISAAC NEWTON.

- BIOGRAPHICAL NOTICE** - - - 193

**AN HISTORICAL ACCOUNT OF TWO CORRUPTIONS  
OF SCRIPTURE.**

## SECT. I.

- On the Text of the Three Heavenly Witnesses* - 235

## SECT. II.

<i>On the Text concerning the Mystery of Godliness manifest in the Flesh</i>	- - - -	291
--	---------	-----



## CHALRES BUTLER.

HISTORICAL OUTLINE OF THE CONTROVERSY RESPECTING THE TEXT OF THE THREE HEAVENLY WITNESSES	- - - -	323
---	---------	-----



WHITBY'S

LAST THOUGHTS.





## WHITBY.

---

ALTHOUGH Whitby's life was lengthened to nearly a century, yet very few facts concerning him are found recorded, except such as may be gleaned from his own writings. And these exhibit little more, so far as he is personally concerned, than a history of his opinions. Biographers have too often been compelled to repeat the remark, that the life of a scholar is seldom fruitful of incidents; but rarely, in the annals of literature, has the truth of this remark been more evident, than in the instance of Whitby.

Thirty years before his death, Anthony Wood, in the *Athenæ Oxonienses*, wrote a brief account of his life and writings up to that period; and this has served as the basis, and sometimes has furnished the materials of the entire structure, for succeeding biographers. To the second edition of Whitby's *Last Thoughts*, printed after his death, Dr Sykes prefixed a short notice of the author, which contained little else, than a repetition of Wood's account, and the titles and dates of all Whitby's works. The same

was again repeated without any essential addition in the *Biographia Britannica*. The supplement to Moreri's *Dictionary* comprises a few other particulars, collected from notices of some of Whitby's publications, as inserted from time to time in Le Clerc's *Bibliothèque*. The French compiler of the article in Moreri seems not to have been over-curious to know much of Whitby, but contented himself with expressing his amazement and horror at his heretical and antipapistical opinions. In *Chaufepié's Continuation of Bayle*, the article on Whitby in the *Biographia Britannica* is translated, but without any thing new, except a few remarks on his writings. From all these sources, and from some others of minor consequence, it is not possible to collect materials, which can be put together in the shape of a memoir, or connected narrative. A short analysis of some of the author's principal works is all that will be attempted.

DANIEL WHITBY was born at Rushden, Northamptonshire, 1638. His father was a clergyman of that place, and a man of some eminence as a scholar and divine. Under his guidance the son made rapid progress in his early studies, and at the age of fifteen was admitted a commoner of Trinity College, Oxford. He took the degree of Master of Arts in 1660, and four years after was elected fellow of the same college. He was appointed chaplain to Dr Ward, Bishop of Salisbury, and in 1668 was made

prebendary of Yatesbury. In 1672 he took the degree of Doctor of Divinity, was admitted chanor of the Cathedral Church in his bishop's diocese, and raised to the rectorship of St Edmund's church, Salisbury. He was appointed prebendary of Taunton Regis in 1696, and to the duties of some or all of these stations he seems to have been devoted during the remainder of his life.

While Whitby was at the university, the popish controversy ran high in England, and his early publications were on that subject. As an author he first came before the public about the time, that he was advanced to his fellowship; and during the fifteen years following, he published six different treatises, chiefly in confutation of some of the peculiarities of the Romish church, or in reply to opponents. He also found leisure to write concerning the laws, both ecclesiastical and civil, which ignorance, or power, or prejudice, or bigotry, had made in different ages of the church against heretics; and he exposed in their true colours the wickedness and folly of persecution.

One of his most celebrated works, the *Protestant Reconciler*, was published in 1683. The title is a significant indication of the author's design. His project was to bring all protestants together, and especially the protestants of England, in the bonds of Christian union and love. He first pleads for condescension on the part of the established church

towards dissenters, in things indifferent and unnecessary ; and among these he reckons some of the ceremonies of the church, to which the dissenters had always been strenuously, and no doubt conscientiously, opposed. He took the ground, that whatever is indifferent, or whatever may be changed without violating the laws of God, ought not to be imposed by superiors as absolute terms of communion. By relaxing the rigour of established forms on these points, and admitting all persons to church fellowship, whose faith and conduct rendered them worthy, he flattered himself that the barriers of separation might be demolished, and a method provided for reconciliation and peace.

But the sequel proved, that he little knew in what dreams he was indulging. A host of adversaries instantly sprung up, like the harvest from the dragon's teeth sown by Cadmus, and attacked the author without moderation or mercy, accusing him of treasonable purposes, and of being a secret instigator of what was then called the Presbyterian Plot. Because he had modestly expressed his opinion, that the surplice, the sign of the cross in baptism, and the kneeling posture at the communion, which were so offensive and shocking in the eyes of the dissenters, might be safely dispensed with for the sake of peace and charity, he was assailed as one, who aimed at nothing less, than the overthrow of the church, and the ruin of its governors. The press was immedi-

ately put in motion to unburden many a labouring mind of the indignation, which weighed it down, and a multitude of pamphlets were sent abroad in quick succession. If, in that day, abuse were a good substitute for argument, and ribaldry for sense, some of these authors might have boasted of a signal triumph.

But these were trifling evils compared with others of a different kind, which awaited the author. His work was condemned by a formal decree of the University of Oxford, as containing doctrines false, impious, and seditious; and, as Wood affirms, it was forthwith burnt by the hands of the University Marshal in the Quadrangle of the Schools. This was no doubt an excellent thing for the bookseller, as nobody would fail to buy and read a book, which had been judged worthy of such a distinction by the grave convocation of a university.

To the offending author it brought no such happy presage. He was more fortunate than Servetus, it is true, in not being tied to his own book when it was committed to the devouring element; but even this lucky escape did not place him beyond the reach of the long arm of power, nor out of the influence of the relentless spirit of intolerance. He was arraigned before Bishop Ward, in whose diocess he held his offices in the church, and was compelled to make a formal Retraction. This is so curious a specimen of hierarchical despotism, practised in a

protestant country in the boasted days of protestant liberty, that it is believed the readers of this article will be gratified to see it entire. It not only relates to a remarkable incident in the life of Whitby, but is a prominent feature in the history of the age. The instrument is dated October 9th, 1683, about three months after the burning at Oxford, and is clothed in the following language.

“ I, Daniel Whitby, doctor of divinity, chantor of the church of Sarum, and rector of the parish church of St Edmund’s in the city and diocese of Sarum, having been the author of a book called the *Protestant Reconciler*, which, through want of prudence, and deference to authority, I have caused to be printed and published, am truly and heartily sorry for the same, and for any evil influence it hath had upon the dissenters from the church of England established by law, or others. And, whereas it containeth several passages, which I am convinced in my conscience are obnoxious to the canons, and do reflect upon the governors of the said church, I do hereby openly revoke and renounce all irreverent and unmeet expressions contained therein, by which I have justly incurred the censure or displeasure of my superiors. And, furthermore, whereas these two propositions have been deduced and concluded from the same book, namely; *first*, that it is not lawful for superiors to impose any thing in the worship of God, that is not antecedently necessary; and,

*secondly*, that the duty of not offending a weak brother is inconsistent with all human authority of making laws concerning indifferent things;—I do hereby openly renounce both the said propositions, being false, erroneous, and schismatical, and do revoke and disclaim all tenets, positions, and assertions contained in the said book, from whence these positions can be inferred; and, whereinsoever I have offended therein, I do heartily beg pardon of God, and the church, for the same.”

This carries back our thoughts at once to the dark ages. It was the tragical farce of the inquisition acted over in miniature; and was equally a disgrace to Ward, and an outrage on religious liberty and the rights of humanity. It flowed from the same spirit of persecution, which condemned and imprisoned Galileo, without the apology of the same degree of ignorance on the part of the persecutors.\*

\* When Galileo taught the Copernican system of the revolutions of the planets, and the earth's motion, about fifty years before Whitby's book was burnt, he was summoned before seven cardinals, by whom he was condemned, and made to retract his opinions. The case is so nearly parallel to that of Whitby and Ward, that they may very properly be mentioned together. The cardinals, like the bishop, found two propositions among Galileo's doctrines, which they held to be worthy of ecclesiastical condemnation.

“1. That the sun is the centre of the world, and immoveable, is a proposition absurd, false in philosophy, and heretical, because it is expressly contrary to Scripture.

“2. That the earth is not the centre of the world, nor immove-

We ought not, however, to judge of the temper of the whole English church at that time by the conduct of Bishop Ward. If report speaks truly, as we have reason to think it does from this example, his character was not one, which the enlightened would praise, or the virtuous envy. As a professor of astronomy at Oxford, and for his mathematical attainments, he was justly eminent; but Anthony Wood, who speaks from personal knowledge, tells us of his shuffling for popular favour, and of his “cowardly wavering for lucre and honour sake, his putting in and out, and occupying other men’s places for several years.” That such a man should be a

able, but has a diurnal motion, is also a proposition absurd, false in philosophy, and, theologically considered, not less erroneous in faith.”

These were the heresies of Galileo, and he was obliged to abjure them by subscribing the formula here annexed.

“From a sincere heart, and faith unfeigned, I abjure, execrate, and detest the above errors and heresies, and, generally, whatsoever other error or opinion, that is contrary to the Holy Church; and with an oath I declare, that I will not any more say or assert, either by speech or writing, any thing from which it may be possible for a similar suspicion to be entertained of me,—So help me God, and his holy Gospels, which I now touch with my own hands.”

*Corde sincero et fide non ficta, abjuro, maledico, et detestor supradictos errores et hæreses, et generaliter quemcunque alium errorem et sectam contrariam supradictæ Sanctæ Ecclesiæ; et juro me in posterum nunquam amplius dicturum aut asserturum, voce aut scripto, quidquam propter quod possit haberi de me similis suspicio,—Sic me Deus adjuvet, et sancta ipsius Evangelia, quæ tango propriis manibus.*



tyrant, is not so strange, as that a whole church should have looked on without indignation.

If the conduct of Ward was reprehensible in the highest degree, the humiliating submission of Whitby is by no means to be commended. He had written what he believed to be truth, and with the best motives ; he had yielded to the impulse of his conscience, and ventured to say what he thought. His independence should not have forsaken him at the moment, when it was most needed to maintain the honesty of his intentions, and the stability of his character, and thereby to give weight to his writings. The cause in which he had engaged either did not deserve the labour, which he had bestowed, or it was worthy of the noble sacrifice, which he was called to make, of all worldly considerations when brought in competition with truth and right. It was some apology, perhaps, that he had then published only half of his work, and that what remained was calculated to wear off the rough aspect of his remarks on church authority. Had his enemies been patient, they would have had less occasion for violence. It was his object to bring churchmen and dissenters together by mutual concessions, and his plea was, that each party should yield to the other in things indifferent. As yet he had alluded chiefly to the concessions, which it became the church to make. The affronted dignity and eager malice of his adversaries found it not convenient to

wait, till the whole subject should be fairly presented before them.

Shortly after his mortifying retraction, the author published the second part of the *Protestant Reconciler*. This was especially designed for the dissenters, showing reasons why they might join conscientiously with the church of England, and answering the objections of nonconformists against the lawfulness of submission to that church. It has been insinuated, that he wrote this part under the influence of authority, with the purpose of counteracting the tendency of the first. This was no other, than an illiberal surmise; for the work must have been far advanced in printing before his retraction, and is evidently in unison with his original scheme.

Dr William Sherlock undertook to confute the whole work, two years after the second part was published. In his *Dedicatory Epistle* to the archbishop of Canterbury, he affects to consider the *Protestant Reconciler's* arguments as very weak and inconclusive; but he condescends to allow, "that he had managed the cause to as much advantage as a popular and insinuating rhetoric could give it." Sherlock is not the only man, who has written a great book to confute what he has at the beginning sneeringly called weak arguments; and, from the labour to which he has submitted in the present instance, most persons would be apt to conclude, that he found the logic of his opponent quite as good as his rhetoric.

Sherlock makes it his strong point to convict Whitby of inconsistency, and to destroy the force of his arguments by making it out, that they confute one another. He charges him with accounting it sinful for the church to impose laws to which he confesses it innocent and advisable for dissenters to submit; and this he calls a contradiction. In reality, however, no such consequence follows. If the church had usurped the authority to impose *things indifferent* as conditions of fellowship, there certainly could be no crime in yielding to these indifferent things; and, if such a concession would promote peace and love, it would rather be commendable than worthy of censure. In addition to this subject, Sherlock went into a full and formal defence of all the rights and ceremonies of the church, and plainly gave his readers to understand, that, if concessions were to be made any where, they could be only on one side. Whitby made no reply to Sherlock, nor to any other person, who wrote against him in this controversy.

On the whole, it may be doubted whether this method of reconciling protestants was likely to be of much practical utility. Very important preliminaries must first be settled. What shall be called *things indifferent*? This must be debated on by both parties, before they can start in the work of reconciliation. And next, which party shall yield first, and in the greatest number of particulars? Till

these preliminaries are adjusted, nothing can be done ; and it is idle to suppose, that they ever can be adjusted by a mutual compact. Time and reflection, the dominion of reason, and the progress of moral improvement, guided by the light and precepts of the Gospel, are the only effectual reconcilers of christians.

Whitby continued to write occasionally against the church of Rome, and employed much learning in discussing the authority of general councils, the claims of the pope to infallibility, and various other matters, then subjects of high debate between the English and Catholic churches. Among his best writings in this controversy, is a *Treatise on Traditions*. His enquiries are first made to bear on the Scriptures ; and he satisfies himself, that we have sufficient evidence from tradition, that they are what they profess to be, the word of God, and that genuine and authentic copies have been preserved. In prosecuting these inquiries further he maintained, that the church of Rome placed too much confidence in traditions ; that many things, which have passed for traditions, are novelties ; and that the heathens used the same argument of traditionary authority in favour of their rites, which has been used by many christians in support of ceremonies and customs not prescribed in the Scriptures.

The work, which, more than any other, has raised Whitby's fame, is his *Paraphrase and Commentary*

*on the New Testament*, first published in 1703, in two volumes folio. The tenth edition appeared, 1807, in quarto. The author informs us in the preface, that this work cost him the labour of fifteen years' study, and it is truly a noble monument of his learning and industry. No Commentary in the English language has been so generally consulted, and so universally commended by all denominations of christians. This is proof enough of the fairness and impartiality of the author, whatever may have been his theological opinions. Not is it a subject of reproach, that he saw reasons afterwards for changing some of his sentiments. It was not the nature of Whitby's mind to remain stationary while truth was to be found. He loved inquiry because he loved truth, and it was not surprising he should detect errors in his former impressions, as he gained more knowledge and experience.

It will hardly be questioned, that Whitby's Commentary was more judicious and accurate, than any similar work, which had appeared in the English language at the time of its publication. The author's method is clumsy, and his annotations sometimes run into an exuberance of learning not required by the occasion. These are not glaring faults, and they are vastly more than balanced by the clearness of his expressions, the vivacity of his manner, and his happy talent at giving a substance and a meaning to many things, which most divines before him had

contrived to shut up in the dark. He had no fondness for mystical senses in the Scriptures, but believed, that what God had revealed, must be capable of being understood. He seldom engages in philological discussions, nor ventures on that department of interpretation, which, in more recent times, has been denominated biblical criticism.

It is true, nevertheless, that Whitby's Commentary constitutes an era in the advancement of a rational mode of explaining the Scriptures. He improved on Hammond, as much as Hammond had done on the scholastic divines. Both of these great commentators confined themselves too much to words, and detached phrases, and isolated texts, especially in the Epistles. The meaning of words is essential, and must first be learnt, but it is possible for the meaning of every word to be known, and, after all, the sense of the author be lost. This was too often the case with the old commentators; they wasted their strength on words; confounded themselves and their readers with useless learning and idle conjectures; and at last left the sacred text so clogged and embarrassed with their officious additions, as to exclude all hope of arriving at a rational, connected sense in the language of the Apostles.

It was the merit of Locke to originate a method of interpretation, which develops the meaning of the sacred writers in its true force and compass. Locke regarded each Epistle as a whole, which had a unity

in its parts, and in each part he sought for a sense corresponding to the general design. By this natural and easy process a thousand difficulties, which had perplexed the learned, and confounded the plain inquirer, were cleared away. Peirce, Hallet, Benson, and Chandler, pursued successfully the plan of Locke, and their works together form a most valuable commentary on the epistolary parts of the New Testament.

Another of Whitby's most popular works is that on the *Five Points* of Calvinism, in which he confutes those doctrines. In his address to the reader, at the commencement of this work, he says, "They, who have known my education, may remember, that I was bred up seven years in the University under men of the Calvinistical persuasion, and so could hear no other doctrine, or receive no other instructions from the men of those times, and therefore had once firmly entertained all their doctrines. Now that which first moved me to search into the *foundation* of these doctrines, namely, the *imputation of Adam's sin* to all his posterity, was the strange *consequences* of it." He adds, that after some years' attention to the subject, he fell in with a deist, who grounded his unbelief in the Scriptures chiefly on the doctrine of original sin, which had been taught him as a part of the christian religion. He alleged, that this doctrine alone was enough in his mind to invalidate all the

testimony, that could be brought in favour of the divine origin of the Scriptures.

By this incident, Whitby was led to think it his duty to review the subject; and he declares the result to have been, that he could discover no proof of such a doctrine in the word of God. He next resorted to antiquity, but was not more successful. Vossius had deceived him, by asserting that it was always the judgment of the church. After having perused all the writings of antiquity till the time of Austin, he was satisfied, that the assertion of Vossius rested on his own authority. As far as appeared, the doctrine originated with Austin.

By a similar occurrence he was induced to examine the doctrine of election. A friend, who had been educated in the belief of the Calvinistic dogma of divine decrees, doubted the truth of the Scriptures, since they contained a doctrine so repugnant to the goodness of God, and so opposite to the understanding of man. The absurdity of this doctrine he thought much greater, than a disbelief in the Scriptures, with all the evidence that could be collected in their support. Whitby again went through the Bible, and the writings of the ancients, with reference to this point; and, as in the former case, he detected no footsteps of the doctrine of election, till he found himself in the company of Austin.

Such were the causes in which originated the Discourse on the Five Points. It contains a learned



and able refutation of these dogmas, and a defence of the Arminian side of the question.

In the year 1718, Whitby published his *Disquisitiones Modestæ*, being a reply to Bull's defence of the Nicene Creed. It was Bull's theory, that the Antenicene fathers entertained what is now called the orthodox faith, respecting the person of Christ, and his equality with the Father. Whitby combated this theory, and aimed to establish the fact, that it was the prevailing faith of the three first centuries, that Christ was derived from the Father, and subordinate to him. This was not a novel subject with Whitby, for he had already touched on it in defending Dr Clarke's Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity; and he seems to have adopted sentiments similar to those of that distinguished philosopher and divine.

The work under notice is written in Latin, and is the result of a long, patient, and laborious investigation of the writings of the early Fathers. The author commences with a prefatory dedication to Dr Clarke, in which he complains, that Bull had made a show of fortifying himself with many quotations not well authenticated, being either allowed by all the learned to be interpolations, or selected from works known to be spurious. These he conceives ought not to have been brought into the question, as they can have no weight on either side.

Whitby starts with two positions; *first*, that nothing can be regarded as a revelation, or justly pro-

posed as an article of faith, which is not intelligible to the human mind ; because faith is an act of the understanding, by which it yields assent to a proposed article, and the mind cannot assent to a thing, which it does not understand ; *secondly*, the sacred Scriptures are the only rule by which to judge of the truth of any article of faith ; because a religious faith is an assent to the testimony of God, and this testimony is to be found in the Scriptures.\* These principles, which he holds to be of the first importance, he charges Bull with having disregarded, both in his speculative and practical fondness for mystery, and in laying down certain fundamental propositions, which it is impossible to prove from the Scriptures. He quotes several examples in which Bull speaks in such mystical language, and this too in some of his most important statements, as to baffle

\* Non posse illud homini cuiquam revelari, aut pro articulo fidei debito proponi, quod mens humana intelligere non potest. Est enim fides actus intellectûs, quo assensum exhibet articulo proposito ; assensum vero rei, quam non intelligit, mens sana non potest adhibere. Res ergo nondum intellecta, est eam non intelligenti nondum revelata ; et id quod mens humana intelligere non valet, eidem non potest revelari. *Disq. Modest. Pref. xix.*

Sacram Scripturam unicam esse regulam, ex quâ de veritate articuli fidei cujuscunque judicium fieri debet ; est enim fides divina assensus testimonio Dei. Ille autem in Scripturis loquitur ; ejusque solius testimonio certa fides adhibenda est, cui ob infinitam ejus sapientiam nihil potest latere, et qui ob summam ejus veracitatem nihil quod falsum est enuntiare potest. *Ibid. xxiv.*

every attempt to gain a distinct conception of his meaning.\*

As these faults are at the basis of Bull's great work, the system, which it engages to defend, is radically defective. It encourages a false interpretation of the Fathers, by converting all their mystery, and confusion, and jargon, to the aid of an assumed theory. After pointing out the erroneous positions, which are at the bottom of Bull's hypothesis, Whitby proceeds to a detailed examination of the authorities by which they are supported. In this process he proves, as he thinks, that Bull, and his learned editor, Grabe, were mistaken in regard to the prevailing opinions of the Antenicene Fathers, and that these Fathers had no knowledge of the present orthodox doctrine of the trinity, but believed in the subordinate nature of Jesus Christ.

Waterland wrote against the *Disquisitiones Modestæ* on the side of Bull, and Whitby replied at considerable length in two separate answers.

Religious liberty was never without a zealous advocate in Whitby when occasion demanded one, and

\* *Sectio quarta, quæ agit de Filii et Spiritûs Sancti subordinatione ad Patrem, et in quâ de Sanctæ Trinitatis doctrinâ explicandâ, et, in quibus rectæ rationi adversari videatur, vindicandâ operam suam Præsul, [Bullus,] mystica plane sit, spissis, immo Cimмериis tenebris involuta, mentibus omnium mortalium crucem figat, eaque pro fidei Nicænæ adeoque Christianæ fundamentis proponat, quorum idea nulla menti perspicacissimæ observari potest. Ibid. xix.*

it was natural that he should be enlisted as an able supporter of Hoadly in the Bangorian Controversy. He wrote an answer to Dr Snape's Second Letter to the Bishop of Bangor, and defended in a separate treatise the principles contained in Hoadly's famous sermon on the church, or kingdom, of Christ.

The work, which closed the long and distinguished labours of Whitby as an author, was his *Last Thoughts*. It was first published in 1727, the year after his death; and, although it was a posthumous work, it was by his own hand entirely prepared for publication. It was designed to correct several mistakes in his Commentary, into which mistakes his further reflections and progress in theological knowledge convinced him that he had fallen, while composing that important work.

His language respecting the change of his opinions is noble and ingenuous; it is worthy of his frank and liberal mind; and claims the admiration of every lover of truth and sincerity. After freely acknowledging a conviction of his former errors, he says, "I cannot but think it the most gross hypocrisy, after such conviction, to persist in a mistake;" and adds, "This my retractation, or change of opinion, after all my former endeavours to assert and establish a contrary doctrine, deserves the more to be considered, because it proceeds, and indeed *can* proceed, from me for no other reason but purely from the strong and irresistible convictions, which

are now upon me, that I was mistaken." He furthermore informs us, that his change of sentiments had been gradual, brought about by calm, deliberate inquiry, into the sense both of Scripture and of antiquity, uninfluenced by any other motive than an earnest desire for the success of truth and pure religion.

A second edition of the *Last Thoughts* was published the next year after the first, and to this was prefixed a short account of the author, by Dr Sykes. This edition is considered the best, and is the one from which the tract is reprinted in the present Collection. It is now for the first time divided into sections with distinct heads. It was thought, that such a division would render the scope of the author's meaning more perspicuous, and more easily apprehended by the generality of readers. A short table of scripture phrases, which was added by the author, has been omitted, as having no essential connexion with the work itself.

Five Discourses were appended to the original edition, which are able and learned, and contain a further proof and illustration of the sentiments advanced in the *Last Thoughts*. In connexion with these, however, their value is not very great, as there is a close resemblance between the two, and some parts of the *Last Thoughts* are literal transcripts from the Discourses.

Besides the publications already mentioned, Whitby was the author of many others, especially on practical and polemical divinity. He published two volumes of Sermons on the attributes of God, and three or four volumes more on various subjects; a work on the necessity and usefulness of the christian revelation; a dissertation in Latin on the interpretation of the Scriptures; a confutation of Sabellianism; and reflections on Dodwell's whimsical notion of the natural mortality of the soul. He, moreover, wrote tracts on politics, was a warm friend of the revolution, and approved and defended the oath of allegiance required on the accession of king William.

He had little to do, however, with politics; his long and useful life was devoted almost exclusively to the interests of religion. He died in the year 1726, at the age of eighty eight. His health was good, and he was able to be abroad, till the day before his death. His memory was uncommonly tenacious, and never forsook him; he was devoted to his studies to the last; his eyesight failed near the end of his life, and he was obliged to employ an amanuensis. His learning in theology was very great, more particularly in the history and technics of polemical divinity; and no man, probably, in modern times, has been so well read in the writings of christian antiquity.

He is represented as having been amiable and cheerful in social life, rigorously attentive to his duties,

without suspicion, and without guile. Of the world he knew nothing, although he lived in it so long, and took so active a part in many of its concerns. Wood said of him, many years before his death, "he hath been all along so wholly devoted to his severer studies, that he hath scarce ever allowed himself leisure to mind any of those mean and trifling worldly concerns, which minister matter of gain, pleasure, reach, and cunning. Also, he hath not been in the least tainted with those too much now-a-days practised arts of fraud, cousenage and deceit." Dr Sykes, after his death, added, "he was ever strangely ignorant of worldly affairs, even to a degree, that is scarce to be conceived. He was easy, affable, pious, devout, and charitable." These traits of character are in harmony with his writings, which, at the same time that they bear testimony to his uncommon talents and learning, prove him to have had the higher merit of being a good man, and a sincere christian.





# WHITBY'S LAST THOUGHTS.

---

## PREFACE.

IT is rightly and truly observed by Justin Martyr,\* in the beginning of his exhortation to the Greeks, "That an exact scrutiny into things doth often produce conviction; that those things, which we once judged to be right, are, after a more diligent inquiry into truth, found to be far otherwise."

And truly I am not ashamed to say, this is my very case. For, when I wrote my Commentaries on the New Testament, I went on, too hastily I own, in the common beaten road of other reputed orthodox divines; conceiving, *first*, that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in one complex notion, were one and the same God, by virtue of the same *individual* essence communicated from the Father. This confused notion I am now fully convinced by the arguments I have offered here, and in the second part of my Reply to Dr Waterland, to be a thing impossible, and full of gross absurdities and contradictions. And then, as a natural consequence from this doc-

\* Orat. Cohort. ad Græcos, p. 1.

trine, I, *secondly*, concluded that those divine persons differed only ἐν τρόπῳ ὑπάρξεως, *in the manner of their existence*. And yet what that can signify in the Son, according to this doctrine, it will not, I think, be very easy intelligibly to declare.

That the difference can be only *modal*, even Dr South hath fully demonstrated; and that this was the opinion generally received from the fourth century, may be seen in the close of my first part to Dr Waterland. And yet the right reverend bishop Bull\* positively affirms, that this is rank Sabellianism, in these words; “A *person* cannot be conceived without essence, unless you make a person in divine matters to be nothing else but a mere mode of existence, which is manifest Sabellianism.” And the judicious Dr Cudworth† tells us, “That the orthodox Anti-Arian fathers did all of them zealously condemn Sabellianism, the doctrine whereof is no other but this, That there is but one *hypostasis*, or single individual essence of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and consequently that they were indeed but three *names*, or *notions*, or *modes*, of one and the self same thing. Whence such absurdities as these would follow, that the Father’s begetting the Son was nothing but a name, notion, or mode of one

\* Addo ego, personam sine essentiâ concipi non posse, nisi statueris personam in divinis nihil aliud esse quam merum *τρόπον ὑπάρξεως*, quod plane *Sabellianum*. L. 4. p. 439.

† Cud. *System*, ch. 4. p. 605.

Deity begetting another ; or else the same Deity under one notion begetting itself under another notion. And when again the Son, or Word, is said to be incarnate, and to have suffered death for us upon the cross, that it was nothing but a mere *logical notion*, or *mode* of the Deity under one particular notion or mode only.”

That the doctrine of the Sabellians was exactly the same with that of those who style themselves the *orthodox*, asserting that the Father and the Son are numerically one and the same God, is evident from the words of Athanasius\* and Epiphanius; † both testifying, that to say the Father and the Son were *μονοῦσιοι* or *ταυτοῦσιοι*, of one and the same substance, was Sabellianism. And surely, of consequence, to contend that this is the doctrine of the Church of England, is to dishonour our church, and in effect to charge her with that heresy, which was exploded with scorn by the whole church of Christ, from the third to this present century.

In a word, all other notions of the word *person*, besides the plain and obvious one, signifying a real and intelligent agent, have been already so excellently baffled and learnedly confuted, ‡ that I own I

\* 'Ουτὲ γὰρ υἱοπάτερα φρονοῦμεν, ὡς οἱ Σαβέλλιοι, μονοῦσιον. Ἐκρος. *Fidei*, p. 241.

† Καὶ οὐ λέγομεν ταυτοῦσιον, ἵνα μὴ ἡ λέξις παρὰ τισι λεγομένη Σαβέλλιον ἀπεικασθῆ. *Anomæorum Hæresis*, 76, N. 7.

‡ See Dr Clarke, Mr Jackson, and others,

am not able to resist the shining evidence of truth ; nor am I ashamed to confess my former mistakes and errors in these matters after such strong and irresistible conviction, seeing, *humanum est errare*, “all men are liable to error.” And as, upon this principle, I cannot but think it the most gross hypocrisy, after such conviction, to persist in a mistake ; so, without question, it is the greatest abuse of humility and free thinking, to attribute such open and ingenuous acknowledgments to a wavering judgment, or levity of mind.

Neither are there wanting examples of good and great men amongst the ancients to bear me out in this matter. St Cyprian\* frankly confesses, in his Epistle to Antonianus, that he was formerly in the rigid opinion of Tertullian, that the peace of the church was never to be given to adulterers, to murderers, and idolaters ; and, having changed his opinion, he apologizes for it by saying, “*Mea apud te et persona et causa purganda est, ne me aliquis existimet a proposito meo leviter decessisse ; et, cum evangelicum vigorem primo et inter initia defendere, postmodum videar animum meum a disciplinâ et censurâ priore flexisse.*” And this honest procedure which he practised himself, he also approved in others, saying, † “*Non, quia semel erratum est, ideo semper errandum esse ; cum magis sapientibus*

\* Epist. 55.

† Epist. 73. Edit. Oxon. p. 208.

et Deum timentibus congruat, patefactæ veritati libenter et incunctanter obsequi, quam pertinaciter atque obstinatè reluctari;" "that a man's having once erred, is not a reason why he should continue to do so; for that it becomes wise men, and such as fear God, to yield freely and readily to truth, whenever made known to them, rather than to persist obstinately in rejecting it."

St Austin was not more renowned for any of his works, than for his two books of *Retractations*, in which he confesseth all the errors he had committed in all his other writings.

And this my retractation, or change of my opinion, after all my former endeavours to assert and establish a contrary doctrine, deserves the more to be considered, because it proceeds, and indeed *can* proceed, from me for no other reason, but purely from the strong and irresistible convictions, which are now upon me, that I was mistaken.

Nothing, I say, but the love of truth can be supposed to extort such a retractation from me, who, having already lived so long beyond the common period of life, can have nothing else to do but to prepare for my great change; and, in order thereunto, to make my peace with God, and my own conscience, before I die. To this purpose I solemnly appeal to the Searcher of hearts, and call God to witness, whether I have hastily, or rashly, departed from the common opinion; or rather, whether I have not

deliberately and calmly weighed the arguments on both sides drawn from scripture and antiquity.

As I have no views for this world, so it cannot be imagined, that the motives drawn from interest, ambition, or secular glory, can have any place with me. Or if I had, neither can it be imagined that I would choose to dissent from the received opinion, the maintainers whereof are they who grasp honours and preferments, and think they have the best title to those advantages.

So that upon the whole, if I have erred in changing my opinion, I desire it may be observed, that my error hath neither prejudice, nor secular views to support it; and that my mistake, if such it will be reputed, hath been all along attended with constant prayers to the throne of grace, and what hath always appeared to me to be the strongest reason, and most undeniable evidence.

And even yet, if any will be so kind, as, *in the spirit of meekness*, to answer the arguments I have produced to justify my change, if it please God to give me the same degree of health and soundness of mind, which, by his blessing and goodness, I now enjoy, I promise sincerely to consider them, and to act suitably to the strength of the argument; but, if any such answer is attempted with angry invectives, and haughty sophistry, aiming to be wise above what is written, I must say, *μένωμεν ὡςπερ ἴσμεν*, that is, *I must remain in my present sentiments*; having in

this short treatise seriously considered all that I had said in my commentary to the contrary, and fully answered the most considerable places I had then produced for confirmation of the doctrines I there too hastily endeavoured to establish.

I conclude with those words of St Austin, *errare possum, hæreticus esse nolo*, that is, "I may err, but I will not be a heretic;" as yet I must be in St Paul's sense,\* if I would act against the dictates and strong convictions of my conscience. He having expressly said that a heretic is one who is *αὐτοκατάκριτος*, *condemned in his own conscience* for what he doth assert. Now, that the God of truth would give to me, and all others, a right understanding in all things, is the prayer of

Your friend and

humble servant,

DANIEL WHITBY.



## SECTION I.

*Proofs from Scripture, that the Nature and Powers of Christ were derived from the Father.*

IT is observable from Scripture, and from the Fathers of the first three centuries, that whatsoever our blessed Lord is said to *have*, as to his nature, or his attributes, he is said to have by the *donation* of the Father, or as *received* from the Father.

\* Titus iii. 10, 11.

FIRST, He has his life from the Father; for, as he himself saith, "As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me shall live by me," John vi. 57; which cannot be understood of his resurrection, since it was spoken in the present tense; for he doth not say, I *shall* live, but, I *live*. He hath his power to raise the dead from him. For our Lord proves, "that the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of Man, and live," because, "as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." John v. 25, 26. And he hath also given him power to judge those whom he should thus raise; for, saith he, "the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son, sent by him." John v. 22. 24. "He hath given him power over all flesh, to give to them, whom God hath given him, eternal life." John xvii. 2. "He gave him all power in heaven and in earth." Matth. xxviii. 18.

Our Saviour also saith, "all that the Father hath, is mine." John xv. 16. "Because the Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand." John iii. 35. "He is Lord of all." Acts x. 36. "Because God made him both Lord and Christ." Acts ii. 36. As St Peter infers from God's raising him from the dead. "Him," saith St Paul, "hath God appointed heir of all things;" Heb. i. 2. "and hath given him to be head over all things to the church." Eph. i. 22. and Phil. ii. 9. "He hath



exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name ;” according to these words of the Psalmist, “The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool.” Psalm cx. 1. “In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.” Col. ii. 9. “Because it pleased the Father, that in him all fulness should dwell.” Col. i. 19. Agreeably to these Scriptures, the primitive Fathers give us an account of Christ’s power and dominion, as derived from the supreme God and Father of all things ; as you may see hereafter in the agreement of the Fathers with these sentiments.

SECONDLY, All his offices are plainly *dependent on, relating to, or received from* the Father. The very nature of his *prophetic office* requires this ; a prophet being one, who is sent from God, and speaketh in his name. Whence he declares, during the execution of that office, that, “he spake not of himself ; but, as the Father that sent him had given him a command, so he spoke ” John xii. 49.

His *priestly office* doth also necessarily imply a relation to him, whom he was to atone and reconcile by the merits of his sufferings ; which sufferings, say the Scriptures, were undergone to reconcile us to God ; “we being reconciled by the death of his son.” Rom. v. 9. Which, by the way, shows, that it is unreasonable and absurd to say it was the same individual godhead, that made satisfaction to the offended per-

son ; for then, both being the same individual God, he must make satisfaction to himself ; whereas, the Scripture doth inform us, “ that there is one Mediator between God and man.” From whence Eusebius infers that he is of a middle nature between God and man.\*

As for his *regal office*, the Scripture plainly testifies, that God hath “ given him authority to execute judgment, because he is the son of man.” John v. 26. And the Apostle tells us, “ that God shall judge the world by Jesus Christ.” Rom. ii. 16. His power to confound all his enemies, and those of the church, is from that God, who said unto him, “ Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool.” His power to give eternal life to his faithful servants at the last day, is *given* him of his Father. John xvii. 2. And when he hath thus crowned his servants, and put his enemies under his feet, then is he to give up the kingdom “ to God the Father, that God may be all in all.” 1 Cor. xv. 28. The mighty works he did, were done by the Father, as the Baptist testifies in these words. “ For he, whom God hath sent, speaketh the words of God ; for God giveth not the spirit by measure unto him. The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand.” John iii. 34. He healed the sick, that came unto him, “ because the power of God was

\* L. 1. Cont. Marc. p. 8.

present to heal them." Luke v. 17. He himself saith, "that the works which my Father hath *given* me [power] to do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me." John v. 36. He also confesseth that he cast out devils "by the finger of God;" Luke xi. 20. that he did these works "by the spirit of God." Matth. xii. 18. And, again, "The Father," saith he, "that dwelleth in me, he doth the works." John xiv. 10. That he hath all his attributes also *derived from* the Father, is generally acknowledged, even by those who style themselves the *orthodox*. And of necessity it must be so, since all properties flow from the essence, and in reality are only the essence partially considered, or with relation to such powers. So that, when the individual essence is *one* and the *same*, the actions and powers flowing from that essence, must be the same. And hence they constantly assert, that the will, power, and wisdom, of the whole trinity, is one and the same; and that what one wills, does, and knows, they all will, do, and know, by virtue of this unity of essence.\*

The primitive Fathers of the first three centuries do also generally agree, that the Son received his power from the Father, as it hath been observed already. And particularly Hippolitus, "that his

\* Dr Waterland, p. 337.

knowledge was given him by the Father ;”\* to which the orthodox are forced to say, that he received this power, this dominion, and these attributes, by receiving the same individual essence with the Father ; which yet is a thing impossible in itself ; since an individual essence cannot be communicated, for that very reason, because it is an individual, that is, one, and no more. Nor can three essences be one and no more, by being *connexè et conjunctè*, as Tertullian’s Thecla, or the Spirit of Montanus taught him, but only three essences joined and connected to one another.

Moreover, hence it must follow, that the same numerical essence must be *self-existent*, and *not self-existent* ; *communicated*, and yet *incommunicable*, as a self-existing essence must necessarily be ; *generated*, and *ungenerated* ; *derived*, and *underived* ; it being certain, that the Father’s essence is self-existing, uncommunicated, and underived ; and that the essence of the Son is not so. So that it must be an express contradiction to predicate these opposite and contradictory assertions of the same numerical essence. And hence it will follow, that this God must be *Deus de Deo*, and yet *Deus de Nullo* ; or, which is the same thing, a self-existing being, as he necessarily is in the Father, and yet he must

\* Πᾶσαν τὴν ἐπιστήμην παρὰ σοῦ πατρὸς λαβὼν. *Contra Nætum.*

communicate himself to another ; who yet only is *another* by having that essence communicated to him ; and he must communicate himself unto another, by continuing invariably the same that he was before. To omit many other like absurdities. Accordingly, a learned author very well observes, “ that, as this doctrine would deprive both the Son and Holy Ghost of any proper essence and attributes of their own, so would it follow that they are only names.”\* For the same reason, neither can an individual power be communicated, as the same author proves in these words ; “ the reason why the individual knowledge or power of God cannot be communicated, any more than his individual existence, is, because they are individual, and nothing that is individual can ever be communicated from one thing to another.”†

---

## SECTION II.

*The Scriptures teach, that Christ is a distinct Being from the Father, and subordinate to him.*

THE essence of the Father being essentially an intelligent and active essence, and so a personal essence, it is evident, it cannot be communicated,

\* Modest Plea continued, Answer to Query 23, p. 50.

† Answer to Remarks, &c. p. 230.

unless a personal essence be communicated; and then the person to whom it is communicated must be two persons. From hence arise these corollaries;

That the Son is a real and distinct person from the Supreme God; and, also,

That he is not of one and the same individual essence with him.

FIRST, *He is a real person distinguished from him.* For Christ every where declares himself not to be the Father, but to come forth from him, to speak by his authority and commission, to do nothing of himself, but every thing by the power of the Father; nothing to his own, but every thing to his Father's glory.

And yet he speaks these things of himself, considered as coming down from heaven; and with pronouns personal; and sometimes in opposition to the whole person of the Father, as when he saith, "He that believeth in me, believeth not in me, but in him that sent me." John xii. 44.

SECONDLY, *That he is not of the same individual or numerical essence with God the Father, is evident from these considerations.*

That, where the numerical essence is one and the same, the will and actions of that essence must be one and the same. And where the will and actions are numerically distinct and diverse, there the individual essence must also be distinct and different.

And this Damascen declares to be the doctrine of the holy Fathers.\*

Hence it demonstratively follows, that, if the essence of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, be numerically one and the same, the will, and all the other actions of these three, must be numerically one and the same ; so that what the Father wills, and does, the Son and Holy Ghost must will, and do, also.

Now to show the inconsistency of this with the plain declarations of holy Scripture, let it be considered,

*First*, that, if the essence of the Son, for instance, is one and the same with that of God the Father, his will must of necessity be one and the same with that of God the Father. And what the Father wills, the Son must of necessity will also ; that is, the will of the Father must of necessity be his will too. But this is directly inconsistent with these words of Christ, “I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which sent me.”† John v. 20. And “I came down from heaven, not that I might do mine own will,

\* “Οι Πατέρες δι ἁγιοὶ ἔφασαν, ὧν ἡ οὐσία μία, τούτων καὶ ἡ ἐνέργεια μία, καὶ ὧν διάφορος ἡ οὐσία, τούτων διάφορος καὶ ἡ ἐνέργεια. c. 15. de *Orthod. Fide*, L. 3. p. 232, and c. 19. p. 255.

† Nec suam, sed Patris perfecit voluntatem, *Tertull. adv. Prax.* c. 8.

“Ἐπερον ἑαυτὸν τοῦ Πατρὸς δέικνυται διὰ τοῦ οὐ ζητῶ τὸ θέλημα τὸ ἑμὸν, ἀλλὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντος με, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατεληλυθῆναι οὐκ ἵνα ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα ἑκουτοῦ ἀλλὰ τοῦ πέμψαντος αὐτόν. *Euseb. Eccles. Theol.* L. 2. c. 7. p. 110.

but the will of him that sent me." John vi. 38. And "My meat is, that I may do the will of him that sent me; and that I may finish his work." John iv. 34. For can the numerical essence send itself, and be sent by itself, and become his own legate? Neither can he, that hath the same numerical will with the Father, come down from heaven not to do his own will. And here note, that all this is spoken of the will of him, that came down from heaven, and therefore of the *divine* will of the Son.

*Secondly*, where the individual essence is one and the same, the *actions* of that essence must be one and the same; so that what is done by the Father, must of necessity be done by the same individual essence of the Son, provided both have one essence. And yet this also is plainly inconsistent with the words of Christ, and with the declarations of holy Scripture. As when Christ saith, "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me." John vii. 16. Again, "The Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment what I should say, and what I should speak; as the Father hath given me a commandment, so I speak." John xii. 49, 50.

Now, can the same individual essence send, and command itself? Or could our Lord absolutely deny that doctrine to be his, which proceeded from his own numerical essence? If *I and the Father are one*, signify one in essence, it must signify one in action also; and so what one sends, the other must



send ; what one commands, the other must also command ; and the doctrine which one teacheth, must be taught by the other also.\*

Again, “The works,” saith he, “which I do in my Father’s name,” that is, by his authority, “and the works which my Father hath given me [power] to do, they bear witness of me.” John v. 36. But how can one of the same individual essence with the Father act in *his* name, and not in his *own* also? Again, “As the Father hath taught me, so I speak.”† John viii. 28. And, “The Father hath not left me alone, for I do always the things that are most pleasing to him.” Now, can one of the same numerical essence with the Father be taught by *another*, and not by *himself*? Or can he do those things, which are pleasing to another, and not to himself? In a word, if the essence of the Father and Son be *one* and the *same*, and consequently the actions flowing from that essence be one and the same in both ; hence it demonstratively follows, that if to beget and to communicate an essence, be to act, the Son must as truly beget and communicate his essence to

\* *Alium dicam oportet, ex necessitate sensûs, eum qui jubet, et eum qui facit. Nam nec juberet, si ipse faceret, dum juberet fieri per eum. Tamen jubebat, haud sibi jussurus si unus esset ; aut sine jussu facturus, quia non expectasset ut sibi juberet. Tertull. adv. Prax. c. 12. et 9. Bonum placitum patris filius perfecit ; mittit enim Pater, mittitur autem et venit Filius. Iren. L. 4. c. 14. ὁ δὲ ἐντελλόμενος ἐπερω ἐντέλλεται τινι. Cons. Antioch. Sex Epis. Concil. Tom. 1. Ed. Lab. p. 84.*

† Vide Euseb. de Eccles. Theol. L. 1. c. 20. p. 90.

himself, as the Father doth, and so must be both Father and Son to himself.

*Thirdly*, one *individual essence* can *give* nothing to, and *receive* nothing from itself, because it can give nothing but what it hath already, and therefore cannot receive by way of *gift*. And this in an all-perfect and self-sufficient being is the more certain, because it is incapable of any accession to its absolute perfection.

If, then, God the Son hath the same numerical essence, which the Father hath, he could not properly and truly say, “All things are delivered to me by my Father.”\* Matth. xi. 17. For could the Father either give or reveal any thing to his own essence, which it had not, or knew not, before? And again, “All power is given to me in heaven and earth;” Matth. xxviii. 18. seeing the same essence must have always the same power. “The Father,” saith Christ, “loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hands,” John iii. 35. even into the hands of that Son, who came down from Heaven, hath he given all things; not by communication of his own numerical essence to him, but from that affection, which he bore to him. So again, “Jesus knowing that the

\* Τὸ γὰρ παρ' ἑτέρου λαμβάνον τί, ἕτερον παρα τὸν δίδοντα νοῦται. Euseb. Eccles. Theol. L. 3. c. 4. p. 169. πῶς δὲ ἀχάριστος ὢν τοῦ Θεοῦ αὐτοῦ ἔλεγεν ἀπιστάλθαι. Ibid. L. 1. c. 20. p. 90. et plenius, L. 2. c. 7. p. 110. Nam nec qui accipit unus est cum dante, nec qui traditum accipit æqualis est ei qui tradidit. *Opus imperf. in Math.* p. 97.

Father had given all things into his hands, and that he came down from Heaven, washed the Disciples' feet." John xiii. 3. And yet, if he that came down from Heaven had the same numerical essence with the Father, he must give all things into his own hands, or give it to him who always had it. Again, "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son," John v. 22. even to that Son which "he had sent down from Heaven." V. 23. and therefore to him, who had a divine nature, by which alone he could be enabled to execute that judgment. And, "Thou (Father) hast given him (thy Son) power over all flesh, that he may give eternal life to all that thou hast given him." Chap. xvii. 2. An earthly parent may give the power to his Son to give gratuities to his servants committed to him, because he is, in essence, numerically distinct from him; but were they numerically one in essence, the power of both must be one; and what was given, must be given by both.

Christ answers thus to the sons of Zebedee, "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."\* Matth. xx, 25. And yet, where the essence is one and the same, the gift must proceed from one and the same essence in

\* Inter cujus non est, et inter cujus est, nec persona una est, nec æqualis potestas. Si Pater et Filius unus est, certe aut potest Filius, aut non potest Pater. *Opus imperf. in Math. Ho. 53. p. 128.*

both, and be prepared for them, to whom it is given by both.

*Fourthly*, the same numerical essence cannot *send* itself; or be *sent from*, and *return to* itself. And yet how frequently doth our Lord inform us that “the Father had sent him into the world,” and that “he came forth from the Father;” and “came into the world?” To select a few of his sayings; “He that receiveth you, receiveth me; and he that receiveth me, receiveth him that sent me.” Matth. x. 40. John xiii. 20. “He that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me.” In which words there seems to be a plain gradation from the lesser to the greater. “He that receiveth me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me.” Mar. ix. 37. “He that believeth in me, believeth not in me, but in him that sent me.” John xii. 14.

Could this negation be truly spoken by one and the same God with him that sent him? Is not the import of these words plainly this? He receiveth, or believeth, not only in me his messenger, speaking in his name, but in that God who sent me on his message? Is not this his own interpretation, when he saith, “the word which you hear, is not mine, but the Father’s which sent me.” John xiv. 24. And is not this the import of the like phrases used both in the Old and New Testament? As when it is said, “Your murmurings are not against us, but

against the Lord." Exod. xvi. 8. And, "they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me." 1 Sam. viii. 7. "He that despiseth our commandment, despiseth not man, but God." Thess. iv. 8. Again, chap. viii. 17, 18. Christ speaketh thus; "In your law it is written, the testimony of two men is true; I am one that bear witness of myself, and the Father that sent me, beareth witness of me." Where observe, that the doctrine of the numerical unity of the Father and the Son in essence and in actions, destroys Christ's argument, and turns it into a parallogism; for upon this supposition the Pharisees might have answered, that the testimony of two men might well be deemed the testimony of two witnesses, because they were as to nature numerically different, and their testimony contained two different actions, the testimony of one being not the testimony of the other; whereas, the testimony of the Father and Son, were only the same numerical action of them both; and so could not properly be said to be two testimonies.

And "Say you of him whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God?"\* John x.

