

BX

9831

.Y37

1822

10/1  
1801  
1/21/2  
1000





# A SEQUEL

TO

“A VINDICATION OF UNITARIANISM,”

IN REPLY TO

*DR. WARDLAW'S TREATISE*

ENTITLED,

“UNITARIANISM INCAPABLE OF VINDICATION.”

---

BY THE AUTHOR OF THE “VINDICATION.”

---

*Second Edition.*

---

Study the best and highest things that are,  
But of thyself an humble thought retain.  
Cast down thyself, and only strive to raise  
The glory of thy Maker's sacred name:  
Use all thy powers, that blessed Power to praise,  
Which gives thee power to be, and use the same.

*Sir John Davies.*

---

LONDON:

*Printed for the Author;*

SOLD BY DAVID EATON, 187, HIGH HOLBORN; ROBINSONS, LIVERPOOL;  
J. BELCHER, BIRMINGHAM; J. BRASH AND CO., GLASGOW; AND  
R. IRELAND, 58, SOUTH BRIDGE, EDINBURGH.

---

PRICE THREE SHILLINGS.

---

1822.

---

*Printed by* GEORGE SMALLFIELD, *Hackney.*

# ADVERTISEMENT

TO THE

Second Edition.



A NEW Edition of the following work having been called for, I have the satisfaction of presenting it to the public with a few slight alterations, and with the omission of some paragraphs, which appeared less important than the rest.

To one subject it is necessary for me now to advert, although I cannot do it without pain and deep regret. This is the conduct of my opponent, Mr. (now Dr.) Wardlaw. It is more than eight years since our controversy commenced, and I have uniformly spoken of him with every expression of esteem and respect, which I thought suitable to his talents and character. This he has returned, not only with frequent contumely, but with a charge of "*wilful and deliberate misrepresentation*;" and although I have, in Part III. Chap. IV. of the following work, completely justified myself from this accusation, and have likewise, in the Advertisement to the Second Edition of my "*Vindication of Unitarianism*," published more than four years ago, observed, that "I still looked to Dr. Wardlaw, *as a man of honour and integrity*," to correct his statements, he has observed a total silence. Although unconscious of any feeling adverse to his true honour and happiness, I wish to inform him, that I esteem my character as valuable as my life, and that I do not make much difference in point of turpitude between the man who attacks the one, and him who traduces the other. Indeed every one will perceive, that such behaviour as Dr. Wardlaw's must put a stop to all intercourse or respectful consideration on the part of such persons as have a regard to moral character; and this notice of it is evidently incumbent upon me as his opponent, since the force of all

that I have written on my side of the controversy would be lost, if he could succeed in destroying my reputation for veracity. Let him not conclude however, that my sentiments towards him are unalterable. Let him retract the charge, which he has kept for six years hanging over me, and which nevertheless, I am certain, he does not believe; and let him do what his conscience must inform him that he ought to do, in regard to the other mis-statements and inaccuracies, which he has committed. Then, but not till then, I shall be able to respect him as an honest man. In the mean time, I leave it to the attentive and impartial reader to judge between us.

JAMES YATES.

*Birmingham, Sept. 17, 1822.*

ERRATA.

Page 35, last line, for 'word,' read *words*.  
 44, line 14, for 'p. 41,' read p. 33.  
 83, Note, for 'also,' read *always*.

*Sold by the same Booksellers,*

A Vindication of Unitarianism, in reply to Dr. Wardlaw's Discourses on the Socinian Controversy. By James Yates, M. A. Second Edition, 1818, price 8s.

*In the press, by the same Author,*

Discourses on the Effects of drinking Spirituous and other Intoxicating Liquors. Second Edition, 12mo., 1s.

*Also preparing for publication,*

The Scriptural Meaning of the Title "Saviour" as applied to our Lord; a Sermon preached July 28th, 1822, at the Annual Meeting of the Scottish Unitarian Association.



# CONTENTS.



## INTRODUCTION.

### PART I.

Chap.	Page
I. Manner of conducting the controversy .....	1
The investigation requires a calm rather than impassioned state of mind .....	2—5
Mr. Wardlaw's Discourses were directed against all Unitarians .....	6
II. The Author's reasons for defending only the general principles of Unitarianism .....	7
Advantages of the constitution of Unitarian congregations as including both Arians and Socinians .....	9
The term <i>Unitarian</i> not intended to signify, that Trinitarians believe in three Gods .....	11
III. Mr. Wardlaw charged <i>all</i> Unitarians with denying the Inspiration of the Scriptures .....	12
Dr. Priestley's language on the subject disapproved .....	13
His character illustrated by a quotation from Pindar ....	<i>ib.</i>
Use of Griesbach's text .....	14
His faith in the Divinity of Christ .....	<i>ib.</i>
IV. Mysteries understood by many Trinitarians as equivalent to Absurdities .....	15
Unitarians receive whatever is contained in Divine Revelation .....	18
Mr. W. used the word " <i>Mystery</i> " to denote propositions, to the terms of which distinct ideas are not attached .....	19
Sometimes to denote " <i>difficulties</i> " .....	21
Tendency of his principles to Universal Scepticism .....	22
Necessity of individual judgment .....	24

### PART II.

I. Propriety of adopting the plain, obvious, and prominent sense of Scripture ..	25
An opposite plan pursued by Mr. Wardlaw .....	26
Impropriety of employing a previously assumed hypothesis in order to detect the meaning of the Scriptures .....	28
Especially such an hypothesis as that chosen by Mr. Wardlaw .....	31
II. The argument from John xvii. 5, unanswered .....	32
Use of DIA to denote the instrumental cause .....	33
Examination of passages, in which Mr. Wardlaw supposes it to denote the <i>primary</i> cause .....	<i>ib.</i>

Chap.		Page
	Statements of the Lexicons .....	40
	Authority of Origen .....	41
	Ancient versions .....	43
	Mr. Wardlaw's apparent indifference about the accuracy of his quotations from the New Testament .....	<i>ib.</i>
	Meaning of HYPO .....	44
	Remainder of Mr. Wardlaw's animadversions on the Second Part of the "Vindication" .....	45