\* Sanctificatum se a Patre proponit; dum ergo sanctificationem accipit a Patre, minor Patre est, minor autem Patre consequenter, sed Filius. Pater enim si fuisset, sanctificationem dedisset, non accepisset; nunc autem profitendo se accipere Sanctificationem a Patre, hoc ipso, quo Patre se minorem accipiendo ab ipso sanctificationem probat, Filium se esse, non Patrem monstravit. *Novat. c. 22.*

37. From this answer it is evident, first, that they accused our Lord of blasphemy, not for saying "I and the Father are one," V. 30. but for styling God his Father, and so in effect saying, he was the Son of God. For this is the reason of that accusation, which our Lord here speaks of. Secondly, our Lord here proves himself to be the Son of God, because the "Father had sanctified him, and sent him into the world," whereas he, who hath one numerical essence with the Father, must do the same action, which the Father doth, and so must sanctify *himself*, and send *himself* into the world. Thirdly, he proves himself to be the Son of God, because he did the works of his Father; for so it immediately follows, "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not to be his Son." V. 38. Now these works, saith he, I do *ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρὸς*, *in my Father's name*, that is, not by *my own*, but by his authority and power; whereas he, who is numerically one in essence with the Father, must do his works by one and the same authority and power.

*Fifthly*, no numerical essence can *do an action by another*; for, where the essence is the same, the action must proceed from the same essence, and so not be done by another. And yet it is expressly said, that "God created all things by Jesus Christ." Ephes. iii. 9. That "by him he made the worlds." Heb. i. 2. That "God will judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ." Rom. ij. 15. "He that

raised up the Lord Jesus Christ, shall raise us up also by Jesus." 1 Cor. iv. 14. "It pleased the Father by him to reconcile all things to himself." Col. i. 19, 20. "Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. vi. 11. and, verse 23. "For the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." And, "I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord." Chap. vii. 25. And again, "Unto him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus." Eph. iii. 21. And, "My God shall supply all your needs, according to his riches in glory, by Christ Jesus." Phil. iv. 19.

For the same reason, we could not, upon this supposition, properly be said to have things *from* God, or to do things *to* God *by* Christ; to have "peace with God *διὰ* *by*, or *through*, our Lord Jesus Christ." Rom. v. 1. 11. "To the only wise God be glory, *διὰ* *by* our Lord Jesus Christ." Rom. xvi. 27. "Thanks be to God who hath given us the victory, *διὰ* *by* our Lord Jesus Christ." 1 Cor. xv. 57. "Such hope have we to God, *by* Christ." 2 Cor. iii. 4. "We are filled with the fruits of righteousness, which are *by* Jesus Christ to the glory of God the Father. Phil. i. 11. "We give thanks, *Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ*, *to* God, *even the Father*, *by* him." Colos. iii. 17. "We offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God, *through* Jesus Christ."

1 Pet. ii. 5. "That God in all things may be glorified, through Jesus Christ." Chap. iv. 11. Now, if Christ be the same only wise God, acting by the same individual essence, can glory be given to him by our Lord, and not by himself? Can our sacrifices be acceptable to God *by* him, and not also *to* him? Or can God in all things be glorified by himself? "By him," saith St Paul, "let us offer up our sacrifices of praise to God always." Heb. xiii. 15. And, if he be the same individual essence, must they not be offered also to him, as well as by him?

In fine, it is observable, that, though our modern writers do endeavour to prove from the miracles our Saviour did, that he was the same supreme God with the Father, yet Christ himself doth only use them to prove, that he was sent by the Father, and had commission from him to deliver this message to the world. As is evident from these words, "But I have greater witness 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." John v. 36. And, when he raised up Lazarus from the dead, he speaks thus to his Father, "Father, I know that thou hearest me always; but this I said, that they [the Jews] might believe that thou hast sent me." John xi. 42.

Hence it is certain, that there can be no communication, internal production, or necessary emanation of the individual essence of the Father to the Son.



*First*, because, as I have already proved, an individual essence cannot be communicated; and also because a particular essence, subsisting by itself, in intelligent beings, as the essence of the Father is, is the same as a person; and therefore cannot be communicated without the communication of the person. And yet, it is on all hands granted, that the person of the Father, as a self-existing being, was not, and cannot be communicated to the Son.

*Secondly*, internal production, that is, production in the essence of the Father, is indeed no production at all. For, since this internal production is said to give to the Son no distinct existence of its own, it is manifest it is a production of nothing, that is, no production at all; for that which hath no existence of its own, is not produced. Nor,

*Thirdly*, can the Son's essence be produced by necessary emanation. Because such emanation, and the essence from which it emanateth, would both be as equally self-existent, as it is equally necessary for God to be an intelligent being, and to be at all. For whatever necessarily and essentially belongs to that which is self-existent, is itself self-existent, as being indeed only the very same thing apprehended under a partial consideration. And, again, it is the general doctrine of the Antenicene Fathers, that the Son was produced by the will of the Father. This is expressly taught by

Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Hippolytus, and Novatian. And, saith Eusebius, it is that doctrine, which *οἱ σοφώτατοι τῶν Πατέρων ἐν τοῖς δικείοις συντάγμασιν ἀπεφήναντο*, *the wisest of the Fathers declared in their genuine works.\** And the same Father puts this difference between the emanation of light from the sun, and the generation of the Son of God; that the first results necessarily from the nature of the sun, it being of necessity that all luminous bodies should send forth rays of light; but that the Son was the image of the Father, *κατὰ γνώμην καὶ προαίρεσιν αὐτοῦ*, *according to his counsel and choice.†*

A necessary emanation from the Father by the will and power of the Father, is an express contradiction; because necessity, in its very notion, excludes all operation of will and power, though it may be consistent with approbation. See all this fully proved, in the Agreement of the Fathers, Sect. 4. and in my answer to Dr Waterland, part 2, p. 19–22.

It is observable that, in Irenæus's time, the way of expressing the proceeding of the Son from the Father, seems not to have been determined by any decision of the church, but only by the Valentinian heretics, as seemeth plain from the words of Irenæus. "The Valentinians," saith he, "are *irration-*

\* Eccles. Theol. L. 1. p. 20.

† Demon. Evang. L. 4. c. 3. p. 147, 148.

*abiliter inflati*, unreasonably puffed up, by pretending to know the unspeakable mysteries of the generation of Christ; and if any man asks," saith he, *Quo modo Filius a Patre prolatus est? Nemo novit, dicemus ei, nisi solus qui generavit Pater, et qui natus est Filius.\** "How the Son proceeds from the Father; whether by prolation, or generation, or by declaration, or by whatsoever name it be called? We answer, No one knows but the Father who begat, and the Son who was begotten of him."



## SECTION III.

*In what Sense Christ may be called God.*

HENCE it follows, that Christ must be truly God, because he hath dominion over all flesh, and all power in Heaven, and in earth, imparted to him. For this dominion is the ground of divine worship and authority; according to that aphorism, *Deus est qui dominium habet, summus summum, verus verum, falsus falsum*, "He is God who has dominion; he is the supreme God, who has the highest and underived dominion; a true God, who has true dominion over all things; a false God, who falsely pretends to that dominion which he has no right to

\* L. 2. c. 48. p. 176. Ed. Grab.

exercise.” And to this we may refer those words, ὁ δὲ κατασκευάσας τὰ πάντα ὁ Θεός, *He that governs all things is God.* Heb. iii. 3, 4. See the note there.\*

Our blessed Lord, therefore, having a true dominion over all things in heaven and earth, must be truly God. And that this dominion is given and committed to him by the Father, doth not render him less truly God; because the word, God, being a relative term, it is not the *metaphysical nature*, but the exercise of dominion, that constitutes him *a God* to us. And this dominion he ascribeth to himself in these words, “The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son;” and hence infers, that “all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father that sent him;” and adds, “he that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father that sent him.” Accordingly, Origen saith, the heathens can shew no command for worshipping Antinous, or any of their other Gods; whereas the christians have an express command, from the most high God, to worship Christ, namely, those words, that “all men should honour the Son,” &c.† And, again, the maker of the world commended Jesus Christ to the breasts of all christians, to be honoured with divine honour, not for his unity

\* Whitby's Paraphrase, Heb. iii. 4.

† Ἀποδείξομεν ὅτι ἀπὸ Θεοῦ δίδεται αὐτῷ τὸ τιμᾶσθαι. *Contra Celsum*, L. 8. p. 384.

of essence with him, but for the efficacy of his wonderful doctrine. Novatian saith, "That God the Father is justly styled the God over all, and the original, even of the Son himself, whom he begat Lord of all; and also, that the Son is the God of all other things subject to him."\* Accordingly St Paul teacheth us, "that God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name above every name; that, at the name of Jesus, every knee should bow, of things in Heaven, things in earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Phil. ii. 9, 10, 11. And, accordingly, Irenæus saith in the forecited passages, that Christ is *verè Deus et Dominus*, "truly God and Lord," though he owned he received his dominion over all creatures from the Father.†

Hence it is evident, that Jesus Christ must have received, as the foundation of this dominion, all power necessary to the exercise thereof, since it is unreasonable to conceive, that an all-wise God should have given that power to him, which he had not enabled him to execute; and, therefore, that his providence must reach to the government and direction of all creatures, "all things being made subject unto him;" and that he must have the largest power, "for he hath put all things under his feet."

\* L. 31. p. 730. † L. 3. c. 6.

1 Cor. xv. 27, 28, 29. For from this power given by the Father "to have life in himself," he infers, "that the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and live." John v. 25, 26. And hence St Paul informs us, "that he shall change our vile bodies into the likeness of his glorious body, according to the mighty power, whereby he is able to subdue all things to himself." Phil. iii. 21. He, being appointed to be the judge of quick and dead, must have the knowledge of the hearts of those whom he is to judge, that so he may judge of all men according to their works. And, therefore, this knowledge he ascribes to himself in these words, "All the churches shall know that I am he, who searcheth the reins and the hearts, and will give to every one according to his works. Rev. ii. 23. Now, to him, who hath the knowledge of the hearts of all them who pray unto him, who hath dominion over all things in heaven and earth, who is able to raise the dead with glorious bodies, who hath power over all flesh, to give eternal life to them that believe in him, and to punish all who obey not his gospel, and to reward every man according to his works, doubtless we have sufficient ground to pray to, as well as to believe, hope, and trust in him, and to depend upon him for all the blessings we can want, and he is able to confer upon us. Thus, therefore, we are to honour the Son, like as we honour the Father that sent him, and hath given all power into his hands.

Now, from what hath been thus discoursed, we learn two reasons, why our blessed Lord may be truly styled God.

*First*, by reason of his divine excellencies, he having derived from the Father the like excellencies to those by which the Father himself doth govern the world, and exerciseth his divine power over all things, namely, a providence ruling over all things, a right to judge all men, and a knowledge of the secrets of the hearts of them whom he is to judge.

And hence most of the Ante-nicene Fathers say, that he is, *εικων τῆς Πατρικῆς Θεότητος, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο Θεός,* *the image of the Father's deity, and therefore God.*

*Secondly*, because he hath dominion over all things in heaven and earth, and God hath put all things under his feet. For, seeing God hath given that very dominion, which he himself exerciseth, into the hands of the Son, he must have thereby constituted him truly God and Lord over us. And, though he was qualified for this dominion before by his divine excellencies, he could not have them given him before there was a heaven and an earth, over which he should have dominion.\*

\* [The word *God*, is used in various significations by the sacred writers, both in the Old and New Testament.

1. It denotes the Supreme Being, the Creator and Governor of all things.

2. It is applied to angels, or celestial beings. "For though there be that are called *gods*, whether in heaven or in earth, as there be *gods*

Hence, even of God the Father, Tertullian saith, though he was always God, he was not always Lord, *nam ex quo esse cœperunt in quæ potestas domini ageret, ex illo per accessionem potestatis, et factus, et dictus est dominus*; and again, *Sic et dominus non ante ea quorum dominus existeret, sed dominus tantum futurus quandoque—per ea quæ sibi servitura fecisset*,\* “He was not Lord, nor to be called so, till he had made those creatures, over which he was to have dominion.”

many and lords many; but to us there is but one God, the Father.”  
1 Cor. viii. 5.

3. Moses is called by this name. “And the Lord said unto Moses, I have made thee a *god* to Pharaoh.” Exod. vii. 1.

4. Magistrates, judges, and kings are called gods. “Thou shalt not revile the *gods*, nor curse the rulers of the people.” Exod. xxii. 28. “God standeth in the congregation of the mighty, he judgeth among the *gods*.—I have said, ye are *gods*.” Psalms lxxxii. 1. 6.

5. It is used to denote the images of heathen deities. “Make us *gods* to go before us” Acts vii. 40. And also to express those deities themselves. “The *gods* are come down to us in the likeness of men.” Acts xiv. 11.

From these different uses of the word, it appears, that it does not relate to the *nature* or *essence* of the being or object to which it is applied; but rather to their superiority, either in power, or goodness, or both. It has not, therefore, a uniform and definite meaning. It is a relative term, and implies degrees. Such is the scriptural application of the term, and in this manner was it also employed by the ancient heathen writers, and the early christian fathers.

---

\* *Contra Hermog.* c. 3. p. 234.



Hence it follows, that the Son of God must be truly inferior to God the Father, and the Father truly superior to him, since he who receiveth all his power and excellencies from the Father, and hath them all derived from him in whom they are self-existent and underived; he who is sent by, and is obedient to his Father's will, must be inferior to him who sent him.\* And hence it follows, that the worship due unto him, though it be divine, is inferior worship, as being the worship of one, to

The Greeks and Romans, says Le Clerc, had no knowledge of a being, who had existed without beginning, or who was possessed of all perfections; nor did the Hebrews embrace these perfections in the idea which they attached to the word אלהים, *God*. Some of the philosophers among the gentiles, and particularly the Platonists, had a notion of the Deity, very nearly resembling that of Christians, but it was not in the power of philosophers to correct the use of language among the common people. The poets had a much greater influence, and they represented the *gods* as coming into existence after the heavens and the earth; and their Chaos had an origin still anterior to these.

The early Christians seem to have been much influenced in many respects by the opinions prevalent among the heathens, and especially in the use of the term *God*. They did not confine it, as is the practice at present, to the Supreme Being, but applied it to Christ, even when they allowed him to be subordinate to the Most High. Hence we find Novatian saying, that the "Father is God over all," and the "Son is God over all other things *subject to him*." And Eusebius tells us, that the "Son is God, *because he is the image of the Father's deity*." It is true, this was only giving the *same name* to the Son as to the

---

\* Τὸ γὰρ ὑπακούειν τὸν δὲ τῷ δὲ, δεῖν γένοιτ' ἂν προσώπων παραστατικόν.  
*Eus. Ecc. Theol. L. 1. c. 20. p. 94.*

whom the Father hath given all dominion both in heaven and earth. *In Heaven*; "For when God brought forth his first begotten into the world, he said, let all the angels of God worship him." Heb. i. 6. And St Peter informs us, "That angels, authorities, and powers, are made subject unto him." 1 Pet. iii. 22. *In earth*; "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 that sent him." John v. 22, 23.

Now, hence it is plain, that because Christ was the Son of man, therefore the Father gave him authority to execute judgment, or committed all judgment to him. And, because God gave him authority to execute judgment, therefore all men should honour him even as they honour the Father; that is, in other words, Christ's honour and worship are founded upon the Father's gift; and the reason

Father, without altering the nature of either; but names do their office very poorly, when they confound, rather than distinguish things. At that time, for reasons above stated, this use of language was more allowable, than at present. Among Christians the word *God*, seems now to be exclusively appropriated to the Almighty; and it must be considered as an improper use of the term to apply it to the Son, unless he is believed to be the Supreme Being.

For an extended view of this subject, see *Clerici Art. Crit.* P. II. S. I. c. II. Reg. 2.—Also, *Schleusner* in verb. Θεός.—*Hallet's Notes and Discourses.* Vol. II. p. 214. EDITOR.]

of the Father's giving it, was his becoming the Son of man. Surely then the most high God must be superior to the Son of man; and he that gave this honour to him, must be superior to him, who received it from him as his gift.

Hence, St Paul informs us, "that God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name, that is above every name, that at the name of Jesus, every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Phil. ii. 9, 10, 11. Now he, who is made Lord, to the glory of God the Father, cannot be the same Lord with God the Father; since, then, he must be Lord, and God to his own glory. All that Dr Waterland offers, to evade the force of this text, is fully considered, and confuted by the ingenious author of *The unity of God*, in his answer to the Dr's remarks, page 38. But against this, Dr Waterland objects these words of Irenæus, *Qui super se habet aliquem superiorem, et sub alterius potestate, est hic neque Deus, neque magnus rex dici potest*;\* that is, "he that hath another superior to him, and is under the power of another, cannot be called God, or a great king." Not considering, or rather unduly concealing, that these words were spoken against the heresies of the

\* L. 1. c. 29. p. 104.

Valentinians, and Marcionites, who not only held that there was another superior to that God, who made the world, but that the God, who gave the law was *only just, but not good*; and that this superior God sent Jesus to annul what he had done.

Irenæus saith, they called him moreover, *malorum fabricatorem*,\* “The maker of evil things.” And that Jesus was sent by that Father, *qui est super mundi fabricatorem Deum*, “who was superior to God, the maker of the world, to dissolve the law and the prophets,” *et omnia opera ejus Dei qui mundum fecit*,† “and all the works of that God who made the world.” And well might Irenæus say, that he that hath thus a superior, and is so far under the power of another, as to destroy all that he had done, and pronounces him a wicked being, can neither be truly God, nor a great king. But yet this hinders not, but that he who hath a power over all things committed to him from the Father, who acts by his authority, and always agreeably to his will, may be truly God; he being, as Eusebius truly saith, *εἰκὼν τῆς πατρικῆς θεότητος, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο θεός*, *The image of the Father's deity, and therefore God.*

\* L. 4. c. 5. p. 278.

† L. 1. c. 29. p. 104. *Cont. Marcel.* L. 2. c. 23. p. 141.  
L. 1. c. 2. p. 61, 62.

## SECTION IV.

*On the Faith necessary for Salvation.*

MOREOVER, the fundamental principle of the protestant religion is this, *That the holy Scriptures contain a sufficient clearness in all things necessary to be believed, or done in order to salvation.*

Whence it clearly follows, that what is not with sufficient clearness contained in the Scripture, cannot be truly deemed a necessary article of christian faith, or a doctrine necessary to be believed unto salvation.

Hence, therefore, I think it may rationally be inquired,

FIRST, Where hath the Scripture said, *That the individual essence of the Father, hath been communicated to the Son, and Holy Ghost, or that they derive the same individual essence ἐξ οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρὸς, from the essence of the Father, or have the same individual essence with him, and so are the same one God?*

SECONDLY, Where hath the Scripture said, *That the Son proceedeth from the Father by necessary emanation? Or,*

THIRDLY, *By an internal production within the essence of the Father; though that seems plainly necessary to be asserted by those, who call them-*

selves orthodox ; since, if he be produced *extra essentiam Patris*, “without the essence of the Father,” he must have another essence from that which is the Father’s.

FOURTHLY, Where hath it any where spoken *any thing of the wonderful emperichoresis of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, which the Post-nicene Fathers speak of with so much confidence and assurance ?

FIFTHLY, Where hath the Scripture plainly spoken any thing of the *ένωσις ύποστάτικη*, or *hypostatical union*, broached first by Cyril of Alexandria, and by Theodoret pronounced to be a thing unknown to the Fathers that lived before him ?\*

SIXTHLY, Where hath it said, *That the Holy Ghost essentially proceeded from the Father and the Son ?*

SEVENTHLY, Where hath it declared, *That all, or any of these things are necessary to be believed in order to salvation*, as the Pseudo-Athanasian creed doth ? Or by what authority do men come after him, and declare that necessary, which God hath never made so ? This being plainly to add unto God’s word, and to usurp the authority of that one Legislator and Judge, “who is able to save,

\* Την δὲ καθ’ ύπόστασιν ένωσιν παντάπασι άγνοῶμεν ὡς ξένην, και άλλοφυλον των Θεϊων γραφῶν, και τῶν ταύτας ήρμηνευκότων Πατερων. *Reproben.* tom. iv. p. 709.

and to destroy." James iv. 12. What is this, but without divine authority, rashly to exclude men from heaven, and sentence them to hell; and to usurp the authority of that God, whom we are only to call Father upon earth, and of that Jesus, who is our only guide, and teacher, in opposition to all other teachers?

EIGHTHLY, Where doth the Scripture say, *That the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, have only one, and the same individual will, or that all three in one complex notion, do one and the same individual action?* The falsehood of which assertion, I have elsewhere proved. And,

NINTHLY, Where doth the Scripture say, *That three persons can subsist in one numerical essence?* This being in effect to say, as Dr. Waterland doth not blush to do, "that three intelligent agents may be one intelligent agent, and no more."\* Had all these things been necessary to have been believed, surely they would have been, either in express words, or plain consequence, contained in the Holy Scripture. And if they cannot be found there, it must be granted, at least by all protestants, that they are not necessary to be believed, as not being contained in their rule of faith.

In our discourses with the doctors of the *Roman communion*, we distinguish between such articles as

\* Defence, p. 350.

we call *positive*, or *affirmative*, or which we do assert to be delivered in that Scripture which is our rule of faith; (and that these are contained in Scripture we own ourselves obliged to prove) and those, which we call *negative*, or such as we deny to be contained in our rule of faith; as that the Pope is Christ's vicar upon earth; that the host is transubstantiated into the real body and blood of Christ, united to his divinity, and therefore is to be worshipped with *Latria*, that is, with worship only due to the great God of heaven; that it is to be offered as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living, or the dead; that saints, and angels are to be worshipped by mental, or oral prayers; that we are to bow down to, or worship images or crucifixes; that the sacraments of the New Testament are seven; that prayers are to be offered for the dead, to free them from the pains of purgatory; that prayers are to be administered in Latin, though it be an unknown tongue to the people; and lastly, that general councils are infallible; and that priests do formally forgive sins, and not declaratively only.

Now, as to these *negative propositions*, we declare we are not obliged to prove from Scripture, that it doth expressly deny them, but think it sufficient, that we do not find them contained in our rule of faith; because, whatsoever is of divine revelation, must be contained in these Scriptures, in which alone we have the mind of God revealed to us. From whence



it follows, that if we would act agreeably to our fundamental principle, we also must reject all other pretended articles of christian faith, which cannot be sufficiently proved to be contained in the holy Scriptures.

It is a true and excellent saying of one of the ancients, that *Deus non ducit ad cælum per difficilia*, "God brings not men to heaven by difficult matters." And seeing "God would have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth," necessary to that end, 1 Tim. ii. 4; and since the gospel was indited for the salvation of all men in general, Greeks, and barbarians, wise, and unwise; and seeing St Paul declares, that in preaching of it, they used "great plainness of speech," 2 Cor. iii. 12; seeing lastly, our excellent homily on this subject, teacheth us, "That there is nothing spoken in dark mysteries in one place of Scripture, but the same thing is more familiarly and plainly taught in another, to the capacity both of the learned, and unlearned; and those things which are plain to understand, and necessary for salvation, every man's duty is to learn them."\* And seeing also, all the ancient fathers expressly and frequently say the same thing, as I have proved elsewhere;† hence it is very evident, that not only the niceties, contained in the Pseudo-Athanasian creed, cannot be necessary to be believed unto salvation, as the

\* *Hom.* 1st. † Defence of Bishop Bangor's Prop. p. 36, 37, 38.

author of that creed thrice asserts, because some of the unlearned laity cannot understand them ; but, also, that the propositions mentioned by me, as not clearly contained in Scripture, cannot be necessary to be believed in order to that end ; since by experience we find, that even learned clerks are so exceedingly divided, and so eagerly dispute concerning the truth, or falsehood of them. Some saying, that they are not only true, but also necessary to be believed ; and others, as sincerely honest, and upright in their inquiries after truth, asserting, not only that they are false, but that they are obnoxious to many contradictions, and absurdities ; which is a certain demonstration, that they are not delivered in holy Scripture, with that clearness of speech, which St Paul mentions ; and much less, without great difficulties, surmounting the capacity of the unlearned.

Again, it seems to me very considerable, that the wisdom of our blessed Lord, of the Holy Ghost, and of the sacred writers, should be so full, copious, and frequently express in things necessary to be done in order to salvation ; and yet, be so sparing, or rather silent, as to the articles pretended to be as necessary to be believed unto salvation. Since all wise agents, truly desirous of the salvation of them, whom they instruct, will be as much concerned, that they should know what is necessary to be believed, as what is necessary to be done in order to salvation.

Nor can salvation be obtained by our obedience to what is necessary to be done in order to salvation, without the knowledge of what is necessary to be believed to the same end.

And yet, it seemeth evident, that the holy Scriptures, and inspired penmen of them, who have so fully taught us all things necessary to be done in order to salvation, have been comparatively silent, in reference to these articles, pretended to be as necessary to be believed to the same end. For instance,

Our blessed Saviour, in his excellent sermon on the Mount, concludes with these words, "Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doth them, I will liken him to a man which built his house upon a rock."

Whence it is evident, that they who did those sayings, must be wise unto salvation. In the very beginning of that sermon, he pronounceth "the pure in heart blessed, for they shall see God; the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven; they that mourn, for they shall be comforted; the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy; the peace-makers, for they shall be called the children of God; they who are persecuted for righteousness sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven;" though in all that whole sermon he taught them nothing of these propositions. Now, either it must be said, that no man can be poor in spirit; pure in heart; truly merciful; true mourners; true peace-makers; or

truly sufferers for righteousness sake ; unless they do assent to those propositions, (and then wonderful is it, that he who said those things to the Jews, "that they might be saved," should in this long discourse speak nothing of them ;) or else it must be certain from our Saviour's words, that they may be blessed, who do not believe them. In the same sermon he saith also, "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doth the will of my Father which is in heaven."

Now, sure, it would be very hard to say, that no man could sincerely do the will of God, who does not firmly believe all the forementioned propositions, of which our Saviour speaketh not one word ; and yet, more hard, to think that he should not only know them to be as necessary to be believed, as any one thing he had taught, was to be done, and yet say nothing of them ; but also say unto his Father, "This is life eternal, to know thee to be the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent."

Our Saviour says, "Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you." John xv. 14. And promised, that "if we keep his commandments, we shall abide in his love ; and that he will give to them that hear his voice, eternal life." V. 10. Since he hath said, that they who *know* his precepts, shall be *happy if they do them* ; that "he who hath his commandments, and keepeth them, is one that loveth

him ; that if any one loveth me, he will keep my sayings, and the Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." John xiv. 23. It must be certain, that they, who yield sincere obedience to his laws, shall be forever happy.

Now, what can be conceived necessary to the performance of this obedience, besides sufficient power to do what is commanded, and the most strong and powerful inducements to engage us so to do ? Seeing the first must make us able, the second must be sufficient to make us willing, to do what is required of us. Since, therefore, it is certain, that a just, and gracious lawgiver cannot require us, on pain of his severe displeasure to do what *he will not* enable us to perform ; and since it is as certain, that the promise of eternal life, that is, the promise of the greatest and most lasting blessing that we can enjoy, must be sufficient to make us willing to do what we are able ; it must be also certain, that the divine assistance, which God will certainly afford to all that do sincerely ask it, that they may strengthened in the inward man to do his will, and that a firm assurance of that eternal life, which he hath promised to them that do so, must be all that is necessary to the performance of that obedience, to which Christ hath annexed the promise of eternal happiness.

St John concludeth the history of his gospel in these words ; " There are many other things which

Jesus did, which are not written in this book ; but these things are written, that ye might believe, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing, ye might have life through his name ;” plainly declaring, that eternal life may be obtained by a plain belief that Jesus is the Christ, and a life suitable to that faith. Where, by the way, we are to observe, that he spoke this of the belief, not of the *Godhead* of Jesus Christ ; but of the deeds done by him, which, as he himself saith, bear witness *that the Father hath sent him*, and therefore that he was the Christ.

Agreeably to this, saith the apostle Paul, “ This is the word of faith which we preach, that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth, that Jesus Christ is Lord ; and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved,” Rom. x. 8, 9. Because, by owning him as our lord, we own our obligation to yield obedience to his commands ; for why, saith he, “ call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say ?” And the belief of his resurrection affords the highest motives to perform it, “ we being,” saith St Peter, “ begotten by his resurrection from the dead, to a lively hope of an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, that fadeth not away, reserved in the heavens for us.” 1 Eph. i. 3.

Now, from this principle, that a rule prescribed by an all-wise God, to teach the most simple, rude,

and ignorant, as well as the wise and prudent, what is necessary for them to believe, and do, in order to salvation, must be plain, and easy to be understood, by the most simple and illiterate, it follows,

FIRST, That it is repugnant to the wisdom of God, to require any thing as necessary to be believed, which is dubious, and obscure in Scripture; since that would be to propound that as a means for obtaining an end, which he knew to be insufficient to obtain it; it being certain, that what is dubious and obscure in Scripture, cannot afford us a certain knowledge of our duty.

SECONDLY, It also seems repugnant to the goodness of God, to perplex and confound weak minds with such subtilties, for the knowledge of which he has not given them suitable qualifications. Seeing, as St Paul observes, "God accepteth, according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not." 2 Cor. viii. 12. Now it is evident, from the continual clashings of our most learned divines about these subtilties, that the illiterate can have no certain knowledge of the truth or falsehood of them.

THIRDLY, It seemeth inconsistent with the justice and righteousness of God, to require any man to believe what he does not, and cannot, understand; for no man can be said to believe, that is, assent to, what he does not understand; because assent is an act of the understanding, and we must understand the meaning of every term in a proposition, before we can assent to

it, or dissent from it ; for words of which we do not understand the meaning, are the same to us, as if they had no signification at all. A righteous God puts upon no man the Egyptian task, “of making brick without straw,” nor requires any thing of us in order to our salvation, which we cannot perform ; that being in effect to require impossible conditions of salvation from us.

Belief, or disbelief, can neither be a virtue, nor a crime, in any one who uses the best means in his power of being informed. If a proposition is evident, we cannot avoid believing of it ; and where is the merit or piety of a necessary assent ? If it is not evident, we cannot help rejecting it, or doubting of it ; and where is the crime of not performing impossibilities, or not believing what does not appear to us to be true ? If I have done my best endeavour to know the mind of God revealed in Scripture, I have done all I could, and, therefore, all that God requires of me in order to that end. Can then a good and gracious God be angry with me, or condemn me for my unwilling mistakes, when I have done all that was in my power to avoid them ?

In fine, it is observable that the very nature of a *prophet* requires this, that he should be a person sent from God, and not speaking in his own, but God's name. Hence, concerning the false prophets, God speaks thus, “I have not sent them, yet they run ;



I have not spoken unto them, yet they prophesy." Jer. xxiii. 21. And again, "Then the Lord said unto me, The prophets prophesy lies in my name; I sent them not, neither have I commanded them, neither spake I unto them; they prophesy unto you a false vision." Chap. xiv. 14.

Hence our blessed Lord having said, "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me." He also adds, "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself; John vii. 17. that is, whether I be a true, or a false prophet. This being the established notion of a prophet; and our Saviour being that Prophet, which Moses told them should come after him, and which was promised to the Jews, he must perform that office, as other prophets did, by speaking not in his own name, but in the name of him that sent him.

Accordingly, during his prophetic office here on earth, he says, that "he spake not of himself, but as the Father that had sent him had given him a commandment, so he spake." John xii. 49. And, "The word which you hear is not mine, but the Father's which sent me." Chap. xiv. 24. Again, "As the Father gave me a commandment, even so I do." V. 31.

And lastly, the prophetic revelations made to St John, in the Apocalypse, are styled "the Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave to him to

shew unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass."

Now, hence, it follows, that the accusations of the Jews must be false, malicious, and scandalous accusations, seeing he who came into the world, as a prophet sent from God, one speaking not in his own, but in his Father's name, and declaring that his doctrine was not his, but his that sent him, could never say at the same time, that he was the very God that sent him, that he spake not in his own, but in the name of God, and delivered not his own doctrine, but that of him that sent him. It being certain that the supreme God could not be the person *sending*, and yet the person *sent*. He could not speak in the name of another, nor say his doctrine was not his.

Hence it is remarkable, that in all those places, in which the Jews accused him of blasphemy, and making himself God, or equal with God, or ascribing to himself what properly belonged to the great God alone, he never directly answers, that he was God, or equal to him, although if he were sent to preach that doctrine to the world, it is reasonable to expect upon these occasions, he would have done it, but he ever speaks as one who waved that assertion.

For when the scribes inquire, "Why doth this man speak blasphemy? Who can forgive sins but one, that is, God?" Mark ii. 7. He doth not answer, as others do for him, that this proved him to be

God; but only saith, "The Son of man hath power upon earth to forgive [the temporal punishment of] sin." Ascribing to himself that power, not as he was the Son of God, much less as being God of the same essence with the Father; but only as he was the Son of man. Again, from these words, "My Father worketh hitherto," works of providential care, goodness, and mercy; and these charitable actions, "I work also." From these words, I say, of his calling God his Father in so peculiar a manner, (as he did, and had just cause to do, had he been only miraculously conceived, and upon that account "the Son of God," Luke i. 25. "The Son of the most High," V. 32.) they invidiously infer, V. 18. that he called God, *πατέρα ἰδίου*, that is, *his Father*, in such a proper sense, as made him equal to God, as a son is to his father.

Now to this, Christ doth not answer, as it might have been expected from one who was sent into the world to confirm that doctrine, to wit, that he had reason thus to call God his Father, as being of the same individual essence with him; but his answer contains many things wholly inconsistent with that doctrine.

For his reply is, "That he could do nothing of himself." V. 19, 20. That "the Father judgeth no man; but hath given all judgment to the Son." V. 22; and that "because he was the Son of man." V. 27. "That he sought not his own will, but the

will of the Father that sent him." V. 30. "That the Father which sent him," he was the person that "bore witness of him." V. 37. And that "he came not in his own, but in his Father's name." V. 43. And lastly, "the works which his Father had given him [power] to do, bore witness of him, that the Father had sent him. V. 36. All which sayings are plainly inconsistent with an identity of essence, will, and actions, in God the Father, and the Son. In the 10th Chap. they accuse him of blasphemy, not for saying "*I and my Father are one,*" V. 30. but as Christ himself declares, because he said, "*I am the Son of God.*" V. 36. And yet, he being accused of blasphemy, "because he being a man made himself God," had reason to reply, had it been true, that being of the same essence with the Father, by representing himself as God, he only told them the truth; whereas he proves himself to be only the Son of God, first, because the Father had "sanctified, and sent him into the world,"\* and yet it is absurd to say, he either sanctified, or sent into the world his own numerical essence. And, again, because "he did the works of his Father," V. 37. namely, by virtue of that power which the Father had given him. John v. 36; and by the spirit of

\* Dum ergo accipit sanctificationem a Patre, minor Patre est; minor autem Patre consequenter est, sed Filius: Pater enim si fuisset, sanctificationem dedisset, non accepisset. *Novatianus de Trinitate*, c. 22.

his Father dwelling in him ; for “ he did them by the spirit of God.” Matth. xii. 28. “ By the finger of God.” Luke xi. 20. “ By the Father in him, as he was in the Apostles.” John xiv. 20. “ And who were in the Father, and Son, as the Father was in the Son, and the Son in the Father.” John xvii. 22, 23.

Farther, it is remarkable that the Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testament, seem plainly to speak of one, who is called God, and Lord, in Scripture, and yet is inferior to, and derives his power from another.

FIRST, to omit Gen. xix. 24, which by the Antenicene Fathers is generally interpreted of God the Father and the Son, this seems expressly to be contained in these words, “ Thy seat, O God, endureth forever, the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre : Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity ; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.” Psal. xlv. 7, 8. Now that these words are applied to Christ we learn from St Paul, saying, “ But to the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever. A sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom.” Heb. i. 8. And again, “ This God hath another God who is styled *his* God, and who hath anointed him with the oil of gladness above his fellows. For, saith the Baptist, “ God gave not the Spirit by measure unto him,” John iii. 34. as

he did unto the other Prophets. A like instance we have of two Lords in these words, "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool."\* Psal. cx. 1. For these words, my Lord, our blessed Saviour himself declares were spoken of Christ. Matth. xxii. 49. And the Apostle represents him as a Lord, who had all things put under him by a superior Lord, by saying, "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, until I have made thy foes thy footstool. Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." Acts ii. 36. And the Apostle represents him as a Lord, who had all things put under him by a superior Lord, by saying; "When he saith, All things are put under him, it is manifest he is excepted, which did put all things under him, that God may be all in all." 1 Cor. xv. 27, 28. From which words, Irenæus,† Tertullian, and Novatian prove that Christ, at the end of the world, is to give up his kingdom, or his dominion received from him, unto God the Father.

SECONDLY, Another evidence of the superiority of God the Father, to our Lord Jesus Christ, ariseth

\* *Just. M. Dial. cum Tryph.* p. 277 and 357. And *Euseb. Præp. Evan.* L. 7. c. 12. p. 322, and L. 11. c. 14. p. 532. hæc habet, τὸν μὲν ἀνωτάτω Θεὸν διὰ τοῦ πρώτου κυρίου, τὸν δὲ τούτου δεύτερον διὰ τῆς δευτέρας ἀποφάντας προσηγορίας.

† Vide *Interp. Patrum in locum.*

from these words of St Paul, "We know there is no other God but one; for though there be that are called Gods, whether in heaven, or in earth, as there be Gods many, and Lords many, yet to us [Christians,] there is but 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." 1 Cor. viii. 4, 5, 6. Where it is plainly said; *first*, that all Christians know, that there is but one God; *secondly*, that that one God is God the Father; *thirdly*, that this God the Father is distinguished from our Lord Jesus Christ by this character, that he is God, *ἐξ ὧν*, *from whom are all things*; but our Lord is only he, *δι' ὧν*, *by whom are all things*; and that God the Father is the Christians' one God, Christ their one Lord.

It is scarcely possible to say this more fully, or more plainly than the Apostle doth. And seeing here the Apostle speaks of the Father in person, styling him the Christians' one God; he must style him that one person, who hath emphatically, or by way of superiority, the divine nature. But of this I have given a fuller proof, in my Reply to Dr Waterland, to which he hath yet returned no answer.\*

THIRDLY, This also is evident, from those places which say, that such a thing was done by Jesus Christ, or such honour was conferred upon him "to

\* Sect. 4, from p. 95 to 100.

the glory of God the Father. We are filled with the fruits of righteousness, which are by Jesus Christ to the glory and praise of God." Phil. i. 11. And that "God had exalted him, who being in the form God took upon him the form of a servant, and given him a name above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, and every tongue should confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Chap. ii. 9, 10, 11.

And, surely, he who is Lord to the glory of God the Father, "who works in us the fruits of righteousness, to the glory of God the Father," must be inferior to him, whose glory is the end, both of his exaltation to be Lord, and of that righteousness he worketh in us. So when St Peter saith, "If a man minister, let him do it, as of the ability which God giveth, that God in all things may be glorified, through Jesus Christ." For seeing actions flow from the essences of them, whose actions they are; where the singular essence is one and the same, the action must be one and the same; and when an action is done by one to this end, that another may be glorified, he, to whose glory it is done, must be superior to him, for whose glory it is done; the end being still more noble than the means by which it is accomplished.

FOURTHLY, This still more visibly appears from that plain distinction, which is put between God the Father, and the Son, by way of gradation, as in these words, "All are yours, for you are of Christ,



[or are Christ's] and Christ is of God." Now we are Christ's, as being members of that body, of which he is the head ; but yet with great inferiority to him. And, therefore, it seems reasonable to conceive, that these words, "Christ is of God," should signify, that he is inferior, and subordinate to him ; especially, if we add to them the like words in this Epistle, chap. xi. 3. "The head of the woman, is the man ; the head of the man, is Christ ; the head of Christ, is God." For the ground of these gradations, is plainly the superiority and dominion, which the one hath over the other.

FIFTHLY, This is evident from those places in which they are put in opposition ; as in these words, "This is life eternal, that they may know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent." John xvii. 3. And, "Ye have turned from idols to serve the living and true God ; and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus which delivered us from the wrath to come." 1 Thess. i. 9, 10. From which words it is evident, that God the Father must be in some more excellent sense, the only true God, the true and living God, than his Son Jesus Christ, whom he sent into the world.\*

\* *Ecclesia Dei non prædicat duos Deos, οὐ γὰρ δύο ἀγέννητα, οὐδὲ δύο ἀναρχα, ἀλλὰ μίαν ἀρχὴν καὶ Θεὸν εἶναι, τὸν αὐτὸν Πατέρα διδάσκουσα εἶναι τοῦ μονογενοῦς καὶ αγαπητοῦ υἱοῦ, μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν, μόνον σόφον, ὁ μόνος ἔχει ἀθανασίαν, Quibus epithetis Deum Patrem a Deo Filio distinguit. Euseb. de Eccles. Theol. L. 2. c. 23. p. 141.*

The same distinction, and opposition appeareth from these words, "To the only wise God be glory, through Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. xvi. 27. And, "I command thee before God who quickeneth all things, that thou keep this commandment unspotted, till the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, which in its proper season he shall shew, who is the only potentate, who only hath immortality." 1 Tim. vi. 13, 14, 15, 16. Where the God, who quickeneth all things, is not only distinguished from our Lord Jesus Christ, but is styled the only potentate, who only hath immortality; that is, by a description, which in some eminent sense must agree to him alone.

SIXTHLY, This may be argued from those epithets, which are peculiar to God the Father, and are never in Scripture applied to the Son. As,

1. That he is *Θεος ὑψίστος*, *God most high*, or *the most high God*. Gen. xiv. 18, 19, 20. So also he is called in the New Testament, Acts xvi. 17. Heb. vii. 1. Whereas the Son is only called *υἱὸς τοῦ ὑψίστου*, *The Son of the most high*. Mark v. 7. Luke i. 32. vi. 35. viii. 28. Acts xvi. 17.

2. The word *παντοκράτωρ*. 2 Cor. vi. 18, which signifies, *omnipotens Deus, qui omnibus imperat*, "the omnipotent God who commands over all," in Scripture is the epithet of God the Father only. He is also styled, "The only true God." John xvii. 3. "The only good God." Matth. xix. 17.

“The only wise God.” Rom. xvi. 27. “To God only wise, be glory, through Jesus Christ for ever. Amen.” See also 1 Tim. i. 17. and Jude 25. All which epithets show, that these excellencies do most eminently, originally, and properly, belong to God the Father, and derivatively, and consequentially, to the Son, to whom they never are ascribed in the sacred writings.

---

#### SECTION V.

*Strange Consequences of the Doctrine, that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are one and the same Being.*

IN fine, this doctrine, that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are of one and the same individual and numerical essence, seems to burlesque the holy Scriptures, or to give them an uncouth and absurd sense, from the beginning of the Gospel, to the end of the Epistles.

To select some few instances of this nature.

*First*, When St Matthew saith, that, at the baptism of our Saviour, the “Holy Ghost descended upon him in the shape of a dove; and a voice was heard from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased;” these words, according to this doctrine, must signify, that the supreme God

descended upon the supreme God, and the voice of the supreme God said from heaven, This is the supreme God in whom I, the same supreme God, am well pleased.

*Secondly*, When it is often said, "He that receiveth you, receiveth me; and he that receiveth me, receiveth him that sent me." Matth. x. 40. Luke x. 16. John xiii. 20. the meaning of these words must be this; He that receiveth you, receiveth the supreme God; and he that receiveth the supreme God, receiveth him that sent the supreme God. So that the supreme God must both send, and be sent by himself.

*Thirdly*, "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me." John. vii. 16. That is, according to this exposition; My doctrine is not the doctrine of the supreme God, but it is the doctrine of the supreme God that sent me. And,

*Fourthly*, When it is said, "Whosoever receiveth me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me." Mark ix. 37. and "He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that sent me." John xii. 44. the meaning must be this; He that receiveth the supreme God, receiveth not the supreme God, but the supreme God that sent him. And he that believeth on me the supreme God, believeth not on me the supreme God, but on the supreme God that sent me.

*Fifthly*, Our Lord saith, "Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me. And I knew that thou hearest

me always ; but because of the people which stand by, I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me." John xi. 41, 42. that is, I thank thee, O supreme God, that thou hast heard me the supreme God, and I knew that thou, the supreme God, hearest me the same supreme God always ; but this I said, that they might know that thou, the supreme God, hast sent me the same supreme God.

*Sixthly*, " I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of truth." John xiv. 16. that is, I, the supreme God, will pray the supreme God, and he shall send you the supreme God.\*

*Seventhly*, " But, when the Comforter is come," saith Christ, " whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me." Chap. xv. 26. Where we have, first, I, the Father, and He, that is, three persons of the same numerical essence, one of which is sent, by the same supreme God, from the same supreme God, and is *ὁ παρακλήτος*, one who is an advocate with the same supreme God.

*Eighthly*, Christ, in his prayer to the Father, saith, " This is life eternal, to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou," the only true

\* Ὑἱὸς μὲν ὁ παρακαλῶν, Πατὴρ δὲ ὁ παρακαλούμενος, παράκλητος δὲ ὑποστελλόμενος. *Basil. Contra Sabellianos.* tom. 1. p. 521. Vide reliqua.

God, "hast sent," John xvii. 3. which, according to this exposition, makes the only true God to send the same only true God with himself.

*Ninthly*, When St Paul saith, "To the only wise God be glory through Jesus Christ our Lord," Rom. xvi. 27. the meaning must be this; To the only wise God be glory through the same only wise God.

*Tenthly*, We have these words, "Then cometh the end, when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority, and power. For he must reign until 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 be subject to him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." 1 Cor. xv. 24—28. Where we are plainly taught to put a clear and full distinction between that God who is the Father, and him who is here styled the Son. For,

1. He, (that is, that Son, who is here said to reign and have a kingdom, and in the prophet Daniel, to be styled "one like the Son of man, who comes to the Ancient of days, and hath dominion, and glory, and a kingdom given him, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him,") he is here said to *deliver up his kingdom*, at the close of the world, *to the Father*.

2. God the Father, or Jehovah, is he that is said to put all things under his feet, with plain relation to these words, "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool. Psal. cx. 1. Whence the Apostle here saith, that he must reign until he, that is, God, hath put all enemies under his feet.

3. The Apostle adds, that when it is said, that he hath put all things under him, it is manifest, that he, that is, God, is excepted, which did put all things under him.

4. He farther saith, that when all things are put under him by God, then shall the Son himself *be subject to him, that did put all things under him.* And,

5. He adds, that this is to be done, *that God, even the Father to whom he is to deliver up this kingdom, may be all in all.*

Now it is the highest absurdity to say that both these persons, this Father and this Son, have both one and the same numerical essence; this being in effect to say,

That this Son must deliver up this kingdom from, and to himself.

That he must sit at his own right hand, and that this Lord must say unto himself, Sit thou on my right hand.

That the one supreme God must be excepted from the one supreme God.

That he must be subject to himself.

And, that all this must be done, that God the Father may be all in all. All which seem palpable absurdities and contradictions.

*Eleventhly*, “Through him we both have an access by one Spirit unto the Father.” Eph. ii. 18. That is, by the supreme God, through the supreme God, we have an access to the same supreme God.

*Twelfthly*, “There is one Spirit, one Lord, one God and Father of all.” Eph. iv. 4. That is, there is one supreme God, one supreme God, and one supreme God.

*Thirteenthly*, The Apostle tells the Philippians, chap. i. 11. “That they are filled with the fruits of righteousness, which are by Jesus Christ, unto the glory and praise of God ;” that is, of himself. And chap. ii. “That Christ being in the form of God,” that is, being the supreme God, “thought it no robbery to be equal with” the same supreme “God ;” that is, with himself ; and that the supreme “God had exalted him, and given him a name,” and requires all persons to confess, “that Jesus was the Lord,” that is, the supreme God, “to the glory of God the Father,” that is, of the same supreme God. Phil. ii. 6, 9.

*Fourteenthly*, “Christ sitteth at the right hand of God.” Col. iii. 4. That is, the supreme God sitteth at his own right hand.



*Fifteenthly*, “Ye turned to God from idols, to serve the living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus which delivered us from the wrath to come.” Thess. i. 9, 10. that is, to serve the living and true God, and to wait for the same supreme God, raised up from the dead.

*Sixteenthly*, “How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord—God also bearing witness to it.” Heb. ii. 3. that is, the one supreme God bearing witness to the word spoken by the same supreme God.

*Seventeenthly*, “By Christ we believe in God ;” that is, by the supreme God we believe in the same supreme God, “that our faith and hope might be in” the same “God.” 1 Pet. i. 21.

*Eighteenthly*, “If we sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins.” 1 John ii. 2. that is, with the same supreme God ; and he, the same supreme God, is the propitiation for our sins.

*Nineteenthly*, “Denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ,” Jude 4. that is denying the only Lord God, and the same only Lord God.

*Twentiethly*, “The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him.” Rev. i. 1. That is, the revelation of the one supreme God, which the one supreme God gave unto him. See also V. 5. and

Chap. iii. 12. "Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God; and I will write upon him the name of my God;" that is, Him that overcometh, I, the one supreme God, will make a pillar in the house of me the same God, and will write upon him the name of me the same God, and the name of the city of me the same God. And, V. 21. "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne." Now, surely the same supreme God must have the same throne with him who is the same supreme God; unless it can be said, that the same essence has one throne, and the person of the same essence has another.

This will be still more evident from a reflection upon the third person of the sacred trinity, who, according to this doctrine, is of the same individual essence with God the Father, and the Son. For, as hence it necessarily follows, that the Spirit of God is the same with the God of God; and to receive this Spirit, is to receive that God who gives the Spirit; so it is manifestly inconsistent with many passages of the holy Scripture which speak of him. For instance, our Saviour saith, "When the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth; for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak, and he will show you things to come. He shall glorify me; for he

shall receive of mine, and show it unto you." John xvi. 13. Now it is self-evident, that the supreme God must speak of, and from himself, and not what he heareth from another; and that he can take nothing from another to show to us. So "The Spirit helpeth our infirmities" in prayer to God, "and maketh intercession to him for us." Rom. viii. 26. that is, he maketh intercession to himself. And, again, "The Spirit maketh intercession for us according to the will of God, V. 27. that is, according to his own will. And, "But God hath revealed the things that he hath prepared for them that love him, to us by his Spirit." 1 Cor. ii. 10. that is, by himself. And, "The things of God knoweth οὐδείς, none, but the Spirit of God," V. 11. that is, God himself. And, "Now we have received the Spirit of God," that is, the supreme God, "that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God." V. 12. that is, of the same God. And, "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God; and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" 1 Cor. iii. 16. that is, the same God dwelleth in you? And, "What! know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost;" that is, of God, which is in you, "and which is given you of" the same "God?" Chap. vi. 19. And, "You are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit." Eph. ii. 22. that is, through the same God. With many other sayings of the like import.