## PART III.

I.	The reader cautioned against resentment and disdain....	47
	Brief view of the controversy on the nature and meaning of the doctrine of the Trinity, and the evidence requisite to prove it .....	48
II.	Mr. Wardlaw's objection to the argument for the unity of God from the light of nature .....	53
	Proofs that the Plural Number is used in Hebrew to ex- press <i>eminence</i> .....	54
	The use of <i>us</i> and <i>our</i> no proof of a plurality of persons in the Deity .....	60
III.	On the list of all the passages, regarded as containing full and direct assertions of a Trinity of Persons in the Godhead	62
	Further remarks on Isaiah xxxiv. 16 .....	63
	—————xlvi. 16 .....	64
	—————on Matt. xxviii. 19 .....	<i>ib.</i>
	—————on 2 Cor. xiii. 14 .....	67
	—————on Rev. i. 4 .....	70
IV.	The doctrine of Christ's Divine and Human Natures self- contradictory .....	<i>ib.</i>
	This follows from the fact stated by Mr. Wardlaw as a proof of the contrary.....	71
	Propriety and correctness of the list of eminent Unitarians	73
	Dr. Whitby a Unitarian.....	75
	And Dr. Watts .....	77
	The production of the list occasioned by Mr. Wardlaw himself	80
	Unjust treatment of Unitarians, and inevitable progress of truth .....	81
V.	Grounds of the interpretation in its lower sense of the title "god," when applied to Jesus.....	82
	Causes of the resentment of the Jews when he said " <i>I and my Father are one,</i> " &c. ....	83
	Propriety of his definition of " <i>gods</i> " as "those to whom the word of God came" .....	86
	Additional examples of this use of the term.....	88
	<i>The general principle</i> , on which the Unitarian interpreta- tion of the term, when applied to Jesus, is vindicated.....	90

Chap.		Page
	Isaiah ix. 6 .....	91
	Mr. Wardlaw's charge against Origen and Eusebius of being ignorant of Greek .....	92
	Middleton on the Greek Article .....	93
	Isaiah vii. 14, and Romans ix. 5 .....	95
	1 John v. 20 .....	97
	Supposed instances of the application of the title " <i>Jehovah</i> " to Jesus .....	98
VI.	John viii. 58 .....	102
	Heb. i. 10 ; Col. i. 17 .....	103
	Rev. i. 8, 17, xxii. 13 .....	104
	Virtual presence of Christ with his disciples .....	105
	His endowments as Judge of mankind .....	106
VII.	Mr. Wardlaw's hypothesis of the two natures formerly combated .....	108
	His limitation of the power and knowledge of God .....	<i>ib.</i>
VIII.	Jesus the Angel who refused worship from John in the Revelation .....	110
	Character and authority of Grotius, and of Le Clerc .....	112
	Passages which speak of Christians as <i>calling on the name</i> <i>of the Lord</i> .....	114
	Praise and petition addressed to Jesus solely out of regard to his exaltation by the Father .....	116
IX.	Proper translation of Phil. ii. 6 .....	118
	Mr. Wardlaw's defence of his "general considerations" accompanied by a misrepresentation, which illustrates their impropriety .....	122
	His account of Mr. Belsham's tract .....	123
	Dr. Magee's assertion that that tract was published by the entire body of English Unitarians, &c. ....	<i>ib.</i>
X.	Prevalence of Unitarianism in the Primitive Church ....	125
	Reports of the Scotch Unitarian Association .....	126
	Obstacles to the progress of Unitarianism .....	<i>ib.</i>
	Unitarians not inferior in moral and religious attainments to Calvinists .....	128
	But <i>ought to be</i> greatly superior to them .....	129
	Exhorted to self-examination, and to greater constancy and zeal in the duties of the Christian life .....	<i>ib.</i>



## INTRODUCTION.



My object in the following work will be, First, to correct the inaccuracies, which I have been enabled to discover in my "Vindication of Unitarianism," by the perusal of Mr. Wardlaw's Reply; and, Secondly, to defend the statements and reasonings, which I have advanced, where they appear to me to be partially represented, or unjustly attacked, by my opponent. I make no pretension to security from errors; I am so far from feeling any unwillingness to acknowledge those, which I have been able to detect, that I think it my duty to bring them prominently into view, as the only means of atoning for my inadvertency, and preventing others from being misled by my want of information; and I esteem it a great advantage to myself and to my readers, that the endeavours of an ardent, acute, and able disputant, to destroy the reputation and expose the fallacies of my work, are likely to leave few errors unnoticed, and may thus be made subservient to what ought to be our only object, the attainment of Truth. But, whilst I am disposed to consider myself as under obligations to my adversary for making me sensible of the mistakes, into which I have fallen, I cannot avoid perceiving, that they are few and insignificant, compared with the great body of evidence, which remains unaffected. Unitarianism still stands like a mighty and majestic tower, to which all the efforts of its innumerable assailants cannot communicate even the slightest vibration. To its sacred and immortal interests I again devote myself, humbly imploring the Father of Lights, that, having called me in the course of his Providence to guard this honourable post, he would endue me with wisdom to discern, honesty to avow, and courage to maintain His Truth; that he would guard my spirit from dictating any expressions, unsuitable to the gracefulness, and purity, and dignity, of so sublime a theme; and imbue my mind with that uniform temper of adoring submission to himself, and of tender affection to mankind, which is the genuine result of a firm faith in ONE GOD, the BENEVOLENT FATHER of his creatures.

## PART I.

---

I DIVIDE this work into Three Parts, corresponding in the nature of their contents with the First, Second, and Third Parts of my former Volume. The first part will consist of Observations, relating to the Investigation and Evidence of Religious Truth.