## SECTION VI.

*Explanation of certain Texts in the Gospel, which have been supposed to prove the Identity of the Father and Son.*

I PROCEED now to expound some passages of Scripture, which seem to have been misunderstood by most modern expositors, and sometimes also by myself. As,

FIRST, Those words of Christ, "No man knoweth who the Son is, but the Father, and who the Father is, but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him." Luke x. 22. "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father," that is, who is intimately acquainted with his mind and will, "he hath declared him." John i. 18.

That these words cannot concern the *metaphysical* nature of the Father and the Son, is evident, because our Saviour hath made no such declaration, or revelation, of that nature, to us, or his disciples. They, therefore, only can concern the dispensation of the New Testament, and salvation by Jesus Christ, and the knowledge of the will of the Father, and the way by which he would be worshipped, delivered to us by his Son.

Hence when St Peter had declared, that "Jesus was the Christ, the Son of the living God," (or as it

is, Mark viii. 29. "Thou art the Christ,") Christ said unto him, "Flesh and blood have not revealed this unto thee; but my Father which is in heaven." Matth. xvi. 17. And Christ also saith, "I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me, and they have known that all things whatsoever thou hast given me are of thee, and have known surely, that thou hast sent me." John xvii. 6.

From which two places it appears, that God the Father, by revealing to St Peter, that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of the living God, revealed the Son to him; and that Christ himself, by manifesting unto his disciples, that he came from God, and that he had sent him, manifested his Father's name to them. And, John xvi. 25. he promised hereafter to show them plainly of the Father; and yet he did this, not by giving them any instructions concerning the metaphysical nature of the Father, or any declarations of that nature, but only by giving them a clear insight into the tenor of the gospel dispensation, and into the counsel of his will.

SECONDLY, To proceed to those words, "I and my Father are one." John x. 30.

The great question here is, whether these words are to be understood of the unity of the Father and Son, as to their same *monadical essence*, or (as many of the Ante-nicene Fathers did interpret them) of an unity in will, design, affection and concord?

That they could not be intended to declare an unity of their individual essence, seems highly probable both from the context, from the like expressions in the Scripture, and from the very nature of the thing.

From the context; for there our Saviour saith, "The works that I do in my Father's name," that is, by his authority and power imparted to me, "bear witness of me." John x. 25. Which words are evidently repugnant to a numerical unity of essence in them both. Since, where the essence is one, the actions must be one, and done by the same authority and power.

To which add, that the words, *I and my Father*, are words plainly importing two persons. For the word, *Father*, is personal, and the word, *I*, is a pronoun personal; so that, if these two are one and the same God by virtue of this text, they must be one in person as well as essence.

Moreover, "My Father which gave them me," saith Christ, "is greater than all." V. 29. Which again destroys the numerical unity of essence between both; since no one essence can give any thing to itself, and much less a divine and all-perfect essence. Nor can one essence be greater than itself. Whereas our Lord expressly saith, "My Father is greater than I." John xiv. 28.

This will be farther evident from the parallel expressions used by our Lord, in the same Gospel,

where he prays that his disciples “ may be one, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they might be made perfect in one ;” and yet, doubtless, he could not pray that his disciples might be one in essence with the Father and Son, but only that they might be one by having the spirit of the Father and Son dwelling in them. In which sense Athenagoras says, the Father and Son are one, namely, ἐνότητι τοῦ πνεύματος, *by unity of the spirit.*\*

Thus Origen interprets this verse.† For having cited these words, *I and my Father are one* ; “ if any one,” saith he, “ is disturbed at these expressions, as if we favoured the opinion of the Noetians, who deny the Father and the Son to be δύο ὑποστάσεις, *two singular existences* ; let him consider this text, ‘ All that believed were of one heart, and one soul,’ Acts iv. 34. and then he will understand this, ‘ I and my Father are one thing.’ We serve therefore, ὡς ἀποδεδώκαμεν, *as we formerly explained it*, one God, the Father and the Son ; we worship the Father of the truth, and also the Son who is the truth, being indeed two things in subsistence, but in agreement and consent, and sameness of will, they are one.”

Here, indeed, he only saith we worship the Father of the truth, and the Son who is the truth and wisdom ; but in his Comment on John, p. 70, he adds, that the Father is πλείων καὶ μείζων ἀλήθεια, *a fuller*

\* Page 10.

† *Contra Celsum*, p. 386.

*and greater truth*, and, being the Father of wisdom, is greater and more excellent, as he is wisdom, than the Son. Then he proceeds, p. 387, to show, that among the multitude of believers, some, differing from the rest, rashly affirmed, as the Noetians did, that our Saviour was the God over all; "which," saith he, "we Christians, or we of the church, do not believe; as giving credit to the same Saviour, who said, "My Father is greater than I." And he saith, p. 388, "We Christians manifestly teach, that the Son is not stronger than the Father, who is the Creator of the world, ἀλλ' ὑποδέϊστος, *but inferior in power* to him." Which words afford the clearest demonstration, that the church of that age did not believe that our Saviour was ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, *the supreme God*, or one of the same numerical essence with the Father; and therefore could not interpret those words of such an unity, but only of an unity of concord, mind, and will. Hence, in his Comment upon St John, p. 227, he saith, that this unity of will is the cause why Christ said, *I and my Father are one*. And his next page adds, that the will which is in Christ is the image of the first will; and the divinity which is in Christ is the image of the true divinity.

Novatian is, if possible, still more express in this interpretation. For, in answer to the objection of the Sabellians from this place, he saith, that "*Unum*, being here put in the neuter gender, denotes not an unity of person, but a concord of society between them;



they being deservedly styled *one*, by reason of their concord and love, and because whatsoever the Son is, he is from the Father." "The Apostle," saith he, "knew this unity of concord with the distinction of persons, by writing to the Corinthians thus; 'I have planted, Apollos watered, but God gave the increase.' For who understands not that Paul is one person, and Apollos another? And that they had diverse offices, one to plant, and another to water? And yet the Apostle Paul saith of these two, *ἐν εἰσι*, *they are one*, though as to the distinction of persons they are two;"\* with other things of like nature.

And here it is to be observed, that Pamelius' note upon these words, is this; *Nempe in hoc loco non satis accuratè scribere Novatianum, quod nullam essentiae Patris et Filii communicationem adferat, sed exemplum ab Apostolo unitati essentiae veluti contrarium; in quo certè hallucinatum fuisse auctorem non vereor dicere, quum postea ecclesia in diversis conciliis diversum definiverit.* That is, "Novatian did not write accurately in this place, as making no mention of the communion of the essence between the Father and the Son, but introducing an example from the Apostle, as it were contrary to it; in which thing I doubt not to pronounce him erroneous, seeing the church afterwards in diverse councils defined the contrary."

\* De Trinitate, c. 27.

And yet it is certain, that many of the Antenicene Fathers in effect said the same thing. For Justin pronounces the Son to be ἕτερος τοῦ πατρὸς ἀριθμῶ οὐ γνώμη,\* *another from the Father in number, but not in consent.* And his reason follows thus, because he never would do any thing but what ὁ τὸν κόσμον ποιήσας, ὑπὲρ ὃν ἄλλος οὐκ ἔστι θεός, βεβούληται καὶ πρᾶξαι καὶ ὁμιλῆσαι, *the maker of the world, above whom there is no other God, would have him do and speak.* Where, first, this God the Father is plainly styled another in number from him that made the world; and, secondly, the Son is represented as one not doing his own will, but being in all things subservient to, and delivering the words of that God, from whom he is thus distinguished.

Lactantius saith, that the Father and Son are one, *quia unanimes incolunt mundum*,† “because they unanimously dwell in the world.”

Eusebius pronounces the Father and Son to be one, οὐ καθ' ὑπόστασιν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν κοινωνίαν τῆς δόξης,‡ *not as to the essence, but as to communion of glory.*

And, lastly, the council of Antioch pronounceth the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to be τρία μὲν ὑποστάσει, τῆ δὲ συμφωνία ἓν, that is, *three in subsistence, but one only in consent*, or concord. Tertullian declares, in answer to this objection of the Sabellians, that these words, “I and the Father,” *duorum esse significatio-*

\* Dial. cum Tryph. p. 276. † L. 4. c. 29. ‡ Ecclès. L. 3. c. 19.

nem, "signify two;" and then adds, that, *unum, neutrali verbo, non pertinet ad singularitatem, sed ad unitatem, ad similitudinem, ad conjunctionem; ad dilectionem Patris qui Filium diligit, et ad obsequium Filii qui voluntati Patris obsequitur*;\* that is, "The word *unum*, being in the neuter gender, does not denote numerical unity, but union, resemblance, connexion; the love of the Father towards the Son, and the obedience of the Son towards the Father." Which last words show, that it is impossible, that this text should be interpreted of the numerical essence, or unity of the Father and Son; seeing one and the same essence cannot be obsequious or obedient to itself. And yet there is nothing more common among the Ante-nicene Fathers, than to say with Novatian, who having affirmed that the Son, *obedierit Patri, et obediat*, "always did, and always doth obey the Father," thence makes this inference; *Quid tam evidens esse potest hunc non Patrem esse, sed Filium, quam quod obediens Patri Deo proponitur?*† "What more evidently shews, that Christ is not the Father, but the Son, than this, that Christ is obedient to the Father?" And again, *Filius nihil ex arbitrio suo gerit, nec ex consilio suo facit, nec a se venit; sed imperiis paternis omnibus et preceptis obedit, ut quamvis probet illum nativitas Filium, tamen morigera obedientia asserat illum*

\* *Adversus Praxeam*, c. 22. p. 575. † *De Trinitate*, c. 26.

*paternæ voluntatis, ex quo est, ministrum. Ita, dum se Patri in omnibus obtemperantem reddit, quamvis sit et Deus, unum tamen Deum Patrem de obedientiâ suâ ostendit, ex quo et originem traxit;*\* that is, in short, “The Son of God by his dutiful obedience to all his Father’s commands, and to his will, (he doing nothing by his own will and counsel,) by this demonstrated, that, though he was God, yet the Father, from whom he came forth, and whom he obeyed, was the one God,” even that one God, of whom he saith, *Nos scimus et legimus et credimus et tenemus, unum esse Deum, qui fecit cælum pariter ac terram; quoniam nec alterum novimus, aut noscere (cum nullus sit) aliquando poterimus;*† that is, “We Christians know, believe, and hold, that there is one only God, the creator of heaven and earth; nor know we, nor can we know any other, because there is no other.” And again, God the Father is, *unus Deus, cujus neque magnitudini, neque majestati, neque virtuti quicquam non dixerim præferri, sed nec comparari potest;*‡ that is, “That one God, to whose greatness, majesty, and power, nothing can be compared.” And, indeed, all the Greek Fathers, from Justin to Eusebius inclusively, do frequently inform us that the Son did ὑπηρετεῖν τῷ θελήματι τοῦ Πατρὸς. *obey the will of the Father*, that he did ὑπουργεῖν, διακονεῖν, ὑπηρετεῖν, *minister, and was subservient to him.*

\* c. 31.      † c. 30.      ‡ c. 31.

And all that writ in Latin, from Tertullian to Lactantius inclusively, inform us that he did, *Patris voluntati administrare*, “administer to the will of the Father;” that he did *obedire in omnibus Patri*, “obey the Father in all things;” that the Son, *voluntati Patris fideliter paret, nec unquam faciat aut fecerit, nisi quod Pater aut voluit aut jussit*, “faithfully obeys the will of his Father, and never doth, or would do any thing, but what the Father willed, or ordered him to do.”\*

It being therefore certain, that one and the same essence can have but one and the same will, and that one singular and numerical essence cannot administer to the will, obey, and be subservient to the will and commands of another; hence it is demonstratively evident, that he who does so, cannot have the same numerical essence and will with the Father.

THIRDLY, “Jesus saith unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father, and how sayest thou then, Show us the Father? 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 doth the works.” John xiv. 9, 10.

\* Lactant. L. 4. c. 29.

Where, as to those words, "I dwell in the Father, and the Father in me," they are so far from proving that he is of the same individual essence with the Father, that the same Apostle, in his general Epistle, ascribes the same to all good Christians; saying, "He that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in God, and God in him." 1 John iii. And, "No man hath seen God at any time. If we love one another, God dwelleth in us, and his love is perfected in us. Hereby know we that we dwell in him, and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit. Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God. And we have known, and believed the love that God hath to us. God is love, and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him." Chap. iv. 12—14. And St Paul saith, that "Christ dwelleth in a Christian's heart by faith." Eph. iii. 17. Yea, in this very Gospel of St John, it is said of all true believers, "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him;" and of his disciples, "that the Spirit of God dwelleth with them, and shall be in them;" and of all true believers, "that the Spirit of God dwelleth in them." Rom. viii. 11. 2 Tim. i. 14. And by so doing renders them the temple of God. And yet it is certain, that by this inhabitation they are not rendered one in essence with God the Father.

And even our communion service saith, that if we are worthy communicants, we dwell in Christ and Christ in us ; and we pray that we may ever dwell in him, and he in us. And this is said agreeably to those words of Christ, " If a man love me, he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." John xiv. 23. And yet, surely, it cannot be affirmed from these texts, that God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are so united to all true believers, as to render them of one and the same individual essence with them.

Moreover, Christ here saith, " The Father that dwelleth in me, he doth the works ;" whereas, where the essence is one and the same, the action done by that essence must be one and the same ; and so could not be truly said to be done by another.

As for these words, " I am in the Father and the Father in me." John xiv. 10. and these, " That ye may believe that the Father is in me, and I in him ;" Chap. x. 38. that they cannot refer to the unity of essence of the Father and Son, is evident from Christ's saying and promising the same thing to his disciples. It being certain, he could neither promise, nor pray the Father, that they should be one in essence with him. And yet he promiseth this in these words, " At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you." John xiv. 20. He prays for this in these

words, "That they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, 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, and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me." John xvii. 21. And so these words are interpreted by Origen and Eusebius.

Nor, **FOURTHLY**, can this be inferred from those words of Christ to Thomas and Philip, chap. xiv. 9. "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father, and how sayest thou then, Show us the Father?" For there our Saviour plainly shows, that they might have known and seen him, by reason of his presence with them, and his discourses to them ; and that by these things he had showed them the Father. And yet it is certain, that neither by his long abodes with them, nor his discourses to them, had he shown them the essence of the Father ; but only had acquainted them with the will and dispensations of the Father. Of these things he by his long continuance with them fully had acquainted them ; but had not said one word of his identity in essence with the Father.

So Christ saith to the Pharisees, "Ye neither know me, nor my Father ; for if ye had known me, ye would have known my Father also." John viii. 19. And to his disciples in this very chapter, V. 7. "From henceforth ye know him, and have



seen him." And yet it is certain they neither knew, nor could see the essence of him who is invisible. Yea, Christ saith of the unbelieving Jews, "Now have they both seen and hated both me, and my Father." John xv. 24. That is, they from those miracles I have wrought amongst them, have had sufficient means to see and know, both that I came from God, and am a revealer of his will, though they, through their prejudice and perverseness, neither truly knew, that is, acknowledged, me nor my Father.

Nor, FIFTHLY, can this be inferred from these words, "All things that the Father hath are mine." John xv. 16. For surely he might say this, whatsoever was his nature, "who knew that the Father had given all things into his hand." John xiii. 3. And that he did this as the effect of his love to him; for, saith the Baptist, "the Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand." John iii. 35. And, then, this is so far from being a proof of the identity of the essence of the Father and Son, that it is a demonstration to the contrary; seeing one individual essence can give nothing to, nor receive any thing from itself, because it can give nothing but what it hath already, and therefore cannot receive by way of gift.

And this, in an all-perfect and self-existent being, is the more certain, because it is incapable of any accession to its absolute perfection. If then God

the Son hath the same numerical essence, which God the Father hath, it could not properly and truly be said, "That the Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand." Or that "Jesus knew that the Father had given all things into his hand." John xiii. 3.

Our Saviour adds, "That the Spirit shall take of mine, and show it unto you." And yet the Spirit did not show to them any thing concerning the metaphysical essence of the Father and the Son. Nor doth he say, all the excellencies and perfections of the Father are mine; but only, *πάντα*, *all things* relating to the gospel dispensation, they being all taught him by the Father. And hence he saith to the Jews, marvelling how he should be able to teach what they thought he never learned, "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me;" that is, as the following words show, "It is not spoken by me from myself, but from God."

Nor, SIXTHLY, will this follow from the mighty works Christ did; because he himself promises to his disciples, John xiv. "Verily, verily, 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, because I go unto my Father," who is greater than I, and so can enable you to do greater works. Hence saith he to them, "If ye loved me, ye would rejoice because I said, I go to my Father, for my Father is greater than I." John xiv. 28.

SEVENTHLY, Nor will this follow from Christ's command to baptize all nations in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. For to be baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is to be baptized into the profession of our belief in *one God the Father Almighty, in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God sent by his Father to reveal his will; and in the Holy Spirit of God, by whose assistance the holy Scriptures were indited.* So that this profession is absolutely necessary to our being worshippers of the true God, who made heaven and earth; to our being Christians, or owners of the Son of God, as the true Messiah, and of the holy Scripture, as indited by the Spirit of God. And therefore it was absolutely necessary, that the Heathens, who owned none of these things whilst they continued infidels, should be baptized into this profession, in order to their embracing the christian faith.

EIGHTHLY, Nor can this be inferred from these words of St Thomas, "My Lord and my God;" as will appear from this consideration, that the faith of St Thomas was only this, that Jesus was really risen from the dead. For, when the Apostles had told him, they had seen the Lord; he answers, that "Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe" it. Then Christ, coming a second time, saith unto him, "Reach hither thy finger, and behold my

hands ; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side, and be not faithless but believing," to wit, "that I am risen."

Again, our Saviour saith, "Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed ;" which shows that he could believe only what he had seen, to wit, that the same body was raised, which had been crucified ; neither had he seen, nor could he see with his bodily eyes, that he who was thus raised, was his Lord and his God. These words therefore, "My Lord and my God," may have this import ; "My Lord and my God have done this ;" and so they exactly agree with the faith of the Apostles, saying, "The God of our Fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew, and hanged on a tree." Acts v. 20. See Acts ii. 24. iii. 15. iv. 10. xiii. 30. Or thus, My Lord and my God ! How great is thy power !" for, saith St Paul, "God exerted the greatness of his power, and the activity of his might, in raising our Lord Jesus from the dead." Eph. i. 19, 20. But whether this be the true import of St Thomas' words or no, certain it is, that it cannot be proved, that he did intend by them to signify that he owned Jesus Christ as his Lord and his God ;

Because he was bred up in the Jewish faith, which taught him that the Lord his God, the God of Israel, was one Lord, and that there was no other than he ; and,

Because it would have contradicted the faith of Christ himself, who after his resurrection speaks to his Disciples thus ; “ I ascend to my Father and to your Father, and to my God and your God.” John xx. 17.

And again, “ Him that overcometh, will I make a pillar in the temple of my God, and he shall go no more out ; and I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, which is in Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my God ; and I will write upon him my new name.” Rev. iii. 12.

Now, hence we learn how weak are the chief arguments of Athanasius, St Ambrose, and Cyril of Alexandria, and other ancients, to confirm this unity of essence between the Father and the Son, they being taken from these words of John, which, as I have showed, afford no firm proof or evidence of this matter.

NINTHLY, Nor will this follow from these words of St John, “ The word was God.” For, if that implies that he is the same numerical God with God the Father, it plainly is repugnant to all the passages following, cited in the foregoing arguments from this Evangelist, and also to the text itself, where of this word, which he styles God, he twice says, “ That he was *with* God.” But to say that he was the same God, with whom he was, is a contradiction in terms ; though indeed it was the ancient heresy of Sabellius.

Moreover, of this word, which is here styled God, the Apostle saith, "He came to his own, and his own received him not." Which cannot be true of God the Father, whom the Jews always owned to be their God; but only of that Jesus, who is here said to be with God, and to be God.

---

## SECTION VII.

### *Texts in the Epistles considered.*

Thus have I considered all the arguments for this identity of the Father and Son, produced from the Evangelists.

I come next to consider those, which are offered to the same purpose from the Epistles.

FIRST, Rom. ix. 5. Where in our translation we read thus, *Of whom as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever, ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς ἐυλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.*

Now to this argument, I have returned one answer in my Reply to Dr Waterland, by approving the ingenious conjecture of a learned critic, that these words are to be read thus, ὢν ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός, and are to be referred to God the Father's being the God of the Jews. And then the whole verse will run thus, ὢν οἱ πατέρες, καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς, *whose are the fathers, and of whom is Christ according to the*

flesh; ᾧν, of whom, or whose, is the God over all, blessed for ever; he being peculiarly known to them, and related to them as their God in covenant. And this exposition is the more probable, because this phrase is by the same Apostle, in this Epistle, and in another, plainly referred to God the Father; as when he says, "The Heathens worshipped the creature more than the creator," ὅς ἐστιν ἐυλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, *who is blessed for ever.* Rom. i. 25. And, "The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, ὅς ἐστιν ἐυλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, *who is blessed forever more,* knoweth that I lie not."\* 2 Cor. xi. 31.

\* [The conjecture here alluded to originated with Schlichtingius. His words are as follows.

*Venire etiam alicui in mentem posset in Apostoli verba levem et facilem vocum istarum ὁ ᾧν transpositionem irrepsisse, cum à Paulo scriptum esset ᾧν ὁ, quorum, nempe Judaeorum intellige, est ille super omnia Deus benedictus in secula.* "One might suppose it possible, that a slight transposition has crept into the words of the Apostle, and that instead of ὁ ᾧν, Paul wrote ᾧν ὁ, of whom, that is, of the Jews, is the God over all blessed for ever.

The author further observes, that this rendering is consistent with the remaining parts of the sentence, and goes on to show its suitableness. The Apostle is enumerating here the particular privileges, of the Jews, to whom, he says, "pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises." And by introducing the above conjectural emendation, the sentence will continue as follows, alluding still to the Jews, "*whose* are the fathers, of *whom* as concerning the flesh Christ came, *whose* is the God over all blessed forever." The learned John Taylor prefers this reading, because, he says, it makes the sense much more perfect; and, in enumerating the peculiar privileges of the Jews, it was certainly natu-

But the words, read according to our translation, are interpreted by Hippolytus, thus; "That Christ is God over all, because God the Father had delivered all things into his hand;" and, as the Apostle saith, "had made him head over all things to the church." Eph. i. 22. His words are these; "In these words of the Apostle he plainly sets forth the mystery of truth. *He that is over all is God*, for so he dares to say, *All things are delivered to me of my Father.*"\* And again, "he rightly calls him omnipotent; for this Christ testifies, by saying, 'All things are delivered to me of my Father;' and he

ral that their greatest privilege should be mentioned, which was, that the supreme God was *their God*, in whom they had gloried, and had reason to glory.

It is a little remarkable, that although Schlichtingius was the first, who proposed this emendation, and pointed out its harmony with the general sense of the passage, yet he did not believe it was correct. He proposes two objections to it; first, that it is supported by no manuscripts; and, secondly, that the phraseology, *God over all*, is never applied in the Scriptures to the Supreme Being. He says, *Christo rectius hic titulus convenerit, ut intelligeretur Christum non super quædam tantum, sed super omnia Dominum ac Deum effectum esse.* "This title applies more properly to Christ, that it may be understood,

---

\* Καλῶς διηγεῖται καὶ λαμπρὸν τὸ τῆς ἀληθείας μυστήριον. οἷτος ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός ἐστιν· λέγει γὰρ ὅτω μετὰ παρρησίας, Πάντα μοι παραδίδεται ὑπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς. Et rursus, Καλῶς εἶπεν παντοκράτορα Χριστὸν· τοῦτο γὰρ εἶπεν καὶ αὐτῷ μαρτυρήσει ὁ Χριστὸς. Μαρτυρῶν γὰρ Χριστὸς εἶπη, Πάντα μοι παραδίδεται ὑπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς. καὶ πάντων κρατεῖ παντοκράτωρ παρὰ Πατρὸς κατιστάθῃ Χριστὸς. *Contra Noet.* p. 10.



hath a dominion over all things, and so is made omnipotent by the Father." And it is worthy of observation, that this interpretation of these words is given by Hippolytus, in answer to Noëtus, who used them in confirmation of his Sabellian doctrine.

And, whereas it is said by some, that the Apostle having said in the immediate preceding words, "That Christ came from the Father, *κατὰ σάρκα* according to the flesh," or, as to his human nature, it is reasonable to conceive he should proceed to say what he was according to his divine nature; that this is not necessary, appears from Clemens Romanus,\* where, speaking of the dignity of Abraham, he saith, "That from him descended the Lord Jesus,

that he has been made Lord and God, not over a certain number of things only, but over all things." Accordingly, in his explanation of the text, he takes it in the same sense as it bears in our common version, and considers it as referring to Christ.

This mode of interpretation from Schlichtingius is accounted for, by knowing that, although he and the other Socinians of his time did not believe in the pre-existence of Christ, yet they considered him as entitled to the name of God by virtue of his exaltation, and his power over all things, granted to him by the Father. In this respect their opinions seem to have differed little from those of Whitby, and the early Arians, as explained in the third section above. Vide *Schlicht. Comment. in Epistolam Pauli ad Rom.* ix, 5. Also *Racovian Catechism.* Sect. iii, Chap. 1.—For a concise and ingenious exposition of the above text, consult Professor Norton's Statement of Reasons, p. 51. EDITOR.]

---

\* *Epist. ad Corinthios*, Sect. 32.

κατὰ σάρκα according to the flesh ;” but saith not one word concerning his spiritual descent.

SECONDLY, Nor doth this follow from these words of the Apostle, “ When ye knew not God, ye worshipped them, who by nature were no Gods.” Gal. iv. 8. Christ being by nature truly God, as having by that nature which he derives from the Father true divine power and dominion over all things both in heaven and earth, in subordination to him who alone is absolutely ὁ παντοκράτωρ, of himself *supreme over all*.

Again, These words may be fairly rendered thus, “ Ye worshipped gods, τοῖς μὴ φύσει, which had no being or existence in nature.” For such were many of their fictitious gods, Venus, Diana, Minerva, &c. or gods made with hands, for of such gods the Apostle saith, “ we know that an idol is nothing.” And Demetrius, the silversmith, complains that St Paul taught, “ That they were no gods that were made with hands.” Acts xix. 26. And the Psalmist saith, “ The gods of the heathens are the works of of men’s hands.” Psalm cxv. 5. and in this sense this text cannot at all concern our blessed Lord.

THIRDLY, Nor will this follow from those passages, which say, “ All things were made by him, and by him were all things created ;” it being expressly said in the same Scriptures, that “ God created all things by Jesus Christ.” Eph. iii. 9. and that “ by him, he,” that is, God the Father, “ made

the worlds."\* Heb. i. 2. Now he, by whom God the Father made all things, cannot be the same God with him who made all things by him.

FOURTHLY, Nor doth this follow from these words of the Apostle, "in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." Col. ii. 9. For, in the first place, this fulness refers not to the divine nature, but to the fulness of his "divine wisdom and knowledge," V. 3. by which he is completely enabled to manifest to us both the will and perfections of God.

And, whereas against this it is objected, that τὸ Θεῖον and Θεότης do never signify the doctrine of the Gospel; and that the will of God cannot be said to dwell bodily in any person; to this I answer, that, though the words, τὸ Θεῖον καὶ Θεότης, absolutely put, do never signify the doctrine of the Gospel; yet πλήρωμα τῆς Θεότητος may signify the complete ability of that divine person who is God. And in this sense the church is said to be, or have the fulness of that God who is all in all, by having his whole will revealed to them. And again, *if all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge may be said to be hid in Christ*, Col. ii. 3. why may they not also be said to dwell in him?

\* Πάντα διὰ τοῦ λόγου ἐγένετο, οὐχ ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ κρείττονος καὶ μείζονος παρὰ τὸν λόγον· τίς δ' ἂν ἄλλος οὗτος τυγχάνῃ ἢ ὁ Πατήρ; Orig. Com. in Johan. p. 56. Et Ὑπηρέτης τοῦ δημιουργοῦ γινόμενος ὁ λόγος τὸν κόσμον κατεσκεύασε. p. 61.

Thus St John the Baptist saith of Christ, Chap. i. 16, 17. "That he was full of grace and truth, and of his fulness have we all received;" not meaning, that we had received of the fulness of his Godhead, but only a full knowledge of the grace and truth, which he was sent to reveal to the world. And St Paul prays, that the "Ephesians might comprehend with all saints, what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God." Eph. iii. 18, 19. Where, certainly, he doth not pray, that all saints may be filled with the divine nature of God, but only, that they might have a sufficient knowledge of the love of God, in sending his beloved Son to acquaint them with the riches of his love to them in Christ Jesus, this fulness being to be obtained *by Christ dwelling in their hearts by faith.* V. 17.

Again, whatever this fulness of the Godhead means, it was conferred on him by the good pleasure of the Father. For, saith the same Apostle, Col. i. 19. "It pleased the Father, that in him should all fulness dwell;" that is, it pleased the Father thus to invest him with the fulness of divine power and wisdom, for the creation of all things, and for the redemption and government and preservation of his whole church. For, had he been one and the same all-perfect God with the Father, it could not have been truly said, that "it pleased the

Father, that in him should all fulness dwell ;” for then he must have had it from the perfection of his own nature, and not from the pleasure of his Father.

And, moreover, this will farther appear from the connexion of these words with the foregoing, where the Apostle cautions the Colossians against the philosophy and vain deceit of the heathen moralists, taught after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ. For, saith he, “In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily ;” which seems to be a plain dehortation from attending to the knowledge taught by these heathen philosophers, because of the fulness of the knowledge which was in Christ ; and adds, that “we are complete in him,” not surely by having the same Godhead with him, but by receiving a full and sufficient knowledge of the whole will of God revealed to us.

FIFTHLY, Nor will this follow from these words of the Apostle, “Looking for that blessed hope, and glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ.” Tit. ii. 13. For that the *great God* there signifies God the Father, is fully proved by Dr Clarke, in his comment upon that text.

SIXTHLY, That the *true God*, mentioned 1 John v. 20. is not the Son of God, but the Father, who by our Saviour is styled the only true God, is proved from the ancient reading of these words thus, “The Son of God is come, and hath given us

an understanding, *ἵνα γινώσκωμεν τὸν ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν, that we may know the true God, καὶ ἔσμεν ἐν τῷ ἀληθινῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, and we are in his true Son Jesus Christ.*" This God, of whom the Son of God hath given us this knowledge, as our Lord hath told us, *is the true God, and the knowledge of him is eternal life.* John xvii. 3. Thus the disciple accords well with his master, and only teacheth what he had learned from him.

*of Francis*  
**BISHOP HARE**

ON THE

**DIFFICULTIES AND DISCOURAGEMENTS,**

WHICH ATTEND THE

**STUDY OF THE SCRIPTURES**

IN THE WAY OF

**PRIVATE JUDGMENT.**

**A LETTER TO A YOUNG CLERGYMAN.**





## HARE.

---

No particulars can now be collected respecting the early life of FRANCIS HARE. The time and place of his birth are equally unknown. We first hear of him at Eton school, where he received the rudiments of education preparatory to the University. In due time he was entered at King's college, Cambridge, and became a fellow of that foundation.

While in this capacity he was entrusted with the tuition of the Marquis of Blanford, the only son of the Duke of Marlborough, and, by the duke, was appointed chaplain general to the army. In regular course he took the degree of doctor of divinity.

By reason of his connexion with the army his thoughts were turned into the channel of politics; and he first appeared, as an author, in defending the war, and the measures of the Whig administration. His writings on these subjects were chiefly published before the year 1712. He wrote the "Barrier Treaty Vindicated," and also a treatise in four parts, entitled "The Allies and the late Ministry,

defended against France and the present Friends of France." These tracts are said to have been much altered and amended by Maynwaring, and printed under the eye of Oldmixon.\* They were serviceable to the war interest, in opposition to the strictures of Swift, and the efforts of the Tory party. Tindal often refers to them, in his continuation of Rapin, as valuable historical documents respecting that period.

In the discharge of his official duties, Hare followed the army to Flanders; but how long he remained there, or when he resigned his station as chaplain general, does not appear. Soon after the publication of his political pieces we find him advanced to the deanery of Worcester, and engaged with great warmth as the coadjutor of Sherlock, Potter, Snape, and others, in the famous Bangorian controversy.

About four years after Hoadly preached his sermon on the Kingdom of Christ, when the controversy to which it gave rise had already raged to an extraordinary height, Hare published an elaborate discourse, in the form of a sermon, on *Church Authority*. In this discourse Hoadly saw, or fancied he saw, many artful though indirect attacks on his sermon, and its whole tenour was opposite to the principles, which he had avowed and defended. Nothing

\* Gentleman's Magazine, Vol. XLIX. p. 441.

more was wanting to rouse the spirit of Hoadly, who was ever ready for action, where truth was to be promoted, or his own sentiments vindicated. Notwithstanding the numerous contests then on his hands with some of the greatest men of his time, he hesitated not to encounter this new opponent with the weapons of controversial warfare, in the use of which no one had acquired greater confidence, or been more successful. He replied to the discourse on church authority, with his usual ability, and perhaps with more than his usual acrimony.

Hare contented himself at first with a few strictures on Hoadly's reply, in a Postscript to a succeeding edition of his discourse, in which argument abounds less than wit, and dignity less than satire. He felt keenly the shafts of his adversary, and endeavoured to destroy their force at one time by ridicule, and at another by personal reflections, neither of which comported with the gravity of the subject, or the character of an honourable disputant. His wit has more point than delicacy, and his animadversions more severity than justice.

The Postscript commences with a hint, which was no doubt intelligible to Hoadly, who had now been Bishop of Bangor nearly four years without once visiting his diocess. It is presumed he had reasons for this neglect satisfactory to himself; but the world did not choose to understand them, nor

to admit them as an apology. Hare was not reluctant to fall in with public opinion, and to make the most of it. "I was apprehensive," he observes, "that the publication of this sermon might give the lord Bishop of Bangor some little trouble, and for that reason, among others, was against it, as thinking it a mean and ungenerous part to add to the number of his adversaries, when he had already so many on his hands; especially at a time when I had good reason to believe his lordship's thoughts were wholly taken up with business of another nature; I mean the *primary visitation* of his diocess, whither I concluded he was gone or going soon; though I find since, I was mistaken."\* This was a seasonable hint, but it was lost on the Bishop of Bangor, who never visited his diocess till he was transferred to another bishopric. Hare next wonders, that the Bishop should waste his moments on a discourse hastily drawn up in two days' time, without premeditation, and published with reluctance at the earnest solicitation of friends. Whoever reads the discourse, perceives it to be a work elaborated with great care, running back into antiquity, and ranging widely in the fields of modern learning, and must acknowledge this to be a piece of affectation, which might have been spared.

\* Hare's Works, Vol. I. p. 161.

Hoadly had ventured to prophesy something, in which the author's theological learning was concerned. "His lordship's skill in prophecy," says Hare, "I dispute not, but am ready to allow that he knows as much of things to come, as of those that are past."\* Hoadly expressed himself occasionally in high commendation of his opponent's general acquisitions and talents as a scholar; but Hare would not take him at his word, alleging that his compliments were intended only to give a keener edge to his satire. "Whatever the meaning of them be," he adds, "as I have no right to one, so I greatly despise the other, and am willing they should be set against and extinguish each other, and so all pass for nothing; which is the only way to make these parts of his lordship's answer of a piece with the rest of his performance; of which and his other writings in this controversy, it must be allowed his lordship judges very truly, when he says they are *faint resemblances* of Mr Chillingworth's."† Such was the spirit of Hare's first remarks, but these were intended only as a feint to draw the public attention away from the arguments of Hoadly, till he should have time to prepare a more formal answer.

This was in readiness and published about a year afterwards, entitled *Scripture vindicated from the*

\* Hare's Works, Vol. i. p. 163. † Ibid. p. 163.

*Misinterpretations of the Lord Bishop of Bangor.* Formidable for its learning and its length, this answer was not wanting in candour and soberness, excepting, perhaps, some parts of the preface, in which the reader is too often reminded of the Postscript. Witty the author must be at times; but he has a dull, pragmatistical way of criticising words and phrases, which soon becomes tiresome; and what is still worse, the point of his argument is lost amidst the barren discussions about words and syllables through which he forces his reader. Whoever will reason must talk rather of things, than of words. Hare knew more of Latin and Greek, than of theology; and, in vindicating the Scriptures, he sometimes forgot that he was not writing notes on the classics.

In the Bangorian controversy our author sent out another piece, called a *New Defence of the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Sermon*. The title is ironical, and such is the general turn of the production itself. The writer feigns a deep concern for the fate of Hoadly's sermon, and is surprised, that neither he nor his friends have hit on a mode of defending it, which he kindly suggests, and which is no other, than to prove from its numerous defects, that it was composed in great haste, and given to the public without revision. In establishing this proof, the style first comes under notice, and here the author finds a favourable opportunity for indulging

himself in his grammatical propensities; he runs into all the extremes of hypercriticism in weighing the Bishop's periods, measuring the force of his adverbs, and displaying the extravagance of his metaphors.

The argumentative part is next examined, and discovered to be full of contradictions, on which no man in his senses could have deliberately blundered. The inquiry at length leads to the conclusion, that "his lordship has only raised a thick dust, but proved nothing;—*πάντα κόνις καὶ πάντα τὸ μηδέν.*" This New Defence has specimens of pungent satire; it is sometimes trifling, but its irony is well sustained; it makes no pretence to serious argument, and it contains none; it leaves impressions, however, which it requires the strength of argument to remove. And so the Bishop of Bangor evidently thought, for his reply, entitled "The Dean of Worcester always the same," is one of the most spirited, severe, and powerful of all his performances.

In the year 1727, Dr Hare was advanced to the bishopric of St Asaph, having been previously removed from the deanery of Worcester to that of St Paul's. He was translated to the See of Chichester in 1731, which, together with the deanery of St Paul's, he retained till his death.

During his residence at the University, and for some time afterwards, a warm friendship subsisted between him and the great writer and classical scholar, Dr Bentley; and, when he went into

Holland as chaplain general of the army, Bentley put into his hands a copy of his notes and emendations to Menander and Philemon, to be delivered to Burman, the celebrated professor at Leyden. Bentley also dedicated to Hare his "Remarks on the Essay of Freethinking," which essay was supposed to have been written by Collins, formerly Hare's pupil. With this dedication he was much gratified, and returned a flattering letter of thanks to the author.

Unluckily this friendship was not destined to be of long continuance. It was interrupted and finally broken off for reasons not well known, but, as Dr Salter insinuates, not very creditable to either party. They were both critics, both addicted to similar studies, and the world has been illnatured enough to spy out the seeds of their growing disaffection in the jealousy of rivalry. As their evil stars would have it, they fell on the design of writing notes to the same authors. Hare had published an edition of Terence, and was preparing his favourite Phædrus for the press, when he was surprised by the intelligence, that his friend Bentley was engaged with both of these authors, and would shortly bring them out together. What real grounds of dissatisfaction existed on either side, or where the greatest blame belongs, cannot now be ascertained. No more can be said, than that an irreconcilable enmity followed.



Bentley left out the dedication in the second edition of his Remarks, and mentions not Hare's name in his Terence. In looking about for the reasons of the first coldness between these distinguished scholars, suspicion has fastened on an early cause. By some unaccountable accident the papers, which Hare took in charge for Burman, missed of him, and found their way into the hands of Toland, then at Amsterdam. Bentley is imagined to have suspected something more than involuntary mistake in this affair, which, it is thought, may be gathered from a passage in the introduction to his Remarks, containing a shrewd compliment to Hare for the manner in which he had executed his commission. This is no better than conjecture. The papers reached Burman at last, and he wrote a preface, remarkable for little else than abuse of Le Clerc, which Bentley was wise enough to omit in the Cambridge edition.

Hare did not fall behind his antagonist in the violence of his dislike, nor in his pains to make it public. His *Epistola Critica*, addressed to Dr Bland, is a professed attack on Bentley's Phædrus, although, in addition to some trifling, and much profound criticism on that work, it is made a vehicle of spleen and personal censure. He boasts of convicting Bentley of ignorance, plagiarism, and all the sins to which an author can be tempted; and, not satisfied with achievements like these, he

proceeds to assert and prove, that the world had been egregiously mistaken in its estimate of the editor's scholarship and critical sagacity.

He is surprised beyond measure, that any thing so imperfect as Bentley's *Phædrus*, should come from a man of such reputed erudition. Many passages needing emendation are left untouched; with others, quite sound and unadulterated, the editor meddles to their injury; almost every thing of seeming value is pilfered from some preceding writer, and frequently without acknowledgment. And even in this there is much that is spurious; trifling conjectures neither necessary, nor supported by the authority of manuscripts; and some things manifestly false and absurd.\*

The only branch of knowledge, in which he allows Bentley to excel, is that of the Greek metres, and the mysteries of Greek verse. Here he permits him to sit in the chair of pre-eminence. He takes care, however, to deduct as much as he can from the value of this concession, first, by charging

\* *Multa enim affecta loca et manum medicam poscentia, intacta reliquit; plura quæ sana atque integra erant, tentando insigniter corripit; pleraque vero omnia, quæ aliquam veri speciem habent, non sua ipsius sunt, sed ab aliis desumpta, nec raro tacitis eorum nominibus unde sublegerit. Inque his ipsis, multa sunt mali commatis, conjecturæ leves, nequaquam certe necessariæ, nec ulla codicum auctoritate suffultæ; nec pauca manifesto falsa et inepta. Vide *Epist. Crit. Hare's Works*, Vol. II. p. 287.*

Bentley with the folly of holding the learning of all other men in contempt, who do not consider this kind of knowledge as the greatest human attainment; and, secondly, by going to the other extreme, and pretending, that it is comparatively worth nothing. He says, and perhaps truly, that it will make no man a better citizen, nor a better christian; and adds, that a single point of theology, or a chapter of the sacred Scriptures, or a question in history and chronology, to say nothing of the sciences and of jurisprudence, frequently demands more time and study than are requisite to pursue the whole doctrine of trimeters and tetrameters from its first elements to the bottom of its deepest mysteries.\*

The spirit of these remarks is intended to apply only to the extreme case of Bentley; and it would be unjust to represent this spirit as in accordance with Hare's general sentiments. No man was a greater friend to learning in all its departments, as his example testifies, and also his beautiful eulogy on learning contained in the preface to "Scripture Vindicated." Bentley knew the prodigious extent of his own learning, and was fully sensible to the admiration, which it drew on him; but he seems not

\* Unus certe theologiæ locus, unum Sacræ Scripturæ caput, una in historicis aut chronologicis quæstio, ut de scientiis vel de juris prudentiâ nihil dicam, plus sibi temporis et studii sæpe postulat, quam tota de trimetris et tetrametris doctrina, ut a primis usque elementis in abditissima ejus mysteria penetres. *Hare's Works*, Vol. II. p. 471.

to have been aware, that its relative value was very much diminished by its being so remote from common life, and that, had all men been as learned as himself, the affairs of the world must have stopped. A man may spend his days in counting pebbles on the seashore, and become profoundly learned in their shape, colour, dimensions, and weight ; another may labour for years to write a poem in which every word shall begin with the same letter ; a third may enumerate the syllables and letters in all the works of Aristotle and Aquinas, and tell the very page and line in which every one is found ; and a fourth may do any other feat, which shall be an equal test of his industry, memory, or perseverance ; but society would receive neither wisdom nor profit from their futile labours.

Utility is doubtless the proper end of all attainments. *Nisi utile est quod facimus, stulta est gloria.* But it must not be forgotten, that utility has its degrees, and that there are many ways of coming to the same end. It is a common weakness with men to clothe the objects in which they excel with a factitious importance ; they do not know the power of intellect and the application required to arrive at high attainments in other branches, because they have not made the experiment ; they judge by a false standard, and judge wrong. This prejudice can be corrected only by a general acquaintance with human pursuits ; it will then be seen, that eminence

is never attained without industry and talents, and that every man is to be valued and respected in proportion as he applies these with wisdom and to good purposes. Bentley was not to be censured because he was more fond of scanning the verses of Sophocles and Aristophanes, than of pondering on the categories of Aristotle, reading the stars, penetrating the subtleties of metaphysics, launching on the ocean of politics, expatiating in the fields of modern literature, or following the light of modern science into the recesses of nature; it was his weakness, that he could not see and allow, that the world was full of men devoted to some of these objects, who were as great and as wise as himself, and many of them destined to render higher benefits to society, and to contribute infinitely more to the progress of human improvement, although they might never read the shortest fragment of Menander, nor be able to resolve a single line of a Greek comedy into its metrical elements.

We shall hardly be disposed to charge Hare with undervaluing Bentley's peculiar attainments, when we know, that he laboured with equal assiduity in a kindred, but still more unpromising region. A work on which he bestowed more pains than on any other, perhaps, was his system of metres in Hebrew poetry, first published in connexion with the Hebrew Psalms, divided in conformity with his notion of their measure.

Josephus and Philo maintained that the poetry of the Hebrews had metres similar to those of the classical poetry of other nations, and in this opinion they were followed by others among the ancients, particularly Origen and Jerom. The opinion made its way silently among the learned till the time of Joseph Scaliger, who set himself in earnest to confute it, alleging at the same time, that it had never been proved, that it rested on assertion, and only held its ground because it had never been opposed. His discussion awakened curiosity, and opened a new theatre on which were to be displayed the skill and talents of the orientalists. Many theories were started, and as many exploded; some critics found every imaginable perfection of art and taste in the poetical numbers of the Hebrews; others met with no success in this search, and zealously maintained, that the poets of Israel did not model their compositions after any principles like those of the classic metres, but were guided by such rules only as the judgment and taste of each writer might suggest. The magic of their poetry consists in sublimity of thought, beauty of imagery, force of sentiment, and accurate delineation of nature, rather than in regularity of measure, and harmony of numbers.

Gomar was one of the most successful metrical adventurers. He discovered both metre and rhyme; Buxtorf and Heinsius approved his work. Cappel and Pfeiffer wrote against it, and gave equal

satisfaction to the opposite party. Le Clerc was for rhyme without metre, a scheme more untenable, in the opinion of Bishop Lowth, than any other. He had some followers, but was opposed by Calmet and Dacier.\*

In England Bishop Hare was the first who entered deeply into this subject; and after having examined it to the bottom, he proposed a new theory of Hebrew metres, which he fondly imagined would reconcile all differences, and restore the poetry of the Bible to its pristine dignity and perfection. When he published his Psalter, however, with a full exposition of his scheme, he had the mortification to find, that it was coldly received by the public. In Psalmanazar's Memoirs it is said, that five hundred copies only were printed. Two hundred and fifty of these were distributed by the author among his friends, and the remaining copies slowly deserted the shelves of the booksellers.† The work has not been republished in a separate form, although it is contained in the thirty-first volume of Ugolini's Thesaurus. It was reprinted in this country with selected notes, but without the scheme of metres.

Notwithstanding the little attention which Hare's hypothesis attracted at first, it was regarded with great respect by the learned, as is manifest from

\* Jebb's Sacred Literature, Sect. 1. † Ibid.

the testimony of Bishop Lowth, who deemed it worthy of a laboured confutation. "The arguments advanced in its favour," says Lowth, "appeared so conclusive to some persons of great erudition, as to persuade them, that the learned prelate had fortunately revived the knowledge of the true Hebrew versification, after an oblivion of more than two thousand years; and that he had established his opinion by such irresistible proofs, as to place it beyond the utmost efforts of controversy."\* Lowth undertook to prove this a delusion, and to overthrow the scheme itself. Public sentiment has for the most part acquiesced in his arguments and decisions. Hare's hypothesis found a strenuous advocate in Dr Edwards, who wrote a Latin treatise in its defence, to which Lowth replied in what he called his Larger Confutation.

Dr Hare's most celebrated performance is a treatise entitled, "The Difficulties and Discouragements, which attend the Study of the Scriptures, in the Way of Private Judgment." This was published without his name soon after his return from Holland, and took so well with the public, that it speedily ran through several editions. It was accounted the finest specimen of irony in the language; and, if we except Hoadly's Dedication

\* See A Brief Confutation of Bishop Hare's System of Hebrew Metres, appended to Lowth's Lectures.



to the Pope, which came out shortly after, no piece in its way has probably since appeared, which would not suffer by a comparison. Some persons affected not to understand him ; they were disposed to take his irony in earnest, and forward to whisper suspicions and discontent in the ears of the convocation. It is not known, that any evils ensued to the author ; he had clearly stated it to be his object, by showing the discouragements attending the study of the Scriptures, to impress on individuals and religious societies the important duty of removing these discouragements. His concluding remarks abundantly evince his sincerity, and are uttered in a tone of seriousness, and with a concern for the interests of religious knowledge, which it would seem impossible to misapprehend.

In the notice here given of Bishop Hare and his works, I have said nothing of his manner of life, his habits, or his peculiarities, which usually add so much interest to the delineation of a character. Concerning these I do not find that any thing has been transmitted. His writings seldom reveal a personal incident ; they never betray his designs, nor acquaint you with his pursuits ; you may converse with his mind, grow familiar with his thoughts, and trace his opinions ; there you must stop ; the man is invisible, and not to be approached. He died 1740 ; and his works were collected by Owen, the printer, and published 1746, in four volumes octavo.

He that shall judge Bishop Hare by his writings will heartily respond to the eulogy of Blackwall, who calls him a "sound critic, consummate scholar, and bright ornament of the church and nation."\* It is presumed there have been few better classical scholars, although he may have towered to the height of his gigantic rival, Dr Bentley. His latinity claims the praise of elegance and purity, and if his *Epistola Critica* were not so much disfigured with hostile attacks and undignified personalities on his great antagonist, it would be a most honourable monument of his erudition and critical skill. His political tracts bear marks of a vigorous intellect, and an acuteness in some of the deeper principles of government. In controversy we have seen that he is less successful; we are oftener fatigued than convinced; verbal disquisitions come upon us in the guise of arguments; learning is expended to show the extent of learning; materials abound, knowledge, mental energy, force of language, but they are awkwardly applied.

Whiston intimates that Hare was skeptical, but seemingly without proper foundation. He speaks of his treating the Scriptures with levity, talking in a trifling manner about the fulfilment of prophecy, and manifesting a willingness to conceal, that he was the author of the "Difficulties and Discourage-

\* Sacred Classics, Vol. II. p. 76.

ments," when he found this circumstance was likely to be a bar in his way to preferment.\* Whoever reads Hare's sermons, and his other theological writings, will not listen to the charge of skepticism from any quarter, if he regards his understanding and sense of justice. Whiston was the last man to report a thing, which he did not believe; but, like many other good men, it was his foible, in the honesty, frankness, and simplicity of his heart, to tell all he had thought or heard, and, what was still more unfortunate, to believe it all. In the present instance, as in some others, it is fair to conclude that he was mistaken.

Hare was a professed friend of toleration and religious freedom in the protestant sense of the terms; but in defending the church he occasionally ran counter to his own principles. Silence and submission were essential requisites in his notion of religious liberty; that is, Christians are free to believe truth, but not to oppose error, free to live without molestation under a church establishment, but not to meditate any change merely because they are dissatisfied. Hoadly drove him from this ground; and it is not surprising, that he should be embarrassed in attempting to reconcile the powers and immunities of a church established by law with an unrestrained liberty of opinion, and the simplicity of scriptural order and discipline.

\* Whiston's Memoirs, Vol. I. p. 110—114.



ON THE  
DIFFICULTIES AND DISCOURAGEMENTS,  
WHICH ATTEND THE  
STUDY OF THE SCRIPTURES.

---

SIR,

I do not wonder at the surprise with which you received, when we were last together, the advice I ventured to give you in relation to the study of the Scriptures. For one, who is a clergyman himself, to seem to dissuade those of his own order from a study that has so many arguments to recommend it; and which, in the opinion of all good men, ought to be their chief business, has, I confess, the appearance of a strange paradox, and that of the worst sort. It looks like popery and priestcraft; and therefore young and tender minds may easily be forgiven, if they startle at the first proposal of it; those, especially, who have a just sense of the excellency and inspiration of the Scriptures, and are eagerly bent on the pursuit of such truths, as more immediately tend to the advancement of virtue and religion. As you are of that number, and went into

orders with no other view, but that you might the better study the Scriptures yourself, and advance the knowledge of them in the world ; it was not to be expected you should presently come into other sentiments. Which I am so far from taking amiss, that I think it to your commendation, that neither the affection nor esteem you so often express for an old friend, could prevail with you to act a part that might have the appearance of levity in a matter of so much consequence. Nor is it less for your credit, that you can retain your opinion, without losing your temper, or showing a backwardness to hear what is to be said against it. Most tempers run into extremes ; they are either too volatile to be fixed, or else so fixed, that no force of argument can move them. But it is your happiness, that you can adhere without obstinacy, and change without levity ; and therefore I shall think it no trouble to resume the subject, and lay before you, in the best manner I can, the reasons that seem to make against the study of the Scriptures in the way of private judgment ; which I hope will not, upon cooler thoughts, appear so strange to you. You will consider they come from one, who is not more a friend to you, than he is to the church ; and, if examples be of any weight, I can assure you this side of the question is by no means destitute of proselytes ; and that, when you come to know the world more, you will find this study

neglected to a degree you little imagined ; but it is reasons, not examples, will determine you. To come therefore to them ;

I. Let me, in the first place, observe to you, that the study of the Scriptures, such a thorough study of them I mean, as you aim at, is extremely difficult, and not to be successfully pursued, without a very great and constant application, and a previous knowledge of many other parts of useful learning. The New Testament cannot be understood without the Old ; the truths, revealed in one, are grounded on the prophecies contained in the other ; which makes the study of the whole Scriptures necessary to him, that would understand thoroughly a part of them. Nor can the Apocryphal books, how much soever they are generally slighted, be safely neglected ; there being a great chasm of five hundred years between the end of the Prophets and the beginning of the Gospel ; which period is of the greatest use for the understanding of the New Testament, and yet is the least known. But now, if the Old Testament must be well studied, a good knowledge of the oriental tongues is absolutely necessary. No man can be ignorant, who knows any thing of letters, that no versions of old books can be thoroughly depended on ; the mistakes are so many, and sometimes of great moment ; especially the versions of books writ in a language little understood, and many parts of it in a style extremely figurative, and

those figures such as these parts of the world are almost wholly strangers to. But, put the case these difficulties were less than they are, it is no easy matter to add to Greek and Latin the knowledge of so many other languages. Do not they two alone find work enough for most scholars? What pains then must a man take, if he will study so many others besides? And, if the knowledge of the Old Testament could be dispensed with, give me leave to tell you, that the language even of the New Testament is not to be understood with so little pains, as is commonly imagined. It is learned indeed in schools, and from hence thought to be the easiest Greek that can be read; but they, who have read it in another manner than school boys, know it to be quite otherwise. Not to mention the difficulties peculiar to St Paul, whose Epistles are a very great part of the New Testament; Plato and Demosthenes are in many respects not so hard, as even the easier books. The style indeed, in the historical books, is plain and simple; but, for all that, even those parts have their difficulty; and the whole is writ in a language peculiar to the Jews; the idiom is Hebrew or Syriac, though the words be Greek; which makes some knowledge of those languages still necessary.

Again, though it were not necessary to read the Old Testament in the original, yet the Greek version of it must be read, and that carefully; it



being often times the best, if not the only help, to explain the language of the New ; besides that, all citations in the New are generally made from it. But now, how laborious a thing must it be, to study an ill version of a very hard book, which we cannot read in the original? I call it an ill version ; for though it be indeed a very good one, considering the time it was writ in, yet, as a version, it must be allowed by those who can judge of it, to be far from being exact or true. A man need only consult it on some hard places in the Pentateuch, as well as in the poetic or prophetic books, to be convinced of this. It was certainly far from perfect at first, and is made much worse by the corruptions it has suffered in handing down to us ; so that I may venture to affirm, that, should any body now a days make a version so imperfect, instead of admiration and esteem, his work would be much despised by most of our modern critics.

I might to these add many other difficulties that attend a serious study of the New Testament. It requires a good knowledge of the Jewish state at the time of our Saviour's coming ; a knowledge of their government, sanhedrim, synagogues, customs, traditions, opinions, sects ; the kinds of learning received among them ; what they borrowed from the Greeks ; when the mystical and allegorical manner of expounding the Scriptures began, and on what grounds ; what their particular expectations

were in relation to the Messiah, and what they taught, and on what grounds, in relation to angels, demons, possessions, oracles, miracles, &c.

But it is in vain, you say, to tell you of difficulties ; you are resolved not to be deterred ; you have time before you, good eyes, a strong constitution, a mind prepared for fatigue, a reasonable degree of skill in the languages, and are furnished with a competent knowledge in all the parts of useful learning, that are preparatory to this study ; so that difficulties animate rather than dishearten you ; and I am not unwilling so far to agree with you, that were there no objection against this study, but the difficulty, this alone should not deter one who is so well prepared for it. But, if you are able to go through so laborious a study, I presume you are not fond of difficulties for difficulties' sake. You cannot think it reasonable to take so much pains, unless it will turn to some good account.

II. I shall therefore, in the second place, take leave to ask, *Cui bono?* What good can come of so much pains ? For it may seem that a free, serious, impartial, and laborious study of the Scriptures will be of no great service, for the following reasons ;

*First,* Because it is plain the orthodox faith is not founded on a nice and critical knowledge of the Scriptures. Many of the ancient Christians, it will be allowed, were not great critics, but argued very much in a mystical way. Origen in particular,

who was the greatest scholar christianity had bred to that time, perpetually turns the letter of Scripture into allegory. From whence we may reasonably conclude, that the knowledge of the bare literal sense was, in the judgment of many even in those times, thought to be of little use.

*Secondly*, But it is certain that the original language of the Old Testament was known to very few for the first six centuries, in which those general councils were held, wherein all the articles of the orthodox faith were settled. They governed themselves, and determined all their controverted points by the Greek version; and those who knew Hebrew best, whether they took to the mystical or literal way, had the misfortune to be least orthodox. So it was with Origen, who knew the Scriptures so well, that he had them all by heart. And Eusebius and others, who studied and understood the literal sense of the Scriptures best in the next ages, succeeded little better; so that this study seems to have been of little use to the establishment of the orthodox faith. Now, if an exact and critical knowledge of the Scriptures was not necessary to the settling of the faith, it cannot be necessary to the understanding of it, or to the understanding those who have writ best in the explication and defence of it. On the contrary, such a knowledge tends to lessen our esteem for the Fathers of the church, by discovering their mistakes; and may

weaken our regard to the decisions of councils, by exposing the falseness of the ground they seem to be built on. A man, well skilled in the literal sense of the Scriptures, will often find, in the Fathers and councils, texts of Scripture urged very insufficiently; and great stress laid upon passages, which, when critically explained, prove nothing, or perhaps make against them. Which suggests to me a third reason, why it may seem that such a study can do no good.

*Thirdly,* And that is, because the orthodox faith does not depend upon the Scriptures considered absolutely in themselves, but as explained by catholic tradition. The faith was preserved in creeds, and handed down from one orthodox bishop to another, whose business it was to keep this sacred *depositum* pure and undefiled, and to deliver it to his successor entire as he received it. It was by this tradition the main articles of faith were preserved in the church, and not from any particular study of the Scriptures. The ground therefore of these articles must carefully be distinguished from the Scriptures that have been brought in proof of them; these proofs may be weak and inconclusive, but the truth stands independent of them. It is the faith they have received; and, if at any time they argue weakly for it from the Scriptures, it is an argument indeed against their learning, but none against their orthodoxy.

This therefore may seem another good argument to prove, that an exact and careful study of the Scriptures is not a safe and profitable study. It is a much safer, as well as a more compendious way to make a man orthodox, to study the tradition of the church.

But you will say, that to send you from Scripture to tradition is to turn you out of paradise, the garden of God, into a vast, confused, bewildered wood ; and that this is so far from mending the matter, that it is ten times more laborious than the study I would dissuade you from ; and so, I confess, it is, if all the ecclesiastical writers were to be carefully read, in order to know the catholic tradition. But that is not my meaning ; the substance of catholic tradition lies in much less compass ; the established church, you will allow, is orthodox in all necessary points. If therefore you know the sense of the established church, you have in epitome the church catholic ; and therefore you need only study her opinions to make you orthodox ; and this the most illiterate man may find in the liturgy and articles. This, I trust you will allow, is as short a way, as could be wished of knowing all that is necessary to be known. A very little time will serve a man to read, in his mother tongue, things which all together would not fill a moderate volume ; and he will be orthodox enough, and have a great deal of time to spare for other studies, that will turn to more

account. Besides that, it is of great advantage to go in a way that is safe as well as short ; and will lead you into the knowledge of all useful truths, without the hazard of falling into any dangerous opinion.

*Fourthly,* But if you will insist that it is Scripture and not tradition, that the faith is founded on ; there is one thing farther I must put you in mind of, which may seem to prove, that a profound and laborious study of the Scriptures will not make you at all more orthodox. It is a fundamental principle among protestants, that whatever is necessary to be believed, is plainly and clearly revealed in the Scriptures ; and consequently what is not plainly and clearly revealed in them, cannot be necessary. Now if what is plain and clear in Scripture is the only part that is necessary to be known, then a laborious search into the obscurer parts may seem unnecessary to the obtaining a true orthodox faith. You will say perhaps, that, notwithstanding this declaration of protestants, it may and has been urged against them by their adversaries, that they do believe, and maintain as necessary, articles that cannot be proved by plain and clear passages of Scripture. This, I confess, has been urged, and may possibly be true of all parties of them, except the established church ; but, if it be, it proves only that they are not true to their principle ; not that the principle is not in itself true and good. And

he surely must be allowed to be the best protestant, who adheres best to the principle on which the Reformation was founded.

*Fifthly*, Once more ; supposing the study of the Scriptures as necessary as you please ; in the last place, I say, and I am sure the world will say it with me, that they have been sufficiently studied already. And, if any parts remain still obscure, who can hope to clear up passages that have puzzled so many great men ? Or will presume in disputable points to set up his private judgment, against them that were men of more learning, of abler parts, of greater application, and better acquainted with the tradition of the church, than any one will now be allowed to be ? And (which is the best guide in knowledge of religion) they were moreover men of most exemplary piety, devotion, and humility ; virtues, of which very little footsteps are to be found in the learned men of our times.

Must not now a man have a strong bent of mind indeed, who cannot, by all these reasons, be dissuaded from giving himself up to a study, that may by many be thought as unprofitable as it is laborious ? but will go on, in defiance of all that has been said to convince him that he wastes himself in vain, and that there will be no fruits of all his labour, but to know he knows nothing ? I call that nothing, which will turn to no account.

But, to show you I am disposed to make all possible concessions, I will grant that even this objection might be got over, were this the worst of it ; but I have one argument still in reserve, that I am persuaded will be decisive.

III. My third argument then is this ; that a painful, exact, impartial study of the Scriptures will by some be thought not only to do no good, but also a great deal of hurt, both to the public, and to yourself.

*First*, It will do hurt to the public. It will disturb the peace of the church, and that cannot but have a malignant influence on the state.

It is certain that disputes in the church disturb the peace of it ; and it is as certain these disputes have been generally raised by men pretending to a superior knowledge of the Scriptures, and to discoveries that have escaped others. The Scriptures have always been made this use of by the heretics of old ; and it is the character of the great heretics of this and the last age, who have set up for a free and impartial search into the literal sense of the Scriptures above the rest of the christian world. But with what success ? They have purchased their pretended knowledge of the Scriptures at the expense of their reputation, and their study has destroyed their orthodoxy. And were not their books and opinions carefully suppressed, and their persons rendered odious to the people, who knows what disturbances they might have created to the



church? On the other hand, the peace the church has enjoyed for many years, among its own members, seems to be owing to no one thing more, than to a general neglect of this study; and the dangers, that at present threaten its tranquillity, come wholly from men, who have endeavoured to revive a study that has so often proved pernicious to its peace.

Nor can it well be otherwise; for what security has a man that sets out in this way; that attempts to study the Scriptures in a free and impartial manner, laying aside all prepossessions and previous notions, resolving to see with his own eyes, and judge for himself, and to believe nothing that he is not upon his own search convinced is clearly contained in them? What security has such a man, that he shall not fall into some opinions that have been already condemned as erroneous and heretical, or which may interfere with those that are commonly received; which, if they do not immediately strike at any fundamental point, yet will be thought to do so; and may have a tendency to put scruples into weak minds, and to disturb the peace of the church, by raising doubts about the meaning or truth of some articles, or by asserting that an explicit belief of them is not necessary? It is so natural for curious and inquisitive minds to deviate from the common road, and the examples are so many, that it is odds but you do so too, unless you had more lead in your constitution, or

a more refined understanding, than any curious man ever had yet ; otherwise you cannot be sure, that you shall not study yourself into doubts at least, if not into opposite opinions concerning some received notions. You will doubt perhaps of the authority or author of some canonical book, and think perhaps that some passages are interpolated, or that some celebrated texts are not genuine, or should be otherwise read, or have not been rightly understood, or do not prove the point they are commonly brought for. You may fall into notions that will be thought tending to Arianism, or the like ; you may reject arguments brought from the Old Testament, to prove the trinity, as trifling, and proving nothing but the ignorance of those that make use of them. You may think a prophecy has a literal meaning, where commonly the mystical is thought the only one. You may think that many texts in the New Testament, which are strong against the Socinians, do not prove against the Arian notion. That the title, Son of God, has not always one uniform meaning in the Gospel ; and that that single expression, of itself, is no proof of any thing in God analogous to generation in men. That the identical consubstantiality of the Son, the eternal procession of the Spirit, and many other notions relating to the trinity, though they may be true in themselves, are not so in virtue of the texts alleged for them. These notions learned men have fallen into ; and from

thence it is to be presumed, you will not easily keep clear of them. I choose to instance chiefly in matters relating to the trinity, because it is the controversy now on foot; but the like may be said on many other articles; in each of which the truth is but one, but the errors infinite; and there is hardly any notion, with respect to any of them, which some learned man, by following his own private judgment, instead of taking the doctrine of the church for his guide, has not fallen into.

Now, if you should study yourself into any new opinions, or into old ones that have been condemned, what will you do? Will you keep them to yourself, or publish them? Or shall I rather say, it is no question. The authors of new notions are apt to be very fond of them; they think it barbarous and cruel, to stifle the infant in its birth. There is a secret pleasure in singularity; to differ from the vulgar is, in appearance, to be above them; and to be distinguished from the herd, is too great a temptation to be easily resisted. But, had you prudence enough to govern your ambition, conscience may come in here, and make you do what ambition could not. The truths, you think you have discovered, either are, or will be thought by you, of too much importance to the honour of God and the good of religion, to be concealed. You will look on them as the blessings of God on your studies; and think it a capital crime to extinguish the light, and sup-

press the knowledge he has imparted to you. In short, you will think yourself under the highest obligation not to dissemble in religious matters, and conceal, from the church of God, opinions which you are convinced are not only true, but of great service to it. Let me then conclude, that the novel or revived opinions, which your study leads you into, will be published to the world; what now will be the consequence? Certain mischief, but no certain good at all. No good, I say; for possibly your notions may be wrong, or not of consequence; and, whether they are or not, the presumption against you will be so strong, that your notions will not be received, and perhaps not examined; they will be condemned as novel notions, or as exploded ones; and, whatever you advance, it will be thought a certain proof of its being of no consequence, that in so many ages it has never been received. There is no room therefore to expect, that what you advance should be received, or do any good. But the mischief is sure and certain; it will raise scruples in weak, unstable minds, sap the foundations of the orthodox faith, and give a handle to skeptical men; who, because some things are called into doubt (though incidental matters only, and of little consequence), will think they have a right from thence to question every thing. Thus the church and established faith will suffer by the scruples put into its friends, and the handle given to its enemies.

And, when religious disputes are begun, designing men know how to intermix affairs of state with them ; and then nobody knows where they will end, or what mischiefs they may not do. Whereas, if you can be content to go in the beaten road ; if you will implicitly submit to the received notions, and humbly think the judgment of the church, where it is not the same, better than your own, you will be out of harm's way, and neither hurt the church, nor yourself.

*Secondly*, I add yourself, as another motive that ought to have great weight with you in this question ; for you cannot disturb the peace of the church, without being greatly a sufferer yourself. If you really do not disturb its peace, it is all one, you will be interpreted to do it, and that will bring on you more evils than I would wish to my greatest enemy. In a word, you will be thought a *heretic* ; a term, which there is a strange magic in, though it has no determinate meaning in the mouth of the people, nor any ill meaning in itself. It is supposed to include in it every thing that is bad ; it makes every thing appear odious and deformed ; it dissolves all friendships, extinguishes all former kind sentiments, however just and well deserved ; and, from the time a man is deemed a heretic, it is charity to act against all rules of charity ; and, the more they violate the laws of God in dealing with him, it is, in their opinion, doing God the greater service.

That you may not think this is said at random, purely to frighten you into a compliance with me ; let me desire you to consider seriously the natural consequences of being under the imputation of heresy. And the first I would observe is, that, from the moment your people have this opinion of you, you are incapacitated from working much good upon them ; and that, I am sure, so good a man as you are, must think to be a great evil. While they think you orthodox, your virtuous and inoffensive behaviour, your strict sobriety and temperance, your affable and familiar manner of conversing with them, your generous and charitable regard to those who are sick or in distress ; these good qualities, joined to your plain and easy, but affectionate and moving manner of instructing them, have a mighty influence, and you may lead them as you please ; they admire and endeavour to imitate your good example ; your virtuous conduct is a constant, though tacit, reproof when they do amiss ; the very sight of you is a lecture of virtue to them ; and the influence you have already had, in the little time you have been among them, is too visible to be denied. But, from the time you are called heretic, much of the good, you could have done, is at an end. Those, who before had a secret veneration of you, think it their duty to defame and injure you ; your virtue they call hypocrisy, your humility spiritual pride ;

they look on you as an abandoned wretch ; that God has withdrawn his grace, and that the Devil is at the bottom of all you have been doing ; that nothing can better testify their orthodoxy, than to throw off all regard both to your doctrine and example ; and, for fear they should seem to be infected with your errors, they will return to the vices you had persuaded them to leave ; and, for the future, will take effectual care not to be the better for you.

Nobody can do much good, whom the people do not think a good man ; and that cannot be expected, when so much reproach and infamy will, right or wrong, be heaped on you, if you do not continue orthodox. And this you cannot doubt, if you will but reflect on what passes under your own eyes ; and therefore it is in vain to fancy your virtue will protect you. No, the most conspicuous virtue will not be believed. If you are guilty of no open vices, secret ones will be imputed to you ; your inquiries will be called vain, curious, and forbidden studies. Pride and ambition will be said to be the secret springs of them ; a search after truth will be called a love of novelty ; the doubting of a single text will be skepticism ; the denial of an argument, a renouncing of the faith. To say what the Scriptures have said, and in the very same words too, if not explained in the common way, will be blasphemy ; and the most sincere concern for the honour of

Almighty God, you cannot be sure, will not be interpreted downright atheism. Every thing you say, or do, will have a wrong turn given it. A slip of memory shall be made wilful prevarication; a mistake in a citation shall be forgery and corruption; an error, in an incidental point of learning, shall be a good proof that you know nothing. Every inaccurate expression shall be pressed into a crime; any little warmth of temper shall be aggravated into pride and positiveness, into a contempt of authority and ill manners. In short, all the indiscretions of a man's former life shall be ripped up; and nothing forgiven, that can be remembered or strained to his disadvantage. And where is the man that can be fond of such usage? For my part, I am free to declare, I am afraid I should not have virtue or courage enough to undergo such a fiery trial.

Now all this a man will draw upon himself, that brings himself under the imputation of heresy. Whereas the orthodox man lives quiet and at ease, unmolested and unenvied. His faults (and who has not some?) shall be extenuated or excused, if not quite buried in oblivion; his want of temper shall be a commendable zeal; his indiscretion, good nature; his mistakes shall be imputed to haste or inadvertency; and, when they cannot be defended, it will be argued in his favour, that the greatest men sometimes err, and the writers of the first rank are not always in the right; or perhaps



a mistake shall turn to his advantage ; it will be shown to be an error on the right side, and that a good cause drew him into it. His learning, on the other hand, shall be magnified beyond measure ; every body will be full of his good qualities, and his virtues shall be set in the best light to show themselves and cover his faults. In a word, orthodoxy atones for all vices, and heresy extinguishes all virtues. That this is nothing but the bare truth, I appeal to what you every day hear and see yourself.

There are, you know, two clergymen\* of the town, who have studied themselves into heresy, or at least into a suspicion of it ; both of them, men of fair, unblemished characters ; one† has all his life been cultivating piety, and virtue, and good learning. Rigidly constant himself in the public and private duties of religion ; and always promoting in others virtue and such learning as he thought would conduce most to the honour of God, by manifesting the greatness and wisdom of his works. He has given the world sufficient proofs that he has not misspent his time, by very useful works of philosophy and mathematics ; he has applied one to the explication of the other, and endeavoured by both to display the glory of the great creator. And to his study of nature, he early joined the study of the Scriptures ; and his attempts, whatever the success be, were at least well meant ; and,

\* Dr Samuel Clarke and Professor Whiston. † Whiston.

considering the difficulty of the subjects he has engaged in, it must be allowed that in the main they are well aimed ; and, if he has not succeeded, no more have others who have meddled with the same subjects. Nor is he more to be blamed than they. To be blamed, did I say ? I should have said, not less to be commended. For sure it is a commendable design, to explain scripture difficulties, and to remove the objections of profane men, by showing there is nothing in the sacred writings, but what is true and rational.

But what does a life, thus spent, avail ? To what purpose so many watchful nights, and weary days ? So much piety and devotion ? So much mortification and self-denial ? Such a zeal to do good, and to be useful to the world ? So many noble specimens of a great genius, and of a fine imagination ? It is the poor man's misfortune (for poor he is, and like to be, not having the least preferment) to have a warm head, and be very zealous in what he thinks the cause of God. He thinks prudence the worldly wisdom condemned by Christ and his Apostles, and that it is gross prevarication and hypocrisy to conceal the discoveries he conceives he has made. This heat of temper betrays him into some indiscreet expressions and hasty assertions ; designing to hurt nobody, he fancies nobody designs to hurt him ; and is simple enough to expect the same favourable allowances will be made to him, that he sees made

to those who write against him. As to his learning, it is his misfortune that he is not skilled enough in the learned languages to be a great critic in them, and yet seems not to be sensible of his deficiency in this respect. And what advantage is taken of this, that he has not less heat and more criticism? His learning is treated in that manner, that you would think he did not know the first elements of Greek; though, even in that, he is much superior to most of those who make so free with him; and you every day hear his performances run down as whimsies and chimeras, by men who never read them, and, if they did, could not understand them. Nor does his warmth of temper come off better; it is all over obstinacy, pride, and heretical pravity; a want of modesty and due deference to just authority; they, that speak most favourably, look upon him as crazed, and little better than a madman. This is the poor man's character; and, low as he is, they cannot be content to leave him quiet in his poverty; whereas, had he not been early possessed with a passionate love for the Scripture and philosophy; had he not thought it his duty above all things to promote the glory of God, and been persuaded that could no way be so well done as by the study of his word and works; it is more than probable he had, at this time, been orthodox; and then, instead of his present treatment, his faults would have been overlooked; the learning, he

excels in, would have been extolled, and no defect would have been found in other parts of it. He would have been cried up as an ornament of the age, and no preferment would have been denied or envied him.

This you know to be the case with one of the new heretics; the other\* is so prudent in his conduct, that he comes under but a suspicion of favouring the same notions. How now is he treated? Prudence in him is as great a crime as the want of it in the other. The imprudent man is treated as a madman, and a rank Arian; the prudent one is less a heretic, but more dangerous; *sobrius accessit ad evertendam ecclesiam*; and therefore the greater alarm must be raised against him. And what has he done? Why, he has, with a great deal of pains, brought together, in the best manner he could, all the passages in the New Testament relating to the doctrine of the trinity. And so far his work is what those, who differ from him, should be pleased with, since he has brought the materials together to enable men to form a right judgment of the question in dispute; and has put into their hands, if he be in the wrong, the best weapons against himself. But he has interpreted some texts in a manner that is not liked; it is true, he has so; but not once, that I remember, has he given an interpretation that is purely of his own head. He brings great vouchers, and, if he errs, it is always in good company. This

\* Dr Samuel Clarke.

is his offence ; he has maintained, with many others, particularly the late dean of St Paul's, in opposition to Sabellianism, that the three persons of the trinity are three real distinct beings ; and the belief of three really distinct beings perfectly equal he maintains with Dr South to be tritheism ; and, that there must therefore be a subordination. Now whether this notion be right, or not ; if he cannot escape ill treatment, give me leave to say, that, if your study should lead you into any opinions contrary to what is generally received, you can with no reason expect better quarter. He is a man, who has all the good qualities that can meet together to recommend him ; he is possessed of all the parts of learning that are valuable in a clergyman, in a degree that few possess any single one ; he has joined to a good skill in the three learned languages a great compass of the best philosophy and mathematics ; as appears by his Latin works ; and his English ones are such a proof of his own piety, and of his knowledge in divinity, and have done so much service to religion, as would make any other man, that was not under the suspicion of heresy, secure the friendship and esteem of all good churchmen, especially of the clergy. And to all this piety and learning, and the good use that has been made of it, is added a temper happy beyond expression ; a sweet, easy, modest, inoffensive, obliging behaviour adorns all his actions ; and no passion, vanity, insolence, or ostentation,

appear either in what he writes or says ; and yet these faults are often incident to the best men, in the freedom of conversation, and in writing against impertinent and unreasonable adversaries, especially such as strike at the foundations of virtue and religion. This is the learning, this the temper of the man, whose study of the Scriptures has betrayed him into a suspicion of some heretical opinions ; and, because it has, he must be blacked and defamed ; he must be worried out of the great and clear reputation he is possessed of ; and he, that has so many shining qualities, must be insulted by every worthless wretch, as if he had as little learning and virtue as the lowest of those who are against him. What protection now can you promise yourself from your virtue, when a man of such a character cannot be safe in his good name ? Whatever therefore you do, be orthodox ; orthodoxy will cover a multitude of sins, but a cloud of virtues cannot cover the want of the minutest particle of orthodoxy.

It is expected, no matter how unreasonably, that a man should always adhere to the party he has once taken. It is the opinion of the world, that he is all his life bound by the subscriptions he made in his first years ; as if a man were as wise at twenty-four, and knew as much of the Scripture and antiquity, and could judge as well of them, as he can at fifty. And yet, if a man will be studying these things, he cannot be sure he shall continue

a year together in the same sentiments ; and, if he should not, he must either stifle his persuasion, against the dictates of his conscience, or be exposed to the worst treatment, to be called a renegado, a false brother, a heretic, or any thing that malice can suggest.

But I have not yet done. This is not the worst of it. This perhaps you may pretend to despise, and not care what the world says of you, so long as your conscience cannot reproach you. Well, let then all concern for reputation go. Can you be proof against one farther consequence of lying under the imputation of heresy ? Can you bear to see yourself, your wife, and children, ruined and undone ? This, I see, startles you. But you ask, What danger can there be of that ? An Englishman, you say, is out of the reach of persecution or an inquisition ; that spirit, God be thanked, is banished the land ; and even convict heretics are protected from the flames. Very true, the spirit of persecution is either gone, or is disarmed ; and that I look on as one of the invaluable blessings of the revolution. But can you be sure it will not return ? And suppose it will not ; are you therefore secure, that an imputation of heresy will not end in the ruin of yourself and family ? You and your children will not be burnt indeed ; but you may be as effectually ruined, as if you were. You may be excommunicated ; and in virtue of that be thrown into a jail,

to rot there, while your family are starving. And (which cannot be too well considered), when once you come into those circumstances, what is there can deliver you? Your punishment will last and be the same, as long as you continue in the same mind. A rule of punishment, peculiar to the ecclesiastic state. In civil cases, the offender, if his crime be not capital, suffers a temporary punishment, proportioned to the fault he has committed; and, when he has undergone that, nothing further is required of him, except in some cases to find security for his good behaviour for the future. But in cases of heresy, there is no regard to the degree of the offence, in the punishment inflicted. Nor is there any end of it. It is not enough to have suffered the severest punishment, though for the smallest offence; it is not enough to give security of not offending for the future. The innocent offender must declare, what it is oftentimes impossible he should declare, that he has changed his sentiments, and is become orthodox; and this, though perhaps no methods of conviction have been used, except that of punishment be one. This is the miserable condition of a convict heretic; the punishment, which fell on him for expressing thoughts heretical, he must continue to endure for barely thinking; which is a thing not in his own power, but depends on the evidence that appears to him. He must forever, (cruel justice!) forever



suffer for his private thoughts (though they go not beyond his own heart) the punishment which some overt act has once drawn upon him. To punish *toties quoties*, as often as these overt acts are repeated, will not satisfy the holy office. Nor can a forbearance of such acts avail any thing, or a promise of silence for the future; which yet is all that is in a man's power. No, he must recant, whether he can or not; and generally it is required to be done in words drawn up for him. So that, if he do not see reason to change his opinion; and will not say he has changed, when he has not; he is in for life, and his punishment can only end with it.

Indeed, on every supposition, a man excommunicated for heresy has a sad time of it. For, if he does not recant, he is, as I have said, in prison for life, and his family must starve; and, if he does recant, what does he get by it? His liberty indeed, but what else? Will people believe he is sincere? Will they not think his recantation loosely drawn in favour of him, to make it a recantation in appearance only? Or, if it be in the strongest words, will he not, if he submit to it, be suspected to equivocate? Will they not expect the reasons of his change? Will they not ask (if he says no more for the orthodox side than has been said before) why, if these reasons are convincing now, he did not think them so before? Will they not conclude, that to him they are inconclusive still, unless he

can find better reasons than the best that had been offered him? Which I take to be a contradiction. And will it not be argued from thence, that he is not changed? that it is the punishment only, and not his opinions, he would leave? So that, if he continues in his opinions, he will lie under all the infamy and punishment of heresy; and, if he does not, yet it will be supposed he does. He is punished for acting according to his conscience; and, if he would leave the heresy imputed to him, he will be said to act against his conscience; and perhaps be reputed a worse man than he was before. This in all events; once a heretic, and always miserable. The reputation (change, or not,) is never to be retrieved; no preferment or employment to be hoped for. He will always be suspected of heresy, who is once guilty; and his wife and children must see him the perpetual subject of reproach and obloquy; and feel it too; feel it in their character, feel it in their maintenance; as if the children of a heretic were a brood of monsters, a nuisance to the commonwealth, and infected the very air they breathe in.

These misfortunes a man of the most unblemished life may draw upon himself and family, if he will be meddling with so dangerous a study, and cannot in conscience dissemble the result of it. Misfortunes, which the vilest, lewdest, most immoral wretch upon earth is in no danger of. The greatest

immoralities, nay, a long course of them, shall oftentimes escape unpunished ; especially if a man be very orthodox. But, if they do not, the punishment extends only to the person of the offender. It derives no infamy on himself if he reforms, nor on his children if he do not. They are rather pitied for having such a father, and every body is willing to be kind to them. Who now, after this, can be fond of a study that may bring on him, let him be ever so innocent, such a load of misery and infamy, a load without measure and without end ? And if this will be the consequence of excommunication, tell me how much better it is than persecution.

But you will say, that it is possible a man's studies may not lead him into any heretical opinion ; and if they should, yet it is not very easy to convict a heretic, or to say what is heresy. To the first, I have already said enough ; as to the other, I confess it is not very easy to convict a man of heresy. The law seems to be deficient in this point ; but who knows how soon this defect may be supplied by a new law ? And, in the mean time, it may be difficult indeed to convict a man of heresy ; but perhaps it may be found not to be impossible. And if it should, it is but changing the word, and the offender may be come upon easy enough. If, through a defect in the laws, he cannot be convicted of heresy, he may however be convicted of writing or speaking against the established

doctrine of the church ; and that will draw on him all the same consequences, that heresy would do. For heresy is the opposing the doctrine of the *catholic* church ; but the doctrine of the *established* church will readily be supposed to be the doctrine of the *catholic* church ; and therefore to oppose the doctrine of one is in effect to oppose both. So that a man shall be deemed a heretic to all intents and purposes, and sentenced to the same punishment ; though in the sentence itself, for his comfort, the word *heresy* may be left out.

But you are willing to think the temper of the English clergy more moderate, and the generality of them averse to every thing that looks like the spirit of popery ; as the ruining of a good man, merely for matters of opinion, must be allowed to do. I wish you may find it so, if ever there should be occasion. I confess there has appeared a good spirit, a very humane and christian temper, in some late writings, where perhaps it was not much expected ; but, for all that, I must beg leave to differ from you. If indeed no one would judge in a cause he did not understand ; if no one were allowed to understand a cause of heresy, but who was a good judge of the sense of Scripture and of primitive antiquity ; if no one were esteemed to know Scripture and antiquity, but those who had studied them well, who had read them carefully with their own eyes, and did not take the sense of

them upon trust from modern writers ; if the arguments for his opinion were to be examined, before his opinion were condemned ; if a man, before he gave his vote, were to lay his hand upon his heart, and declare himself thus qualified to judge ; that he had considered the matter, and would speak nothing but what he thought ; on these suppositions, I am apt to think a number of judges would not very easily be found ; and when they were, it may reasonably be presumed, that they would not be very forward to condemn. They would be sensible there was room for honest minds to be misled, from what they had read and observed themselves ; they would know that there is more to be said on the other side, than the generality at all dream of ; they would be careful how they discouraged learning, by discouraging the inquiries of learned men. They would be very unwilling a man should suffer by their sentence, whose life they are sure is innocent and virtuous, but whose opinions they cannot be so sure are false and dangerous. They know discouragements in learning and virtue to be of such ill consequence, that a man's opinions must be very bad indeed, to make it necessary to come to such extremities. But give me leave to say, you have no reason to expect such judges, or such a backwardness to judge. It is always supposed, that the doctrine of the church you are of, is right ; that it is the doctrine of Scripture and antiquity. And

this, every body thinks he understands. So that little learning or reading is necessary, to make any clergyman a judge over the learnedest man alive.

Another thing I take leave to tell you, is, that most men think they can do *conscientiously* whatever they can do *legally*. Men of refined and exalted understandings, who have a large compass of thought, and have looked into the principles of things, know that written laws are but deductions of the law of nature, which is prior to all human institutions; that these sometimes deviate from that unwritten law; and, when they do, are of no real intrinsic authority. They know that a thing is not just and reasonable, because it is enacted; but, in good governments, is enacted, because it is just and reasonable. They know that laws are sometimes obtained by surprise or corruption, by party management, by craft or superstition. They know that penal laws, in matters of religion, are seldom advisable. They would not easily contribute to the making them; and, when they are made, would be glad to have them generally lie dormant. They know that no authority of man can alter the nature of things, or justify a cruel or unjust sentence in the sight of God. They are sure, that, if to punish men for their opinions be not *very right*, there is no medium, it must be *very wrong*. It is public robbery or murder, to deprive a man of his life or

goods for his religion ; if it be not just in itself to do so, as well as legal.

Some perhaps may think in this manner ; but these must be men of refined and exalted understandings ; and therefore must be very few. The generality think they may do *justly*, whatever they can do *legally*. And it is, no doubt, for them, a good rule. They cannot judge of the nature of things for themselves ; and therefore the law is the most proper guide and direction they can have. As long therefore as there are laws to punish the asserters of heretical opinions, or such as oppose the established doctrines ; you may depend on it, they will not be suffered to lie dormant. There will never be wanting great numbers, who will call aloud to have them put in execution ; and they will think their zeal, in this matter, the best service they can do the church.

This is human nature ; thus it has been in all times. And no experience of the mischief done to christianity by a forwardness to pronounce anathemas on those, who dissent from the received opinions, will make us wiser. It may, I doubt not, be demonstrated with the greatest evidence, that all christian churches have suffered more by their zeal for orthodoxy, and by the violent methods taken to promote it, than from the utmost efforts of their greatest enemies. But, for all that, the world will still think the same methods necessary.

The same *zeal* will prompt to the same *persecutions* or *prosecutions* (call them which you will), without considering the same matter must necessarily produce, at long run, the same fatal consequences.

Let me therefore intreat you, not to fancy the world is altered in this point. Do not think your opinions cannot ruin you, because it is not reasonable they should. Do not flatter yourself, that temper, prudence, and moderation can, in religious controversies, get the better of indiscreet zeal, bigotry, and superstition. In short, be not hasty in espousing opinions, which can have no other effect, but to lay the best men at the mercy of the worst. Every mean person, who has nothing to recommend him but his orthodoxy, and owes that perhaps wholly to his ignorance, will think he has a right to trample on you with contempt; to asperse your character with virulent reflections; to run down your writings as mean and pitiful performances, and give hard names to opinions he does not understand; which you must bear, without the least hopes of being heard a word in your defence.

Let me observe one thing more, that it is the misfortune of a clergyman that he is confined to one profession. Other men, if they cannot live in one way, are at liberty to try another; but a man, who has once the indelible character, must live by the one profession he has made his choice. If therefore that livelihood be taken from him, it is



in vain he has learning, parts, industry, and application. He will not be allowed to take any other course to repair the loss he suffers by his opinions as a clergyman. His time, and fortune, and studies have been spent to make him useful in that one profession; and, if he had abilities to maintain himself in any other, it is too late; he has made his choice, and must abide by it. This then is the unhappy dilemma a reputed heretic is reduced to; he will neither be suffered to *keep* the profession, nor to *leave* it; he shall neither live *in it*, nor *out of it*. So that, notwithstanding his learning, parts, virtue, and industry; though he could make a good lawyer, physician, merchant, or mechanic; if he be not orthodox, all possibilities of living comfortably, at least, and reputably, are taken from him. Go now, and think, if you can, that the advice I give you is not the advice of a friend. It is the advice of one who loves virtue and learning, who is a friend to all good men, and is in particular greatly concerned for your success and advancement in the world. It is advice seconded by the examples of the greatest men; for name me any one of the men most famed for learning in this or the last age, who has seriously turned himself to the study of the Scriptures. I might name to you the most eminent men down from Scaliger and Casaubon to the present time. Capellus, indeed, and the excellent

Grotius, are exceptions; but they met with such usage, that one has little encouragement from their examples. But not to go beyond our own country; who are the men that have excelled most (excepting always Sir Isaac Newton) in philosophy, astronomy, and mathematics? Have they not been clergymen? And was not their skill, in these sciences, the effect of their great and constant application to them? Was not that time spent in these studies, that you think should have been applied to the study of the Scriptures? On the other hand, take out two or three from so great a body, and where is there a clergyman of a great genius, and that has made a chief figure in the learned world, that has written upon the Scriptures, at least with any masterly skill in criticism?

And what is it that all this can be imputed to? Did these learned men decline this study, because they wanted the abilities proper for it? Surely that will not be said of men of their confessed learning. Or was there want of inclination and good will to it? No, they were men of virtue, and good protestants, as well as scholars and men of letters. What then? Did they, who have taken so much pains upon other books, and with so much success, think the Scriptures the only ones that needed not their help? Neither can that be pretended. They saw the sacred books, through the injury of time and the ignorance of scribes, had

suffered as well as others ; and much more by false and absurd interpretations. To be plain ; the one thing, that turned them from so noble and necessary a study, was the want of *liberty*, which, in this study only, is denied men. They found it was dangerous to examine impartially, and speak freely ; that they must write without liberty, or with no safety ; that it would be expected of them, to strain all their wit and learning, to patronise and palliate gross errors, instead of exposing or mending them ; and to support the received interpretations, however absurd, instead of such as reason and learning convinced them were the only true ones. But this was a task, which men of ingenuous minds, whose integrity and love of truth were equal to their penetration and great abilities, could not submit to. For men to have eyes and understandings of their own, and yet not see or understand, but as they were bid, and that by men who could not see or understand themselves ; *ὡς ἀργαλέον πρᾶγμα!* To make such a blind use of their learning and abilities was, they thought, to pervert the very end of them, and really to dishonour God, whose service they were given for. Since therefore they could not bear the thoughts of studying the Scriptures on these terms, no part was left men who could not be idle, but to turn to some other study, in which, without fear of danger or offence, they might freely go whither truth and reason led. The consequence of which, besides

the improvements made in arts and sciences, has been, that many of them have separately made more good emendations, and happily explained more difficulties in the smallest pagan writer, than they have done, take them all together, in two hundred years, upon the whole body of the Scriptures.

What then I would advise you is, to follow such examples. Turn yourself to the study of the heathen historians, poets, orators, and philosophers. Spend ten or twelve years upon Horace or Terence. To illustrate a billet-doux, or a drunken catch; to explain an obscene jest; to make a happy emendation on a passage, that a modest man would blush at, will do you more credit, and be of greater service to you, than the most useful employment of your time upon the Scriptures, unless you can resolve to conceal your sentiments, and speak always with the vulgar. You see a present example in the great Bentley; what a reputation has he acquired by the noble edition he has given us of Horace? How are his abilities confessed and admired by all? But had the same genius, the same sagacity and labour, been applied to the study of the Scriptures, to settle the texts in doubtful places, to mend corrupted ones, explain hard ones, fix the meaning of obscure ones, and to trace out the literal sense where it can be done; should he, I say, have attempted a work of this

kind ; instead of thanks and applause, it is more than probable he would have been treated as a rash man, of no judgment, of little learning, and less religion ; and, if his works had been sentenced to the flames, a majority would have been for throwing him in after them.

Consider well, therefore, how you engage where there is no retreat, no repentance, no room for pardon, if you once offend. You have two ways before you. *One* will enable you to be useful in the world, without great trouble to yourself ; it will crown your labours with success ; it will bring you to reputation and esteem ; it will put you into a way of making a decent provision for your family, and giving a good education to those two fine children God has blessed you with, and you may have many more. The *other* will itself fatigue you with many difficulties, and expose you to the most fatal consequences ; it will draw on you an insupportable load of infamy, as a disturber of the church, and an enemy to the orthodox faith, and, in all probability, end in the extreme poverty and ruin of yourself and family. Which God forbid should ever be the case of one, who has no other views but to dedicate his life to God's service.

I am,

Sir,

Your faithful humble servant.

## CONCLUSION.

AFTER all that has been said in this long letter, I am persuaded that many readers will still think what is here advanced, a strange paradox ; or perhaps be scandalized at it, as a very wicked one ; and will on no terms allow, that clergymen should lay aside what ought to be their chief study. And, to be ingenuous, I will confess I am entirely of the same mind. I am as unwilling as they can be, to admit the conclusion, that the study of the Scriptures should be deserted ; and yet cannot deny, but, humanly speaking, this must be the consequence from these premises. If therefore we will not allow the conclusion, we must show the premises to be untrue, and that this study will not be attended with so much danger. But this we in vain attempt, if we do not our parts at least, that these may not be the consequences. For, as long as they are, the study of the Scriptures will certainly continue to be neglected, as it now is ; and all men, who contribute to these consequences in any degree, do so far discourage the study of the Scriptures, whatever they pretend.

In truth, there is nothing more absurd, than to say the glorious things we do daily of the Scriptures ; and, at the same time, make the study of them, to men of sincere and honest minds, so extremely

hazardous and inconvenient. If then we would not be guilty of discouraging a study which we acknowledge to be the great duty of the clergy, as we are Christians; if we would be true to the fundamental principles of the reformation, as protestants, that the Scriptures are the only rule of faith; let us use our best endeavours to remove the great obstacles that lie against the study of them; let us do what we can, that learned men may have full liberty to study the Scriptures freely and impartially; good encouragement given them to go through the labour and difficulties of such a study, not slightly and superficially, but with such application and diligence as the nature of the thing requires; and have leave to speak their sense with all manner of safety; that their opinions may be examined fairly, and with temper; that their names be not unjustly loaded with calumny and slander; that their words and actions may be interpreted with the same candour, as is shown to those that differ from them; that, if what they advance be right, it may be received; if wrong, their errors may be refuted, as the mistakes of learned men on other subjects; if doubtful, and the Scriptures say so little, or speak so obscurely, that nothing can certainly be decided either way; that then nobody may be obliged to take either side as necessary; that, whether their notions be right or wrong, their persons may, in all events, be safe, and their maintenance not affected by it; that, as long

as they live virtuously, and write with all due modesty and good manners, and advance nothing that breaks in upon morality and government, they may be treated in all respects as those are or ought to be, who employ themselves in any other part of useful learning.

I must add, let them be never so much in the wrong, I can apprehend no danger from it to the church; or that the errors of a few men can have considerable influence in opposition to a great body of a vigilant and learned clergy, who will be always able and ready to defend the received notions, if they can be defended; and, if they cannot, it must be allowed they ought not. But, if some inconveniences would arise from the liberty I contend for, they are nothing in comparison of those that must follow from the want of it.

Till there is such a liberty allowed to clergymen; till there is such a security for their reputations, fortunes, and persons; I fear I must add, till so difficult a study meets with proportionable encouragement; it is impossible a sincere, impartial, and laborious application to it should generally prevail; and, till it does, it is as impossible the Scriptures should be well understood; and, till they are, they are a rule of faith in name only. For it is not the words of Scripture, but the sense, which is the rule; and, so far as that is not understood, so far the Scriptures are not our rule, whatever we pretend;



but the sense that men have put on them ; men fallible as ourselves, and who were by no means so well furnished, as the learned at present are, with the proper helps to find out the true meaning of Scripture. And while we take the sense of the Scriptures in this manner upon content, and see not with our own eyes, we insensibly relapse into the principles of popery, and give up the only ground on which we can justify our separation from the church of Rome. It was a right to study and judge of the Scriptures for themselves, that our first reformers asserted with so good effect ; and their successors can defend their adherence to them, on no other principle.

If then we are concerned for the study of the Scriptures, farther than in words ; if we in earnest think them the only rule of faith ; let us act as if we thought so ; let us heartily encourage a free and impartial study of them ; let us lay aside that malignant, arbitrary, persecuting, popish spirit ; let us put no fetters on men's understandings, nor any other bounds to their inquiries, but what God and truth have set. Let us, if we would not give up the protestant principle, that the Scriptures are plain and clear in the necessary articles, declare nothing to be necessary, but what is clearly revealed in them.

Then may we hope to see the study of these divine books so happily cultivated by the united

labours of the learned, when under no discouragements, that all may, in the main, agree in the true meaning of them. Places, that can be understood, they will agree in understanding alike ; such at least as are of consequence to the faith. And, for such as are too obscure to be cleared up with any certainty, those likewise they will agree about and unanimously confess they are such as no article of faith can be grounded upon, or proved from. Next to the understanding a text of Scripture, is to know it cannot be certainly understood. When the clear and dark parts of Scripture are thus distinguished, an unity may then reasonably be hoped for among protestants in necessary points ; and a difference of opinion, in such as are not necessary, can have no manner of ill consequence, nor any way disturb the peace of the church ; since there will then be nothing left in its doctrines, to inflame men's passions, or feed their corrupt interests, when we are all agreed about what is essential to religion ; and what is not essential is looked on as indifferent, so that a man may take one side, or the other, or neither, or may change, as he sees reason, without offence.

Upon the whole, a free and impartial study of the Scriptures either ought to be encouraged, or it ought not. There is no medium ; and therefore those who are against one side, which ever it be, are necessarily espousers of the other. Those, who think it ought not to be encouraged, will, I

hope, think it no injury to be thought to defend their opinion upon such reasons as have been here brought for it, till they give better. On the other hand, those who think these reasons inconclusive, and cannot find better, will find themselves obliged to confess, that such a study ought to be encouraged; and consequently must take care how they are accessory to such practices, as in their natural consequence cannot but tend to its discouragement; lest they come into the condemnation of those who love darkness rather than light, and, for their punishment, be finally adjudged to it; there is, in this case, no other medium between encouraging and discouraging, but what there is between light and darkness. Every degree of darkness is a want of so much light; and all want of light is a certain degree of darkness. To refuse then a greater degree of light, where it can be had, is, in truth, to prefer darkness; which, in my humble opinion, can never be reasonable or excusable. Those, who are of another mind, plainly distrust themselves or their cause. Which if it can bear the light, why should it not be shown in it? But, if it cannot, it is not the cause of God, or of the Son of God; for God is light, and in him is no darkness; and the Son of God is the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.