---

### CHAPTER I.

THE acrimony of theological contests has been one of the principal means, by which the professors of Christianity have contributed to bring it into disrepute. It was my anxious desire to avoid this common and disgraceful error. I wished to do all that lay in my power towards furnishing, in the controversy between Mr. Wardlaw and myself, the pleasing and edifying spectacle of two men, attached to their respective systems, giving one another credit for honesty and sincerity, defending their opposite opinions with clearness, with accuracy, and with strength of argument, but at the same time maintaining a spirit of candour and conciliation, and regarding one another with the sentiments of benevolence and esteem. Influenced by such motives, I often expressed, with an undisguised freedom, my admiration of the talents and virtues of my opponent; and, at the close of my volume, I declared my renunciation of every hostile feeling, and ventured to designate him as no longer my adversary, but "my friend." The correctness of this expression is called into question by Mr. Wardlaw, and combated by a consideration of the degree of intimacy and cordiality which is necessary to constitute

true friendship. \* I can only reply, that the expression proceeded from the fulness of my heart ; that it was not intended to bear a critical investigation ; that it is sufficient to ask, in such cases, Is the emotion of the mind innocent and commendable? and that, when the heart glows with a good feeling, the want of perfect accuracy in the language which it dictates, ought to be pardoned.

But Mr. Wardlaw observes, that, although I have complimented him strongly and generously, I have brought against him various charges, the truth of which would render him unworthy of my esteem, or the esteem of any one else. I am not desirous of proving that my animadversions were never too severe ; they certainly were so, if they were in any instance more harsh than was absolutely requisite for the vindication of the truth. But it is probable, that my opponent and his partisans, being personally interested, may over-rate their keenness ; and it is evident, that they present a far more offensive aspect, when ranged by Mr. Wardlaw into a formidable phalanx, than when scattered through the volume from which he has collected them, and introduced in relation to particular parts of the argument. In several instances, as we shall notice hereafter, the truth of my charges is acknowledged by Mr. Wardlaw, and in many others, he has passed them over without attempting a refutation. I still think, that they were in general well-founded ; and yet I do not perceive, that I did wrong in regarding my opponent as an estimable man. Even great and good minds are liable to be betrayed, in the heat of disputation, into false and uncandid statements. I never suspected Mr. Wardlaw, as he has accused me, of *wilful and deliberate* falsehood ; but, knowing his ardent and impetuous zeal in the cause he had espoused, I conceived him to be hurried into bitterness and misrepresentation, which in his more sober moments he would disapprove.

As the best method of avoiding such indecencies, and as an obvious and necessary precaution in the pursuit of truth, I have recommended, that, in discussing the evidence of religious doctrines,

---

\* Unit. Incap. of Vindication, pp. 1, 2.

*fancy, feeling, and passion*, should be suppressed, and the *judgment* preserved as cool and clear as possible.\* On this ground I have condemned the *eloquent declamation* and *fervent pleading*, which Mr. Wardlaw has employed through a large part of his Discourses, in place of the simple statement of facts and arguments. I have maintained, that such glowing appeals can only serve to confirm the mind in its preconceived opinions, whether true or false, and ought not to be employed, *until the controversy is terminated*, when the passions may properly aid the understanding in applying to practice the truths, which have been ascertained. To this Mr. Wardlaw replies, that the controversy was terminated *in his own mind*.† The question is, Was it terminated *in the minds of his hearers*? Mr. Wardlaw's Discourses are composed upon the supposition, *that it was not*. His volume is professedly a work of investigation; not designed *to enforce the discharge of duty* upon ascertained principles, but *to inform the understanding* concerning the evidences of disputed doctrines, and thus to assist in guiding it to the reception of the truth. Accordingly, in concluding his series of Discourses, he says, "*My sole object has been to vindicate and establish important scriptural truth.*" This object was doubtless deserving of all the attention he could bestow upon it. But he ought to have kept it distinct from the other object of "*persuading men*," by exciting in them feelings and desires upon the presumption that the truth was already established. By neglecting this important distinction, Mr. Wardlaw, as it appeared to me, greatly diminished the value of his Discourses to all readers who might go to them with a desire to judge of the truth of his doctrines, and not with a resolution to be confirmed in the belief of them.

I have already given it as my opinion, that, in the ordinary discourses delivered for the edification of his flock, a preacher ought to take his doctrines for granted, and to adopt, in the application of them to practice, an affectionate, fervent, and animated strain. But in sermons preached, or books published, simply for the purpose

---

\* Vind. of Unitarianism, pp. 3, 4, 36, 37, 245.

† Unit. Incap. of Vindication, p. 9.

of *instruction*, especially if they be upon subjects in themselves highly interesting, and therefore not requiring any embellishment to excite attention, but every caution to prevent the rise of turbulent passions, I still maintain, that the style of the reasoner and the critic ought to be adopted,—a style, calm, correct, deliberate, and dignified. The person who enters upon such a discussion, ought to avoid either the feeling, or the expression, of astonishment, scorn, or disgust, and, *in writing*, the vulgar appendage of frequent notes of admiration. By omitting the latter, Mr. Wardlaw has in the volume now under review evinced his usual good sense; but upon the former point he still adheres to his previous habits. He does not appear to discern, that, in sustaining the character which he has assumed in this controversy, he stands in a very different situation from the man, who is addressing a jury in a court of law, or a crowd at a popular election. In these cases, tones of surprise, expressions of pity, exaggerated statements, ludicrous portraits, and mental reservations, may be expected; the avowed intention of each orator being, as such affairs are usually transacted, to bring his hearers over to his own side of the question, whether true or false. But, when a man comes before the public, as Mr. Wardlaw has done,\* solemnly declaring, that TRUTH is the simple and exclusive aim of his INQUIRY, he ought to be the first object of his own astonishment and pity, if he attempts to rouse the ardent feelings and sectarian antipathies of his readers, instead of simply endeavouring to instruct their understandings by the serious, dispassionate, and impartial examination of the evidence, which is produced on each side of the disputed question.