**SIR ISAAC NEWTON'S**

**HISTORY**

**OF**

**TWO CORRUPTIONS OF SCRIPTURE.**





## NEWTON.

---

IN the annals of the human race are recorded the names of a few men, who have shone as the ornament and the boast of their species, whose wisdom has multiplied the triumphs and hastened the progress of intellect, and whose genius has thrown a splendor over the world. Of this fortunate number Newton stands at the head. To give a full account of this extraordinary man, of his life and character, his discoveries and their influence, would be to analyze all that is wonderful in the human mind, to reveal the deep things of nature, unfold the mechanism of the universe, and enumerate the achievements of science during the last century. No such arduous and venturesome task will here be undertaken, nor any thing more than the outlines of a subject, whose compass is so vast, and whose objects are so elevated.

Sir Isaac Newton was born at Woolsthorpe, near Grantham, Lincolnshire, on the 25th of December, 1642. In his early infancy he was extremely feeble, and little hope of his life was entertained. His

father died three months before he was born, and accordingly the charge of the son devolved wholly on the mother. She spared no pains with his education, and kept him under her own eye till he was twelve years old, when she sent him to the public school at Grantham. He was boarded in the house of an apothecary, whose brother was usher of the school.

It was here that he first began to display the peculiar bent of his genius, and to give a presage of what its future versatility and power would accomplish. It is recorded of him, while at this school, that his thoughts ran more on practical mechanics, than on his regular exercises, and that during the hours of recreation, which the other boys devoted to play, he was busy with hammers, saws, and hatchets, constructing miniature models and machines of wood. Among his first efforts was a wooden clock, kept in motion by water, and telling the hours on a dial-plate at the top. He made kites, to which were attached paper lanterns, and one of his favourite amusements was flying them in the night, to the consternation of the neighbouring inhabitants. He fabricated tables and other articles of furniture for his schoolfellows, and is said to have invented and executed a vehicle with four wheels, on which he could transport himself from one place to another by turning a windlass. The motions of the heavenly bodies did not escape his notice even at this period; for he formed a dial

of a curious construction, by fastening pegs in the walls of the house, which indicated the hours and half hours of the day. At first his fondness for these occupations caused him to neglect his regular studies; but he had too much spirit quietly to look on while other boys were gaining places above him, and he at length maintained not only a reputable, but a distinguished standing in the school.

In the mean time his mother's second husband died, and as she needed the assistance of her son, she took him home to manage the affairs of the farm. To this business he was devoted for a year or two, but with so little interest in the pursuit, that his mother soon found her agricultural concerns were not likely to flourish in his hands. It was one part of his business to go to Grantham market and dispose of the produce of the farm, but in executing this charge he is neither to be applauded for his diligence, nor admired for a love of his duties. The important task of finding a purchaser and making a bargain, he usually entrusted to the enterprise of a servant, and his own time was passed in his early haunts at the apothecary's house, reading books, or planning machines, till it was announced that the time of his return had arrived. At home, the farm itself was managed much in the same way as the sale of its produce at the market. It was neglected, or left to the care of others, while the mind of its nominal superintendent was invoking the genius of invention,

roaming the fields of philosophy, or exploring the regions of hidden nature.

So unpromising were the prospects of making him a farmer, that his mother resolved to yield to his propensities, and put him in the way of being a scholar. To this end he was again sent to Grantham school. At Grantham he resided nine months, and was then entered at Trinity College, Cambridge, on the 5th of June, 1660, in the eighteenth year of his age. In this situation, so favourable for drawing out and improving his peculiar talents, his success was equal to his advantages. It was not among the least fortunate circumstances to Newton, that Dr Barrow was at that time fellow of Trinity College. With mathematical powers of the highest order, and a strong predilection for the natural sciences, this great man would not be long in discovering so bright a genius as that which then began to dawn in his college; and, with a modesty and good temper equal to his greatness, he would not be slow to encourage the ardour with which the young student was animated, nor to lend assistance where it could advance his attainments. Barrow became not only his adviser and teacher, but his sincere friend; and few were the men of his time, who were better able to teach, or whose friendship was more to be desired.

Newton's mind soon turned into the channel of his favourite studies, and he read with avidity the works of the modern geometers then in vogue, especially

Kepler, Descartes, Saunderson, and Wallis. It is remarked of him, that he gave no time to the more elementary books usually put into the hands of beginners. Euclid himself he studied but partially, for by a glance of the eye at the enunciation and diagram, he saw at once the process and result of the demonstration. The wide distance, which others are forced to traverse with slow and painful steps, in their entrance to the profound sciences of numbers and geometry, he passed over at a single stride. Propositions, which required elaborate demonstrations to bring them out of the mists of doubt, and make them evident to other minds, were to him self-evident truths. With these endowments from nature, and with the aids in his reach, we ought not to be surprised, that his progress in mathematical attainments was unexampled; but with all these on his side, we can hardly realize the fact, that while yet an undergraduate at the university he should conceive one of the sublimest inventions of human genius. It was during the last year of this period that he first detected the principles of the Fluxional Analysis, of which more will hereafter be said.

He took the degree of bachelor of arts in the year 1664, at which time, and for some months after, he appears to have been engaged in optical researches. His attention was particularly occupied in attempting to devise some method of improving telescopes; and it is known, that at this time he had purchased a prism

with the design of making experiments to try Descartes' theory of colours. The next year after he was graduated, these inquiries were interrupted, and he was compelled to leave Cambridge on account of the plague, and take refuge at his own home in the country.

In this retirement he spent nearly two years, and it is natural to suppose, that a mind like his, with the world of unexplored nature before him, would not be idle. It was during this season of seclusion, that he caught the dawning hints of his great discovery of gravitation, the origin of which is among the most striking illustrations of the force of accident in developing the genius, and swaying the opinions of men. Newton was one day passing a solitary hour in a garden, occupied in philosophical musings, when an apple fell from a tree near him. Trifling as was this incident, it quickened the inquiring spirit of Newton, and immediately called out his mind to search for the cause. Why should an apple fall to the earth? Why should any other body fall? By what power is it impelled, by what laws directed? These were the questions, which he asked himself; and, although he could not answer them, he was led into a train of reflections, which ultimately carried him to the highest of human attainments.

The fact had been well established, that on every part of the earth's surface there is a tendency in bodies to fall to its centre, and that this tendency is

not perceptibly diminished by ascending to different elevations, as the tops of lofty buildings, and the summits of high mountains. Why then should not the power, which causes this gravitating tendency, reach beyond the remotest points of the earth's surface? Why not to the moon, and the other celestial bodies? And if so, why may not their motions be in some way influenced by this power, as well as the motions of bodies less distant from the centre of the earth? Not that it is necessary, that the tendency, or force, should everywhere be the same; for although it is not sensibly diminished on any part of the earth's surface, yet at a point so far distant as the moon, it may possibly become weaker. Pursuing this train of thought, he instituted a calculation. By comparing the periods of the planets, with their several distances from the sun, he ascertained, that if they were actually held in their orbits by a power like that of gravitation on the earth's surface, this power must act by a fixed law, and decrease in proportion as the squares of the distances of the gravitating bodies increase.

It only remained to determine, whether a power, acting by such a law, would keep the moon in its orbit, and produce its several motions. He went through a rigorous computation, but it was unsuccessful; the results did not correspond with observation; it did not appear that the moon was actuated by such a power; and he was not encouraged to prosecute his labours. Hereafter it will be seen, however, that he

was deceived, and that he had already discovered the great law of the universe.

In the year 1667 Newton took his degree of master of arts, and was elected fellow of his college. About the same time he returned to Cambridge. For two years he had been more or less engaged in his optical experiments, although only at intervals during his retirement. His primary object was to improve the telescope; and to accomplish this, he employed himself in grinding lenses of elliptical and parabolic forms, hoping thus to correct the indistinctness of figure produced by the aberration of rays in passing through a spherical lens. His attempts proved abortive, for, whatever figure he gave to his lens, the image was still defective. Wearied with ill success, he desisted from the labour of grinding lenses, and betook himself to experiments with his prism. In these experiments he was struck with the oblong form of the spectrum, and the brilliancy of the colours which it exhibited. He took for granted, that the rays of light, in passing through the prism, were equally refracted, in which case the spectrum ought to be circular. It was, nevertheless, invariably oblong. He observed, moreover, that the colours were regularly arranged, the red uniformly appearing at one end, and the violet at the other. From these appearances he drew the conclusion, that the rays in passing through the prism are not equally refracted, but those composing each colour are refracted in a different angle



from those of any other colour, and are thus separated. It hence followed, that light is composed of rays of as many different colours, as there are distinct colours in the spectrum, and that the rays of each colour are refracted in a certain uniform angle. This is called the *refrangibility* of light.

Newton soon perceived this great discovery to be susceptible of the most extensive application, since it is intimately concerned with all the phenomena of light and colours. He discovered the mistake under which he had laboured respecting the cause of the imperfection of telescopes; for he found by computation, that the different refrangibility of light contributed several hundred times more to produce this effect, than refraction through a spherical lens. Hence, if a figure could be so formed as to correct the errors of refraction, the different refrangibility would still remain, and the image would scarcely be more distinct. He despaired of conquering this double difficulty, and resorted for the most convenient remedy to the principle of reflection. He applied himself to forming and polishing metallic concave mirrors with his own hands, and finally constructed two telescopes of this description, the first of which is now in the possession of the Royal Society. This kind of instrument received the name of the Newtonian telescope, and was the foundation of all the great improvements which have since been made. In a letter to Oldenburg, a plan of a refracting telescope was suggested by

Newton, in which the errors of refrangibility might be corrected by passing the rays of light through substances possessing different dispersive powers, so that the refraction of one should be counteracted by the opposite refraction of another. But there is no evidence, that he carried this plan into execution. The hint was not lost; it has been so far improved, that refracting telescopes have been made perfectly achromatic.

One of the most remarkable results of Newton's discovery in light, was his explanation of the phenomena of colours. He analyzed the rainbow. He laid open, in a most ingenious manner, the causes of various colours in all natural objects. By a series of curious experiments and philosophical deductions, he was led to the conclusion, that there is a thin, transparent covering on the surfaces of bodies, in which light is both refracted and reflected, producing by this process different colours. One colour prevails over another, because the configuration of the particles on which light falls is such, as to absorb nearly all the rays except of one kind. In almost all the fixed colours of opaque bodies, the three principal properties of light, refraction, reflection, and inflection, are concerned. There is no colour where there is no light, and this shows that colour is an accident, and not a property inherent in matter. Newton has explained its cause and its nature. In the language of a poet, he "untwisted all the shining robe of day,"

and in the words of a philosopher, who happily pursued the figure so beautifully started, "he made known the texture of the magic garment, which nature has so kindly spread over the surface of the visible world."\* In short, the science of optics was so completely renovated by Newton, and established on the principles of truth and reason, that he may be considered as having been its author.

While thus successfully going forward in the march of discovery, his patron, Dr Barrow, had been appointed professor of mathematics at Cambridge. But in 1669, he concluded to resign his professorship, as he wished to devote himself more exclusively to theology. By his desire Newton was made his successor. The duties of his new office encroached so much on his leisure, that he was forced to relax in some degree the intenseness with which he had prosecuted his researches. That he might, however, complete what he had so successfully begun, he caused his optical inquiries to be the chief subject of his lectures during the first three years after he was raised to the professor's chair, and thus gradually matured his new discoveries into a system.

Newton was elected a member of the Royal Society in 1672, and, at the time he was chosen, a telescope sent by him was exhibited for the inspection of the society. So highly was it approved, that a resolution was passed to forward a description of it

\* Playfair's Second Dissertation, Part II. sect. 3.

to Huygens, the celebrated philosopher and optician, that the invention might be secured to its true author. In a letter read by Oldenburg shortly after to the Society, Newton gave intimations of discoveries to which he had been conducted in optics, and which he proposed to submit to the consideration of that learned body. These proved to be no other, than his new theory of light and colours, which he had never as yet made public. At the earnest solicitation of the Royal Society, his papers on these subjects were immediately printed in their Transactions. Newton was now more than thirty years old, and had been employed for nearly ten years in developing the profoundest mysteries of nature, but this was the first occasion on which he had appeared before the public as a writer.

His theory met with a chilling opposition from almost every quarter, and he was so much disturbed at the petulance and peevishness with which he was assailed by ignorance in the garb of pretended knowledge, he was so much vexed by the narrowness and jealousy of some, and the bitterness of others, that he sometimes repented of having jeopardized his peace by an unavailing attempt to enlighten the world with truths, which it was so averse to receive, and which had cost him the patient labour of years to elicit and mature. He was first attacked by Hooke, and then by Pardies, Gascoigne, Lucas, and other writers on the continent. Being once

enlisted, it did not accord with his spirit to shrink from the contest, and he replied promptly to every animadversion from a respectable source, which was published against him. He was at last triumphant over all opposition, and settled his theory on a basis which has never been moved.

So foreign were such controversies from his disposition and feelings, that he absolutely refused to publish his *Optical Lectures*, which were then ready for the press; nor did they see the light till more than thirty years afterwards. In alluding to this controversy, he says, "I blamed my own imprudence for parting with so real a blessing as my quiet, to run after a shadow." This remark sufficiently indicates the reluctance with which he forced himself to combat prejudice and passion. It may justly command our applause as the evidence of a pacific and unassuming temper, but we can hardly be required to descend to the level of his modesty in thinking the splendid reality of which he was in pursuit to be no more than a shadow. He was conscious of no other motives than love of truth, and zeal for science; and notwithstanding his chagrin at the outset, he had the satisfaction of witnessing the gradual reception of his theory by those most enlightened, and best qualified to understand it, till at length it gave a new aspect to the science of optics.

Twelve years had passed away since the apple in the garden had carried up his thoughts to the cause

of the celestial motions, when he was again induced to resume that subject. He received a letter from Dr Hooke concerning the kind of curve described by a falling body, subjected to the double influence of the diurnal motion of the earth, and the power of gravitation. This letter put Newton on new inquiries into the nature of this description of curves, and prompted him to retrace the steps of his former calculations in regard to the moon's motion. The truth is, he had been deceived by the old measurement of the earth, which was essentially false; making a degree to consist of sixty English miles, whereas, by the late and more accurate measurement of Picard, a degree was ascertained to be sixty-nine miles and a half. As Newton reckoned the moon's distance in semidiameters of the earth, and as the length of a semidiameter depended on the length of a degree, this difference gave rise to an enormous error, and was the cause of his failure and discouragement.

By a new calculation with corrected data, his most sanguine hopes were more than realized. He proved with demonstrative accuracy, that the deflection of the moon towards the earth is precisely what it ought to be on the supposition, that it is actuated by a force operating inversely as the squares of the distances. He then brought the other planets within his calculation, and found the same law to hold in them all. Thus was accomplished a discovery more sublime in its nature, more profound in its details, more difficult

in its demonstration, and more important in its results, than any which has ever yielded to the force of industry, or the light of genius. The law which governs the heavens and the earth, the uniting principle of the universe, the cement of nature, was detected, and its rules of action developed and made applicable to the highest purposes of science.

We are not to understand, that Newton was the first, who imagined the existence of such a power as attraction between natural bodies. This was conjectured long before, but no one had been able to prove the fact. It is not certain that the ancients had any distinct notions of a power like that of gravity. Lucretius, in his romantic account of the origin and formation of the world, has some fanciful allusions to a kind of principle, which keeps the earth self-balanced in the centre of the universe, and operates in some inexplicable manner in producing the motions of the stars. But it is doubtful, after all, whether he supposes these effects to be produced by an internal power of attraction, or an external pressure.\* Lucretius is mentioned, because he may be allowed to have spoken the sense of the large and flourishing sect of the Epicureans, whose philosophy he defended with an ingenuity and eloquence worthy of a better subject.

Copernicus had some obscure notions of a gravitating principle in the earth, which he supposed to

\* De Rerum Natura, Lib. V.

exist also in the stars and planets, and preserve them in their spherical forms. He calls it a kind of natural appetency.\* Kepler went one step farther, and supposed that an attracting power not only existed in the earth, but that it might reach to the moon and other planets, and that they might reciprocally attract each other. To such extravagant lengths did his fancy lead him, that he even assigned to the planets a sort of animating, self-directing principle, by which they were endowed with a sympathy for one another and enabled to make their way through the regions of space. Dr Hooke found out, that if such a power as gravity exists, it must act in proportion to the distance of the body, and the quantity of matter.

From this brief sketch it appears, that the ancients had no conception of a gravitating power; that Copernicus supposed it to extend not beyond the body of each planet; that Kepler assigned to it a reciprocal influence among the several planets, but knew nothing of its nature or laws of action, and that Dr Hooke advanced farther, but in establishing the existence of such a power, he went not beyond the confines of probability. Newton's discovery embraces two essential particulars; first, the fact, that an attracting principle pervades all matter; secondly, the law by which this principle acts. Take these away, and no conjectures about attraction could ever

\* Equidem existimo gravitatem non aliud esse quam appetentiam quandam naturalem. *De Revol. Cæl. Orb. Lib. I. Cap. 9.*



be converted to a single practical use. But now they are settled on the immovable basis of demonstration, they put in our hands the great key of nature. Newton undoubtedly profited as far as he could by what others had done ; but, compared with his discoveries, they had literally done nothing. They were tapers guiding the meridian sun in the career of his glory.

With this law at command, Newton constructed a new system of the world. He solved the most difficult problems pertaining to the motions of the heavenly bodies, and explained the celestial phenomena in a manner at once simple and satisfactory. In all his inquiries on these subjects, as well as on every other, he rigidly pursued the mode of philosophizing recommended by Lord Bacon ; or rather his own mode, as he made it peculiarly his own by being the first, who reduced it to practice, and gave it a prevalence in the world. With him it was a fundamental axiom, that nothing is to be assumed as a principle, which does not rest on observation or experiment, and that no hypothesis is to be admitted as establishing a fact.\*

This axiom he never deserted, and hence the profound investigations into which his sublime geom-

\* Quicquid enim ex phænomenis non deducitur, *hypothesis* vocanda est ; et hypotheses seu metaphysicæ, seu physicæ, seu qualitatum occultarum, seu mechanicæ, in philosophia experimentalis locum non habent. *Principia, Lib. III. Schol. General.*

etry carried him, were clothed with the same certainty, as the results of humble and obvious calculations. He walked among the planets, and took their dimensions, and measured their periods, and ascertained their motions and influence on each other; with as much security as the mariner traverses the ocean with his compass; and he went forward with equal assurance, that he should not be deceived nor misled. He explained the lunar irregularities, which had baffled all former astronomers, he suggested and demonstrated the true figure of the earth, solved the perplexing problem of the precession of the equinoxes, illustrated the causes of the tides, and extended his researches with brilliant success to the eccentric orbits and erratic motions of the comets.\*

The first public intimation, which Newton gave of these discoveries, was in 1683, when he sent a short paper to the Royal Society containing a dozen propositions relating to the planetary motions. This paper attracted the attention of Dr Halley, who visited Newton at Cambridge the year following, and became fully acquainted with his novel and astonishing attainments in these high departments of astronomy. No man was better qualified to understand and estimate them, and he extorted a promise from Newton, that he would make farther communications to the

\* Lorsque la comète de 1680 parut, le vaste génie de Newton embrassoit l'univers entier. *Cométographie, par Pingré, Tom. I. p. 148.*

Royal Society. Accordingly at a subsequent meeting, Dr Halley and Mr Paget were appointed to correspond with Newton, and remind him of his promise. The consequence was, that he immediately began to arrange his materials into a methodical form, and on the 18th of April, 1686, he presented to the Society the manuscript of the *Philosophiæ Naturalis Principia Mathematica*. It was put to press by order of the Royal Society under the superintendance of Dr Halley.

This great work, although it ranks among the highest efforts of human genius, was not at first greeted with so much applause as it deserved, and as it was destined to receive. Its originality and profoundness were no doubt obstacles to its success. It is hard to make the world believe what it does not understand, especially when such a faith is met by prejudice on the one hand, and a spirit of jealousy on the other. Theory and observation harmonized so perfectly in this system, that the more impartial were constrained to fall in with the author's conclusions, although they could not go with him to the depths of his geometry. But the power of old opinions was too strong to suffer the scales to drop from the eyes of the multitude. Many there were in the higher walks of science, who would see and confess nothing; it was their pride to be sceptics as to the new philosophy. They had ranged themselves under the popular standard of Aristotle and Descartes; they

dwelt in a fairy land, and could not descend from the region of dreams to the humble sphere of demonstration and fact. So strong did the current set against Newton's philosophy, that Voltaire spoke truth, in the opinion of Playfair, when he said that the *Principia* had not twenty advocates out of England at the time of the author's death, notwithstanding it had been nearly forty years before the public. And even in England, the Newtonian philosophy was not formally introduced into the universities at an earlier period. It made its way slowly, but surely.

The schools astonished stood, but found it vain  
 To combat still with demonstration strong,  
 And, unawakened, dream beneath the blaze  
 Of truth.

When the new philosophy had once gained a footing abroad, its progress was as rapid as it had been tardy in the outset. It fortunately passed through the hands of a succession of men eminently qualified, both by intellectual ascendancy and mathematical skill, to illustrate its deepest principles. The fluxional analysis opened an untrodden field; it was a magic wand in the grasp of the mathematician. Armed with this potent instrument, he interrogated nature with an authority and success before unknown. It let in a flood of light upon all that was dark or difficult in the philosophy of Newton. The prodigious achievements of Euler, Clairaut, D'Alembert, La Grange, and La Place, conspire to give lustre to

Newton's fame, and certainly to his discoveries. La Place, in particular, has gone up with the transcendental calculus to the summit of the Newtonian system, and all his labours have tended to fix it on a firmer foundation. After having proved throughout his great work, that a law like that of gravitation, explains with rigid precision all the irregularities of the celestial motions, he concludes, that from this circumstance, and the extreme simplicity of such a law, we are authorized to believe it the law of nature.\*

Newton's discovery did not end here. It created the science of physical astronomy, but it was not limited to the compass of the heavens. The principle of attraction pervades all things, the smallest as well as the largest. It lets us into the mystery of chemical affinities, and tells us all that we know of the composition of bodies, their texture, internal relations, and other properties. In this sphere of its influence, it is called contiguous attraction, and although it does not ostensibly observe the same laws of action as in the case of remote bodies, yet there is reason to suppose, that this deviation is caused by the figure, position, and other accidents of the particles brought in contact. Newton made many experiments with chemical agents to try his theory, and he is allowed to have discovered the principle on which the operations of

\* *Mécanique Céleste*, Tom. I. Liv. 2. chap. 1.

chemistry depend.\* We thus find him applying his discovery not only to explain the machinery of the universe, but to detect the method of penetrating the inmost recesses of nature, and bringing to light the hidden properties of things.

Serious objections were at first offered to this theory, by Euler and some others, from the circumstance of its not accounting for the *cause* of attraction. They said it was the scholastic notion of an *occult quality*, and that the whole system was no more than a revival of the old, exploded philosophy. To this objection it was only replied on Newton's part, that he did not pretend to have discovered the cause of gravity; and, moreover, that if such a discovery were made, it would add nothing towards confirming the truth of his theory.† He was concerned with effects; the uniformity of these he called a law; while this uniformity continues, the law will remain the same. The law is investigated in its *operations*, and while these are subject to a fixed rule, nothing will be gained or lost by knowing the cause. And here, it may be observed, is exemplified the peculiar character of the Newtonian philosophy, in which the causes of physic-

\* Murray's Chemistry, Introduction, p. 20.

† Rationem vero harum gravitatis proprietatum ex phænomenis nondum potui deducere, et hypotheses non fingo. *Princip. Lib. III. Schol. Gen.* And, after his discussion on contiguous attraction, he says, "I scruple not to propose the principles of motion above mentioned, they being of very general extent, and leave the causes to be found out." *Optics, Query 31.*

all events do not come under consideration, till the phenomena and laws of effects are explained and understood.

We now come to speak of the fluxional analysis. It was remarked above, that the first conception of this invention occurred to Newton in 1663, a short time before he received his bachelor's degree. At this period, however, he attained to nothing more than slight improvements of Dr Wallis's treatise on infinities. It was two years afterwards, as he tells us, that he arrived at the method of fluxions; and even then he published nothing on the subject, but contented himself with using the instrument, which he had invented, solely as a means of advancing his studies in mathematics and philosophy.

Before this invention, the mixed mathematics laboured under great difficulties. Problems were perpetually occurring, especially on the properties of curves and the phenomena of motion, which involved intricacies, that would yield to no powers of calculation then known. It was frequently impossible so far to simplify the data, as to subject them either to a geometrical or algebraical process, and no more than an indefinite approximation to truth could be obtained. The method of fluxions is free from the most of these sources of difficulty, and easily accommodates itself to the conditions of abstruse problems. It embraces all the relations of numbers and quantity, and may be applied with equal advantage

throughout the whole circle of the sciences. It is a powerful aid to the researches of the philosopher, and introduces him to those higher departments of knowledge, to which he could never ascend without its assistance.

The first public notice, which Newton gave of this invention, was in the *Principia*, twenty-four years after its origin. This dilatoriness in making it known was the cause of a long and sharp controversy. Leibnitz, in Germany, had already published several papers in which the principles of fluxions were clearly laid down, and the mathematicians of the continent claimed for him the honour of the invention. The contest was carried on with warmth between the partizans of these two illustrious philosophers, till at length the Royal Society appointed a committee to investigate the subject to the bottom. In their report it was decided in the most conclusive manner that Newton was the original inventor, and the only question was, whether Leibnitz had seen any of Newton's papers, which might unfold to him the mystery. This question has never been completely answered. That Leibnitz had seen in London some of Newton's mathematical papers in manuscript, is certain; but there is no good evidence of his having derived any hints from them on this subject, nor any positive proof to the contrary. Fontenelle considered Newton as unquestionably the first inventor, and the French Academy of Sciences confessed the



same.\* Playfair, and other English mathematicians have conceded, that Leibnitz was the second inventor, although many years after Newton.

This concession, whether well founded or not, detracts in no degree from Newton's glory, for nothing is more certain, than that he invented and employed the calculus long before it was known to any other person. It is among the fortunate events connected with the progress of science, that the same mind, which detected the law of gravitation, should invent the only instrument by which this law could be demonstrated, and its influence traced in the motions of the universe. To this task the old geometry was not adequate. In the *Principia*, however, the author never uses directly the fluxional analysis.† Many of his theorems

\* In the preface to the *Elements of the Geometry of Infinities*, published by the Academy at Paris, 1727, it was stated that, "M. Newton trouva le premier ce merveilleux calcul; M. Leibnitz le publia le premier."

† The principles of fluxions are explained in the Second Lemma of the Second Book, but they do not enter into the demonstrations in the body of the work.

Newton was charged with having preferred the old geometry to his own new analysis. The truth seems to be, however, that he preferred each in its proper place. Castiglione said of him,—*sæpius se reprehendebat, quod res mere geometricas algebraicis rationibus tractavisset, et quod libro suo de algebra Arithmeticae Universalis titulum posuisset, melius asserens Cartesium suum de re eadem volumen dixisse Geometriam, ut sic ostenderet has computationes subsidia tantum esse geometriæ ad iuveniendum.* Dr Winthrop, Professor of Mathematics at Harvard University, wrote a tract to show that this representation is erroneous, and founded on a misrepresentation of a remark by Dr Pemberton in the

and propositions were discovered, and their truth established by this analysis; but in communicating these truths, he gives a decided preference to the synthetical mode. It is not so much his purpose to describe the process by which he comes to certain results, as to make these results obvious to others; and it will at least admit a question, whether the profound researches of the French mathematicians might not have done more to enlarge the bounds of science, if they had taken a little more pains to simplify and elucidate the achievements of their wonder-working analysis, by the aids of the old geometry.

We have now briefly touched on Newton's three great discoveries, the law of gravitation, the refrangibility of light, and the fluxional analysis. These constituted the brightest era in the progress of human knowledge; they were destined to work an entire revolution in the received system of things, and to raise a majestic and imperishable monument to the fame of their author. The study of the creation was commenced on new principles, and prosecuted with new success. Truth was called down from heaven to earth; it beamed on the inquirer's path, and encouraged him to persevere in the enterprize of discovery. The hiding places of nature, and many of the mysterious workings of omnipotence, became familiar to mortals.

preface to his *View of Newton's philosophy.* *Gent. Magazine,* vol. 44, for 1774, p. 531.

Our philosopher lived a retired life at Cambridge, devoted to the duties of his professorship, and absorbed in his favourite studies. Scarcely a single incident is known of him, unconnected with his immediate pursuits and discoveries, during the space of thirty years. It is mentioned as greatly to his credit and as an instance of his firmness of character, that when king James sent a mandamus to the university to confer the degree of master of arts on father Francis, an ignorant Benedictine monk, Newton was at the head of those who strenuously resisted what was deemed an encroachment on the privileges of the university. He was among the delegates appointed to remonstrate to the high commission court, and such was the earnestness with which their charge was executed, that the king thought it expedient not to enforce his demand. In 1688 Newton was chosen by the university a member of the convention parliament, in which he held a seat till that body was dissolved.

Mr Montague, at that time chancellor of the exchequer, and afterwards earl of Halifax, was educated at the same college with Newton, and contracted for him a warm and sincere friendship. The great work of a recoinage of money was about to take place, and Montague wished to profit by the distinguished talents of his friend, as well as to elevate him to an office of dignity and emolument. At the solicitation of the chancellor, the king appointed

him warden of the mint in 1696, and three years afterwards he was raised to the responsible post of master of the mint. This place yielded him an annual income of nearly fifteen hundred pounds, and he retained it during the remainder of his life. His services were of high value in this important station, and at all times gave the fullest satisfaction.

When appointed to his office in the mint, he made Mr Whiston his deputy in the professorship of mathematics, and allowed him the whole salary. In 1703 he resigned all his duties at Cambridge, and through his influence Whiston was elected his successor. In the same year Newton was chosen president of the Royal Society, and two years afterwards the order of knighthood was conferred on him by Queen Anne in consideration of his extraordinary merit.

It was not probable, that a mind like Newton's would suffer the labours of his new station to drive him entirely from philosophical pursuits; yet we do not learn, that he did any thing more in this way, than to prepare for the press his work on *Optics*, and his *Method of Fluxions*, which had been nearly in readiness for many years. The book on Optics was published in 1704, and is more diligently elaborated perhaps, than the Principia itself. The author seems to have set a peculiar value on his discoveries in optics, being fully aware of their originality and importance. His work exhibits a masterly example of the experimental philosophy, and testifies to the

splendid success, which may crown the efforts of genius when aided by persevering industry. It was translated into Latin, with the approbation of the author, by Dr Samuel Clarke.

The *Queries* appended to the treatise on optics have been admired for the deep and original thoughts by which they are marked, and for the sagacity of their author in suggesting many probable results in philosophy, which experiment and observation have since verified. Some of them no doubt he had proved, but his apprehension, that they might not be acceptable to a public not yet prepared for their reception, induced him to employ this cautious method of making them known. He had been taught by the discipline of experience, that truth is no welcome guest when it comes in the garb of innovation, and that ignorance is easily dazzled to blindness by the too sudden light of knowledge.

From the time of publishing his *Method of Fluxions*, Newton gave himself but little to the study of mathematics, unless for occasional amusement. He used to say, that “no old man loved mathematics except Dr Wallis.” It was after this period that the controversy with Leibnitz occurred, but in this he was not personally engaged. It was carried on by Dr Keill, and other English mathematicians. The facility with which he solved the famous problem sent by Leibnitz in the year 1715, as a challenge to the English nation, is a proof that neither the quickness of

his genius, nor his mathematical skill, was impaired by neglect. At four o'clock in the afternoon he received the problem, as he was returning fatigued from his labours in the mint. Before he went to bed the solution was completed.

We may now speak of the success with which the capacious and grasping mind of Newton sought out other treasures of knowledge. As his early years were spent in reading the book of nature with the scrutinizing eye of a philosopher, so his declining days carried him onward in the still nobler pursuit of unfolding the science of the moral world, and contemplating the ways of God to man. The ardour with which he measured the physical and visible heavens, was not more fervent than that with which he inquired for the truths of the spiritual and invisible. He read the scriptures, pondered their meaning, illustrated many of their darker parts, and settled down into a firm belief of their divine origin and holy import. In many respects he stood as high in the rank of theologians as of philosophers. The same power of intellect was applied with equal energy in both characters; and had not his brilliant discoveries in the former engrossed all the admiration of which the mind of man is capable, his achievements in the latter would have elevated him to a commanding station among the most able and erudite divines. A person of eminence in the church, said of him in his lifetime, that "he was the best divine and commen-

tator on the Bible he had ever met with." And it is a remark of Dr Chalmers, that "we see in the theology of Newton, the very spirit and principle which gave all its stability, and all its sureness, to the philosophy of Newton." He was deeply versed in sacred history, and had made himself master of all the external means of understanding the Scriptures.

His great work on *Chronology* had for one of its main objects the verification of the writings of the Old Testament. This work cost him the labour of many years, and was not published entire till after his death. It is drawn from an immense fund of classical and ancient learning, and shows in the author an intimate acquaintance with the poets, historians, and critics of former times. He begins with a historical sketch of chronological science from its origin, and proves that the chronology of ancient kingdoms is involved in the utmost uncertainty. All profane history runs back to tradition, and then soon loses itself in utter darkness. The Europeans had no chronology before the establishment of the Persian empire, and the Greek antiquities are so full of fable, that no reliance can be placed on them in fixing dates. The first Greek chronologists were addicted to fiction, and instituted inaccurate modes of reckoning. It has been the foible of nations to refer their origin to as remote a period as possible, and this vanity has usually shown itself in proportion to the obscurity, which hung about their early history. It was so in Greece, and the

Grecian writers have been guides to all future chronologists. The Romans depended on the Greeks for the chronology of the East, while in the history of their own nation, the accounts of dates and times are not worthy of credit, till the age of Alexander. And as for western Europe in general, it had no chronology till the third and fourth centuries, and in some parts much later.

Out of this chaos, Newton undertook to bring light and certainty. He has made it appear that the Greek mode of reckoning was erroneous, and assigned to the Greek nation too high an antiquity. On a series of arguments established by astronomical calculations, in addition to various historical testimony, he builds a system of chronology, widely different from any, which learned moderns have deduced from ancient writers. The difference of time amounts in general to about three hundred years, and in some important events to much more. The same cautious and rigid mode of reasoning prevails throughout his chronological treatise, as in his philosophical researches; the same exactness of logic, fertility of invention, and sagacity in detecting and combining the forcible points of an argument.

On the Grecian mythology he throws much light, and with learned ingenuity traces the gods and minor deities of Greece and Rome to the deified heroes of Egypt. He finds their origin at a much later period than most writers, and discovers that various names



have been multiplied from the same original. The work closes with a curious discussion concerning the first peopling of the earth, the commencement of towns, of agriculture, the arts and sciences, idolatrous worship, and numerous other circumstances and institutions, which have grown out of the social compact. The value which the author set upon this treatise, may be estimated from the fact, that the first chapter, which constitutes more than half of the whole work, he copied out eighteen times with his own hand. He observes, that he commenced the study of chronology and history while at Cambridge, as a relaxation from his severer pursuits.

With all his horror of controversy he was again driven into it in the latter years of his life. Queen Caroline, renowned for her love of knowledge and her civilities to men of literature and science, was fond of conversing with Newton, and often expressed her satisfaction, that it was her fortune to live in the same age and country with such a man. She had caught glimpses of his new views of chronology, and desired him to favour her with an abstract of his system. At her request, also, a copy was given to Abbé Conti, a Venetian nobleman, on condition of its being kept secret. But the treacherous Venetian betrayed his trust after he arrived in Paris. He procured the abstract to be translated into French and published without the author's consent or knowledge. To this translation notes were affixed confut-

ing its positions. Newton was so indignant at this unworthy conduct of Conti, as well as the perfidy of the translator, who pretended to have asked consent to publish the abstract, that he wrote a reply in the *Philosophical Transactions*, although now in his eighty-third year, which was equally remarkable for the power of its argument, and the keenness of its rebuke. The controversy was continued by Souciet on one side, and Dr Halley on the other, and was not brought to a close till about the time of Newton's death. Whiston wrote against the *Chronology*, and boasted many years afterwards, that his objections were never answered.

Another posthumous work of our author, was the *Observations on the Prophecies of Daniel, and the Apocalypse of St John*. These were left unfinished. The remarks on Daniel are more matured than those on the Apocalypse; but on both they exhibit traces of the same depth of learning and patience of investigation, which characterize the *Chronology*. He starts with an inquiry into the origin of the books of the Old Testament, and advances the theory, so much enlarged on of late, that the historical parts are compiled from various written documents now lost. This he thinks particularly demonstrable of Genesis, and the books of the Kings. The present number and arrangement of the Jewish scriptures were not settled till after the Roman captivity, when the Jews added the points, and committed their

oral traditions to writing in the Talmud. No various readings were preserved, and whatever errors had crept into the text before this period cannot now be repaired, except from the version of the Seventy.

Newton places Daniel at the head of the prophetic writers, and considers his prophecies as a key to the interpretation of the others, and the foundation of the christian religion. The periods foretold by Daniel accord so exactly with the times of the ministry and death of our Saviour, as to present the clearest possible evidence, that the prophet spoke the dictates of divine inspiration. The book of Daniel was written by different persons; the six first chapters are a collection of papers of a historical character; the six last only were written by Daniel, and these at various times.

After a series of preliminary observations to this effect, the author traces each of the prophecies of Daniel to its verification in succeeding events. The vision of the Four Beasts, and the Ten Horns of the fourth beast, he explains with particularity and immense erudition. The prophecy of the Seventy Weeks he translates anew, and, contrary to the usual mode of interpretation, refers one clause of it to the second coming of Christ. His acquaintance with chronology enabled him to apply the several parts of this remarkable prophecy with great exactness to the principal events relating to the Messiah, to the time of his birth, his death, the duration

of his ministry, the wars of the Jews, and the ruin of the Jewish nation. His deductions from civil and scriptural history he fortifies by astronomical calculations.

In regard to the Apocalypse, it has been the prevailing opinion of learned men, that this book was written later, than any other part of the Scriptures ; but Newton assigns to it an earlier origin. He would seem to hint that it was written before John's Gospel, and at all events before the general Epistles of Peter, and that to the Hebrews, as he supposes it to be alluded to in those Epistles. After a few remarks on the authenticity of the Apocalypse, he proceeds to explain some of its dark prophecies, which, as he considers them to bear an intimate relation to the prophecies of Daniel, he interprets on similar principles. Daniel and John in certain points predict the same events, many of which have already taken place. In pursuing the parallel which conducts him to this opinion, he dwells on the origin and progress of the papal hierarchy. All his discourses on the prophecies are confined to those predictions which he believes to have been fulfilled ; he hazards no conjectures beyond the limits of evidence ; hence some parts of the Apocalypse he does not touch, but leaves them to be unfolded in the order of providence.

A tract by Newton, entitled a *History of Two Notable Corruptions of Scripture*, was first publish-

ed in 1754. A copy was obtained from Holland, which was among the papers formerly belonging to Le Clerc, and deposited after his death in the Remonstrants' Library at Amsterdam. So early as 1708, Le Clerc mentioned this tract in his preface to Kuster's edition of Mill's Testament; but he was ignorant of its author, as it came to him from Locke in his own handwriting. Some years afterwards Wetstein ascertained, that it was written by Newton, and as the copy in Holland was mutilated at the beginning and end, he applied to the heirs of Newton to be favoured with a perfect transcript from the original.\* From motives never explained, this request was not granted, and the piece found its way to the public in the imperfect state in which it was left by Le Clerc. When Horsley published an edition of Newton's works, however, this tract was printed from a copy of the original manuscript then in the possession of Dr Ekins.

It is the author's purpose in this treatise to prove the famous text of the Three Heavenly Witnesses in John to be an interpolation, and to defend the Vulgate reading of the disputed passage in Timothy.† Considering the early stage at which he took up this subject, and the comparatively unexplored region through which he was compelled to pass, he has managed his argument with remarkable ability and

\* Wetstenii Prolegomena, p. 185.

† 1 John v. 7; 1 Tim. iii, 16

success. His knowledge of the Greek and Latin Fathers, the theologians of the middle ages, and the history of sacred learning, as displayed in this work, impresses the reader with amazement at the universality of his powers and attainments. Notwithstanding the length to which the controversy on the text in John has since been carried, and the eminent talents it has called into action, very few weighty particulars have been added to those first collected by Newton; and it would have been no disparagement to the champions of the cause he sustained, if they had manifested more willingness, than they have done, to acknowledge their obligation for the aids they have received from so illustrious a source.

Newton left many writings on theological subjects, which have not been published. Whiston mentions a tract on the *Rule of Faith*, and one on the *Dominion of the Clergy*. In the catalogue of Newton's manuscripts, arranged by order of his executors, we find noticed an article on *Corruptions of Scripture*, and another entitled *Paradoxical Questions concerning Athanasius*. Several pieces are designated by the general title of *Church Matters*. No reason has been assigned by the persons into whose hands these papers have fallen, why they should be withheld from the public. Horsley examined them, but introduced them not into his edition of the author's works. It has been supposed, and no doubt rightly, that the opinions they express on certain doctrines in theolo-

ogy are not such as squared with the orthodox standard of Horsley. Whatever may have been the cause, every fair mind must seriously regret, that the recorded thoughts of such a man as Newton, on the important subjects of religious truth and scriptural interpretation, should be withheld from the world.

Some of his peculiar theological sentiments may be discovered from his writings, and the testimony of his friends. Whiston tells us of his profound knowledge of church history during the three first centuries of the christian era, and of his having been convinced by his study of this history, that the doctrine of the trinity was introduced into the christian scheme many years after the time of the Apostles.\* The tenour of Newton's writings is in accordance with this declaration, nor do they exhibit any evidence, that their author ever believed in a trinity. The charge against Horsley of having suppressed his papers because they were adverse to this doctrine, has never been contradicted.

It was also the faith of Newton, that in early times christian preachers were first chosen by the people, and then ordained by bishops, and that no person could be ordained to the pastoral office over any

\* The Present State of the Republic of Letters, vol. III. p. 282. In the same work may be seen several other particulars concerning the theological opinions of Newton. See also *An Inquiry into the comparative Moral Tendency of Unitarian and Trinitarian Doctrines*, p. 367.

congregation, till he had been elected by the people, whom he was to teach.\* In this respect his views of church government seem to have approached nearly to those of the Independents. He did not hold to the baptism of infants, but believed that all the subjects of this ceremony should be sufficiently advanced in age and understanding to receive religious instruction.†

To theology and ecclesiastical history the leisure hours of this great philosopher were devoted during the last thirty years of his life. The duties of his office in the mint were arduous, but his habits of close application to study, early formed and long continued, enabled him to penetrate deeply into those branches of sacred knowledge, to which he at first applied for relaxation and amusement.

Till his eightieth year his health was usually good. He was then afflicted with a severe illness, from which he never entirely recovered, although he went punctually through the labours of his office till within a year of his death.

It has been said, that his mind became so much impaired in his advanced age, that he could not understand his own works; but this is a mistake, as is testified by Pemberton. In his last illness, and for some time previously, Newton was attended by Dr Mead, with whom he held such conversations as

\* Republic of Letters, vol. III, p. 281.

† Ibid. p. 280.



proved him to have full possession of his faculties. He died on the 20th of March, 1727, in the eighty-fifth year of his age, and his remains were deposited in Westminster Abbey.

Plato thought, and others as wise as Plato have indulged the dream, that there is a chain of intelligences descending by a regular gradation from the highest to the lowest. If wisdom deceive not her children, and the vision of Plato be indeed a reality, who will deny to Newton the first rank in that portion of the scale, which the human race is destined to occupy? Other philosophers have been renowned for genius, acuteness, and power of intellect; they have been quick to invent, and sagacious to discover the more hidden phenomena of nature, and the deeper reasons of things. Other philosophers have shone as stars of the first magnitude in the firmament of science; in one happy discovery they may have gone before the rest of mankind; in one endowment of nature they may have stood without an equal. Such there have been, and they have reflected glory on the world; but in the blaze of Newton's effulgence they are eclipsed and lost. All the rare qualities, which singly measured the greatness of others, were combined in him, and contributed their respective shares to raise him to the eminence he held, and sustain him there. To no being whose destiny has been fixed among mortals, can be more justly applied the words of the sweetest poet

that ever invoked the philosophic muse. Of Newton it may truly be said, that he was one,

Qui genus humanum ingenio superavit, et omnes  
Præstinxit, stellas exortus uti ætherius Sol.\*

In private life he was mild and affable, peaceful in his temper, gentle in his manners, and a lover of tranquillity and retirement. Although he went out little into the world, he was social in his feelings, and ready in conversation. Humility and modesty were among his most striking virtues. He was without arrogance or pretension, putting himself on a level with other men, and ascribing whatever progress he had made in knowledge wholly to his untiring industry and patience. As he was a stranger to pride, so he was free from any affected singularities. He was generous in his benefactions, and a patron of true worth wherever it was found. His religious faith was settled on the foundation of reason and the Scriptures; his piety was steady and strong; he was a christian in belief and in practice. In short, the balance of principles and powers which marked the rare structure of his mind, together with the unison in his philosophy, morals, and religion, formed a perfect and wonderful harmony in all the parts of his character.

\* Lucret. de Rerum Nat. Lib. III. v. 1056.

## HISTORICAL ACCOUNT

OF

## TWO CORRUPTIONS OF SCRIPTURE.

---

IN A LETTER TO A FRIEND.

---

## SECTION I.

*On the Text of the Three Heavenly Witnesses.*

I. SINCE the discourses of some late writers have raised in you a curiosity of knowing the truth of that text of scripture concerning the testimony of the Three in Heaven, 1 John v. 7, I have here sent you an account of what the reading has been in all ages, and by what steps it has been changed, so far as I can hitherto determine by records. And I have done it the more freely, because to you, who understand the many abuses which they of the Roman church have put upon the world, it will scarce be ungrateful to be convinced of one more than is commonly believed. For although the more learned and quick-sighted men, as Luther, Erasmus, Bullin-

ger, Grotius, and some others, would not dissemble their knowledge, yet the generality are fond of the place for its making against heresy. But whilst we exclaim against the pious frauds of the Roman church, and make it a part of our religion to detect and renounce all things of that kind, we must acknowledge it a greater crime in us to favour such practices, than in the Papists we so much blame on that account; for they act according to their religion, but we contrary to ours. In the eastern nations, and for a long time in the western, the faith subsisted without this text; and it is rather a danger to religion, than an advantage, to make it now lean upon a bruised reed. There cannot be better service done to the truth, than to purge it of things spurious; and, therefore, knowing your prudence, and calmness of temper, I am confident I shall not offend you by telling you my mind plainly; especially since it is no article of faith, no point of discipline, nothing but a criticism concerning a text of scripture which I am going to write about.

II. The history of the corruption, in short, is this. First, some of the Latins interpreted the spirit, water, and blood, of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to prove them one. Then Jerome, for the same end, inserted the Trinity in express words into his version. Out of him the Africans began to allege it against the Vandals, about sixty-four years after his death. Afterwards the Latins noted his variations in the mar-

gins of their books; and thence it began at length to creep into the text in transcribing, and that chiefly in the twelfth and following centuries, when disputing was revived by the schoolmen. And when printing came up, it crept out of the Latin into the printed Greek, against the authority of all the Greek MSS. and ancient versions; and from the Venetian presses it went soon after into Greece. Now the truth of this history will appear by considering the arguments on both sides.

III. The arguments alleged for the testimony of the Three in Heaven, are the authorities of Cyprian, Athanasius, and Jerome, and of many Greek manuscripts, and almost all the Latin ones.

IV. Cyprian's words run thus,\*—"the Lord saith, 'I and the Father are one.' And again of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost it is written, 'And these Three are One.'" The Socinians here deal too injuriously with Cyprian, while they would have this place corrupted; for Cyprian in another place repeats almost the same thing.† "If," saith he, ["one baptized among heretics] be made the temple of God, tell me, I pray, of what God? If of the

\* *Dicit Dominus, Ego et Pater unum sumus; et iterum de Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto scriptum est, Et tres unum sunt. Cypr. de Unit. Eccles.*

† *Si templum Dei factus est, quæso cujus Dei? Si Spiritus Sancti, cum tres unum sint, quomodo Spiritus Sanctus placatus ei esse potest, qui aut Patris aut Filii inimicus est. Cypr. Epist. 73, ad Jubaianum.*

Holy Ghost, since these Three are One, how can the Holy Ghost be reconciled to him who is the enemy of either the Father or the Son?" These places of Cyprian being, in my opinion, genuine, seem so apposite to prove the testimony of the Three in Heaven, that I should never have suspected a mistake in it, could I but have reconciled it with the ignorance I meet with of this reading in the next age, amongst the Latins of both Africa and Europe, as well as among the Greeks. For had it been in Cyprian's Bible, the Latins of the next age, when all the world was engaged in disputing about the Trinity, and all arguments that could be thought of were diligently sought out, and daily brought upon the stage, could never have been ignorant of a text, which in our age, now the dispute is over, is chiefly insisted upon. In reconciling this difficulty, I consider, therefore, that the only words of the text quoted by Cyprian in both places are, "And these Three are One;" which words may belong to the eighth verse as well as to the seventh. For Eucherius,\* bishop of Lion in France, and contemporary to St

\* Eucherius reads the text thus : *Tria sunt quæ testimonium perhibent ; aqua, sanguis, et spiritus.* And then adds this interpretation, *Plures hic ipsam, interpretatione mystica, intelligunt Trinitatem ; eo quod perfecta ipsa perhibeat testimonium Christo ; aqua, Patrem indicans ; quia ipse de se dicit, me dereliquerunt fontem aquæ vivæ ; sanguine, Christum demonstrans, utique per passionis cruorem ; spiritu vero Sanctum Spiritum manifestans.*  
*Eucher. de Quest. N. Test.*

Austin, reading the text without the seventh verse, tells us, that many then understood the spirit, the water, and the blood, to signify the Trinity. And St Austin\* is one of those many; as you may see in his third book against Maximinus, where he tells us, that “the spirit is the Father, for God is a spirit; the water the Holy Ghost, for he is the water which Christ gives to them that thirst; and the blood the Son, for the word was made flesh.” Now if it was the opinion of many in the western churches of those times, that the spirit, the water, and the blood, signified the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; it is plain that the testimony of Three in Heaven, in express words, was not yet crept into their books; and even without this testimony, it was obvious for Cyprian, or any man else of that opinion, to say of

\* Sane falli te nolo in epistolâ Joannis Apostoli, ubi ait, “tres sunt testes, spiritus, aqua, et sanguis, et tres unum sunt;” ne forte dicas, spiritum et aquam et sanguinem diversas esse substantias, et tamen dictum esse, tres unum sunt. Propter hoc admonui te, ne fallaris; hæc enim sunt, in quibus non quid sint, sed quid ostendant, semper attenditur. Si vero ea, quæ his significata sunt, velimus inquirere; non absurde occurrit ipsa Trinitas, quæ unus, solus, summus est Deus, Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus; de quibus verissime dici potuit, tres sunt testes, et tres unum sunt; ut nomine spiritûs significatum accipiamus Deum Patrem, (de Deo ipso quippe adorando loquebatur Dominus, ubi ait, “spiritus est Deus); nomine autem sanguinis, Filium; quia verbum caro factum est; nomine autem aquæ, Spiritum Sanctum. Cum enim de aquâ loqueretur Jesus, quam daturus erat sitientibus, ait evangelista; “hoc autem dicit de Spiritu, quem accepturi erant credentes in eum.”