Another consideration, which has often seriously impressed my own mind, is this: Many persons, observing that my opponent and I, although presumed to be acquainted with the original languages of the Scriptures, and to enjoy every requisite for discovering their signification, are, nevertheless, unable to agree between ourselves upon their most important and fundamental doctrines, will be disposed to infer, that the Scriptures themselves are full of obscurity,



and that that cannot be a Revelation from God, the very import of which it appears so difficult to determine. This conclusion may be false :—it *is* false. But it will be regarded by many as certainly true. Ought not we, then, who conduct the discussion, to be most deeply affected by that awful responsibility which appears to involve, not the interests of Orthodoxy or Unitarianism merely, but the acknowledgment of the divine origin of Christianity itself? In such a situation, I feel it to be incumbent upon me to retract, as quickly and as publicly as possible, every *error* into which I have fallen : to make every just and reasonable *concession*, however unfavourable to the consistency and stability of my own opinions ; in translating any passage of Scripture, to give *the exact sense* of the original words, although, taken by themselves, they should appear to present the most formidable objection to Unitarianism, or even to Christianity ; and, through the whole investigation, to labour to free my mind from every prejudice and false seduction, to suppress every emotion of pride, resentment, or party-spirit, and to preserve a single eye to truth, duty, and the approbation of God.

I have charged Mr. Wardlaw with employing, in the defence of his doctrines, “ a kind of management and generalship, which a votary of truth would scorn.” I have said, that in various instances he has represented the proofs which he has brought forward, as an *example* of what he might adduce, although he had nearly or entirely exhausted his store ; and I have specified six cases particularly.\* These cases Mr. Wardlaw has omitted to notice. He has merely denied the general charge ; and, after having promised † “ various additional proofs,” has shown that he might have produced more arguments to establish the single doctrine of the divinity of Christ, ‡ a fact, which I was not so ignorant of the subject as to call in question. My accusation stands unrefuted ; and, even if it had been expressed in those terms, to which Mr. Wardlaw has accommodated his reply, I should still think that he had offered an exaggerated

\* Vind. of Unitarianism, pp. 4, 5, 139, 144, 158, 167, 189, 202.

† See Advertisement to the Second Edition of his Discourses.

‡ Unit. of Incap. of Vind. pp. 364—378.

statement of the strength of his cause in professing to pursue A PLAN OF SELECTION, when the evidence which he passed over was so much less in amount than that which he employed.

Perhaps my language was unnecessarily offensive, when I accused Mr. Wardlaw of endeavouring to render Unitarianism odious, “by bringing into notice every thing absurd or dangerous that was ever written by a Unitarian.” But I am not satisfied with his reply, that he was writing against *Socinians*, and, in exposing their sentiments, took his extracts from their principal writers.\* The general strain even of Socinian † authors is exceedingly opposite to the spirit of the passages which Mr. Wardlaw has cited. But the fact is, that his Discourses, though entitled “Discourses on the *Socinian* Controversy,” are directed against all Unitarians. They contain a defence of the Trinitarian doctrine in opposition to Arians as well as Socinians, and the sentiments of the former are repeatedly condemned as equally unscriptural with the opinions of the latter. In conducting this general attack, Mr. Wardlaw has selected some of their boldest conjectures from the two writers ‡ among Socinians, who have probably pushed to the greatest extreme their departure from the orthodox standard, and he has represented these as the doctrines held by the great body of the Unitarians. If he was writing, as he asserts that he was, “against *Socinians*,” he ought to have aimed simply at the subversion of Socinianism; if against *Unitarians*, he ought not to have confounded their doctrines with the peculiarities of Socinianism, and certainly not with sentiments received by a small number even among Socinians. §

\* Unit. of Incap. of Vind. p. 11.

† I use the term *Socinian* to denote all Unitarians who deny the *pre-existence* of Christ. In this sense the word is commonly understood, and seems to be uniformly employed by Mr. Wardlaw. If the reader prefer *Humanitarian*, or any other term, he may substitute it in place of Socinian wherever the latter occurs.

‡ Dr. Priestley and Mr. Belsham. See Discourses, pp. 166—172, &c. &c.

§ Although it is my intention to say little or nothing upon the *temper and spirit* in which Mr. Wardlaw has composed his last publication, I must not

With respect to the remark of Judge Cooper, I am satisfied, if it be understood by our readers, *that it was not the remark of a Unitarian*. Previously to the explanation which has now taken place, there can be little doubt that the contrary opinion would be suggested by the circumstances in which it was introduced by Mr. Wardlaw.



## CHAPTER II.

OUR author repeatedly expresses his opinion, that, besides vindicating the general principles of Unitarianism, which was the object of my work, I ought also to have explained in it my own particular sentiments respecting the person of Christ.\* “Mr. Yates,” says he, “has accused me of management and generalship. I will not retort the charge. There is one thing, however, for which I have felt it difficult to account, consistently with that manly openness and decision, which I should have expected of him; I mean the impossibility of discovering from his book, what his own sentiments are.”—To have stated my own particular opinions would have been *open* and *manly*.—Why?—Of course, because they would have been liable to be attacked. Now this was precisely the thing I wished to avoid. I was employed in writing a “Vindication of UNITARIANISM.”

---

omit to notice his repetition of the very same species of misrepresentation of which I complained in his Discourses. In the work now under review, if not in the former, he certainly professes to write, not against Socinians merely, but against Unitarians in general. He nevertheless persists in bringing forward a great variety of obnoxious opinions as the principles of Unitarianism, although they have been held *by a small number only among the Socinians*. See Unit. Incap. of Vindication, pp. 380, 383, 391, 392, 395, 404. If Unitarianism were such a system as is here represented, never would I have written in its vindication. But every candid inquirer will probably regard it as a considerable presumption in favour of the doctrine, which I *have* vindicated, that Mr. Wardlaw should have recourse to such a method of bringing it into disrepute.

\* Unit. Incap. of Vind. pp. 15—18, 199, 201, 229, 267.

To its evidences I wished the attention of the public to be directed, perfectly confident, as I am still, that a conviction of its truth would arise in many readers from a careful and dispassionate perusal of the controversy; I had observed the disposition in Mr. Wardlaw's party, (strikingly manifested by their publication of a trifling pamphlet of Extracts from Dr. Magee,) to draw off the minds of inquirers from the great questions in debate, and to occupy them with frivolous discussions upon minute points of doctrine, maintained by a few Unitarians, represented as the tenets of the whole body, and thus calculated to preserve the fabric of orthodoxy by inviting to themselves the assaults which might occasion its speedy demolition; and I had not a doubt, that if I simply *declared my opinion* upon any minor topic, I should be dragged into a tedious and unprofitable dispute upon it to the neglect of my proper and avowed object. The design of my volume being the defence of Unitarianism, I was careful not only to admit into it no sentiment which I do not myself fully believe, but also to admit no general doctrine, and no explanation of any particular passage, to which every Unitarian of every degree of deviation from the orthodox faith might not give his assent. None of my interpretations from Scripture are adapted to the *distinctive peculiarities* either of Arianism or Socinianism. Mr. Wardlaw's assertion is therefore utterly false, that "whenever I have found myself pinched by a text on the Socinian hypothesis of the mere manhood of Christ, I have had recourse to the Arian view of his pre-existence." At the same time, his conclusions are equally unjustifiable, that I "consider it as a matter of little or no consequence, whether Jesus was the first and most exalted of creatures, or a mere man, the offspring of Joseph and Mary," and that I "regard the Scriptures as leaving this point quite unsettled." Upon all proper occasions, I freely state either my opinions or my doubts. But I shall not sacrifice the opportunity of bringing into discussion the great principles of Unitarianism for the purpose of obtaining the praise of "manly openness and decision."

Mr. Wardlaw further expresses his apprehension, that "my attempt to please every body will end in pleasing no body; and that most, if not all, both of Socinians and Arians, will be dissatisfied

with what they will consider as a compromise of important truth." I solemnly assure Mr. Wardlaw, that I wrote my work, "not as pleasing men, but God who trieth the heart." Nevertheless, through his blessing, and the candid indulgence of my readers, it has been received on both sides of the Atlantic with an approbation far exceeding any hopes which I could have ventured to indulge; and one of the circumstances, upon which this approbation has been chiefly grounded, is the omission of all doctrines except the general principles of Unitarianism.

Indeed it was impossible for me, in defending the opinions of Unitarians, to employ any other method. Among them Arians and Socinians, and even Arian and Socinian *ministers*, are continually meeting together as members of the same congregations; and in every part of the world where they exist, they are, I believe, accustomed to unite in all the works of Christian faith and charity.

Did I not confidently expect, I should earnestly hope and desire, that they may never separate into distinct denominations. Many express precepts of the New Testament, \* and the whole spirit of the gospel, require us to avoid divisions. They are disgraceful to Christianity; they tend to prevent the exercise of the pious and benevolent affections; among Trinitarians they have unhappily produced the most bitter animosity and cruel persecution. Let those, who worship one God, the Father, and serve one master, the Lord Jesus Christ, be for ever united by one spirit of devotion and love.

The great purpose, for which we meet together as members of religious societies, is to perform Divine worship. It is therefore evidently necessary, that we be agreed respecting the object, to whom our worship is addressed. Hence we are unavoidably constrained to separate from our Christian brethren of *Trinitarian* sentiments, preserving, however, the respect due to the talents, the piety, and the virtues, which we observe among them, wishing them the blessing of God in every good work, desirous of their advance-

---

\* See Rom. xii. 16, xiv. 1, xv. 7, xvi. 17; 1 Cor. i. 10—13, iii. 3—23, xii. 12—31; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Gal. v. 13—26, &c. &c. &c.

ment in knowledge and in holiness, and praying that by the serious and impartial study of the Holy Scriptures they may be brought to the exclusive worship of the One True God. Conscientious Unitarians cannot possibly perform the duties of social worship in places, where supreme adoration is paid to two persons, whom they do not believe to be God. In them such a practice would be idolatry, and a profanation of the Sabbath. But, having separated from Trinitarians, and being agreed that THE FATHER is the being, whom men ought to worship, they are under no necessity to separate any further.

Whilst Unitarians, notwithstanding their differences of opinion upon minor topics, maintain the spirit of unity and mutual affection, they may avoid contracting a careless indifference to truth. Indeed, their constitution furnishes them with singular advantages in pursuing it, because a change of sentiment, founded upon inquiry, is not attended with a painful separation from former religious connexions: and while, by uniting *as worshippers of the Father only*, they are free from those impediments to further investigation, which would arise from a subdivision into parties, they have every opportunity of assisting one another by friendly discussion and the mutual communication of their sentiments.

Although no man of an impartial and inquiring mind need long remain in doubt concerning the truth or falsehood of the doctrine of the Trinity, it is much more difficult to decide between the systems, avowed by different descriptions of Unitarians; especially for those who cannot study the Scriptures in their original languages. A person so situated may argue, “ I find abundant proof in the Scriptures, that the Father is the Only True God, and that Jesus Christ is a created, subordinate, and dependant being; but I cannot so easily determine in my own mind every question which has been raised respecting his nature, person, and office. Upon the one side I observe men of great candour, learning, and piety, such as Doctors Clarke, Price, and Taylor, who think that the Scriptures assert the *pre-existence* of our Saviour. I observe others, such as Dr. Lardner, Dr. Priestley, and Mr. Lindsey, who maintain, that the New Testament represents him to have been *originally a man*. Were

I to be guided *by the general tenor* of the New Testament, I should probably adopt the latter opinion, because I find the Sacred Writers continually ascribing to Jesus the ordinary actions, feelings, and appearance of a human being. But I find particular passages, which it is difficult to interpret in consistency with this supposition; which bear at least the semblance of Arianism; and upon the explanation of which Socinians themselves are not agreed. I am at a loss to arrive at a decided opinion, and think it better to remain a little longer in doubt than to form a judgment precipitately." Supposing a man in this state,—a state very likely to occur to the most candid and reflecting minds, ought the Unitarians, who deviate either more or less from the standard of orthodoxy, to exclude such a one from their religious societies, until he has made up his opinion upon these points? Ought they to endeavour to bring him over to a party by such a hasty determination, and such a tumultuous contest of his thoughts and feelings, as must be in the highest degree unfavourable to the discovery of truth? Or ought they not rather to preserve that constitution of their religious societies, which may invite and assist him to apply for the habitual consolation and improvement of his mind those great truths, upon which his belief is already fixed, while he proceeds to investigate with due caution the various points upon which it is more difficult to arrive at a certain conclusion? In fine, if it be desirable, as doubtless it is, that we should all entertain correct views respecting the Person of Christ, it is yet more desirable that we should maintain the spirit and temper of the Gospel; and the liberal principles upon which our societies are at present formed, appear far more conducive to the attainment of *both* of these important ends, than a division into distinct denominations would be to the attainment of *either*.