*D. Augustin. cont. Maximinum. Lib. iii. cap. xxii.*

the Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost, "it is written, 'And these Three are One.'" And that this was Cyprian's meaning, Facundus,\* an African bishop in the sixth century, is my author; for he tells us expressly, that Cyprian, in the above mentioned place, understood it so, interpreting the spirit, water, and blood, to be the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and thence affirming, that John said of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, "These Three are One." This at least may be gathered from this passage of Facundus, that some in those early ages interpreted Cyprian after this manner. Nor do I understand how any of those many who

\* Facundus, in the beginning of his book to the Emperor Justinian, pro Defensione trium Capitulum Concilii Chalcedonensis, first recites the text after the manner of Cyprian, but more distinctly in these words; Nam Joannes Apostolus, in epistolâ suâ, de Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto sic dicit, "Tres sunt, qui testimonium dant in terra, spiritus, aqua, et sanguis; et hi tres unum sunt;" in spiritu significans Patrem, &c. Joan. iv. 21. in aquâ Spiritum Sanctum, Joan. vii. 37, in sanguine vero Filium. And a little after he thus confirms this interpretation by Cyprian's authority, saying, Aut si forsâ ipsi, qui de verbo contendunt, in eo quod dixit, "tres sunt qui testificantur in terra, spiritus, aqua, et sanguis, et hi tres unum sunt," Trinitatem nolunt intelligi; secundum ipsa verba quæ posuit, pro Apostolo Joanne respondeant. Numquid hi tres, qui in terrâ testificari, et qui unum esse dicuntur, possunt spiritus et aquæ et sanguines dici? Quod tamen Joannis Apostoli testimonium B. Cyprianus Carthaginensis, antistes et martyr, in epistolâ sive libro quem de Trinitate, immo de Unitate Ecclesiæ scripsit, de Patre, Filio, et Spiritu Sancto dictum intelligit; ait enim, "dicit Dominus, 'ego et Pater unum sumus;' et iterum de Patre, Filio, et Spiritu Sancto scriptum est, 'et hi tres unum sunt.'" *Facund. Lib. i. p. 16; ex edit. Sirmondi, Parisiis, 1629.*



took the spirit, water, and blood, for a type of the Trinity ; or any man else, who was ignorant of the testimony of the Three in Heaven, as the churches in the times of the Arian controversy generally were ; could understand him otherwise. And even Cyprian's own words do plainly make for the interpretation. For he does not say, "the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost," as it is now in the seventh verse ; but "the Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost," as it is in baptism ; the place from which they tried at first to derive the Trinity. If it be pretended, that the words cited by Cyprian are taken out of the seventh verse, rather than out of the eighth, because he reads not, *Hi Tres in Unum sunt*, but *Hi Tres Unum sunt* ; I answer, that the Latins generally read, *Hi Tres Unum sunt*, as well in the eighth verse, as in the seventh ; as you may see in the newly cited places of St Austin and Facundus, and those of Ambrose, Pope Leo, Beda, and Cassiodorus, which follow, and in the present vulgar Latin. So then the testimony of Cyprian respects the eighth, or at least is as applicable to that verse as to the seventh, and therefore is of no force for proving the truth of the seventh ; but, on the contrary, for disproving it we have here the testimony of Facundus, St Austin, Eucherius, and those many others whom Eucherius mentions. For if those of that age had met with it in their books, they would never have understood the spirit, the water, and the blood, to be the three persons of the Trinity, in order to prove them one God.

V. These passages in Cyprian may receive further light by a like passage in Tertullian, from whence Cyprian seems to have borrowed them; for it is well known that Cyprian was a great admirer of Tertullian's writings, and read them frequently, calling Tertullian his master. The passage is this;\* "The connexion of the Father in the Son, and of the Son in the Paraclete, makes three coherent ones from one another, which Three are One, (one thing, not one person,) as it is said, 'I and the Father are One;' denoting the unity of substance, not the singularity of number." Here, you see, Tertullian says not, "the Father, Word, and Holy Ghost," as the text now has it, but "the Father, Son, and Paraclete;" nor cites any thing more of the text than these words, "which Three are One." Though this treatise against St Praxeas be wholly spent in discoursing about the Trinity, and all texts of scripture are cited to prove it, and this text of St John, as we now read it, would have been one of the most obvious and apposite to have been cited at large, yet Tertullian could find no more obvious words in it for his purpose than "these Three are One." These, therefore, he interprets of the Trinity, and enforces the interpretation by that other text, "I and the Father are One;" as if the phrase was of the same importance in both places.

\* Connexus Patris in Filio, et Filii in Paracleto, tres efficit co-hærentes, alterum ex altero, "qui Tres Unum sunt," (non Unus) quomodo dictum est, "Ego et Pater Unum sumus;" ad substantiæ unitatem, non ad numeri singularitatem. *Tertullian. advers. Prax. c. 25.*

VI. So then this interpretation seems to have been invented by the Montanists for giving countenance to their Trinity. For Tertullian was a Montanist when he wrote this; and it is most likely that so corrupt and forced an interpretation had its rise among a sect of men accustomed to make bold with the Scriptures. Cyprian being used to it in his master's writings, it seems from thence to have dropt into his; for this may be gathered from the likeness between their citations. And by the disciples of these two great men, it seems to have been propagated among those many Latins, who, as Eucherius tells us, received it in the next age, understanding the Trinity by the "spirit, water, and blood." For how, without the countenance of some such authority, an interpretation so corrupt and strained should come to be received in that age so generally, I do not understand.

VII. And what is said of the testimony of Tertullian and Cyprian, may be much more said of that in the feigned disputation of Athanasius with Arius at Nice. For there the words cited are only *καὶ οἱ τρεῖς τὸ ἓν εἰσιν*, and *these Three are One*; and they are taken out of the seventh verse, without naming the persons of the Trinity before them. For the Greeks interpreted "the spirit, water, and blood," of the Trinity, as well as the Latins; as is manifest from the annotations they made on this text in the margin of some of their manuscripts. For Father Si-

mon\* informs us that in one of the MSS in the library of the king of France, marked number 2247, over against these words, ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῇ γῆ,† τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ τὸ αἷμα, for there are *Three that bear record [in earth,] the spirit, the water, and the blood*; there is this remark, τετάρτη τὸ πνεῦμά τὸ ἅγιον, καὶ ὁ Πατήρ, καὶ αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ, that is, *the Holy Ghost, and the Father, and He of Himself*. And in the same copy over against these words, καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσι, and these *Three are One*; this note is added, τετέυρτι μία θεότης, εἷς θεός, that is, *One Deity, One God*. This MS is about 500 years old.

VIII. Also in the margin of one of the MSS. in Monsieur Colbert's library, number 871, father Simon tells us there is a like remark. For besides these words, εἷς θεός, μία θεότης, *One God, One Godhead*; there are added, μαρτυρία τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεῦματος, *the testimony of God, the Father, and the Holy Ghost*. These marginal notes sufficiently show how the Greeks used to apply this text to the Trinity; and by consequence how the author of that disputation is to be understood. But I should tell you also, that that disputation was not writ by Athanasius, but by a later author, and therefore, as a spurious piece, uses not to be much insisted upon.

\* Critical History of the New Testament, chap. 18.

† Suspicio verba ἐν τῇ γῆ non extare in MS.

IX. Now this mystical application of “the spirit, water, and blood,” to signify the Trinity, seems to me to have given occasion to somebody, either fraudulently to insert the testimony of “the Three in Heaven” in express words into the text, for proving the Trinity; or else to note it in the margin of his book, by way of interpretation; whence it might afterwards creep into the text in transcribing. And the first upon record that inserted it, is Jerome; if the preface\* to the canonical epistles, which goes

\*The whole preface runs thus; *Incipit prologus in epistolas canonicas. Non ita est ordo apud Græcos, qui integre sapiunt, fidemque rectam sectantur, epistolarum septem, quæ canonicæ nuncupantur, sicut in Latinis codicibus invenitur; ut quia Petrus est primus in ordine apostolorum, primæ sint etiam ejus epistolæ in ordine ceterarum. Sed sicut evangelistas dudum ad veritatis lineam correximus, ita has proprio ordini, Deo juvante, reddidimus. Est enim una earum prima Jacobi, duæ Petri, tres Johannis, et Judæ una. Quæ si sicut ab eis digestæ sunt, ita quoque ab interpretibus fideliter in Latinum verterentur eloquium, nec ambiguitatem legentibus facerent, nec sermonum sese varietates impugnarent, illo præcipue loco ubi de Unitate Trinitatis in primâ Johannis epistolâ, positum legimus. In quâ etiam ab infidelibus translatoribus multum erratum esse a fidei veritate comperimus, trium tantummodo vocabula, hoc est, aquæ, sanguinis, et spiritûs, in ipsâ suâ editione ponentibus; et Patris, Verbique, ac Spiritûs testimonium omittentibus; in quo maxime et fides catholica roboratur, et Patris ac Filii et Spiritûs una divinitatis substantia comprobatur. In cæteris vero epistolis, quantum a nostrâ aliorum distet editio, lectoris judicio derelinquo. Sed tu, virgo Christi Eustochium, dum a me impensius scripturæ veritatem inquiris, meam quodammodo senectutem invidorum dentibus corrodam exponis, qui me falsarium, corruptoremque Sanctarum pronunciant Scripturarum. Sed ego, in tali opere, nec æmulum meorum invidiam pertimesco, nec Sanctæ Scripturæ veritatem poscentibus denegabo.*

under his name, be his. For whilst he composed not a new translation of the New Testament, but only corrected the ancient vulgar Latin, as learned men think, and among his emendations, written perhaps at first in the margin of his book, he inserted this testimony; he complains in the said preface, how he was thereupon accused by some of the Latins for falsifying scripture; and makes answer, that former Latin translators had much erred from the faith, in putting only "the spirit, water, and blood," in their edition, and omitting the testimony of "the Three in Heaven," whereby the Catholic faith is established. In this defence he seems to say, that he corrected the vulgar Latin translation by the original Greek; and this is the great testimony the text relies upon.

X. But whilst he confesses it was not in the Latin before, and accuses former translators of falsifying the Scriptures in omitting it, he satisfies us that it has crept into the Latin since his time, and so cuts off all the authority of the present vulgar Latin for justifying it. And whilst he was accused by his contemporaries of falsifying the Scriptures in inserting it, this accusation also confirms that he altered the public reading. For had the reading been dubious before he made it so, no man would have charged him with falsification for following either part. Also whilst, upon this accusation, he recommends the alteration by its usefulness for establishing the Catholic faith, this renders it the

more suspected; by discovering both the design of his making it, and the ground of his hoping for success. However, seeing he was thus accused by his contemporaries, it gives us just reason to examine the business between him and his accusers. And so he being called to the bar, we are not to lay stress upon his own testimony for himself (for no man is a witness in his own cause), but laying aside all prejudice, we ought, according to the ordinary rules of justice, to examine the business between him and his accusers by other witnesses.

XI. They that have been conversant in his writings, observe a strange liberty which he takes in asserting things. Many notable instances of this he has left us in composing those very fabulous lives of Paul and Hilarion, not to mention what he has written upon other occasions. Whence Erasmus said of him, that he was in affirming things, “frequently violent and impudent, and often contrary to himself.”\* But I accuse him not. It is possible that he might be sometimes imposed upon, or, through inadvertency, commit a mistake. Yet since his contemporaries accused him, it is but just that we should lay aside the prejudice of his great name, and hear the cause impartially between them.

\* *Sæpe numero violentus, parumque pudens, sæpe varius, parumque sibi constans. Erasmii Annotation. in Johan. v. 7.*

Vide etiam quæ Erasmus contra Leum in hunc locum de Hieronymo fusius dixit.

XII. Now the witnesses between them are partly the ancient translators of the Scriptures into the various languages; partly the writers of his own age, and of the ages next before and after him; and partly the scribes who have copied out the Greek manuscripts of the Scriptures in all ages. And all these are against him. For by the unanimous evidence of all these, it will appear that the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" was wanting in the Greek manuscripts, from whence Jerome, or whoever was the author of that preface to the canonical epistles, pretends to have borrowed it.

XIII. The ancient interpreters which I cite as witnesses against him, are chiefly the authors of the ancient vulgar Latin, of the Syriac, and the Æthiopic versions. For as he tells us, that the Latins omitted the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" in their version before his time, so in the Syriac and Æthiopic versions, (both which, from bishop Walton's account of them, are much ancients than Jerome's time, being the versions which the oriental Æthiopic nations received from the beginning, and generally used, as the Latins did the vulgar Latin) that same testimony is wanting to this day; and the authors of these three most ancient, most famous, and most received versions, by omitting it, are concurrent witnesses, that they found it wanting in the original Greek manuscripts of their own times. It is wanting also in other ancient versions; as in the Egyptian Arabic, published



in Walton's Polyglot; in the Armenian version,\* used, ever since Chrysostom's age, by the Armenian nations; and in the Illyrican of Cyrillus, used in Rascia, Bulgaria, Moldavia, Russia, Muscovy, and other countries, which use the Slavonic tongue. In a copy of this version,† printed at Ostrobe (Ostrow) in Volhinia, in the year 1581, I have seen it wanting; and one Camillus‡ relates the same thing out of ancient manuscripts of this version seen by him. Father Simon notes it wanting also in a certain version of the French church, which, saith he, is at least 1000 years old, and which was published by father Mabillon, a Benedictine monk. Nor do I know of any version wherein it is extant, except the modern vulgar Latin, and such modern versions, of the western nations, as have been influenced by it. So then, by the unanimous consent of all the ancient and faithful interpreters which we have hitherto met with, who doubtless made use of the best manuscripts

\* Codex Armeniacus ante 400 annos exaratus, quem vidi apud Episcopum Ecclesiæ Armeniacæ, quæ Amstelodami colligitur, locum illum non legit. *Sandius. Append. Interpret. Paradox. in h. l.*

† The printed Slavonic version runs thus; "Quia Tres sunt qui testificantur, spiritus, et aqua, et sanguis; et Tres in Unum sunt. Si testimonium, &c."

‡ Testimonium Trium in Cælo non est in antiquissimis Illyricorum et Ruthenorum codicibus; quorum unum exemplar, a sexcentis fere annis manuscriptum, jam pridem apud illustrissimum Gabrielem Chineum, terræ Bactricæ Dominum vidi, et legi; alterum manibus nostris teritur, fide et antiquitate suâ nobile. *Camillus de Antichristo, Lib. ii. cap. 2. pag. 156.*

they could get, the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" was not anciently in the Greek.

XIV. And that it was neither in the ancient versions nor in the Greek, but was wholly unknown to the first churches, is most certain by an argument hinted above; namely, that in all that vehement, universal, and lasting controversy about the Trinity in Jerome's time, and both before and long enough after it, this text of "the Three in Heaven" was never once thought of. It is now in every body's mouth, and accounted the main text for the business, and would assuredly have been so too with them, had it been in their books. And yet it is not once to be met with in all the disputes, epistles, orations, and other writings of the Greeks and Latins (Alexander of Alexandria, Athanasius, the council of Sardica, Basil, Nazianzen, Nyssen, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Cyril, Theodoret, Hilary, Ambrose, Austin, Victorinus Afer, Philastrius Brixienensis, Phæbedius Agenensis, Gregorius Bæticus, Faustinus Diaconus, Paschasius, Arnobius Junior, Cerealis, and others) in the times of those controversies; no, not in Jerome himself, if his version and preface to the canonical epistles be excepted. The writings of those times were very many, and copious; and there is no argument, or text of scripture, which they do not urge again and again. That of St John's Gospel, "I and the Father are One," is every where inculcated, but this of "the Three in Heaven" and their being

“One,” is no where to be met with, till at length, when the ignorant ages came on, it began by degrees to creep into the Latin copies out of Jerome’s version. So far are they from citing the testimony of “the Three in Heaven,” that, on the contrary, as often as they have occasion to mention the place, they omit it, and that too, as well after Jerome’s age, as in, and before it. For Hesychius\* cites the place thus; *Audi Johannem dicentem, Tria sunt qui testimonium præbent, et Tres Unum sunt, spiritus, et sanguis, et aqua.* The words *in terrâ* he omits, which is never done, but in copies where “the Three in Heaven” is wanting. Cassiodorus, or whoever was the author of the Latin version of the discourse of Clemens Alexandrinus on these epistles of St John, reads it thus; *Quia tres sunt, qui testificantur, spiritus, et aqua, et sanguis, et hi Tres Unum sunt.*† Beda, in his commentary on the place, reads it thus; *Et spiritus est qui testificatur, quoniam Christus est veritas. Quoniam Tres sunt, qui testimonium dant in terrâ, spiritus, aqua, et sanguis, et Tres Unum sunt. Si testimonium, &c.* But here the words *in terrâ*, so far as I can gather from his commentary on this text, have been inserted by some later hand. The author of the first epistle, ascribed to Pope Eusebius, reads it, as Beda doth, omitting only the words *in terrâ*. And if the authority of popes be valuable,

\* Hesych. in Levit. Lib. ii. c. 8. post med.

† Cassiodor. in Bibl. S. Patr. edit. Paris. 1589.

Pope Leo the Great, in his tenth epistle, thus cites the place ; *Et spiritus est qui testificatur, quoniam spiritus est veritas ; quia Tres sunt qui testimonium dant, spiritus, et aqua, et sanguis ; et hi Tres Unum sunt.* St Ambrose, in the sixth chapter of his first book *De Spiritu Sancto*, disputing for the unity of the Three Persons, says, *Hi Tres Unum sunt, Johannes dixit, aqua, sanguis, et spiritus ; Unum in mysterio, non in naturâ.* This is all he could find of the text, while he was disputing about the Trinity, and therefore he proves the unity of the persons by the mystical unity of the spirit, water, and blood ; interpreting those of the Trinity with Cyprian and others. Yea, in the eleventh chapter of his third book, he fully recites the text thus ; *Per aquam et sanguinem venit Christus Jesus, non solum in aquâ, sed in aquâ et sanguine ; et spiritus testimonium dat, quoniam spiritus est veritas. Quia Tres sunt testes, spiritus, aqua, et sanguis ; et hi Tres Unum sunt in Christo Jesu.\** The like reading of Facundus, Eucherius, and St Austin, you have in the places cited above. These are Latins as late, or later than Jerome ; for Jerome did not prevail with the churches of his own time to receive the testimony of “ the Three in Heaven.” And for them to know his version, and not receive his testimony, was in effect to condemn it.

XV. And as for the Greeks, Cyril of Alexandria reads the text without this testimony in the xivth

\* See also Ambrose in Luc. xxii. 10, and in his book *De iis qui mysteriis initiantur*, cap. 4.

book of his *Thesaurus*, cap. 5 ; and again in his first book *De Fide ad Reginas*, a little after the middle ; and so does Œcumenius, a later Greek, in his commentary on this place of St John's epistle. Also, Didymus Alexandrinus, in his commentary on the same passage, reads, "the spirit, water, and blood," without mentioning "the Three in Heaven ;" and so he doth in his book of the Holy Ghost, where he seems to omit nothing that he could find for his purpose ; and so doth Gregory Nazianzen in his xxxviith oration concerning the Holy Ghost ; and also Nicetas in his commentary on Gregory Nazianzen's xlvith oration. And here it is farther observable, that, as the Eusebians had contended that "the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," were not to be connumerated, because they were things of a different kind ; Nazianzen and Nicetas answer, that they may be connumerated, because St John connumerates three things not consubstantial, namely, "the spirit, the water, and the blood." By the objection of the Eusebians, it then appears that the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" was not in their books ; and by the answer of the Catholics it is as evident, that it was not in theirs ; for while they answer by instancing "the spirit, water, and blood," they could not have missed of "the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost," had they been connumerated, and called one in the words immediately before ; and to answer by instancing in these, would have been far more to their pur-

pose, because it was the very thing in question. In like manner the Eunomians, in disputing against the Catholics, had objected, that the Holy Ghost is nowhere in scripture conjoined with the Father and the Son, except in the form of baptism; which is as much as to say, that the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" was not in their books; and yet St Basil,\* whilst he is very diligent in returning an answer to them, and perplexes himself in citing places, which are nothing to the purpose, does not produce this text of "the Three in Heaven," though it be the most obvious, and the only proper passage, had it been then in the Scriptures; and therefore he knew nothing of it. The objection of the Eunomians, and the answer of the Catholics, sufficiently show that it was in the books of neither party. Besides all this, the tenth epistle of Pope Leo, mentioned above, was that very famous epistle to Flavian, patriarch of Constantinople, against Eutyches, which went about through all the churches, both eastern and western, being translated into Greek, and sent about in the east by Flavian. It was generally applauded in the west, and read in the council of Chalcedon, and there solemnly approved and subscribed by all the bishops; and in this epistle the text was thus cited; *Et spiritus est qui testificatur, quoniam Christus est veritas; quia Tres sunt qui testimonium dant, spiritus, et aqua, et sanguis; et hi Tres Unum sunt.* And

\* Lib. V. adversus Eunomium, sub finem.

by putting πνεῦμα, according to the Greek reading, for *Christus*, which is still the vulgar Latin, it was thus translated by the Greeks : καὶ τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν τὸ μαρτυροῦν ἐπειδὴ τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν ἡ ἀλήθεια· τρεῖς γὰρ εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες, τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ τὸ αἷμα, καὶ οἱ τρεῖς τὸ ἓν εἰσι. So then we have the reading, quoted by the Pope, owned in the west, and solemnly subscribed in the east by the fourth general council, and therefore it continued the public received reading in both the east and west, till after the age of that council.

XVI. So then the testimony of “the Three in Heaven,” which, in the times of these controversies, would have been in every body’s mouth, had it been in their books, was wholly unknown to the churches of those ages. All that they could find in their books was the testimony of “the water, the spirit, and the blood.” Will you now say that the testimony of “the Three in Heaven” was razed out of their books by the prevailing Arians? Yes, truly, those Arians were crafty knaves, that could conspire so cunningly and slyly all the world over at once (as at the word of a Mithridates) in the latter end of the reign of the Emperor Constantius, to get all men’s books in their hands, and correct them without being perceived; ay, and conjurors too, to do it without leaving any blot or chasm in their books, whereby the knavery might be suspected and discovered; and to wipe away the memory of it out of all

men's brains, so that neither Athanasius, nor any body else, could afterwards remember that they had ever seen it in their books before ; and out of their own books too, so that when they turned to the consubstantial faith, as they generally did in the west, soon after the death of Constantius, they could then remember no more of it than any body else. Well, then, it was out of their books in Jerome's age, when he pretended it was in ; which is the point we are to prove ; and when any body can show, that it was in their books before, it may be pertinent to consider that point also ; but till then we are only to inquire how, since it was out, it came into the copies that are now extant. For they that, without proof, accuse the heretics of corrupting books, and upon that pretence correct them at their pleasure without the authority of ancient manuscripts, as some learned men of the fourth and fifth centuries used to do, are falsaries by their own confession, and certainly need no other confutation. And therefore if this reading was once out, we are bound in justice to believe, that it was out from the beginning ; unless the razing of it out can be proved by some better argument than that of pretence and clamour.

XVII. Will you now say, that Jerome followed some copy different from any which the Greeks were acquainted with ? This is to overthrow the authority of his version by making him depart from the received Greek ; and besides, it is contrary to



what he himself seems to represent ; for in his blaming not the vulgar Greek copies, but the Latin interpreters only, which were before his time, as if they had varied from the received Greek, he represents that he himself followed it. He does not excuse and justify himself for reading differently from the received Greek, to follow a private copy, but accuses former interpreters, as if, in leaving out the testimony of “the Three in Heaven,” they had not followed the received Greek, as he did. And therefore, since the Greeks knew nothing of this testimony, the authority of his version sinks ; and that the rather, because he was then accused of corrupting the text, and could not persuade either the Greeks or the Latins of those times to receive his reading ; for the Latins received it not till many years after his death ; and the Greeks not till this present age, when the Venetians sent it amongst them in printed books ; and their not receiving it was plainly to approve the accusation.

XVIII. The authority of this version being thus far discussed, it remains, that we consider the authority of the manuscripts, wherein we now read the testimony of “the Three in Heaven.” And by the best inquiry that I have been able to make, it is wanting in the manuscripts of all languages but the Latin. For, as we have shown, that the *Æthiopic*, *Syriac*, *Arabic*, *Armenian*, and *Slavonian* versions, still in use in the several eastern nations, *Ethiopia*,

Egypt, Syria, Mesopotamia, Armenia, Muscovy, and some others, are strangers to this reading, and that it was anciently wanting also in the French; so I am told by those who have been in Turkey, that it is wanting to this day in the Greek manuscripts, which have been brought from those parts into the west; and that the Greeks, now that they have got it in print from the Venetians, when their manuscripts are objected against it, pretend that the Arians razed it out. A reading to be found in no manuscripts but the Latin, and not in the Latin before Jerome's age, as Jerome himself confesses, can be but of little authority; and this authority sinks, because we have already proved the reading spurious, by showing that it was heretofore unknown, both to the western and the eastern churches, in the times of the great controversy about the Trinity. But, however, for further satisfaction, we shall now give you an account of the Latin and Greek manuscripts; and show, first, how, in the dark ages, it crept into the Latin manuscripts out of Jerome's version; and then how it lately crept out of the Latin into the printed Greek without the authority of MSS; those who first published it in Greek, having never yet so much as seen it in any Greek manuscript.

XIX. That the vulgar Latin, now in use, is a mixture of the old vulgar Latin, and Jerome's version together, is the received opinion. Few of these manuscripts are above four or five hundred years

old. The latest generally have the testimony of "the Three in Heaven;" the oldest of all usually want it, which shows that it has crept in by degrees. Erasmus notes it to be wanting in three very ancient ones, one of which was in the Pope's library at Rome, the other two were at Bruges; and he adds, that in another manuscript belonging to the library of the Minorites in Antwerp, the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" was noted in the margin in a newer hand. Peter Cholinus notes in the margin of his Latin edition of the Scriptures, printed anno Christi 1543 and 1544, that it was wanting in the most ancient manuscript of the Tugurine library. Dr Gilbert Burnet has lately, in the first letter of his travels, noted it wanting in five other ones kept at Strasburg, Zurich, and Basil; one of which MSS. he reckons about 1000 years old, and the other four about 800. Father Simon has noted it wanting in five others in the libraries of the king of France, Mons. Colbert, and the Benedictines of the abbey of St Germain's. An ancient and diligent collator of manuscripts, cited by Lucas Brugensis by the name of Epanorthotes, notes in general, that it was wanting in the ancient Latin manuscripts. Lucas himself, collating many Latin ones, notes it to be wanting in only *five*, that is, in the few old ones he had, his manuscripts being almost all of them new ones. For he praises\* the Codex Lobiensis written anno Christi 1084, and the

\* Lucas Brug. in calce annot.

Codex Tornacensis written anno Christi 1105, as most ancient and venerable for their antiquity; and used others much more new, of which a great number was easily had; such as was the Codex Buslidianus, written anno Christi 1432, that is, but eight years before the invention of printing. The Lateran council, collected under Innocent the Third, anno Christi 1215, canon 2, mentions Joachim, the abbot, quoting the text in these words; *Quoniam in canonicâ Johannis epistolâ legitur, Quia Tres sunt qui testimonium dant in cælo, Pater, et Verbum, et Spiritus, et hi Tres Unum sunt; statimque subjungitur—Et Tres sunt qui testimonium dant in terrâ, spiritus, aqua, et sanguis, et Tres Unum sunt: sicut in codicibus quibusdam invenitur.* This was written by Joachim\* in the papacy of Alexander the Third, that is, in or before the year 1180, and therefore this reading was then got but into some books; for the words *sicut in codicibus quibusdam invenitur* refer as well to the first words of Joachim, *quoniam in canonicâ Johannis epistolâ legitur*, as to the next *statimque subjungitur*; and more to the first than the next, because the first part of the citation was then but in some books, as appears by ancient manuscripts; but the second part was in almost all; the words *Tres Unum sunt* being in all the books which wanted the testimony of “the Three in Heaven,” and in most of those which had it; though afterwards

\* Vide Math. Paris Histor. Angl. A. D. 1179.

left out in many, when branded by the schoolmen for Arian.

XX. But to go to the original of the corruption. Gregory the Great\* writes, that Jerome's version was in use in his time, and therefore no wonder if the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" began to be cited out of it before. Eugenius, bishop of Carthage, in the seventh year of Hunneric, king of the Vandals, anno Christi 484, in the summary of his faith exhibited to the king, cited it the first of any man, so far as I can find. A while after, Fulgentius, another African bishop, disputing against the same Vandals, cited it again, and backed it with the forementioned place of Cyprian, applied to the testimony of "the Three in Heaven." And so it is probable, that by that abused authority of Cyprian it began first in Afric, in the disputes with the ignorant Vandals, to get some credit; and thence at length crept into use. It occurs also frequently in Vigilius Tapsensis, another African bishop, contemporary to Fulgentius. In its defence, some allege earlier writers; namely, the first epistle of Pope Hyginus, the epistle of Pope John II. the book of Idacius Clarus against Varimadus; and the book *De unitate Deitatis Trinitatis*, ascribed to Athanasius. But Chiffletius, who published the works of Victor Viten-sis and Vigilius Tapsensis, sufficiently proves the book against Varimadus to be this Vigilius's, and er-

\* Vide Walton's Prolegomena, x. 5.

roneously ascribed to Idacius. To the same Vigilus he asserts also the book *De unitâ Deitate Trinitatis*. Certainly Athanasius was not its author. All the epistles of Hyginus, except the beginning and the end, and the first part of the epistle of Pope John, wherein the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" is cited, are nothing else than the fragments of the book against Varimadus, described word by word by some forger of decretal epistles, as may appear by comparing them. So then Eugenius is the first upon record that quotes it.

XXI. But though he set it on foot among the Africans, yet I cannot find that it became of authority in Europe before the revival of learning in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. In those ages St Barnard, the Schoolmen, Joachim, and the Lateran council, spread it abroad, and scribes began generally to insert it into the text; but in such Latin manuscripts and European writers, as are ancients than those times, it is scarce to be met with.

XXII. Now that it was inserted into the vulgar Latin out of Jerome's version, is manifest by the manner how the vulgar Latin and that version came to be mixed. For it is agreed that the Latins, after Jerome's version began to be of use, noted out of it his corrections of the vulgar Latin in the margin of their books; and these the transcribers afterwards inserted into the text. By this means, the old Latin has been so generally corrected, that it is nowhere

to be found sincere. It is Jerome that we now read, and not the old vulgar Latin ; and what wonder, if in Jerome we read the testimony of “the Three in Heaven?” For who that inserted the rest of Jerome into the text, would leave out such a passage for the Trinity, as this hath been taken to be?

XXIII. But to put the question out of dispute, there are footsteps of the insertion still remaining. For in some old manuscripts, it has been found noted in the margin ; in others, the various readings are such as ought to arise, by transcribing it out of the margin into the text. I shall only mention the three following varieties. Of the manuscripts which have not the testimony of “the Three in Heaven,” some have the words *in terrá*, in the eighth verse, but the most want it ; which seems to proceed from hence, that some, before they allowed so great an addition to the text, as the testimony of “the Three in Heaven,” noted only *in terrá* in the margin of their books, to be inserted into the testimony of the spirit, water, and blood. Of the manuscripts which have the testimony of “the Three in Heaven,” some in the eighth verse have *Hi Tres Unum sunt* ; others not. The reason of this seems to be, that of those who noted this testimony in the margin, some blotted out *Et hi Tres Unum sunt* in the eighth verse according to Jerome ; and others did not. And, lastly, the testimony of “the Three in Heaven” is in most books set before the testimony of “the Three in

earth ;” in some, it is set after ; so Erasmus notes two old books, in which it is set after ; Lucas Brugensis a third ; and Hesselius (if I misremember not) a fourth ; and so Vigilius Tapsensis\* sets it after ; which seems to proceed from hence, that it was sometimes so noted in the margin, that the reader or transcriber knew not whether it were to come before or after. Now these discords in the Latin manuscripts, as they detract from the authority of the manuscripts, so they confirm to us, that the old vulgar Latin has in these things been tampered with, and corrected by Jerome’s version.

XXIV. In the next place, I am to show how, and when, the testimony of “the Three in Heaven” crept out of the Latin into the Greek. Those who first printed the Greek testament, did generally, in following their manuscripts, omit the testimony of “the Three in Heaven,” except in Spain ; for it was omitted in the first and second edition of Erasmus, anno Christi 1516 and 1519 ; in the edition of Francis Asulan, printed at Venice by Aldus, anno Christi 1518 ; in that of Nicholas Gerbelius, printed at Haganau, anno Christi 1521 ; and a little after, in that of Wolfius Cephalius, printed at Strasburg, anno Christi 1524 ; and again in 1526, in the Badian edition, as Erasmus notes ; and in that of Simon Colinæus at Paris, anno Christi 1534.† At the

\* Vigilius, libr. advers. Varimadum, cap. 5.

† In editis exemplaribus nonnullis non legi ; ut in Aldinâ et Badianâ editione. Adde, nec in Græco Testamento Gerbelii, Haganæ, 1521 ; nec in Colinæi Parisiis edito. *Gomarus in h. l.*



same time it was omitted in some editions of other western languages, as in the Saxon and German editions of Luther; and in the Latin Tugurine editions of Peter Cholinus, anno Christi 1543 and 1544. The first edition in Greek, which has the testimony of "the Three in Heaven," was that of Cardinal Ximenes, printed at Complutum in Spain, in 1515; but not published before the year 1521. The cardinal, in his edition, used the assistance of several divines, which he called together to Complutum, there founding an university, anno Christi 1517, or a little before. Two of those divines were Antonius Nebrissensis and Stunica. For Stunica then resided at Complutum, and in the preface\* to a treatise he wrote against Erasmus, gives this testimony of himself; "that he had spent some years in reading the holy Scriptures in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin; and had diligently collated the Hebrew and Greek exemplars with the Latin copies." This book, displeasing the cardinal, was not printed till after his death; and then it came forth at Complutum, anno Christi 1520. The year before, one Lee,

\* Cum præsertim, si quisquam alius, et nos quoque his de rebus, nostro quodam jure, judicium ferre possumus. [Quippe] qui non paucos annos in sanctis scripturis Veteris et Novi Testamenti, Hebraice, Græce, et Latine perlegendis consumpserimus; ac Hebraica Græcaque ipsa divinarum literarum exemplaria cum Latinis codicibus diligentissime contulerimus. Longâ igitur lectione ac experientiâ jam pridem edocti, quantum translationi huic ecclesiasticæ Novi Testamenti deferendum sit, ni fallor, optime novi. *Hæc Stunica in præm. libri sui.*

an Englishman, wrote also against Erasmus; and both Stunica and Lee, amongst other things, reprehended him for omitting the testimony of "the Three in Heaven." Afterwards Erasmus, finding the Spaniards, and some others of the Roman Church, in a heat against him, printed this testimony in his third edition, anno Christi 1522, representing, "that in his former editions he had printed the text as he found it in his manuscripts; but now there being found in England one manuscript which had the testimony of "the Three in Heaven," he had inserted it, according to that manuscript; for avoiding the calumnies raised against him." And so it continued in his two following editions. And at length Robert Stephens, anno Christi 1550, reprinted Erasmus's edition, with some few alterations and various lections, taken out of the Complutensian edition, and fifteen Greek manuscripts, which he named after the numeral letters,  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $\gamma$ ,  $\delta$ ,  $\epsilon$ , &c. putting  $\alpha$  for the Complutensian edition, and  $\beta$ ,  $\gamma$ ,  $\delta$ ,  $\epsilon$ , &c. for the manuscripts in order; and noting in the margin, that the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" was wanting in the seven manuscripts,  $\delta$ ,  $\epsilon$ ,  $\zeta$ ,  $\theta$ ,  $\iota$ ,  $\kappa$ ,  $\lambda$ . Whence Beza\* tells us, that he had read it in the rest. His words are, *Legit Hieronymus, legit Erasmus in Britannico codice et in Complutensi editione. Legimus et nos in nonnullis Roberti nostri veteribus libris.* And this is the original and authority of the printed editions. For

\* Beza in hunc locum.

these are the editions ever since followed by all the West; and of late years propagated by the Venetian presses into Greece; and nothing further, that I know of, has been discovered in any manuscripts in favour of these editions.

XXV. Now to pull off the vizard, I cannot but, in the first place, extremely complain of Beza's want of modesty and caution in expressing himself.\* In the preface to his annotations, describing what helps he had in composing his first edition, he tells us, "that he had the annotations of Valla, Stapulensis, and Erasmus, and the writings of the ancients and moderns collated by himself; and out of Stephens's library, the exemplar which Stephens had collated with about twenty-five manuscripts, almost all of which were printed." He should have said seventeen; for that number he puts in other places, and in his annotations cites no more. So then he had the collations of two more manuscripts than Stephens has given us in print. And this was all his furniture. The original manuscripts he does not here pretend to have; nor could he have them; for they were not Stephens's manuscripts, but belonged to several libraries in France and Italy. The manuscript 6

\* Non desunt, qui Bezam nimis audacem fuisse judicant, dum a receptâ lectione sæpius sine necessitate recedit; et unius, interdum nullius, codicis autoritate fretus, prætoriam exercet potestatem, ex conjecturis mutando et interpolando textum sacrum pro libito. *Walton. Prolegom. iv. sect. 15. in Bibl. Polyglott.*

Stephens himself never saw; but had only various lections collected out of it by his friends in Italy. The manuscripts γ, δ, ε, ζ, η, ι, κ, were not Stephens's, but belonged to the library of the king of France, to whom Stephens was printer. The other six books, θ, λ, μ, ν, ο, π, Stephens had not out of his own library, but borrowed them for a time from several places to collate, his friends studying to promote the design of his edition. And yet Beza in his annotations, when he would favour any text, cites the collations of Stephens in such a manner, as if he had the very original manuscripts at Geneva before his eyes. And where Stephens does not cite various lections, there he reckons, that in the text of Stephens's collated books he read all the manuscripts. So in Mark vi. 11. where Stephens notes a certain period to be wanting in the manuscript copies ς and ζ, Beza saith, *Hæc periodus in omnibus exemplaribus Græcis legitur, exceptis secundo et octavo.* In the Acts xiii 33. because Stephens had noted no various lections, Beza affirms of the Greek text, *Ita scriptum invenimus in omnibus vetustis codicibus.* In 1 John iv. 3. where Stephens is silent, Beza speaks; *Sic legitur in omnibus Græcis exemplaribus, quæ quidem mihi inspicere licuit.* In James i. 22. where Stephens is again silent, Beza tells us of the word *μόνον*, *Ego in Omnibus nostris vetustis libris inveni.* And so, where Stephens in the margin had noted the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" to be want-

ing in seven manuscripts, he thinks that, in reading the text of Stephen's collated book, he reads it in the rest; and so tells us, *Legimus et nos in nonnullis Roberti Stephani codicibus*. This he did in the first edition of his annotations. Afterwards, when he had got two real manuscripts, the Claromontan, and that which at length he presented to the University of Cambridge (in both which the canonical epistles are wanting;) in the epistle to his fourth edition, in reckoning up the books he then used, he put only these two, and the seventeen of Stephens; and in his fifth edition he writes summarily, that he used nineteen manuscripts, joining with those two real ones the collations of Stephens, as if in those he had seventeen others; which sufficiently explains his way of speaking in his annotations. But whilst he had not the manuscripts themselves to read with his own eyes, it was too hard and unwarrantable a way of speaking to tell us, *Legimus et nos in nonnullis Roberti Stephani codicibus*; and therefore, in his later editions, he corrects himself, and tells us only, that the reading doth *extare in nonnullis Stephani veteribus libris*. Thus Beza argues from Stephens's book of collations; and the same inference has been made by Lucas Brugensis and others, ever since, from Stephens's forementioned edition of that book. "For," say they, "Stephens had fifteen manuscripts in all, and found the testimony of 'the Three in Heaven' wanting but in seven; and therefore it was in the other

eight ; and so being found in the greater part of his manuscripts, has the authority of manuscripts on its side." Thus they argue ; and this is the great argument by which the printed Greek has hitherto been justified.

XXVI. But if they please to consider the business a little better, they will find themselves very much mistaken. For though Stephens had fifteen manuscripts in all, yet all of them did not contain all the Greek testament. Four of them, noted  $\gamma$ .  $\epsilon$ ,  $\iota\epsilon$ ,  $\iota\delta$ , had each of them the four Gospels only. Two, noted  $\zeta$ ,  $\eta$ , contained only the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. One, noted  $\iota\epsilon$ , contained the Apocalypse only. One, noted  $\iota\epsilon$ , had only the Apocalypse, with St Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians. The other seven, noted  $\delta$ ,  $\epsilon$ ,  $\zeta$ ,  $\theta$ ,  $\iota$ ,  $\iota\alpha$ ,  $\iota\gamma$ , contained both St Paul's Epistles and the canonical ones, besides some other books ; namely, the manuscript  $\zeta$  contained the Epistles and Gospels ; the manuscripts  $\iota$ ,  $\iota\alpha$ ,  $\iota\gamma$ , the Epistles and Acts of the Apostles ; and the manuscripts  $\delta$ ,  $\epsilon$ ,  $\theta$ , the Epistles, Gospels, and Acts. And this any one may gather, by noting what manuscripts the various lections are cited out of, in every book of the New Testament. For in the various lections of the canonical epistles, and those to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians, are found these seven manuscripts,  $\delta$ .  $\epsilon$ ,  $\zeta$ ,  $\theta$ ,  $\iota$ ,  $\iota\alpha$ ,  $\iota\gamma$ , every where cited, and no more than these. The same

also, and no more, are cited in the Epistles to the Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, and the Hebrews; one numeral error, whether of the scribe or typographer excepted. Stephens therefore did collect various lections of the Epistles out of only these seven manuscripts,  $\delta$ ,  $\epsilon$ ,  $\zeta$ ,  $\theta$ ,  $\iota$ ,  $\kappa$ ,  $\nu$ ; and in all these seven he found the testimony of “the Three in Heaven” to be wanting; as you may see noted in the margin of his edition.

XXVII. And that this testimony was wanting in all Stephens’s manuscripts, is apparent also by its being generally wanting in the manuscripts which are now extant in France. For father Simon\* tells us, “that after a diligent search in the library of the king of France, and in that also of Monsieur Colbert, he could not find it in any one manuscript; though he consulted seven manuscripts in the king’s library, and one in Colbert’s.” And because Stephens had some of his various lections from Italy, I will add, that a gentleman, who, in his travels, had consulted twelve MSS in several libraries in Italy, assured me that he found it wanting in them all. One of the twelve was that most ancient and most famous MS in the Pope’s library, written in capital letters.

XXVIII. So then the authority of the printed books rests only upon the authority of the editions of Erasmus and Cardinal Ximenes. But seeing that Erasmus omitted it in his two first editions, and in-

\* Simon’s Critical History of the New Test. chap. xviii.

serted it unwillingly, against the authority of his manuscripts, in his three last; the authority of these three can be none at all. When Lee, upon Erasmus's putting forth his second edition, fell foul upon him for leaving out the testimony of "the Three in Heaven," Erasmus\* answered, "that he had consulted more than seven Greek manuscripts, and found it wanting in them all; and that if he could have found it in any one manuscript, he would have followed that in favour of the Latin." Hence notice was sent to Erasmus out of England, that it was in a manuscript there, and thereupon to avoid† their calumnies, as he saith, he printed it in his following editions; notwithstanding that he suspected that manuscript to be a new one, corrected by the Latin. But since, upon inquiry, I cannot learn that they in England ever heard of any such manuscript, but from Erasmus; and since he was only told of such a manuscript, in the time of the controversy between him

\* Dicam mihi diversis temporibus plura fuisse exemplaria quam septem [scilicet Græca]; nec in ullo horum repertum, quod in nostris [scilicet Latinis] legitur. Quod si contigisset unum exemplar, in quo fuisset, quod nos legimus, nimirum illinc adjecissem, quod in cæteris aberat. Id quia non contigit, quod solum licuit, feci; indicavi quid in Græcis codicibus minus esset. *Hæc Erasmus contra Leum, in hunc locum.*

† Ex hoc igitur codice Britannico reposuimus, quod in nostris dicebatur deesse; ne cui sit ansa calumniandi. Quanquam et hunc suspicor, ad Latinorum codices, fuisse castigatum. Posteaquam enim concordiam inierunt cum ecclesiâ Romanâ, studuerunt et hâc in parte cum Romanis consentire. *Erasmî Annotation. in hunc locum; editio tertia, et sequen.*



and Lee, and never saw it himself; I cannot forbear to suspect, that it was nothing but a trick put upon him by the Popish clergy, to try if he would make good what he had offered, the printing of the testimony of “the Three in Heaven” by the authority of one Greek copy, and thereby to get it into his edition.\* Greek manuscripts of the Scripture are things of value, and do not use to be thrown away; and such a manuscript for the testimony of “the Three in Heaven,” would have made a greater noise than the rest have done against it. Let those who have such a manuscript, at length tell us where it is.

XXIX. So also let them who insist upon the edition of cardinal Ximenes, tell us by what manuscript he printed this testimony; or, at least, where any such manuscript of good note is to be seen; for till then I must take the liberty to believe, that he printed nothing else than a translation out of the Latin, and that for these reasons.

First; because in the preface to his edition of the New Testament we are told, that this testament was printed after the manuscripts taken out of the Pope’s library; and these the cardinal only borrowed †

\* Versiculus I Joan. v. 7. in Syriacâ, ut et vetustissimis Græcis exemplaribus, nostro Alexandrino, aliis manuscriptis Græcis, quos contulimus, non reperitur. *Walton. Prolegomena*, xix. 23, in *Bibl. Polyglott.*

† Accivit e Vaticanâ Romæ Bibliothecâ, bonâ cum Leonis X. pontificis maximi veniâ. As Gaspar Bellerus, in his epistle prefixed to the Quinquagena of Antonius Nabrissensis, expresses it.

thence, and therefore returned them back so soon as his edition was finished. And Caryophilus some time after, by the Pope's command, collating the Vatican manuscripts, found the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" wanting in them all. I do not say but that the Cardinal had other manuscripts; but these were the chief, and the only ones he thought worth while to tell his reader of.

Secondly; I startle at the marginal note in this place of the Cardinal's edition. For it is beside the use of this edition, to put notes in the margin of the Greek text. I have not found it done above thrice in all this edition of the New Testament; and therefore there must be something extraordinary; and that, in respect of the Greek, because it is in the margin of this text. In 1 Corinth. xv. there is noted in this margin a notable variation in the Greek reading. In Matthew vi. 13. where they, in their edition, recede from the Greek copies and correct it by the Latin, they make a marginal note, to justify their doing so; and so here, where the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" is generally wanting in the Greek copies, they make a third marginal note, to secure themselves from being blamed for printing it. Now in such a case as this, there is no question but they would make the best defence they could; and yet they do not tell of the various lections in the Greek manuscripts, nor produce any one Greek manuscript on their side, but

run to the authority of Thomas Aquinas.\* The Greek manuscripts have the text thus, "For there are Three that bear record, the spirit, the water, and the blood; and these Three are One." In many of the Latin manuscripts, the words, "these Three are One," are here omitted, and put only at the end of the testimony of "the Three in Heaven," before that of "the spirit, water, and blood;" in others, they are put after both testimonies. In the Complutensian edition, they follow the former copies, and justify their doing so, by the authority of Thomas Aquinas. "Thomas," say they, "in treating of the Three which bear witness in Heaven, teaches, that the words 'these Three are One' are subjoined for insinuating the unity of the essence of the Three Persons. And whereas one Joachim interpreted this unity to be only in *love* and *consent*, it being thus

\* The marginal note is this; Sanctus Thomas, in expositione secundæ decretalis de summâ Trinitate et Fide Catholicâ, tractans istum passum contra Abbatem Joachim, viz. "Tres sunt qui testimonium dant in cœlo, Pater, Verbum, et Spiritus Sanctus," dicit ad literam verba sequentia. "Et ad insinuandam unitatem trium personarum subditur, et 'hi Tres Unum sunt;' quod quidem dicitur propter essentiæ unitatem. Sed hoc Joachim perverse trahere volens ad unitatem charitatis et consensus, inducebat consequentem auctoritatem. Nam subditur ibidem, 'Et Tres sunt, qui testimonium dant in terrâ, sanctus spiritus, aqua, et sanguis;' et in quibusdam libris additur, 'et hi Tres Unum sunt.' Sed hoc in veris exemplaribus non habetur; sed dicitur esse appositum ab Hæreticis Arianis ad pervertendum intellectum sanum auctoritatis præmissæ de unitate essentiæ Trium Personarum." Hæc Beatus Thomas, ubi supra.

said of the spirit, water, and blood, in some copies, 'these Three are One;' Thomas replied, that this last clause is not extant in the true copies, but was added by the Arians for perverting the sense." Thus far this annotation. Now this plainly respects the Latin copies, for Thomas understood not Greek, and therefore part of the design of this annotation is to set right the Latin reading. But this is not the main design. For so the annotation should have been set in the margin of the Latin version. Its being inserted in the margin of the Greek text shows, that its main design is to justify the Greek by the Latin thus rectified and confirmed. Now to make Thomas thus, in a few words, do all the work, was very artificial; and in Spain, where Thomas is of apostolic authority, might pass for a very judicious and substantial defence of the printed Greek. But to us, Thomas Aquinas is no Apostle. We are seeking for the authority of Greek manuscripts.