In that part of his work which has called forth the preceding observations, Mr. Wardlaw affirms, "that those who arrogate to themselves the exclusive title of *Unitarians*, design to convey by it the tacit insinuation that Trinitarians deny the Divine unity."—Far from it. When our opponents call themselves *Trinitarians*, they do not mean to intimate that they believe in *three Gods*; nor, when we call ourselves *Unitarians*, do we intend that term to signify that

we believe in *one God*. The former term was first in use, having been adopted by the Trinitarians themselves to express their belief, that there are *Three Persons* in the Godhead. The latter was invented as a correlative appellation to designate those who believe, that there is in the Godhead *only one person*. If *any* Unitarians employ the term as Mr. Wardlaw asserts that *all* of them do, they mistake its correct meaning ; and, when professed Trinitarians maintain, as is sometimes the case, that *they* are Unitarians, they either attribute to the name a sense which does not belong to it, or concede the very point in debate, namely, that there is but one Person in the Godhead.

◆

### CHAPTER III.

MR. WARDLAW in his former work, (especially in his Sixth Discourse,) gave what appeared to me a most false and injurious representation of the regard paid to the Sacred Scriptures by Unitarians, and thus compelled me to write a Chapter, stating facts, which would present a fairer view of their conduct and sentiments upon this subject. To the accuracy of my remarks he is unable to offer any objection. But, instead of acknowledging the injustice of his former assertions, he now says, that his accusations were only intended for the *Socinians*, especially those of modern times.\* Had this been the case, I should not have thought it incumbent upon me to refute them, although I believe they would be untenable, even as applied to Socinians. But Mr. Wardlaw in his Discourses generally, and in his Discourse “on the Test of Truth” particularly, was opposing not only Socinians, but Unitarians of every variety of sentiment. “It is extremely difficult,” says he,† “to maintain a process of scriptural reasoning *with the adversaries of the Divinity and Atonement of Christ*, because the notions which they entertain respecting the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures are so very vague and undefined.” Thus does Mr. Wardlaw set out with a charge

---

\* Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 23.

† P. 166.



against the whole body of Unitarians. "Of this," he proceeds to say in the next sentence, "I must lay before you two or three instances." The examples, which he quotes, are from Dr. Priestley and Mr. Belsham, the former of whom he introduces as "one of the most eminent writers," and the latter "as a leading author," among those who deny the Divinity of Christ, adding that, "although all the writers of this class may not express themselves with the same decidedness, and reject, in terms equally unqualified, the inspiration of the Sacred Volume, yet they are all characterized by a similar laxity of principle on this important point." The reader may now judge, whether Mr. Wardlaw's charges were not directed against Unitarians generally, and whether I had not ground to accuse him \* of availing himself of the latitude of inquiry and freedom of expression prevalent among them, in order to bring forward the sentiments of individual writers as a representation of the principles of the whole party.

Of the language and sentiments of Dr. Priestley, contained in the passages which Mr. Wardlaw has quoted, I strongly disapprove; and I have no doubt, that my sentiments are those of the great mass of Unitarians. But I hope I shall always be far more abhorrent from the spirit of virulence, malignity, and persecution, of which he was the object. This spirit would be almost unavoidably excited in many of Mr. Wardlaw's readers by the quotation of the most objectionable passages from the Doctor's writings, unaccompanied by any notice of his various and extraordinary excellencies, both as a philosopher and as a man. My remarks upon his character were intended to supply this deficiency, and have fully answered their end. In contemplating Dr. Priestley's eminent abilities as a literary, scientific, and theological writer, and the vehement opposition which he experienced, I recollected a passage of Pindar, upon my quotation of which Mr. Wardlaw grounds the remark, that I have "honoured him with a place amongst crows and chattering jays, in their impertinent pursuit of the bird of Jove." † I should have hoped his self-knowledge might have enabled him to discover, that the quotation

---

\* Vindication of Unit. pp. 5, 6.

† Unit. Incap. of Vind. pp. 2, 29.

was not designed for him, as his talents appear to be of a different kind from those, which are there designated. The Greek poet expresses a very important and philosophical distinction between the man of original invention, (*ὁ πολλὰ εἰδώς φυγ,*) and the man, who merely amasses the sentiments and expressions of those who have gone before him. The *discoveries* of the former are always opposed by the *prejudices and borrowed knowledge* of the latter,—a fact, strikingly illustrated by the literary life of Dr. Priestley, than whom, I imagine, few men have appeared in any age of the world, to whom the description of Pindar was more applicable.

It gives me peculiar pleasure to find, that Mr. Wardlaw approves of my statement of the general principles, which ought to be followed in ascertaining the sense of the Scriptures. It is likewise a great satisfaction to read his acknowledgments, expressed in the strongest terms, of the applause due to Professor Griesbach for his corrected edition of the Greek Testament. I have now nothing more to ask, but that Mr. Wardlaw would permit me and other Unitarians to follow Griesbach's text, without accusing us in so doing of "*vaunting,*" "*pitiful disingenuousness,*" "*triumphant confidence,*" &c. He complains of the "*perpetual appeal of the Unitarians to the authority of Griesbach.*"\* I humbly think, that our appeal *ought* to be perpetual. If not, by what rule are we to determine, when to follow the text formerly in use among the learned, and when to employ that of Griesbach? The superior correctness of his text is now universally conceded. Why may we not manifest at least equal respect in studying the Scriptures as in reading *profane authors*, by preferring the constant use of the most accurate edition?

There was little occasion for Mr. Wardlaw † to solicit *my* serious attention to the solemn declaration, made by this eminent critic, of his faith in the Divinity of Christ. The passage quoted was not new to me, and in my "*Vindication*" ‡ I had remarked, that Griesbach was himself a Trinitarian, and therefore could not be supposed to have been influenced, in his corrections of the text, by any desire to favour the opposite doctrines. This conclusion is obvious and

\* Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 32—34.

† Ibid. pp. 31, 32.

‡ P. 29.

irresistible. But the inference, which Mr. Wardlaw wishes me to draw, namely, that the New Testament may be presumed to teach the Supreme Deity of Christ, because Griesbach thought that it does, is founded upon a very different species of logic. Griesbach was educated in the orthodox faith ; he was accustomed to associate with orthodox men ; he was a Professor of Theology in an orthodox university. He was therefore subject to numerous prejudices and sinister influences, which would tend to divert his mind from the direct pursuit of truth ; and, unless we are assured, that, when investigating the doctrines of Christianity, he made strenuous exertions to guard against the undue bias of education, interest, and all the seductive circumstances, by which he was surrounded, we owe no particular deference to his opinion upon these subjects. I believe, the *translation* and *interpretation* of Scripture did not in any considerable degree occupy his attention. The great object of his life was the *emendation of the text*. In this department of criticism, to which his time and talents were devoted, I bow to his authority. But, as a *translator* and *interpreter* of the New Testament, I believe, he never sought,—he certainly has not obtained, any distinguished reputation.



#### CHAPTER IV.

IN my Chapter “on the Propriety of believing in Mysteries,” I have brought into notice three senses, in which the word *Mystery* is used.

In the first place, I have considered the propriety of assenting to Mysteries, supposing that term to mean “*Doctrines, which are understood, and seen to be absurd.*” Upon this definition Mr. Wardlaw makes the following remark, amounting to an assertion, that no Trinitarians have ever professed to believe mysteries in this sense of the term. “That those doctrines which are denominated ‘mysteries’ by Triniturians, are understood, and seen to be absurd by Unitarians we know ;—but who they are, who apply the word *mysteries* to doctrines, which are understood, and seen to be absurd *by themselves*,

we do *not* know." \* The following extracts from some of the most eminent Trinitarians will suffice to justify me in considering this as one of the principal senses, in which the term *mystery* has been employed.

1. "As we are obliged to obey the Divine law, though our *will* murmur against it; so are we obliged to believe the word of God, though our *reason* be shocked at it. For, *if we should believe only such things as are agreeable to our reason*, we assent to the matter, and not to the author; which is no more than we do to a suspected witness. But the faith, imputed to Abraham for righteousness, consisted in a particular laughed at by Sarah, who in that respect was an image of the natural Reason. And therefore *the more absurd and incredible any Divine mystery is, the greater honour we do to God in believing it, and so much the more noble the victory of faith.*"

LORD BACON, De Aug. Scient. L. ix. prope initium.

2. "He (*namely*, Lord Bacon) is here express, *that Reason and Faith are opposites*; and if this position be allowed, *Revelation will then perhaps stand on its just foundation.*"

DR. SHAW; Note on the above passage.

3. "For that any one should be both Father and Son to the same person, produce himself, be Cause and Effect too, and so the copy give being to its original, seems at first sight so very strange and unaccountable, that, *were it not to be adored as a Mystery, it would be exploded as a Contradiction.*"

DR. SOUTH; Sermons, Vol. III. No. 7, on Rev. xxii. 16.

4. "I ever did, and ever shall, look upon those apprehensions of God to be the truest, whereby we apprehend him to be the most incomprehensible, *and that to be the most true of God, which seems most impossible unto us.* Upon this ground, therefore, it is, that the mysteries of the gospel, which I am less able to conceive, I think myself the more obliged to believe; especially this mystery of mysteries, the Trinity in Unity, and Unity in Trinity, which I am so far

---

\* Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 47.

from being able to comprehend or indeed to apprehend, that I cannot set myself seriously to think of it, or to screw up my thoughts a little concerning it, but I immediately lose myself, as in a trance or ecstasy : that God the Father should be one perfect God of himself, God the Son one perfect God of himself, and God the Holy Ghost one perfect God of himself ; and yet that these three should be but one perfect God of himself, so that one should be perfectly three, and three perfectly one ; that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, should be Three, and yet but One ; but One, and yet Three ! O heart-amazing, thought-devouring, unconceivable mystery ! Who cannot believe it to be true of the glorious Deity ?”

BISHOP BEVERIDGE ; *Private Thoughts*, Art. III.

5. “ The Satisfaction of Christ is *an unaccountable, irrational doctrine, destroys every natural idea we have of Divine Justice, and, lay aside the evidence of Scripture, is so far from being true, that it is ridiculous.*”

MR. THOMAS BRADBURY ; *Sermons*, pp. 39, 40.

6. “ In this awfully stupendous manner,” that is, in the scheme of Redemption, as maintained by Trinitarians, “ *at which Reason stands aghast, and Faith herself is half confounded*, was the grace of God to man at length manifested.”

BISHOP HURD ; *Sermons at Lincoln's Inn*, Vol. II. No. XVII.

7. “ That three Beings should be one Being, is a proposition, *which certainly contradicts reason*, that is, *our reason* ; but it does not from thence follow, that it cannot be true ; *for there are many propositions, which contradict our reason, and yet are demonstrably true.*”

MR. SOAME JENYNS ; *View of the Internal Evidence of the Christian Religion*, p. 160, 4th Edition.

It is evident, that those, who coincide with the principles of these extracts, conceive it proper to admit doctrines, which they think contrary to the decisions of the human understanding, because they suppose them to be declared in a religion, to which God has borne his testimony by the display of miracles. In opposition to this

reasoning I have stated \* the well-known argument, that the intrinsic absurdity of a doctrine is a stronger proof *against* it than even miracles could be *for* it; because the evidence of miracles depends only upon *the testimony of the senses*, and upon *a deduction of the understanding* respecting the proof which they afford of the Divine authority of him who displays them, and because this evidence can never be sufficient *to overbalance the objection* arising from the very nature of absurd and self-contradictory propositions. Mr. Wardlaw repeats his assent to this maxim. Supposing "*Mysteries*" to mean "propositions, which directly contradict first principles, known facts, or indisputable truths," he observes that "instead of the Scriptures warranting the reception of such mysteries, such mysteries would warrant the rejection of the Scriptures." †

Unitarians maintain, as universally and as strenuously as their opponents, that what is declared in Divine Revelation must be true, however averse the understandings of individual men may be to its reception. To prove this fact, in opposition to Mr. Wardlaw's accusations, I formerly quoted a passage from the old Socinian Tracts. ‡ Mr. Wardlaw is not at all disposed to retract, or even to abate his charge, but contents himself with objecting, that the passage alluded to was written "*a hundred and fifty years since.*" § I now therefore quote the very same sentiments from one of those writers, whom he has mentioned *by name*, || as the sources of his information and the direct objects of his charge.