A third reason why I conceive the Complutensian Greek to have been in this place a translation from the Latin, is, because Stunica (who, as I told you, was one of the divines employed by the Cardinal in this edition, and at that time wrote against Erasmus) when, in his objections, he comes to this text of the testimony of "the Three in Heaven," he cites not one Greek manuscript for it against Erasmus; but argues wholly from the authority of the Latin. On the contrary, he sets down, by way

of concession, the common reading of the Greek manuscripts, as well as his own, and that of others, in these words, ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες, τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ τὸ αἷμα· καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσι; and then condemns them altogether without exception; and justifies the Latin against them by the authority of Jerome. “Know,” saith he, “that in this place the Greek manuscripts are most evidently corrupted; but ours (that is, the Latin ones) contain the truth itself, as they are translated from the first original; which is manifest by the prologue of St Jerome upon the Epistles, &c.”\* And this prologue, which he goes on to cite at length, and of which we gave you an account above, is all he argues in favour of the testimony of “the Three in Heaven.” In other places of scripture, where he had Greek manuscripts on his side, he produces them readily. So 1 Thessalonians ii. 7. *Ita quidem legitur*, says he, *in Græcis codicibus, quos ego viderim*. In James i. 11. he saith, *Sciendum in omnibus Græcis codicibus πορεύεται hic legi per εἰ diphthongum*. In 1 Thessalonians v. 23. he saith, *Cum in Græcis exemplaribus quotquot sunt, ὁλόκληρον, et in Latinis integer hic legatur, nemine discrepante, nescio cur Erasmus dixerit, &c.* In

\* Sciendum est, hoc loco codices apertissime esse corruptos; nostros vero veritatem ipsam, ut a primâ origine traducti sunt, continere; quod ex prologo B. Hieronymi super epistolas manifeste apparet. Ait enim, “Quæ si sicut ab eis digestæ sunt; ita quoque ab interpretibus fideliter in Latinum verterentur eloquium,” &c. *Hæc Stunica in h. locum. Ejus Liber exstat in Criticor. vol. ix.*

Philipp. iv. 9. *Si quidem in omnibus*, saith he, *Græcis codicibus*, ταῦτα λογίζεσθαι *hic legitur*; *neque Græci sunt libri*, qui πρῶτον ἐστὶ *hoc loco*, *neque Latini*, qui agite; *nisi mendosos utriusque linguæ codices*, *cum hæc commentaretur Erasmus*, *perlegit*. After this manner does Stunica produce the manuscripts used in the Complutensian edition, when they make for him; and here he produces them too, but it is for Erasmus against himself. “Know,” saith he, “that in this place the Greek manuscripts are most evidently corrupted.” In other places, if he hath but one manuscript on his side, he produces it magificently enough; as the Codex Rhodiensis in his discourses upon 2 Corinthians ii. 3. James i. 22. 2 Peter ii. 2. and other texts. Here he produces all the manuscripts against himself, without excepting so much as one. And hence Erasmus, in his answer to Stunica, gloried in the consent of the Spanish manuscripts with his own; and Sanctius Caranza, another of the Complutensian divines, in his defence of Stunica, written presently after, had nothing to reply in this point. Neither could Sepulveda, or the Spanish monks who next undertook the controversy, find one Greek manuscript, which here made against Erasmus. Neither had Marchio Valesius better success, though on that occasion he collated sixteen Greek manuscripts, eight whereof belonged to the king of Spain’s library, and the other eight to other libraries of Spain; and he did it on purpose to collect out of

them whatever he could meet with in favour of the present vulgar Latin. Neither did the reprinting of the Complutensian Bible by Arias Montanus produce the notice of any such manuscript; though, on that occasion, many manuscripts, as well Greek as Latin, fetched from Complutum and other places, were collated by Arias, Lucas Brugensis, Canter, and others.

XXX. So then, to sum up the argument, the Complutensian divines did sometimes correct the Greek by the Latin, without the authority of any Greek manuscript, as appears by their practice in Matthew vi. 13. and therefore their printing the testimony of “the Three in Heaven” is no evidence that they did it by a manuscript, but on the contrary, for want of one, they contented themselves with the authority of Thomas Aquinas; and Stunica confessed that they had none. Nor has all the zeal for this text been able since to discover one either in Spain, or any where else.

XXXI. And now you may understand whence it is, that the Complutensian edition, and the reading of the pretended English manuscript, set down by Erasmus in his annotations, differ so much from one another; for the Complutensian edition has the text thus; *ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ὁ πατήρ, καὶ ὁ λόγος, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα· καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσι. καὶ τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ τὸ αἷμα.* The pretended English manuscript thus; *ὅτι τρεῖς*

εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, πατήρ. λόγος, καὶ πνεῦμα· καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἐν εἰσιν. καὶ τρεῖς μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῇ γῆ, πνεῦμα καὶ ὕδωρ, καὶ αἷμα. The differences are too great to spring from the bare errors of scribes, and arise rather from the various translations of the place, out of Latin into Greek, by two several persons.

XXXII. But whilst these two readings, by their discord, confute one another, the readings of the real Greek manuscripts by their agreement confirm one another as much. For Caryophilus, who, by the command of Pope Urban the Eighth, collated the Vatican and other manuscripts, borrowed out of the principal libraries in Rome, found one common reading in them all, without the testimony of “the Three in Heaven;” as you may see in those his collations, printed in 1673 by Peter Possinus, in the end of his *Catena* of the Greek Fathers upon Mark. He met with eight manuscripts in all upon the Epistles, and notes their reading thus; 1 Joan. v. 7. *Manuscripti octo (omnes nempe) legunt, “Ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες, τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ τὸ αἷμα. καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἐν εἰσι. Porro totus septimus versus hujus capituli desideratur in octo manuscriptis codicibus Græcis, &c.* Thus Caryophilus.

XXXIII. The very same reading Erasmus, in his annotations on this place, gives us of all his manuscripts, which were more than seven; and so doth Stephens of all his seven, without noting any various lections in them. Only the comma, which in Ste-



phens's edition is, surely by mistake, set after  $\sigma\tilde{\upsilon}\rho\alpha\nu\tilde{\phi}$ , is to be put in its right place. The very same reading does Stunica also, in his book against Erasmus, note out of the manuscript he had seen in Spain, as was seen above. Nor does Valesius, in his collection of the sixteen Spanish manuscripts, note any various lections in this text. The same reading exactly have also the manuscripts in England; namely, that most ancient and famous one in the king's library, which was conveyed thither from Egypt through Greece, and published in Walton's Polyglott Bible; and the four at Oxford, viz. that in New College, and that in Magdalen College, both very old, and two in Lincoln College; and four or five other ancient ones lately collated at Oxford, in order to a new impression of the Greek testament, as I am informed. The very same reading have also the three manuscripts of Monsieur Petavius Gachon, a senator of Paris, whose various lections, collected by his son John Gachon, were printed in the Oxford edition of the New Testament, anno Christi 1675. The same reading, without any variation, is published by Francis Asulan in his edition, printed anno Christi 1518, by Aldus at Venice, out of the manuscripts of those parts. The same reading  $\text{\textcircled{E}}$ cumenius, six hundred years ago, found in the manuscripts of Greece; as you may see in the text of his commentary on this epistle of St John. The same reading also Cyril of Alexandria met with in the manuscripts of Egypt, above eleven

hundred years ago ; as you may see in his citations of the text ; both in his *Thesaurus*, lib. xiv. cap. 5. and in his first book *De Fide ad Reginas* ; excepting that in the latter of these two citations, the particle εἰς is omitted ; and μαρτυροῦσι written for οἱ μαρτυροῦντες. And that the very same reading was also in the manuscripts of the first ages, may be gathered from the conformity of this reading to all the ancient versions.

XXXIV. It may be seen by what has been hitherto said, that this testimony is not to be found in the Greek manuscripts. Epanorthotes,\* whom Lucas Brugensis describes to be an ancient, accurate, full, and industrious collator of manuscripts, found it wanting in all those he met with. *Epanorthotes*, saith Lucas, *desse hæc eadem Græcis libris, et antiquis Latinis annotat.* Nor have other collators made a further discovery

\* Habuimus ab Hunnæo, id quod maximi facimus, MS Bibl. correctorium ab incerto auctore, quem Epanorthotem, aut correctorem fere vocamus, magnâ diligentîâ ac fide contextum, secuto uti oportet antiquos nostræ editionis codices, eosque cum Hæbræis, Græcis, et veterum Patrum commentariis sedulo collatos ; qui liber ad Genesin viii. 7. latius a nobis descriptus est. *Hæc Lucas ; qui ad Genesin viii. 7. dixit hunc librum multis annis scriptum, et pluribus forte compositum. Dein, loco ex eo citato, pergit. Ad quæ dici quid possit ? An quod libro fidendum non sit ? Non hoc dicet, qui evolverit ; quæ namque a nostri seculi scriptoribus ex MSS codicibus collectæ sunt variæ lectiones, omnes propemodum in eo comperimus ; et ad fontes fideliter examinatasprehendimus. Scripsit hæc Lucas, anno 1579 ; unde sequitur correctorium ante disputationes Erasmicas de testibus in cælo elaboratum esse.*

to this day. Lee, Stunica, and the rest in England, Spain, Flanders, France, and Italy, who conspired against Erasmus, could find nothing in the manuscripts of those parts against him; if that Phœnix be excepted, which once appeared to somebody somewhere in England, but could never since be seen. Hesselius,\* about the year 1565, professor of divinity at Louvain, in his commentary on this place, ingeniously confesses it wanting in all the Greek manuscripts then known, except two, the one in Spain, the other in England; meaning those by which the Complutensian divines and Erasmus printed it. Which two we have shown to be none at all; unless one Annius dug up one in England. Since that time nothing further has been produced, besides the imaginary books of dreaming Beza. And yet I will not say, but that it may hereafter be found in some Greek copies. For in the times of the holy war, the Latins had much to do in the East. They were long united to the Greek church; they made Latin patriarchs of Jerusalem and Antioch; they reigned at Constantinople over the Greeks from the year

\* *Hesselius in hunc locum ait*; Manuscripti Græci fere omnes sic se habent; “Quoniam Tres sunt, qui testimonium dant in terrâ, spiritus, aqua, et sanguis, et hi Tres Unum sunt;” nullâ factâ mentione triplicis testimonii de cœlo “Patris, Verbi, et Spiritus Sancti.” *Dein codices aliter legentes describendo sic pergit*; Nostro tempore duo Græci codices manuscripti reperti sunt; unus in Angliâ, et alter in Hispaniâ; quorum uterque hoc loco testimonium habet “Patris, Verbi, et Spiritus Sancti.”

1204, for above fifty years together ; and during this their kingdom, in the year 1215, was assembled the Lateran council, consisting of four hundred and fifteen bishops, Greeks and Latins together ; and therein the testimony of “the Three in Heaven” was quoted out of some of the Latin manuscripts, as we told you above. All which might occasion some Greeks, as well as Latins, to note it in the margins of their books ; and hence insert it into the text in transcribing. For this is most certain, that some Greek manuscripts have been corrected by the Latin ones. Such a book Erasmus\* tells us, that he “once met with, and that there was such another in the Pope’s library.” He suspected also that book in England, out of which he printed the testimony of “the Three in Heaven,” to be of the same kind ; though I rather think it was none at all ; unless some falsary of that age were at the pains to transcribe one or two of St Paul’s Epistles. Such another book was one of those, out of which Valesius collected his various lections. Whence Mariana,

\* Hic obiter illud incidit admonendum esse Græcorum quosdam Novi Testamenti codices ad Latina exemplaria emendatos. Id factum est in fœdere Græcorum cum Romanâ ecclesiâ ; quod fœdus testatur Bulla, quæ dicitur Aurea ; visum est enim et hoc ad firmandam concordiam pertinere. Et nos olim in hujusmodi codicem incidimus ; et talis adhuc dicitur adseruari in Bibliothecâ Pontif. Verum ex his corrigere nostros est Lesbiam, ut aiunt, admoveere regulam. *Erasmus ad Lectorem. Editio 5ta Novi Testamenti.*

into whose hands the manuscript book of those lections fell, tells us, that for that reason, in his annotations on the New Testament, he used those lections but sparingly and cautiously. And that Valesius did meet with such a corrected manuscript, appears by the lections themselves. For in the Apocalypse xviii. 17. where the Greek reads ἐπὶ τόπον; and the Latin translates *in locum*, and by the error of one letter *in lacum*, as the books now have it; some Grecian has here corrected this book by the Latin, and written ἐπὶ λίμνην; as it is in the lections of Valesius, taken out of this. Again in the Apocalypse ix. 11. where the Latin translation, in expounding the names *Abaddon et Apollyon*, adds, *Et Latine habens nomen exterminans*; Valesius notes the reading in his Greek copy to be ρωμαῖσι ἔχων ὄνομα ἐξτερμινανς; which certainly is a translation of the Latin. Again, in the Apocalypse xxi. 12. where the Greek has ἀγγέλος, and some ancient Latin copies, *angelos*, but the far greater part of the Latin copies at present have *angulos*; Valesius, in his manuscript, reads γωνίας. So in the Apocalypse xix. 6. where the Greek is ὄχλος πολλοῦ; the Latin, *turbæ magnæ*, and in the later copies, *tubæ magnæ*; Valesius, in his manuscript, reads σάλπιγγος μεγάλης. In Hebrews xiii. 2. for ἔλαθον, *latuerunt*; and in later copies, *placuerunt*, Valesius reads ἤξεσαν; and in 1 Peter iii. 8. for τὸ δε σέλος. *in fine*, and by an error *in fide*, Valesius reads ἐν τῇ πίσει δέ. These, and such like instances, put

the thing out of dispute. Now, though Valesius found not the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" in this manuscript; and Erasmus tells us, that he never saw it in any Greek manuscript; and, by consequence, not in that corrected one which fell into his hands; yet it may have crept out of the Latin into some other books, not yet taken notice of; and even in some manuscripts, which, in other places, have not been corrected by the Latin, it may possibly have been inserted by some of the Greek bishops of the Lateran council, where the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" was read. And therefore he that shall hereafter meet with it in any book, ought first, before he insist upon the authority of that book, to examine whether it has not been corrected by the Latin; and whether it be ancients than the Lateran council, and empire of the Latins in Greece; for, if it be liable to either of these two exceptions, it can signify nothing to produce it.

XXXV. Having given you the history of the controversy, I shall now confirm all that I have said from the sense of the text itself. For, without the testimony of "the Three in Heaven," the sense is good and easy, as you may see by the following paraphrase inserted in the text in a different character.

"WHO IS HE THAT OVERCOMETH THE WORLD, BUT HE THAT BELIEVETH THAT JESUS IS THE SON OF GOD, that Son spoken of in the Psalms, where he saith, 'Thou art my Son; this day have I begot-

ten thee.' 'THIS IS HE THAT, after the Jews had long expected him, CAME, first in a mortal body, BY baptism of WATER, AND then in an immortal one by shedding his BLOOD upon the cross, and rising again from the dead ; NOT BY WATER ONLY, BUT BY WATER AND BLOOD ; being the Son of God, as well by his resurrection from the dead, Acts xiii. 33. as by his supernatural birth of the Virgin, Luke i, 35. AND IT IS THE SPIRIT also THAT, together with the water and blood, BEARETH WITNESS of the truth of his coming ; BECAUSE THE SPIRIT IS TRUTH ; and so a fit and unexceptionable witness. FOR THERE ARE THREE THAT BEAR RECORD of his coming ; THE SPIRIT, which he promised to send, and which was shed forth upon us in the form of cloven tongues, and in various gifts ; THE baptism of WATER, wherein God testified, 'This is my beloved Son ; AND THE shedding of his BLOOD, accompanied with his resurrection, whereby he became the most faithful martyr or witness of this truth. AND THESE THREE, the spirit, the baptism, and passion of Christ, AGREE IN witnessing ONE and the same thing, namely, that the Son of God is come, and, therefore, their evidence is strong ; for the law requires but two consenting witnesses, and here we have three. AND IF WE RECEIVE THE WITNESS OF MEN, THE threefold WITNESS OF GOD, which he bare of his Son, by declaring at his baptism, 'This is my beloved Son ;' by raising him from the dead, and by pouring out his

spirit on us, IS GREATER ; and therefore ought to be more readily received."

XXXVI. Thus is the sense plain and natural, and the argument full and strong ; but, if you insert the testimony of "the Three in heaven," you interrupt and spoil it. For the whole design of the apostle being here to prove to men by witness the truth of Christ's coming, I would ask how the testimony of "the Three in heaven" makes to this purpose. If their testimony be not given to men, how does it prove to them the truth of Christ's coming? If it be, how is the testimony in heaven distinguished from that on earth? It is the same spirit which witnesses in heaven and in earth. If in both cases it witnesses to us men, wherein lies the difference between its witnessing in heaven, and its witnessing in earth? If, in the first case, it does not witness to men, to whom doth it witness? And to what purpose? And how does its witnessing make to the design of St John's discourse? Let them make good sense of it, who are able. For my part, I can make none. If it be said that we are not to determine what is scripture, and what not, by our private judgments ; I confess it in places not controverted ; but in disputable places, I love to take up with what I can best understand. It is the temper of the hot and superstitious part of mankind, in matters of religion, ever to be fond of mysteries ; and for that reason, to like best what they understand least.



Such men may use the apostle John as they please ; but I have that honour for him, as to believe that he wrote good sense ; and therefore take that sense to be *his*, which is the best ; especially since I am defended in it by so great authority. For I have on my side the authority of the Fourth General Council, and, so far as I know, of all the churches in all ages, except the modern Latin, and such others as have lately been influenced by them ; and that also of all the old versions, and Greek manuscripts, and ancient Latin ones ; and nothing against me, but the authority of Jerome, and the credulity and heat of his followers.

For to tell us of other manuscripts, without ever letting us know in what libraries they were to be seen ; to pretend manuscripts, which, since their first discovery, could never be heard of ; nor were then seen by persons whose names and credit we know ; is plainly to impose on the learned world, and ought not to pass any longer for plain dealing. The Spaniards tell us plainly that they followed the Latin, and by the authority of Thomas left out the clause, “And these Three are One,” in the eighth verse, as inserted by the Arians. And yet St Ambrose, St Austin, Eucherius, and other Latins, in the Arian age, gathered the unity of the Deity from this clause ; and the omission of it is now, by printing it, acknowledged to be an erroneous correction. The manuscript in England wanted the same clause,

and therefore, if there was any such MS, it was a corrected one, like the Spanish edition, and the manuscript of Valesius. Erasmus, who printed the triple testimony in heaven by that English manuscript, never saw it; tells us it was a new one; suspected its sincerity; and accused it publicly in his writings on several occasions, for several years together; and yet his adversaries in England never answered his accusation; never endeavoured to satisfy him and the world about it; did not so much as let us know, where the record might be consulted for confuting him; but, on the contrary, when they had got the Trinity into his edition, threw by their manuscript, if they had one, as an almanac out of date. And can such shuffling dealings satisfy considering men? Let manuscripts at length be produced, and freely exposed to the sight of the learned world; but let such manuscripts be produced as are of authority; or else let it be confessed, that whilst Jerome pretended to correct the Latin by the Greek, the Latins have corrected both the Latin and the Greek by the sole authority of Jerome.

## SECTION II.

*On the Text concerning the Mystery of Godliness manifest in the Flesh.*

I. WHAT the Latins have done to the foregoing, the Greeks have done to that of St Paul, 1 Timothy iii. 16. For by changing  $\theta'$  into  $\Theta\epsilon$ , the abbreviation of  $\Theta\epsilon\delta\varsigma$ , they now read, "Great is the mystery of godliness; GOD manifested in the flesh." Whereas all the churches for the first four or five hundred years, and the authors of all the ancient versions, Jerome, as well as the rest, read, "Great is the mystery of godliness, which was manifested in the flesh." For this is the common reading of the Ethiopic, Syriac, and Latin versions to this day; Jerome's manuscripts having given him no occasion to correct the old vulgar Latin in this place. Grotius adds the Arabic, but the Egyptian Arabic version has  $\Theta\epsilon\delta\varsigma$ ; and so has the above mentioned Sclavonian version of Cyrillus; for these two versions were made long after the sixth century, wherein the corruption began. With the ancients versions agree the writers of the first five centuries, both Greeks and Latins. For they, in all their discourses to prove the Deity of the Son, never allege this text, that I can find, as they would all have done, and some of them frequently, had they read "God manifested in the flesh;" and therefore they read  $\theta'$ . Ter-

tullian *adversus Praxeam*, and Cyprian *adversus Judæos*, industriously cite all the places where Christ is called God, but have nothing of this. Alexander of Alexandria, Athanasius, the bishops of the council of Sardica, Epiphanius, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory Nyssen, Chrysostom, Cyril of Jerusalem, Cyril of Alexandria, Cassian, also Hilary, Lucifer, Jerome, Ambrose, Austin, Phœbadius, Victorinus Afer, Faustinus Diaconus, Pope Leo the Great, Arnobius Junior, Cerealis, Vigilus Tapsensis, Fulgentius, wrote all of them in the fourth and fifth centuries, for the deity of the Son, and incarnation of God; and some of them largely, and in several tracts; and yet I cannot find that they ever allege this text to prove it, excepting that Gregory Nyssen once urges it,\* if the passage crept not into him out of some marginal annotation. In all the times of the hot and lasting Arian controversy, it never came into play; though now those disputes are over, they that read "God manifested in the flesh," think it one of the most obvious and pertinent texts for the business.

II. The churches, therefore, of those ages were absolute strangers to this reading. For, on the contrary, their writers, as often as they have any occasion to cite the reading then in use, discover that it was *∅*. For though they cite it not to prove

\* Orat. xi. contra Eunom.

the deity of the Son, yet in their commentaries, and sometimes in other discourses, they produce it. And particularly Hilary, lib. 2. *de Trinitate*, and Ambrose, or whoever of his contemporaries was the author of the commentary on the Epistles, reads  $\frac{1}{2}$ ; and so doth St Austin in *Genesin ad literam*, lib. 5; and Beda in his commentary on this text, where he cites the reading of St Austin, and the author of the commentary on the Epistles, ascribed to Jerome. So also do Primasius and Sedulius in their commentaries on this text; and Victorinus Afer, lib. 1. *adversus Arium*; and Idacius Clarus, or rather Vigilus Tapsensis, lib. 3. *adversus Varimadum*, cap. 12; and Fulgentius, c. 2. *de Incarnatione*; and so did Pope Leo the Great, epist. 20. *ad Flavianum*; and Pope Gregory the Great, lib. 34. *Moral.* cap. 7. These ancient Latins all cite the text after this manner, "Great is the mystery of Godliness, which was manifested in the flesh;" as the Latin manuscripts of St Paul's Epistles generally have it to this day; and therefore it cannot be doubted, but that this hath been the constant public reading of the Latin churches from the beginning. So also one of the Arians in a homily, printed in Fulgentius's works, reads  $\frac{1}{2}$ , and interprets it of the Son of God, who was born of the Father *ante secula*; and of the Virgin, *in novissimo tempore*. And Fulgentius, in his answer to this homily, found no fault with the citation; but on the contrary, in his first book *ad Trasimundum*, cap.

6. seems to have read and understood the text after the same manner with other Latins.

III. Now, for the Greeks, I find indeed that they have changed the ancient reading of the text, not only in the manuscripts of St Paul's Epistles, but also in other authors; and yet there are still remaining sufficient instances among them of what the reading was at first. So in Chrysostom's commentary on this epistle, they have now gotten Θεός into the text; and yet by considering the commentary itself, I am satisfied that he read ὁ. For he neither in this commentary, nor any where else, infers the deity of Christ from this text; nor expounds it, as they do who read Θεός; but with the Latins, who read ὁ, understands by it Christ incarnate; or, as he expresses it, "Man made God, and God made Man;" and so leaves it at liberty to be taken for either God or man. And accordingly in one place of his commentary he saith, Ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκὶ ὁ δημιουργός. In another place; Ἄνθρωπος ὄφθη ἀναμάρτητος, ἄνθρωπος ἀναλήφθη, ἐκηρύχθη ἐν κόσμῳ, μεθ' ἡμῶν εἶδον αὐτὸν οἱ ἄγγελοι. *Man appeared without sin; Man was received up; Man was preached in the world; was seen amongst us by angels.* Instead of ὁ ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκὶ, εἰδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι, &c. he saith, *Man appeared without sin;* making *Man* the nominative case to these and all the verbs which follow; which certainly he would not have done, had Θεός been their nominative case expressly in the text. He might properly put man

for ὁ, but not for Θεός. Neither could he have put ἀναμάρτητος for ἐδικαιώθη, if he had read in his text Θεός ἐδικαιώθη. For what man of common sense would say, that God was made sinless in and through the spirit? But what I have said of Chrysostom will be more evident, when I shall have shown you how afterwards, in the time of the Nestorian controversy, all parties read ὁ or ὁς, without any dispute raised about the reading; and how the Greeks have since corrupted the text in Cyril's writings, and changed ὁ and ὁς into Θεός, as they have done in Chrysostom's.

IV. And, first, that the Nestorians read ὁ is evident by some fragments of the orations or homilies of Nestorius, sent by him to the Pope, and cited by Arnobius Junior, in the second book of his conflict with Serapion. For there, in order to show what was the opinion of Nestorius, and how he defended it, he cites two of his orations in these words; *Non peperit sanctissima Maria Deitatem; nam quod natum est de carne, caro est. Non peperit creatura Creatorem; sed peperit hominem Deitatis ministrum. Non ædificavit Deum, Verbum, Spiritus Sanctus; quod ex ipsâ natum est, de Spiritu Sancto est. Deo itaque virgo templum ex virgine ædificavit. Et paulo post; Qui per se natus est Deus in utero (scilicet ante Luciphorum) Deus est. Et paulo post; Θεοτόκος formam in Deo honoramus. Et in aliâ prædicatione; Spiritum divina separat natura, qui humanitatem ejus creavit. Quicquid ex Mariâ natum est, de Spiritu*

*Sancto est, qui et secundum justitiam replevit, quod creatum est; hoc quod manifestatum est in carne, justificatum est in Spiritu.* Which last words in the language wherein Nestorius wrote those homilies, are, ὁ ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι.

V. Here you see that Nestorius reads ὁ expressly; not only so, but absolutely excludes God from being understood by it; arguing, that the Virgin was not θεοτόκος because that thing which was manifested in the flesh, was justified in the spirit; or, as he expounds it, replenished by the spirit in righteousness, and calling that thing which was manifested in the flesh, a creature; *Spiritus*, saith he, *secundum justitiam replevit [hoc] quod creatum est; [nempe] hoc quod manifestatum est in carne, justificatum est in Spiritu.*

VI. And now, whilst he read the text after this manner, and urged it thus against the deity of Christ, one would suspect, that if this had not been the received public reading in the Greek churches, his adversaries would have fallen foul upon him, and exclaimed against him for falsifying the text, and blasphemously saying it was a created thing, which the Scripture calls “God manifested in the flesh.” And such an accusation as this would surely have made as great a noise as any thing else in the controversy; and yet I meet with nothing of this kind in history. His adversaries do not so much as tell him, that Θεός was in the text. They were so far



from raising any controversy about the reading, that they do not in the least correct him for it; but on the contrary they themselves, in their answers to his writings, read  $\beta$ , as he did; and only laboured by various disputations to put another sense upon the text, as I find by Cassian and Cyril, the two principal who at that time wrote against him.

VII. John Cassian was Chrysostom's scholar, and his deacon and legate to the Pope; and after the banishment of Chrysostom, retired from Constantinople into Syria and Egypt, where he lived a monkish life for some time, and then ended his days in France. At that time, therefore, when Nestorius, who was patriarch of Constantinople, broached his opinion, and Cyril, the patriarch of Alexandria, opposed him; Nestorius sent a legacy to Rome with copies of his orations, to let the Pope understand the controversy; and thereupon Leo the Great, who was then archdeacon of the Church of Rome, and afterwards Pope, put Cassian, then in France, upon writing this book, *De Incarnatione Domini*, against Nestorius. He wrote it therefore, in the year 430, as Baronius also reckons. For he wrote it before the condemnation of Nestorius in the council of Ephesus, as appears by the book itself. This book is now extant only in Latin; but, considering that his design in writing was to stir up the Greek church against Nestorius, and that for the making great impression upon them, he quotes Greek Fathers at

the end of his book, and concludes with an exhortation to the citizens of Constantinople, telling them, that what he wrote he had received from his master Chrysostom; I am satisfied that he wrote it originally in Greek. His other books were in both languages. For Photius saw them in eloquent Greek; and it is more likely that they had their author's eloquent language from their author, and the Latin from one of the Latins where he lived; than that the contrary should be true. Now in this treatise,\* when he comes to consider the passage of Nestorius about this text, of which we gave you an account above out of Arnobius, he returns this answer to it; *Jam primum enim hoc quod ais, Nestori, quia justitiâ repleverit, quod creatum est; et hoc apostolico vis testimonio comprobare, quod dicat, apparuit in carne; justificatus est in Spiritu; utrumque falso sensu et furioso Spiritu loqueris. Quia et hoc, quod a Spiritu vis eum repletum esse justitiâ, ideo ponis, ut ostendas ejus vacuitatem, cui præstitam esse asseras justitiæ adimpletionem. Et hoc, quod super hâc re apostolico testimonio uteris, divini testimonii ordinem rationemque furaris. Non enim ita ab apostolo positum est, ut tu id truncatum vitiatumque posuisti. Quid enim apostolus ait? Et manifeste magnum est pietatis sacramentum, quod manifestatum est in carne, justificatum est in Spiritu. Vides ergo, quod mysterium pietatis, vel sacramentum justificatum apos-*

\* Libro septimo, cap. 18.

*tolus prædicavit.* Thus far Cassian is not only reading  $\zeta$ , but confuting Nestorius by that reading. For whereas Nestorius said it was a creature which was justified, Cassian tells him, that if he had read the whole text, he would have found that it was “the mystery of godliness.” *Vides ergo, saith he, quod mysterium pietatis justificatum apostolus prædicavit.* He does not say, *Deum justificatum apostolus prædicavit* (as he certainly would have done, had that been in his Bible,) but *mysterium*; and so makes *mysterium*, or, which is all one, its relative *quod*, the nominative case to the verbs which follow. In another part of this treatise, lib. 5. cap. 12. Cassian cites and interprets the text as follows; *Et manifeste magnum est pietatis sacramentum, quod manifestatum est in carne, &c. Quod ergo magnum est illud sacramentum, quod manifestatum est in carne? Deus scilicet natus in carne, Deus visus in corpore, qui utique sicut palam est manifestatus in carne, ita palam est assumptus in gloriâ.* So you see Nestorius and Cassian agree in reading  $\zeta$ , but differ in interpreting it; the one restraining it to a creature, by reason of its being justified; the other restraining it to God, by reason of its being a great mystery, and assumed in glory.

VIII. In like manner Cyril, the grand adversary of Nestorius, in his three books *De Fide ad Imperatorem et Reginas*, written against him in the beginning of that controversy, did not reprehend

him, as if he had cited the text falsely, but only complained of his misinterpreting it; telling him, that he did not understand the great mystery of godliness, and that it was not a created thing, as he thought, but the Word or Son of God; and arguing for this interpretation from the circumstances of the text. And, first, in his book *De Fide ad Imperatorem*, sect. 7. he has this passage; Πλανᾶσθε, μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφάς· μήτε μὲν τὸ μέγα τῆς εὐσεβείας μυσῆριον, τετέσι Χριστὸν, ὅς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι, &c. *Ye err*, saith he, *not knowing the Scriptures, nor the great mystery of godliness, that is Christ; who was manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit.* By this citation it is plain that he read ὅς, using one of these MSS which, by understanding Χριστὸν for μυσῆριον, turned εἰ into ὅς; and, by way of interpretation, inserting τετέσι Χριστὸν, which in those MSS was to be understood; unless you will say that he turns Θεὸς in ὅς, which is very hard. For had Θεὸς been in this text, he would not have said μυσῆριον, τετέσι Χριστὸν, ὅς ἐφανερώθη; but μυσῆριον, Θεὸς, τετέσι Χριστὸς ἐφανερώθη; putting Χριστὸς, not for μυσῆριον, but for Θεὸς. For Χριστὸς, and Θεὸς are more plainly equipollent than Χριστὸς and μυσῆριον. And making Χριστὸς and μυσῆριον equipollent, he makes μυσῆριον the nominative case to ἐφανερώθη; and therefore read them joined in this text by the article ὁ. Had he read Θεὸς, he would never have left out that authentic and demonstrative word, and by way of interpretation for μυσῆριον Θεὸς, written Χριστὸν ὅς. For this

was not to argue against Nestorius, but to spoil the argument which lay before him. Neither would he have gone on, as he does, within a few lines, to recite the same text, putting λόγος by way of interpretation for μυστήριον; and after to propound it as his bare opinion, that the Word or the Son of God was here to be understood by this mystery, and to dispute for this his opinion, as needing proof out of other texts of scripture, as he does after this manner; \* *Moreover, saith he, in my opinion, that mystery of godliness is nothing else than he who came to us from God the Father; the Word, who was manifested in the flesh. For in taking the form of a servant, he was born of the holy God-bearing Virgin, &c.* And then after many other things he at length in sect. 23 and 24, concludes, that “this divine mystery is above our understanding; and that the only-begotten, who is God, and, according to the Scriptures, the Lord of all things, appeared to us, was seen on earth, and became a man.” This he makes not the text itself, but the interpretation thereof; and from the preceding disputation, concludes it to be genuine.

IX. Again, in the first of his two treatises, *De Fide ad Reginas*, near the end, he cites the text, and argues thus against the interpretation of Nesto-

\* "Εἶη γὰρ ἂν οὐχ ἕτερον οἶμαι τι τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον, ἢ αὐτὸς ἡμῖν ὁ ἐκ Θεοῦ πατρὸς λόγος, ὃς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί. Γεγένηται γὰρ διὰ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου καὶ θεοτόκου, μορφὴν δούλου λαβών. *Cyril. de Fide ad Imperatorem, Sect. 8.*

rius. "Who is he," saith he, "that is manifested in the flesh? Is it not fully evident, that it is no other than the Word of God the Father? For so will that be a great mystery of godliness (which was\* manifested in the flesh); he was seen of angels, ascending into heaven; he was preached to the Gentiles by the holy Apostles; he was believed on in the world; but this not as a mere man; but as God born in the flesh, and after our manner."

X. So also in his second book, *De Fide ad Reginas*,† he cites the place again; and then argues upon it against the opinion of Nestorius after this manner; "If the word, being God, is said to become a man, and yet continue what he was before, without losing his deity, the mystery of godliness is without doubt a very great one; but if Christ be a mere man, joined with God only in the parity of dignity and power, (for this is maintained by some unlearned men,) how is he manifested in the flesh? Is it not plain, that every man is in the flesh, and cannot otherwise be seen by any body; how then was he said to be seen of the holy angels? For do they not also see us? What was there therefore new or extraordinary in Christ, if the angels saw him such a man as we are, and nothing more, &c." Thus Cyril goes on to give his reasons why that which was manifested in the flesh, was not a mere created

\* Codex Græcus hoc loco jam legit ΘC pro ο; sensu perturbato.

† Section 33.

man, as Nestorius interpreted, but the eternal Word, or Son of God; all which would have been very superfluous and impertinent, if God had then been expressly in the text.

XI. Seeing therefore Nestorius alleged the text to prove, that it was a created thing which was manifested in the flesh; and Cyril, in confuting him, did not answer that it was God expressly in the text, nor raise any debate about the reading, but only put another interpretation upon the text than Nestorius had done; arguing with Cassian, that in the text it was not a mere man, as Nestorius contended, but a great mystery of godliness; and by consequence Christ, or God the Son, which was manifested in the flesh; and labouring by divers other arguments to prove this interpretation, it is evident beyond all cavil, that Cyril was a stranger to Θεός, now got into the text; and read ὁς or ὁ, as Nestorius and Cassian did.

XII And all this is further confirmed by Photius, who, in his commentary on the Epistles not yet published, relates that Cyril, in the 12th chapter of his Scholiums, read ὁς ἐφανερώθη, &c. and consonant to this reading is Cyril's commentary upon the text in his explanation of the second of the twelve Anathematisms, where he puts the question, *Quid est igitur quod dicit, Apparuit in carne?* And explains it by saying, *Hoc est, Dei patris verbum caro factum est*, and concludes, that it is hence that we call him God and Man. Whereas had Θεός been in the

text, it would have needed no interpretation; nor would he have put  $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$  for  $\Theta\epsilon\delta\epsilon$ , in order to prove that God was manifested in the flesh. And yet in his books *ad Reginas*, and in other writings, wherever he quotes this text, the Greeks have since corrected it by their corrected manuscripts of St Paul's Epistles, and written  $\Theta\epsilon\delta\varsigma$  instead of  $\delta'$ ; whence, if you would truly understand the Nestorian history, you must read  $\delta'$  or  $\delta'$ , for  $\Theta\epsilon\delta\epsilon$  in all Cyril's citations of this text.

XIII. Now, whilst Cyril read  $\delta'$  or  $\delta'\varsigma$ , and in the explanation of the twelve chapters, or articles, quoted this text in the second article; and this explanation was recited by him in the council of Ephesus, and approved by the council,\* with an anathema at the end of every article; it is manifest that this council allowed the reading  $\delta'\varsigma$  or  $\delta'$ ; and by consequence that  $\delta'\varsigma$  or  $\delta'$  was the authentic and public uncontroverted reading till after the times of this council. For if Nestorius and Cyril, the patriarchs of Constantinople and Alexandria, and the heads of the two parties in this controversy, read  $\delta'\varsigma$  or  $\delta'$ ; and their writings went about amongst the eastern churches, and were canvassed by the bishops and clergy without any dispute raised about the reading; and if Cyril read  $\delta'\varsigma$  by the approbation of the council itself; I think that the conclusion we make of its being then the general uncontroverted reading, must needs be granted us. And if the authority of one of the

\* Concil. Ephes. par. iii. sub initio.



first four general councils make any thing for the truth of the reading, we have that into the bargain.

XIV. Yet whilst the Nestorian controversy brought the text into play, and the two parties ran the interpretation into extremes, the one disputing that *ὁ* or *ὁς* was a creature; the other that it was the Word of God; the prevalence of the latter party made it pass for the orthodox opinion, that *ὁ* or *ὁς* was God; and so gave occasion to the Greeks henceforward to change the language of *Christ* into that of *God*; and say, in their expositions of the text, that God was manifested in the flesh, as I find Thodoret doth, and at length to write God in the text itself; the easy change of *ο* or *οc* into *οc*, inviting them to do it; and, if this was become the orthodox authentic reading, to set right the text in Chrysostom, Cyril, Theodoret, and wherever else they found it, in their opinion, corrupted by heretics.

XV. And the man that first began thus to alter the sacred text, was Macedonius, the patriarch of Constantinople, in the beginning of the sixth century. For the Emperor Anastasius banished him for corrupting it. At that time, the Greek church had been long divided about the council of Chalcedon. Many who allowed the condemnation of Eutyches, rejected the council; by reason of its decreeing, by the influence of the bishop of Rome's letter against Eutyches, that Christ subsisted not only *ex duabus naturis*, which Eutyches allowed, but also *in duabus*

*naturis* ; which language was new to the Greeks, and by a great part of that church taken for Nestorianism. For they understood, that as the body and soul made the nature of man, so God and man made the nature of Christ ; assigning the nature to the person of Christ, as well as to all other things, and not considering that in all compounds the several parts have also their several natures. Hence each party endeavoured to render the other suspected of heresy ; as if they that were for the council secretly favoured the Nestorians, and they that were against it, the Eutychians. For one party, in maintaining two distinct natures in Christ, were thought to deny the nature of one person with Nestorius ; and the other party, in opposing two distinct natures in him, were thought to deny the truth of one of the natures with Eutyches. Both parties, therefore, to clear themselves of those imputations, anathematised both those heresies ; and therefore whilst they thus differed in their modes of speaking, they agreed in their sense, as Evagrius well observes. But the bishops of Rome and Alexandria being engaged against one another, and for a long time distracting the East by these disputes ; at length the Emperor Zeno, to quiet his empire, and perhaps to secure it from the encroachment of the bishop of Rome, who, by this verbal contest,\* aspired to the name and authority of universal bishop, sent about an

\* Vide Baronium, anno 451 ; sect. 149, 150, 151.

*henoticum*, or pacificatory decree ; wherein he anathematised both Nestorius and Eutyches with their followers on the one hand, and abrogated the Pope's letter and the council on the other ; and his successor, Anastasius, for the same end, laboured to have this decree signed by all the bishops. And Macedonius at first subscribed it ; but afterwards heading those who stood up for the council,\* was, for corrupting the Scriptures in favour of his opinion, and such other things as were laid to his charge, deposed and banished, ann. C. 512.† But his own party, which at length prevailed, defended him, as if oppressed by calumnies ; and so received that reading for genuine, which he had put about among them. For how ready are all parties to receive what they reckon on their side, Jerome well knew, when he recommended the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" by its usefulness ; and we have a notable instance of it in the last age, when the churches, both eastern and western, received this testimony in a moment into their Greek testaments, and still continue with great zeal and passion to defend it for the ancient reading, against the authority of all the Greek manuscripts.

XVI. But now I have told you the original of the

\* Evagrius, lib. iii. cap. xxi. 44.—Theodorus Lector, lib. ii. and Marcellini Chronicon.

† Flavian was banished in the year of Antioch 561, as Evagrius notes ; and Macedonius was banished the same year, or the year before.

corruption, I must tell you my author; and he is Liberatus, archdeacon of the church of Carthage, who lived in that very age. For in his Breviary, which he wrote in the year 535, or soon after, and collected, as he saith in his preface, out of Greek records, he delivers it in these words; \* *Hoc tempore Macedonius Constantinopolitanus episcopus ab imperatore Anastasio dicitur expulsus, tanquam evangelia falsaret; et maxime illud apostoli dictum, Quia apparuit in carne, justificatum in spiritu. Hunc enim mutassc, ubi habet qui.....hoc est.....monosyllabum Græcum, literâ mutâtâ in.....vertisse et fecisse....id est, ut esset Deus, apparuit per carnem. Tanquam Nestorianus ergo culpatus expellitur per severum Monachum.* † The Greek letters here omitted are, in the second edition of Sunius, and in those of the councils, thus inserted; *Ubi habet ε̄ς, hoc est qui, monosyllabum Græcum, literâ mutâtâ ο̄ in ω, vertisse et fecisse ω̄ς; id est, ut esset, Deus apparuit per carnem.* But this interpolation was surely made by conjecture; for if Θε̄ος was in the sacred text before the corruption, then ε̄ς or ε̄ was not in, and so could not be changed into ω̄ς; but if Θε̄ος was not in, it could not be brought in by this change. The interpolation therefore is inconsistent and spurious, and seems to have been occasioned by straining to make out Nestorianism here; the scribes for that end, ‡ refer-

\* Liberati Brev. cap. xix. † Vide Baronii Annal. 510. sect. 9.

‡ N. B. In Hinemari opusc. xxxiii. cap. 22. the words *ut esset*.

ring the words *ut esset* to the sacred text ; and then the interpolator writing *ús* for *ut*. Whereas they should have referred *ut esset* to the words of Liberatus, thus distinguished from the sacred text ; *Id est, ut esset, Deus apparuit per carnem*. I had rather, therefore, wave the conjecture of this interpolator, and fill up the *lacunæ* by the authority of an ancient author, Hincmarus ; who above eight hundred years ago\* related the fact out of Liberatus after this manner ; *Quidam ipsas Scripturas verbis illicitis imposturaverunt ; sicut Macedonius Constantinopolitanus episcopus, qui ab Anastasio Imperatore, ideo a civitate expulsus legitur, quoniam falsavit evangelia ; et illum apostoli locum, quod apparuit in carne, justificatum est in spiritu ; per cognationem Græcarum literarum O et Θ hoc modo mutando falsavit. Ubi enim habuit, qui, hoc est OC, monosyllabum Græcum, literâ mutâtâ O in Θ, mutavit, et fecit ΘC, id est, ut esset, Deus apparuit per carnem ; quapropter tanquam Nestorianus fuit expulsus* He was banished therefore for changing the ancient reading (which in some MSS was OC, as these authors have it, and in others O) into ΘC. But whereas he is here represented are in like manner referred to the sacred text ; and somebody, to make out the sense, has in their stead added *ut appareret* to the words of Liberatus, and written *ut appareret, ut esset Deus, &c.* But the words *ut appareret* not being in Liberatus, must be struck out, and supplied by setting the comma after *ut esset*, to part these words from the sacred text

\* Hincmari opuscul. artic. xxxiii. cap. 18.

a Nestorian, for doing this, the meaning is, that he was banished for corrupting the text in favour of the doctrine of two natures in Christ ; which his enemies accounted Nestorianism, though it was not really so. Nestorius held only a human nature in Christ ; and that God, *the Word*, dwelt in this nature, as the spirit in a holy man ; and therefore interpreted *of* the human nature. This doctrine Macedonius anthematised, and maintained two natures in Christ ; and, for proving this, corrupted the text, and made it *God manifested in the flesh*. This distinguishing Christ into two natures was, by the enemies of Macedonius, accounted Nestorianism in another language ; and in this respect the historian saith, that they banished him as a Nestorian for corrupting the text, though he was not really of that opinion.

XVII. But whilst he is said to be banished as a Nestorian for this, without explaining what is here meant by a Nestorian, it looks like a trickish way of speaking, used by his friends to ridicule the proceedings against him as inconsistent ; perhaps to invert the crime of falsation ; as if a Nestorian would rather change  $\ominus c$  into  $\circ$ . For they that read history with judgment, will too often meet with such trickish reports ; and even in the very story of Macedonius, I meet with some other reports of the same kind. For Macedonius having in his keeping the original acts of the council of Chalcedon, signed by that emperor under whom it was called, and

refusing to deliver up this book to the emperor Anastasius ; some, to make this emperor perjured, distorted the story ; as if, at his coming to the crown, he had promised under his hand and oath, that he would not act against the council of Chalcedon ; and represented his subscribed promise to be the book, which Macedonius refused to deliver back to him. Macedonius had got his bishopric by being against the council of Chalcedon, and had subscribed the *henoticum*\* of Zeno, in which that council was anathematised ; and this being objected against him, his friends, to stifle the accusation, make a contrary story of the emperor ; as if, when he came to the crown, he had done as much as that in behalf of the council. Another report was,† “ That the people of Alexandria and all Egypt, great and small, bond and free, priests and monks, excepting only strangers, became about this time possessed with evil spirits, and being deprived of human speech, barked day and night like dogs ; so that they were afterwards bound with iron chains, and drawn to the church, that they might recover their health. For they all ate their hands and arms. And then an angel appeared to some of the people, saying, that this happened to them because they anathematised the council of Chalcedon, and threatened, that they should do so no more.” Again, we are told in his-

\* Vide Annotationes Valesii in Evagr. &c. lib. iii. cap. 31.

† Victor Tununensis in Chronico.

tory,\* “That the adversaries of Macedonius produced certain boys in judgment to accuse both him and themselves of sodomy; but that when they found that his genitals were cut off, they betook themselves to other arts for deposing him.” Now if you can believe that a eunuch had the beard and voice of another man; and that in a solemn council the great patriarch of the East was thus accused and thus acquitted, and yet deposed; you must acknowledge, that there were many bishops among the Greeks who would not stick at as ill and shameless things, as corrupting the Scriptures. But if all this be a sham invented to discredit the council, the need of such shams, adds credit to their proceedings in condemning him for a falsary.

XVIII. This council, if I mistake not, sat first at Constantinople, being that council which Theodorus calls “a company of mercenary wretches;” and Nicephorus, “a convention of heretics, assembled against Macedonius.” Upon their adding to the † “thrice holy” these words, “who art crucified for us” the people fell into a tumult; and afterwards, when Macedonius came to be accused, they fell into a greater tumult, crying out, “The time of persecution is at hand; let no man desert the father;” meaning Macedonius. In this tumult, which was said

\* Evagrius, lib. iii. cap. 32.

† Theodor. lib. ii.—Nicephor. lib. xvi. cap. 26 —Evagr. lib. iii. cap. 44.



to be stirred up by the clergy of Constantinople, many parts of the city were burnt, and the nobles and emperor brought into the greatest danger; insomuch that the emperor was forced to proffer the resignation of his empire, before he could quiet the multitude. Then seeing that, if Macedonius were judged, the people would defend him, he caused him to be carried by force in the night to Chalcedon; and thence into banishment, as Theodorus writes. Whence I gather, that the council removed also to Chalcedon to avoid the tumult, and finish their proceedings there. For the story of his being accused in judgment by boys, Nicephorus places after this tumult; and all agree that he was condemned; and the monks of Palestine, in an epistle recorded by Evagrius, say that Xenaias and Dioscorus, joined with many bishops, banished him. When his condemnation was sent him, signed by the emperor, he asked, whether they that had condemned him, received the council of Chalcedon; and when they that brought him the sentence denied it, he replied, "If Arians and Macedonians had sent me a book of condemnation, could I receive it?" So that it seems he stood upon the illegality of the council. The next day one Timothy was made bishop of Constantinople, and he sent about the condemnation of Macedonius to all the absent bishops to be subscribed.\* Whence I think it will easily be granted, that he

\* Theophanes, p. 135.

was condemned as a falsary by the greatest part of the eastern empire; and by consequence, that the genuine reading was till then, by the churches of that empire, accounted  $\delta$ . For had not the public reading then been  $\delta$ , there could have been no colour for pretending that he changed it into  $\Theta$ c.

XIX. About six years after, Anastasius died, and his successors, Justin and Justinian, set up the authority of the council of Chalcedon again, together with that of the Pope over the eastern churches, as universal bishop; and from that time the friends of Macedonius prevailing, it is probable, that in opposition to the heretics, which condemned him, and for promoting and establishing the doctrine of two natures in Christ, they received and spread abroad the reading  $\Theta$ c. But as for the authority of the Pope, that fell again with Rome in the Gothic wars, and slept till Phocas revived it.

XX. I told you of several shams put about by the friends of Macedonius, to discredit the proceedings of the council against him. There is one which notably confirms what has hitherto been said, and makes it plain that his friends received his corruptions as genuine scripture. For whereas Macedonius was banished for corrupting the New Testament, his friends retorted the crime upon the council, as if they had taken upon them, under colour of purging the Scriptures from the corruptions of Macedonius, to correct in them whatever they thought the Apostles, as un-

skilful men and idiots, had written amiss. For this I gather from an ironical report of this kind put about in the West, and thus recorded by Victor Tununensis. *Messalâ V. C. consulibus, Constantinopoli, jubente Anastasio Imperatore, sancta Evangelia, tanquam ab idiotis composita, reprehenduntur et emendantur*; that is, “In the consulship of Messala, the holy Gospels, by the command of the emperor Anastasius, were censured and corrected at Constantinople; as if written by Evangelists that were idiots.” Here Victor errs in the year. For Messala was consul anno Christi 506, that is, six years before the banishment of Macedonius. But Victor is very uncertain in dates of the years; for he places the banishment of Macedonius in the consulship of Avienus 502; and the abovementioned tumult about the *Trisagium* in the consulship of Probus, anno Christi 513; whereas all these things happened in the same year. For it is plain by this chronicle, that the Scriptures were examined and corrected about this time by a council at Constantinople, by the order of Anastasius; and I meet with no other council to which this character can agree, besides that which deposed Macedonius. Now that they should censure and correct the Gospels, as if written by idiots, is too plainly ironical to be true history; and therefore it must be an abusive report, invented and put about to ridicule and shame the council, and to propagate the corruptions of Mace-

donius as the genuine apostolic reading of the Scriptures, which the council had rashly corrected.

XXI. So then the falsation was set on foot in the beginning of the fifth century, and is now of about twelve hundred years standing; and therefore since it lay but in a letter, and so was more easily spread abroad in the Greek manuscripts than the testimony of "the Three in Heaven" in the Latin ones; we need not wonder if the old reading be scarce to be met with in any Greek manuscripts now extant; and yet it is in some.

XXII. For though Beza tells us, that all the Greek manuscripts read  $\Theta\epsilon\delta\varsigma$ ; yet I must tell Beza's readers, that all his manuscripts read  $\delta$ . For he had no other manuscripts of the Epistles besides the Claromontan; and in this manuscript, as Morinus by ocular inspection has since informed us, the ancient reading was  $\delta$ ;\* but yet in another hand, and with other ink, the letter  $\Theta$  has been written out of the line; and the letter  $O$ , thickened† to make

\* Aliâ manu et atramento, extra lineæ seriem, addita est litera  $\Theta$ , et ambesa paululum  $O$ , ut appareret sigma. Sed præpostera emendatio facile conspicitur. *Hæc Morinus in Exercitationibus Biblicis, Lib. i. Exercitat. ii. cap. 4.*—At Beza nobis aliqua invidit, ut ex ejus epistolâ ad Academiam Cantabrigiensem a Waltono editâ liquet; ubi variantes aliquas lectiones celandas esse admonet.

†["Thickened." Such is the reading in the defective edition of 1754, as well as in the late edition of the entire essay from which the present is reprinted; but the sense of the passage implies, what is expressed by "ambesa paululum" in the preceding note, a *partial erasure* of the letter  $O$ . ED.]

a C, appears; which instance shows sufficiently by whom the ancient reading has been changed. Vallesius also read  $\psi$  in one of the Spanish manuscripts; and so did the author of the Oxford edition of the New Testament, anno Christi 1675, in the manuscript of Lincoln College Library, which is the oldest of the Oxford manuscripts. The Alexandrian MS\* and one of Colbert's, and Cyril, c. 12. Scholiorum, (teste Photio MS com. in Epist.) read  $\Theta\sigma$ . So then there are some ancient Greek manuscripts which read  $\psi$ , and others  $\psi\varsigma$ ; but I do not hear of any Latin ones, either ancient or modern, which read  $\Theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ .

XXIII. And besides to read  $\Theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$  makes the sense obscure and difficult. For how can it properly be said, "that God was justified in the spirit?" But

\* Alio atramento jam ducta cernitur tam lineola per medium literæ O, quam virgula superna; ut jam legatur  $\overline{\Theta\sigma}$ . Putat autem Millius, lineolas illas olim tenues fuisse et prope evanidas, et novo dein atramento incrassatas fuisse; eo quod perlustrato attentius loco, lineolæ per medium  $\Theta$  ductæ, quæ primam aciem fugerat, ductus quosdam ac vestigia satis certa deprehendere visus esset; præsertim ad partem sinistram, quæ peripheriam literæ pertingit; luculentiora multo habiturus nisi obstante liturâ quam dixit hodiernâ lineolæ ipsi superinductâ. Verum si lineola antiquitus tam conspicua esset, ut usque nunc per medium lineæ crassioris, alio atramento superinductæ, cerni possit; quid opus esset, ut a lineâ illâ superinductâ incrassaretur. Sin olim tam evanida esset, ut cerni vix posset; mirum est, quod ejus ductus et vestigia satis certa, per medium literæ illius superinductæ, etiamnum appareant. Doceant verba evanida aliis in locis atramento novo incrassata fuisse, vel fateantur  $\overline{\Theta\sigma}$  hic mutatum in  $\Theta\sigma$ .

to read  $\vartheta$ , and interpret it of Christ, as the ancient Christians did, without restraining it to his divinity, makes the sense very easy. For the promised and long expected Messias, the hope of Israel, is to us "the great mystery of godliness." And this mystery was at length manifested to the Jews from the time of his baptism, and justified to be the person whom they expected.

XXIV. I have now given you an account of the corruption of the text, the sum of which is this; the difference between the Greek and the ancient versions puts it past dispute, that either the Greeks have corrupted their MSS, or the Latins, Syrians, and Ethiopians, their versions; and it is more reasonable to lay the fault upon the Greeks than upon the other three, for these considerations. It was easier for one nation to do it than for three to conspire. It was easier to change a letter or two in the Greek, than six words in the Latin. In the Greek, the sense is obscure; in the versions, clear. It was agreeable to the interest of the Greeks, to make the change, but against the interest of other nations to do it; and men are never false to their interest. The Greek reading was unknown in the times of the Arian controversy; but that of the versions then in use amongst both Greeks and Latins. Some Greek MSS render the Greek reading dubious; but those of the versions hitherto collated agree. There are no signs of corruption in the versions, hitherto dis-

covered ; but in the Greek we have shewed you particularly when, on what occasion, and by whom, the text was corrupted.

XXV. I know not whether it be worth the while to tell you, that in the printed works of Athanasius, there is an epistle *De incarnatione verbi*, which reads  $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ . For this epistle relates to the Nestorian heresy, and so was written by a much later author than Athanasius, and may also possibly have been since corrected, like the works of Chrysostom and Cyril, by the corrected texts of St John's Epistles. I have had so short a time to run my eye over authors, that I cannot tell whether, upon further search, more passages about this falsation may not hereafter occur pertinent to the argument. But if there should, I presume it will not be difficult, now the falsation is thus far laid open, to know what construction to put upon them, and how to apply them.

XXVI. You see what freedom I have used in this discourse, and I hope you will interpret it candidly. For if the ancient churches, in debating and deciding the greatest mysteries of religion, knew nothing of these two texts, I understand not, why we should be so fond of them now the debates are over. And whilst it is the character of an honest man to be pleased, and of a man of interest to be troubled at the detection of frauds, and of both to run most into those passions when the detection is made plainest ;

I hope this letter will, to one of your integrity, prove so much the more acceptable, as it makes a further discovery than you have hitherto met with in commentators.



**BUTLER'S**

**HISTORICAL OUTLINE.**



HISTORICAL OUTLINE  
OF THE CONTROVERSY RESPECTING THE TEXT  
OF THE  
THREE HEAVENLY WITNESSES.

BY CHARLES BUTLER OF LINCOLN'S INN.

---

[The following comparative view of the arguments, which have been advanced on both sides in discussing the genuineness of 1 John, v. 7. is taken from the Appendix to Butler's *Horæ Biblicæ*. As coming from a Roman Catholic and a Trinitarian, this article must be supposed to be free from any bias on the part of the writer against the genuineness of the text. He seems, indeed, to have reviewed the subject with great impartiality, and to have given as accurate an outline of the controversy through the several stages of its progress, as the limits he prescribed to himself would admit. If in some instances he is too brief for perspicuity, he has on the whole contrived to embrace the most important points of the discussion within a smaller compass than any other writer.]

THE genuineness of the verse of the Three Heavenly Witnesses, or 1 John v. 7. has engaged much of

the attention of the learned during the three last centuries ; so that, as Mr. Herbert Marsh observes, "there is hardly a library in all Europe, from the Vatican to the Bodleian, from Madrid to Moscow, in which the manuscripts of the Greek Testament have not been examined, in order to determine, whether it really proceeded from the pen of St John ;" and, as Mr Travis observes, "there are few subjects, in the walks of philology or criticism, in which, one simple question, as it appears on a distant view, expands itself, on a nearer approach, into so many complicated branches, and covers so large a field of historical and theological criticism."

The following sheets may be found to contain, I. Some account of the state of the question ; II. Of the history of the general admission of The Verse into the printed text ; III. And of the principal disputes to which it has given rise ; IV. An inquiry whether the general sense of the text is affected by the omission of The Verse ; V. Some account of the argument in favour of its authenticity from prescription ; VI. Some account of the arguments against it from its absence from the Greek manuscripts ; VII. Of the answers to those arguments, from its supposed existence in the manuscripts of Valla ; VIII. From its supposed existence in the manuscripts of the Complutensian editors ; IX. And from its supposed existence in the manuscripts used by Robert Stephens ; X. Some observations on the

argument arising on its not being inserted in the Apostolos or Collection of Epistles read in the Greek Church ; XI. On its not being inserted in the oriental versions ; XII. On its not being inserted in the most ancient Latin manuscripts ; XIII. On the silence of all the Greek Fathers respecting it ; XIV. On the silence of the most ancient of the Latin Fathers respecting it ; XV. Some account will then be given of what has been written respecting its first introduction into the Greek and Latin manuscripts.

There are many other important topics for and against the authenticity of The Verse ; and several of those which have been mentioned, lead to facts and subjects which are not noticed in these sheets ;—but, what is noticed, will, perhaps, be found sufficient to shew the general turn and bearings of the controversy.

I. THE STATE OF THE QUESTION is as follows :—In the *Textus Receptus*, or received Greek text of the 1st Epistle of St John, the 7th and 8th verses of the fifth chapter are expressed in these words :

#### Seventh Verse.

Ὅτι τρεῖς εἶπιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὁ πατήρ, ὁ λόγος, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα· καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἓν εἰσιν.

#### Eighth Verse.

Καὶ τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῇ γῆ, τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ τὸ αἷμα· καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσιν.

In the vulgate, the verses are thus translated :

7th.

*Quoniam tres sunt, qui testimonium dant in cælo ;  
Pater, Verbum, et Spiritus Sanctus : et hi tres unum  
sunt.*

8th.

*Et tres sunt, qui testimonium dant in terrâ ; spiri-  
tus, et aqua, et sanguis : et hi tres in unum sunt.*

The question is, whether the whole of the 7th verse,—or, to speak with greater accuracy, whether the words, ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὁ πατήρ, ὁ λόγος, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἐν εἰσιν, in the 7th verse, and the words, καὶ τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῇ γῆ, in the 8th verse, are genuine or spurious. If the passage in question be genuine, the text stands properly, as it is now expressed : if it be spurious, it should stand ; “Ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες, τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ τὸ αἷμα καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἐν εἰσιν, in the Greek ;—and in the Latin, “*Quoniam tres sunt, qui testimonium dant ; spiritus, et aqua, et sanguis : et hi tres in unum sunt.*”

II. With respect to the HISTORY OF THE GENERAL ADMISSION OF THE VERSE INTO THE PRINTED TEXT :

1. The first event, which deserves attention, is the insertion of it in the *Latin Vulgate* :—what should be understood by the Vulgate, in this place, will be mentioned afterwards.

2. The second is *Erasmus's* insertion of *The Verse*, in his three last editions of the *Greek Testament*.

Erasmus had the honour of being the person who published the first printed edition of the Greek New Testament. He published five editions, in 1516, 1519, 1522, 1527, and 1535. The Complutensian Polyglott was printed in 1517, and published in 1522. In his edition of 1522, and in his two subsequent editions, Erasmus is supposed to have conformed his text, in different places, to the Complutensian edition; this makes his edition of 1519 the most esteemed of all he published. In his editions of 1516 and 1519, he did not insert The Verse of the Heavenly Witnesses. This gave rise to a dispute between him and Lee, an Englishman, and to a dispute between him and the Spanish divines employed on the Complutensian Polyglott. He promised to restore The Verse, if it could be found in a single Greek manuscript. Such a manuscript was found,—the manuscript now in Trinity College, Dublin, then called the Codex Britannicus, since called the Codex Montfortianus; and, in consequence of this discovery, Erasmus inserted The Verse in his edition of 1522, and retained it in his two subsequent editions.

3. The third of these events, is the insertion of The Verse in the *Complutensian Polyglott*. That noble work was begun in 1502, completed in 1517, and published in 1522.

4. The fourth of these events, is the insertion of The Verse by *Robert Stephens*, in his celebrated edition of the New Testament, in 1550; the text of it,

with a very few variations, is similar to that of the fifth edition of Erasmus.

5. The fifth of these events, is the insertion of The Verse in *Beza's editions of the Greek Testament*. The first of his editions was published in 1565; he principally follows in it, the third edition of Robert Stephens. He printed other editions in 1576, 1582, 1589, and 1598; they do not contain every where the same text, but in all of them, The Verse is inserted.

6. The sixth of these events, is the insertion of The Verse in the *Elzevir edition* of the Greek New Testament.

Five several printers of the name and family of Elzevir, are immortalized by the successful labours of their presses. Lewis, the eldest of them, was a printer of distinction in 1505; Daniel, the last of them, died in 1680.

Their edition of the Greek Testament was first printed, at Leyden, in 1624; it was printed from the third edition of Robert Stephens: where it varies from that edition, it follows, generally, the edition of Beza; and, like each of those editions, contains The Verse. By this edition, the text, which had fluctuated, in the preceding editions, acquired a consistency. It was followed, in all subsequent editions, and, on that account, it deservedly acquired the appellation of *Editio Recepta*: the editors of it are unknown.

7. The seventh of these events, is the insertion of The Verse in the modern edition of *Luther's transla-*



*tion of the New Testament.* From the translations published by himself, he uniformly rejected it. The last edition, which was in the press, while he was living, but was not quite finished till after his death, was that of 1546. In that, as in all his former editions, it is wholly absent. Luther concludes his preface to that edition, with what may be termed his dying request, that, upon no account, his translation should be altered, in the slightest instance. The Verse, however, was inserted in the Frankfort edition of 1574; and, for a time, inserted in some, and rejected in other editions: but, since the beginning of the 17th century, with the exception of the Wittenberg edition of 1607, the insertion of it, in the editions of Luther's translation, has been general.

8. It should be added, that the principal printed editions of the Greek New Testament since the Elzevir, are those of *Mill*, *Bengel*, *Wetstein*, and *Griesbach*. The Verse is found in the text of them all:—it is determined by the two first, to be genuine; by the two last, to be spurious. To the credit of all the editors, it should be observed, that, notwithstanding their particular sentiments, they state, with equal candour and fairness, the arguments for and the arguments against The Verse.

III. With respect to THE PRINCIPAL DISPUTES TO WHICH IT HAS GIVEN RISE :

1. The first, is *the dispute between Erasmus and Lee, and between Erasmus and the Editors of the Complutensian Polyglott.*

It has been mentioned that Erasmus published five editions of the Greek New Testament. He did not insert The Verse in the two editions of 1516 and 1519. For this, he was reprehended, in the severest terms, by Lee or Ley, an English divine of some note, afterwards advanced, by Henry the Eighth, to the archbishopric of York; and by Stunica, a Spanish divine, employed on the Complutensian Polyglott. In answer to them, he declared his readiness to insert The Verse, if a single manuscript should be found to contain it. As The Verse was inserted in the Complutensian Polyglott, and ought not to have been inserted in it, without the authority of one or more manuscripts, Stunica was bound, in honour, to produce such a manuscript; but he produced none. (For the controversy between Erasmus and Lee, see *Burigni, Vie d'Erasme*, 2 vol. Svo. Paris, 1757, 1 vol. 372-381;—for the controversy between Erasmus and Stunica, see the same work, 2 vol. 163-175; and for Stunica's attack and Erasmus's defence, see the *Crit. Sac.* Tom. vii. p. 1229.) At length, the Codex Montfortianus, then called the Codex Britannicus, now in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, was found to contain The Verse. In performance of his promise, Erasmus inserted The Verse in his edition of 1522; and retained it in his editions of 1527 and 1535.

2. *The second dispute*, respecting the authenticity of The Verse, may be considered to have begun

with *Sandius* the Arian, and to have continued, till the note respecting it, in Mr Gibbon's History, provoked a fresh dispute.

By *Sandius*, it was pointedly attacked in his *Nucleus Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ*, Cosmopoli, 1669, 8vo. Col. 1676. 4to. and his *Interpretationes Paradoxæ in Johannem*.

Its authenticity is defended by *Mr Selden*. In his treatise *de Synedriis Ebræorum*, L. 2. C. 4. S. 4. he sums up the arguments on each side of the question, and pronounces in favour of The Verse.

A regular and able attack on it was made by *Father Simon*, in his *Histoire critique du Texte du Nouveau Testament*, Rot. 1680. 4to. Part I. ch. 18. Part II. ch. 9. and in several other parts of his writings.

It found a zealous advocate in *Martin*, the Pastor of the church of Utrecht. In support of it, he published the following works.

*Deux Dissertations Critiques, la première sur le verset 7 du ch. v. de la première Epistre de St Jean, "Il y a trois au Ciel," &c. dans laquelle on prouve l'authenticité de ce texte. La seconde sur le passage de Joseph touchant Jesus Christ, où l'on fait voir que ce passage n'est point supposé. Utrecht, 1717, 8vo.*

*Examen de la réponse de Monsieur Emlyn à la Dissertation Critique sur le verset 7 du ch. v. de la 1 Epistre de St Jean. Londres, 1719, 8vo.*

*La verité du Texte de la première Epistre de St Jean, v. 7. démontrée par des preuves qui sont au dessus de toute exception, prises du témoignage de l'Eglise Latine, et de l'Eglise Grecque, et en particulier d'un manuscrit du Nouveau Testament, trouvé en Irlande. Par David Martin, Pasteur de l'Eglise à Utrecht. Utrecht, 1721.*

The Verse found an able adversary in *Mr Thomas Emlyn*, an eminent presbyterian divine, whose sufferings for his religious principles, all true christians must lament and reprobate; he attacked it in the following works.

*A full inquiry into the original authority of that text, 1 John, v. 7. London. 1815, 8vo. reprinted in 1719, 1757.*

*An answer to Mr Martin's critical dissertation on 1 John, v. 7. London, 1709, 8vo.*

*Reply to Mr Martin's examination of the answer. London, 1720.*

Martin also met with an able adversary in *Cæsar de Missy*, a native of Berlin, French preacher in the Savoy, and French chaplain at St James's, the author of *Four Letters against the genuineness of the verse, inserted in the 8th and 9th volumes of the Journal Britannique.*

The *Bible de Vencc*, published at Paris, about the middle of the last century, Tom. xiii. p. 5. contains a candid, learned, and sensible dissertation in favour of The Verse. The author cites in it, *Ketneri Dis-*

*sertatio hujus loci, Dissertatio singularis; Roger, Dissertatio Critico-Theologica, in hunc locum, Paris, 1713.*

A regular attack upon The Verse was made by *Dr Benson*, a presbyterian divine, in his *Paraphrase of the Gospels*; 2 vol. 4to. 1756.

*Sir Isaac Newton* is the author of a treatise against the genuineness of The Verse. It made its appearance, under the title of *Two Letters from Sir Isaac Newton to Mr Le Clerc*, 1754, reprinted from a manuscript in the possession of *Dr Ekins*, dean of Carlisle, in the fifth volume of *Dr Horsley's* late edition of *Sir Isaac Newton's* works.

They are written with the force, candour, and perspicuity, which might be expected from *Sir Isaac Newton*.

The English opposition to The Verse, in this stage of the controversy, is respectably closed by *Mr Bowyer*, the learned printer's *Conjectures on the New Testament*, London, 4to. 1781.

In the mean time, The Verse had been the subject of much controversy in Germany. Some mention of the principal works which there have made their appearance on this subject, may be found in the note on *St John's* first Epistle, in *Schmidius's Historia Antiqua et Vindicatio canonis sacri veteris novique Testamenti, Lipsiæ, 8vo. 1774.* an excellent publication of the high Lutheran school; in *Bengel's Gnomon*, 2 vol. 4to. *Tubingæ*, 1773; and in *Michaelis's*

*Introduction to the New Testament, translated by Mr Herbert Marsh, vol. 4. ch. 21.*—Michaelis had, at first, declared himself an advocate for The Verse, in his *Vindiciæ plurium lectionum codicis Græci Novi Testamenti adversus Whistonum et ab eo latis leges criticas*, Halæ, 1751; but, afterwards, became one of its most powerful opposers, in his *Historical and Critical Collections, relative to what are called the proof passages, in dogmatic theology.*

3. This leads to the third stage of the controversy. In the 119th Note to the 37th Chapter of his *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, (3 vol. p. 545, 4to.) Mr Gibbon asserts, that “The Three Witnesses have been established, in our Greek Testament, by the prudence of Erasmus; the honest bigotry of the Complutensian editors, the typographical fraud, or error, of Robert Stephens, in the placing a crotchet; or the deliberate falsehood or strange misapprehension of Theodore Beza.”

This note was attacked by Mr Travis, Archdeacon of Chester, in three letters, in the Gentleman's Magazine of 1782. He printed them, with two others, in a separate publication, in quarto, in 1784, and reprinted the five, with considerable further additions, in octavo, in 1786. To these, Mr Professor Porson replied in several letters, published in the Gentleman's Magazine of 1788, 1789. In the Magazine for January 1790, another letter, on the subject, appeared from Mr Travis. Mr Porson replied

to it, in the Magazine of the following month, and soon afterwards, all Mr Porson's Letters, with additions, which increased their number to twelve, were published in one octavo volume,—an eternal monument of his uncommon erudition, critical sagacity, and wit. In 1794, Mr Travis republished his letters, with considerable additions; he took no particular notice in them, of Mr Porson's letters to him, but professes to answer, one after another, the arguments of other distinguished opponents of *The Verse*. In 1795, *Mr Herbert Marsh* published a series of letters to Mr Travis, entitled *Letters to Mr Archdeacon Travis, in vindication of one of the Translator's notes to Michaelis's Introduction, and in confirmation of the opinion, that a Greek Manuscript now preserved in the public library of the University of Cambridge, is one of the seven, which are quoted by Robert Stephens, at 1 John v. 7. with an Appendix, containing a review of Mr Travis's Collation of the Greek MSS which he examined at Paris; an extract from Mr Pappelbaum's Treatise on the Berlin MS; and an Essay on the Origin and Object of the Velelian readings. By the Translator of Michaelis; Leipsig and London, 1795.*

The principal object of Mr Marsh's letters was, as the title expresses it, to vindicate his assertion, in one of his notes to his translation of Michaelis's Introduction, that the Greek manuscript referred to in the title of his book, is one of the seven, which are quot-

ed by Robert Stephens, at 1 John, v. 7 ; but his letters abound with most learned, ingenious, and profound remarks on almost every point, which comes into consideration, in the discussion of the genuineness of The Verse.

Mr Clarke has lately circulated among his friends, an interesting pamphlet on the subject of The Verse, with this title, *Observations on the Text of the Three Divine Witnesses, accompanied with a Plate, containing two very exact Fac-Similes of 1 John, Chap. v. verse 7, 8, and 9, as they stand in the first Edition of the New Testament, printed at Complutum, 1514, and in the Codex Montfortii, a Manuscript marked C. 97, in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin. By A. Clarke, Manchester, 1805.* It is to be hoped he will put it into public circulation.

Such have been the principal stages of this controversy. The following may be found to contain a distinct view of the principal arguments used by the combatants in support of their opinions.

IV. The first object of the inquiry is to ascertain WHETHER THE GENERAL SENSE OR IMPORT OF THE TEXT, IS ASSISTED OR INJURED, BY THE INSERTION OR OMISSION OF THE VERSE. The ascertainment of this fact, will establish a strong argument for or against the internal evidence of the text. This is an inquiry of some nicety ; the verse is obscure, is susceptible of more than one construction, and the partisans of each opinion, have attempted to fix that sense on it, which best suits their cause.



This much must be granted, that The Verse is not absolutely necessary to the sense of the text. Without it, the text will stand as follows. "Who is he that overcometh the world, but he, who believeth that Jesus is the son of God? This is he, who came by water and blood, even Jesus the Christ; not, by the water only, but by the water and the blood. And it is the Spirit who witnessed; because the spirit is truth. Thus there are three who bear witness, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood; and the three agree in one."

Whatever be its right construction, the sentence is complete and perfect in itself. Jesus, the Christ, is the person to whom testimony is borne; the spirit, the water, and the blood, are the witnesses bearing testimony to him. Thus without further aid, the construction and meaning of the sentence are complete. The Verse therefore is not essentially necessary to the text.

V. 1. ERASMUS has been stated to have made the first attack on The Verse. At that time, from its general insertion in the manuscript and printed copies of the Latin text, the universal opinion of the Latin church was in its favour. The text of these copies had been adopted by the spiritual and temporal courts, appealed to in disputes, taught in the schools, and praised and commented on by the learned men of every state, within the Latin pale. *Prescription* therefore, if prescription be pleadable in these cases, was in its favour.

2. If we believe the opposers of The Verse, the introduction of The Verse, was first owing to the spiritualization of the 8th verse by the African fathers, which became common in the 4th century ; The Verse gained little ground till the 8th ; and was universally received for genuine in the 12th. It is remarkable, that not the slightest vestige of opposition to it is discoverable in the works of those times, which have reached us ; nothing, which intimates, that even a suspicion had been entertained of the genuineness of The Verse.

3. Here the communicant with the see of Rome takes a higher ground. The council of Trent, Session 4, declared Anathema to all, " who should not receive for holy and canonical, all and every part of the books of the Old and New Testament, as they had been accustomedly read in the Catholic Church, and as they stood in the old vulgate edition ;" and in the sixth session, declared " the Vulgate to be authentic, and that no one should, on any pretence, dare or presume to reject it."

Now, when the council of Trent made this decree, The Verse had long been accustomedly read in the catholic church, and long made a part in the old vulgate edition ; those, therefore, in communion with the see of Rome, who now reject The Verse, fall within the council's Anathema.

To these objections the adversaries of The Verse reply ;

1st. That in the times of which we are now speaking, there was little of biblical criticism, and that no works of those times have reached us, in which such an objection either would be made, or would be noticed.

2dly. That, before too great a stress is laid on its insertion in the Vulgate, an accurate notion should be formed of the edition denoted, in these cases, by the appellation of the Latin Vulgate. It does not denote the edition, anterior to St Jerome, which, from its superior celebrity, was called the Ancient Italic ; it does not denote the edition published by St Jerome ; it merely denotes that edition, which, at the time of the council of Trent, was generally in use ; and afterwards served as the groundwork of the editions published, first by Sixtus Quintus, afterwards by Clement the Eighth, and which last edition is the archetype of the modern Vulgate ; that this edition partook more of the modern, than of ancient versions ; and, that standing by itself, it is, in a matter of criticism, of no authority.

3dly. To suppose, that the council of Trent pronounced the Vulgate to be wholly free from error, and that no one was at liberty to vary from it, in translation or exposition, is going to an extreme. In declaring it to be authentic, the council did not declare the Vulgate to be inspired or infallible ; the council only pronounced it to be inerrant, where the dogmata of faith or morals are concerned. In this

decision, every Roman Catholic must acquiesce, as he receives the scripture from the church, under her authority, and with her interpretation; but further than this, the council leaves the Vulgate in mere matters of criticism, to the private judgment of every individual. To this effect, father Salmeron, who was one of the ten first disciples of St Ignatius, and who assisted at the council of Trent in the character of one of the pope's theologians, is cited by the Abbé de Vence, to have expressed himself in the third of his prolegomena.

In this stage of the argument, Bossuet takes very high ground, in one of his letters to Leibnitz, published by Mr Dutens, in his edition of Leibnitz's works; as, in that letter, Bossuet seems to place the general acquiescence of the Roman Catholic church, in the authenticity of The Verse, among the traditions which the church receives, and the faithful are therefore bound to adopt.—As every thing which has fallen from the pen of that great man, is important, and the passage in question is little known, it is here transcribed at length.

“ J'avoue au reste, Monsieur, ce que vous dites des anciens exemplaires Grecs sur le passage, *Tres Sunt, &c.* mais vous sçavez aussi bien que moi, que l'article contenu dans ce passage ne doit pas être pour cela révoqué en doute, étant d'ailleurs établi, non seulement *par la Tradition des Eglises*, mais encore par l'Écriture très évidemment. Vous sçavez aussi

sans doute, que ce passage se trouve reçu dans tout l'Occident ; ce qui parôit manifeste, sans même remonter plus haut, par la production qu'en fait S. Fulgence dans ses Ecrits, et même dans une excellente Confession de foi présentée unanimément au Roi Huneric par toute l'Eglise d'Afrique. Ce témoignage produit par un aussi grand Théologien, et par cette sçavante Eglise, n'ayant point été reproché par les hérétiques, et au contraire étant confirmé par le sang de tant de martyrs, et encore par tant de miracles, dont cette Confession de foi fut suivie, est une démonstration de la Tradition, du moins de toute l'Eglise d'Afrique, l'une des plus illustres du monde. On trouve même dans S. Cyprien une allusion manifeste a ce passage, qui a passé naturellement dans notre Vulgate ; et confirme la Tradition de tout l'Occident. Je suis, &c.

“J. Bénigne, Evêque de Meaux.”

Such is the state of the argument, so far as the authenticity of The Verse depends on the general prepossession, in its favour, before the impression of the Greek original.

It certainly imposes on the adversaries of The Verse, the obligation of attack. The following are their principal arguments against its authenticity, and the principal answers to them.

VI. They say, that there is hardly a library in Europe, in which the *Manuscripts of the Greek Testament* have not been examined, in order to deter-

mine whether *The Verse* really proceeded from the pen of *St John*; and that the result of this long and laborious examination is, that of all the *Greek manuscripts* of the *Catholic Epistles*, now extant, of which more than a hundred have been quoted by name, independently of those which have been quoted in the aggregate, (as where *Dr Griesbach*, *Professor Birch*, or *Professor Alter* speak, at large, of all the manuscripts they have seen), the passage has been discovered in one manuscript only,—the *Codex Montfortianus*, which is neither of sufficient antiquity nor of sufficient integrity, to be entitled to a voice in a question of sacred criticism.

This, the advocates of *The Verse* generally admit;—but reply that, though no such manuscript be now extant, there existed formerly *Greek manuscripts*, which contained *The Verse*,—for which they cite those, which were in the possession of *Valla*, the *Complutensian editors*, and *Robert Stephens*.

VII. With respect to *THE MANUSCRIPTS OF VALLA*;—the advocates of *The Verse* assert, that *Valla* had seven *Greek manuscripts* of the 1st *Epistle* of *St John*, and that all his manuscripts exhibited *The Verse*. They observe, that it was his plan to mark, in his annotations, those passages, in which the *Vulgate* receded from the *Greek*; that he takes no notice, in his annotations, of the omission of *The Verse*, in any of his manuscripts; from which they infer, that it was contained in them all.

The adversaries of *The Verse* reply,—that we are ignorant of the number of manuscripts which Valla used, and of his plan of annotation ; that, though it be probable he had seven Greek manuscripts, which exhibited St John's Gospel, ch. vii. v. 29. where he expressly mentions that number of manuscripts, it does not appear, and it is highly improbable, he should have the like number of Greek manuscripts of the 1st Epistle of St John ; that *The Verse* might have been wanting in the Latin text, with which he made his collation ; that he might studiously have avoided a remark, which, in the country and the times in which he lived, might have exposed him to persecution ; that it is highly probable that some or other of his manuscripts have been quoted under different titles ; that no manuscript contains *The Verse*, and that, of course, there is the same probability of none of his manuscripts having contained it, as there is that we are now in possession of some or other of his manuscripts. From these circumstances, the adversaries of *The Verse* infer, that nothing near to a conclusion in its favour can be drawn from his silence respecting the passage in his manuscripts.

It is observable that Mr Archdeacon Travis objects heavily to Erasmus, that, when he was pressed by Lee, with the contents of Valla's manuscripts, he attempted to bear him down by other arguments, but did not deny that *The Verse* was to be found in

the manuscripts of Valla, which manuscripts the archdeacon asserts, were in Erasmus's possession. But the archdeacon appears to have been mistaken in this supposition; Erasmus was the editor of Valla's commentary; but it no where appears that he was in possession of Valla's manuscripts, and he himself asserts the contrary.—Such are the obligations of literature to Erasmus, that men of letters should eagerly rise in his defence, whenever they think he is unjustly accused.

VIII. With respect to THE MANUSCRIPTS USED BY THE COMPLUTENSIAN EDITORS;—The Polyglott Bible, printed at Alcalá or Complutum, under the patronage, and at the expense of Cardinal Ximenes, was begun in 1502; the whole impression of it was finished in 1517, and published in 1522. It is certain that the cardinal spared no expense in procuring manuscripts; but, whether he had any that were truly valuable, has been much doubted. The Verse has its place in this edition; from which its advocates infer, that it was exhibited by all, or at least the greatest part of the manuscripts used by the Complutensian editors. This inference is denied by the adversaries of The Verse. They contend, that, from the deference, which the Complutensian editors had for the Vulgate, they were honestly persuaded, that The Verse was genuine, and therefore inserted, and thought themselves warranted in inserting in their text, a translation of it from the Latin. This,



they say, appears clearly from the dispute between Stunica and Erasmus;—the former in the bitterest terms, reproached the latter with the omission of The Verse, in his printed edition; Erasmus, with equal vehemence, challenged Stunica to produce a single Greek manuscript in support of The Verse; Stunica did not cite a single manuscript, but persisted in urging the authority of the Latin.—This, Mr Archdeacon Travis owns himself unable to account for satisfactorily.

IX. With respect to ROBERT STEPHENS'S MANUSCRIPTS;—To explain this part of the case, to persons unacquainted with Stephens's celebrated edition of the Greek Testament, which gives rise to the present question, and which was the edition published by him in 1550,—it is necessary to observe that the text of it is a re-impression of the fifth edition of Erasmus, with a few alterations. In the margin, Stephens quotes various readings from the Complutensian edition, and from fifteen Greek manuscripts, eight of which were borrowed from the King's library, six were procured from various quarters, and one was collated in Italy. The Complutensian text and the fifteen copies he denoted, when he cited various readings from them, by the Greek numerals  $\alpha'$ ,  $\beta'$ ,  $\gamma'$ , as far as fifteen. The copy  $\alpha'$ , he quotes throughout the whole New Testament, because, like other printed editions, the Complutensian edition, which it denotes, contains the whole. Of his fifteen

manuscripts, he quotes some in one part, some in another ; but none throughout the whole New Testament. In the Catholic Epistles, Stephens has quoted only seven manuscripts, which he denotes by the numerals δ', ε', ζ', θ', ι', ιά, ιγ', of which the four marked δ', ε', ζ', ι', were from the King's library, and the other three ε', ιά, ιγ', were among the six which he had procured elsewhere. At the 1 John v. 7. the disputed passage stands thus in Stephens's text, *ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὁ πᾶτηρ, ὁ λόγος, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἐν εἰσι καὶ τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῇ γῆ.*

In the margin, Stephens has quoted the seven manuscripts just mentioned, with an obelus prefixed. Now, according to his plan of annotation, when any word or number of words is omitted in the quoted manuscript, he expresses it by placing in his text, an obelus before the first word, and a little crotchet in the shape of a semicircle, and of the size of a comma, after the last word. At the place in question, the obelus is set before ἐν, which precedes τῷ οὐρανῷ, and the semicircle immediately after οὐρανῷ ; so that by this notation the words ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, and not the whole passage, are represented as absent from these seven manuscripts. But, as compositors are not infallible, and marks of reference are frequently placed wrong, through various accidents in printing, this edition of Robert Stephens had not been published many years, when Lucas Brugensis suspected, that Stephens's compositor had here made a mistake, and

that he ought to have set the crotchet, not after  $\sigma\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\tilde{\phi}$ , but after  $\gamma\tilde{\eta}$ , that is, after the last word of the controverted passage, and not after the third; for, even in the sixteenth century it was well known, that the Greek manuscripts, in general, omitted the whole passage; but no one, either before or since the time of Robert Stephens, has ever seen a Greek manuscript which omitted the three first words only. This, however, was not admitted by the advocates of The Verse, who still quoted these seven manuscripts, as authority, not indeed for the whole passage, but, what is of some importance in a case of necessity, for at least three quarters of it. About a hundred years after the time of Lucas Brugensis, Simon examined all the Greek manuscripts in the library of the king of France, and found that not only  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\tilde{\phi}\ \sigma\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\tilde{\phi}$ , but that all the following words, as far as  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\tilde{\eta}\ \gamma\tilde{\eta}$  were absent from them all; and, as four out of the seven, which Stephens has quoted at 1 John v. 7. had been borrowed from this library, though Simon did not attempt to determine what particular four, he concluded, that Stephens's representation at that passage was inaccurate. To evade this argument, the patrons of Stephens's semi-circle had recourse to the hypothesis, that the eight manuscripts, which, in the time of Robert Stephens, belonged to the king's library, were no longer there, and even that they were no longer in existence; a position, which, though wholly incapable of defence,

is indispensably necessary for those, who maintain, that the semicircle is set right, because the manuscripts which still exist, both in Paris and in other places, decide against them. From this untenable post, they were driven, a few years afterwards, by Le Long, who, in 1720, undertook to determine the particular eight manuscripts, in the royal library, which had been used by Robert Stephens, and consequently four out of the seven, which are quoted at 1 John v. 7. The eight manuscripts he imperfectly described in the *Journal des Sçavans* for June 1720; but he gave a more complete and accurate account of them in the edition of his *Bibliotheca Sacra*, which was published in 1723, soon after the death of the author.

From this time, the accuracy of Stephens's semicircle appeared to be given up, and his manuscripts, as evidence for the authenticity of The Verse, appeared to be wholly abandoned. But, in 1791, Mr Archdeacon Travis took a journey to Paris, in order to compare Stephens's quotations from the eight manuscripts, which he had borrowed from the royal library, with the readings of those on which Le Long had fixed, as the eight, which were used by Stephens. In this comparison, he found, according to his own account, that the quotations made by R. Stephens differed, so frequently, from the readings in Le Long's manuscripts, as to warrant the inference, that these were not the eight, which Stephens

used. The grounds of his opinion, he mentions at length, in the sixth edition of his letters to Mr Gibbon;—they have been attacked by Mr Marsh.—Previously to the publication of Mr Travis's last edition of his letters to Mr Gibbon, Mr Marsh in one of his notes to Michaelis, (Vol. II. p. 789), had informed the world, that he had found a Greek manuscript, marked K  $\alpha$ . 6. 4. in the public library of the University of Cambridge, which he had discovered to be the manuscript which Stephens had quoted by the mark, 'γ', and consequently, one of the seven manuscripts which are quoted in Stephens's edition of 1550, at 1 John v. 7; and at the same time, assigned the reasons, which induced him to believe, that the manuscript in question had been at Paris, and that it was no other than the manuscript which Stephens called 'γ'. Now, this manuscript omits not only ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, but all the following words, including ἐν τῇ γῆ;—and, since Stephens quotes all his seven manuscripts of the Catholic Epistles for the same omission, it follows, that, as one of them omitted the whole passage, the others did the same. Of the truth of this inference, Mr Travis was well aware; and, in his last edition of his letters to Mr Gibbon, attacked Mr Marsh's arguments in support of the identity of the manuscript K  $\alpha$ . 6. 4. and Stephens's 'γ'.

To this Mr Herbert Marsh answered, by "*his Letters to Mr Archdeacon Travis, published in 1795.*"

In this publication, Mr Marsh states the several steps which led to the discovery of the identity of the two manuscripts. He establishes it by various proofs; and, by an application of an algebraical theorem to the documents produced by him, he shows, that the probability in favour of the identity of the manuscripts is to the probability of the contrary, as two nonillions to a unity. This is one of the most curious instances which have appeared, of the application of mathematical calculation to a critical inquiry.—One of the points, principally discussed by Mr Marsh, is, how far the inference, deduced from a general and remarkable similarity, in favour of the identity of manuscripts, is counteracted by a certain number of discordances; a consideration of the utmost importance, in all collations of manuscripts; but Mr Marsh's treatise abounds with other curious and important remarks, and is a mine of recondite and useful biblical erudition.

The nature of this inquiry does not admit of more than this general outline of that part of the controversy, which arises from the subject of Robert Stephens's manuscripts. Persons to whom the subject is new, would be surprised, in their investigation of it, to find that it embraces so wide a field of inquiry. Perhaps, nothing has contributed so much to the accurate knowledge, which seems now to be obtained of the Greek text of the New Testament, as the discussions to which The Verse has given rise.

X. The adversaries of The Verse continue the attack ;—they observe that there are many Greek manuscripts of THE APOSTOLOS, or the collection of lessons, read in the Greek churches, from the Epistles, and which they call the Apostolos, to distinguish it from the Lectionarium, which contains the lessons from the Gospels. Now, they observe, that no one has been able to discover The Verse in a single manuscript apostolos.

The advocates of The Verse observe, that it is to be found in the first printed edition of the apostolos, which appeared at Venice in 1602 ; but the adversaries of The Verse contend, that this does not afford the slightest argument in favour of the authenticity of The Verse, as, in all probability, the lessons were printed from the modern Greek text, into which it had long found its way.

XI. The adversaries of The Verse further contend, —THAT IT IS WHOLLY UNKNOWN TO ANY OF THE ORIENTAL VERSIONS WHICH WERE MADE FROM THE TEXT, while it was in its original purity. It is totally unknown to the manuscripts of the old Syriac version ; it is wanting in the new Syriac or Philoxenian version, which was made in the beginning of the sixth century, and collated with Greek manuscripts at Alexandria, in the beginning of the seventh ; it is wanting also in the Arabic manuscripts, as well of the version printed in the Polyglott, as in that published

by Erpenius; it is wanting in the Ethiopic, the Cophtic, the Sahidic, and the Armenian versions.

To this, the advocates of The Verse reply, that all those versions, except the Armenian, were made from the Syriac, which, they say, is faulty beyond description. That we know little of the Armenian version; but that The Verse is contained in the first edition of that version, published at Amsterdam, in 1666; from which they infer, that The Verse was contained in the manuscript or manuscripts, from which that edition was printed. We certainly know little of the Armenian version; but no one has actually pretended to have seen The Verse in any Armenian manuscript; and Professor Alter, in the second volume of his edition of the Iliad, page 85, mentions his having been informed by "Pater Zohrab Armenus, Bibliothecarius Meghitarensium in insulâ S. Lazari Venetiis," that having examined many Armenian manuscripts, in the library of his convent, he had not found The Verse in any one of them.

XII. The adversaries of The Verse contend that —IT IS WANTING IN FORTY OF THE MOST ANCIENT MANUSCRIPTS OF THE LATIN VERSION. This, they say, equipoises, if it do not overbalance the authority of those Latin manuscripts in which it is contained.

In 1743, Sabatier published, at Rheims, his "*Bibliorum sacrorum Latinæ versiones antiquæ, seu vetus Italica, et ceteræ quæcunque in codicibus Manuscrip-*



tis reperiri potuerunt, quæ cum vulgatâ Latinâ et cum textu Greco comparantur." The object of the work is to restore the text of the ancient Italic, by putting together the quotations of the Bible, in the works of the ancient Fathers; where none can be found, Sabatier supplies the chasm from the Vulgate. He was so fortunate as to find, in different parts of the works of St Augustin, a sufficient number of quotations, to form the whole of the four first chapters, and likewise the beginning of the fifth. But, when he comes to the seventh verse, this very voluminous Father, who wrote not less than ten treatises on the epistle in question, suddenly deserts him, though immediately after this critical place, he comes again to his assistance. This chasm, therefore, Sabatier fills up, by a quotation from Vigilius Tapsensis, who wrote at the end of the fifth century.

XIII. The adversaries of The Verse urge,—that THE GREEK FATHERS HAVE NEVER QUOTED IT, in their warmest disputes about the Trinity, which they certainly would have done, if the passage had been known to them; and this, they observe, is the more remarkable, as they often quote and dwell upon the sixth and eighth verses in succession, without once mentioning or even slightly alluding to the seventh verse. This is one of the strongest parts of the cause of the adversaries of The Verse. Its advocates have little to reply to it, except that it proves no more, than that The Verse did not exist in the

copies, which those Fathers used ; that many works written by those Fathers, and many other works written at the same time, have not come down to us ; and that The Verse might have been mentioned in all or some or one of these.

XIV. The adversaries of The Verse urge the same argument from THE SILENCE OF THE LATIN FATHERS TILL THE FOURTH CENTURY.—Here, they are met by the advocates of The Verse, who contend that, though The Verse is not quoted, it is expressly referred to by several of the earliest Latin Fathers ; particularly Tertullian and St Cyprian.—The adversaries of the Verse reply, that none of these passages refer to the seventh verse, but refer to the eighth verse, by mystically interpreting the Spirit, the blood, and the water, mentioned in that verse, of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. They dwell much on a passage of St Augustin, in which he expressly says, that “ the Spirit, the blood, and the water, may be understood, *without any absurdity*, of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost,” an expression, which, most assuredly, St Augustin would never have used, if he had been aware of the seventh verse.

It is certain that The Verse is mentioned in St Jerome's Preface to the Canonical Epistles ; but the authenticity of these prefaces, first suspected by Erasmus, is given up by Dom Martianay, the Benedictine monk, and almost all modern writers.

XV. The adversaries of The Verse thus account for THE INTERPOLATION OF IT INTO THE TEXT OF THE MANUSCRIPTS.—The mystical interpretation of the 8th verse, which some of the fathers adopted, was, as they allege, frequently inserted in their commentaries, and sometimes in the margin of their copies; by degrees it slid from the margin into the text; insensibly it came to be considered as part of it; at first, it appeared sometimes in one form, and sometimes in another, and was inserted sometimes before, and sometimes after the eighth verse; at length the dignity of the subject gave it a precedence over the eighth verse; and thus it came to be considered as the seventh verse of the chapter. Probably it had gained a place in no manuscript, as part of the text, till some time after the death of St Augustin; and the eighth century may be considered as the era of its final settlement in the Latin text.

From the Latin text it was transplanted into the Greek. At the general council of Lateran, held in 1215, The Verse was quoted from the Greek. The acts of the council, with the quotation of the Vulgate, were translated into the Greek and sent to the Greek churches. About a century after this period, the Greeks began to quote The Verse; *the first Greek writers who have quoted it, are Manuel Callecas, who lived in the fourteenth, and Bryennius, who lived in the fifteenth century;* and it is observable, that, when the passage first

appeared in Greek, it presented itself under as many different shapes, as when it first made its appearance in Latin.

XVI. This, perhaps, may be considered an outline of the history of the controversy respecting this celebrated Verse. It has the merit of having rendered invaluable services to the biblical criticism of the sacred text. It has led to a minute discussion of several curious and interesting topics of literary history, particularly the rules for judging of the age of manuscripts, the nature of manuscript collations, the different merits of the principal editions of the Old and New Testament, the early versions of them, and the characters of the different persons, by whom they were edited or published. A full and complete history of the controversy, which should enter, at large, into all its particulars, would be an invaluable acquisition to literature.

Considering Mr Archdeacon Travis was a mere novice in biblical criticism, when he first engaged in the controversy, he performed wonders; but it was his misfortune to combat with giants.

The principal argument in its favour, which appears not to be satisfactorily answered, is its having a place in the confession of faith presented by the African bishops to Huneric. Mr Porson has treated this argument with abundance of wit; but it seems to deserve a more serious treatment. It is not necessary to suppose, as Mr Porson humourously says,

that each of the four-hundred bishops had a Bible in his pocket, and the useful place doubled down.— If there were such a number of copies exhibiting The Verse, as induced the bishops to adopt it into the confession of faith, this fact would afford strong ground to contend, that it was inserted in the copies then generally in use.

This circumstance, therefore, may be thought to deserve further investigation ;—and a more complete examination of the manuscripts in the royal library at Paris, is much to be desired ; in other respects the topics of argument respecting the authenticity of this celebrated Verse, appear to have been exhausted.

·END OF THE SECOND VOLUME.

---

CAMBRIDGE :

PRINTED AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, BY HILLIARD AND METCALF.

1823.



1