"I will frankly own," says Mr. LINDSEY, ¶ "that I must reject whatever comes to me as *inconsistent with* and *contrary to* my reason; because this is the only light and direction, which my Maker has given me, by which to judge of any thing, even of his own character and perfections, and the credibility of any farther discovery he may

\* Vind. of Unitarianism, pp. 39, 40, 128, 129, 160, 161.

† Unit. Incap. of Vind. pp. 46, 47.

‡ Vind. of Unit. p. 18.

§ Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 26.

|| Ibid. p. 11.

¶ Examination of Mr. Robert Robinson's Plea for the Divinity of Christ, London, 1785, Preface, p. xxiii.

make of his will than this his light of nature affords ; and I am persuaded, he cannot require the belief of any thing which shocks and goes against the natural understanding he has given me ; for that would be to put me under different and impossible obligations at the same time.—But no Unitarian that I know, or have read of, did ever object to any part of a Divine Revelation, because it was *beyond his comprehension*. Let me but know clearly, that God has signified his mind and will ; and then, let the subject be ever so unfathomable by me, I will receive and believe it ; because no better reason can possibly be given for any thing, than that God hath said it.”—Should Mr. Wardlaw say, that this too is “ a curious and interesting relic,” I hope the reader will believe me, that it expresses, so far as I know, the sentiments still universally held by Unitarians.

Having laid down these principles concerning *absurd but intelligible* propositions, I have, in the second place, considered what regard is due to Mysteries, supposing them to be “ propositions, to the terms of which *no distinct ideas* are annexed.” I proposed this definition, as better adapted to the general *tenor* of Mr. Wardlaw’s reasoning,—to the *confirmation* of it, if just, and of course, to its “ *subversion*,” if false. I am sorry to find Mr. Wardlaw opposing this statement by a charge of *disingenuous misrepresentation*.\* I am unconscious of any such *intention* ; and, although Mr. Wardlaw’s expressions upon this subject seem to me deficient in *clearness* both in his Discourses and in his Rejoinder to my Reply, I think I had sufficient grounds for the view which I have taken of the nature of his reasoning.

When he proposes his doctrines of a Trinity of persons in the Godhead, and of the union of two opposite natures in Jesus Christ, he allows that these doctrines are Mysteries, but maintains that they are not on that account to be disbelieved. Let us observe some of the expressions by which he illustrates his meaning. To justify a belief in the Trinity, he remarks that we are accustomed to assert

---

\* Unit. Incap. of Vindication, p. 56.

the omnipresence of God: "but," he inquires, "while *certain modes of expression* are on this subject familiar to our minds, have we ever endeavoured to analyse *the conceptions*, which these modes of expression *APPEAR to convey?*"\* Shortly afterwards,† he expresses his doubt, "whether any thing that is above reason can ever be shewn to be contrary to it;" he vindicates this doubt by the following clear and satisfactory argument: "For, unless we have *some notion* of the thing itself, on what principle can we possibly make out the contrariety?" And, in the next sentence, he applies this general principle to the particular doctrine, which he is treating as a *mystery*, and expresses himself as follows: "Were we to say, that the persons of the Godhead are one and three *in the same sense*, we should evidently affirm what is contrary to reason, because such a proposition would involve in the very terms of it an irreconcilable contradiction; but so long as *we do not pretend to know, or to say, HOW they are one, and HOW they are three,*" (*that is, IN WHAT SENSE they are one, and IN WHAT SENSE they are three; ‡ or in other words, so long as we do not pretend TO ANNEX ANY DISTINCT IDEAS TO THE TERMS OF THE PROPOSITION,*) "to prove that we assert what is contrary to reason, when we affirm that they are both, is from the very nature of the thing impossible." "For what is it," he proceeds, "which is to be proved contrary to reason? Upon the supposition made, *we cannot tell: it is something which we do not know; OF THE NATURE AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF WHICH WE ARE LEFT IN TOTAL IGNORANCE.*" §

In other parts of his Discourses, where Mr. Wardlaw is obviating the objections of those who say that his doctrines are mysteries, unreasonable and therefore incredible, he allows that they are indeed Mysteries, *because no clear conception, or distinct idea, can be conveyed to the mind of any man, respecting the import of the terms in which they are expressed.*

\* Discourses, p. 20.

† P. 23.

‡ In his last work, Mr. Wardlaw employs this exact language: "I believe, that *in one sense* Deity is One, and that *in some other sense* Deity is Three." Unit. of Incap. of Vind. p. 59.

§ Pp. 11, 34, 35.



If the impartial reader will attentively consider the passages of Mr. Wardlaw's Discourses, to which I have now referred, he will be at no loss to perceive, that my definition of a Mystery, (namely, as *a Proposition, to the terms of which no distinct ideas are annexed,*) is the only definition, which is accommodated to the tenor of his reasoning. I nevertheless allow, that there is, in all that he has written upon this subject, a great want of consistency, clearness, and precision, and that expressions might be quoted, which would lead to a different explication of the term. Thus he asks, \* whether we ought to refuse to admit "mysteries" in religion, when we find innumerable "DIFFICULTIES" in the study of nature? As if by "a mystery" he only intended to denote what we are accustomed to call "*a difficulty.*" A large portion of what Mr. Wardlaw has said might lead us to define a mystery to be *a Fact, which we believe upon competent evidence, although we do not perceive its conformity with other facts.* He says, for instance, We may believe that *a thing is*, without pretending to know how it is. By this he must either intend, that we may admit the truth of a proposition without understanding the terms, in which it is expressed, that is, believe that *a thing is*, without pretending to know *in what sense* it is; or he must mean, that we may believe a fact, without knowing *how to reconcile it to other facts*, or how to account for it upon previously admitted principles. Understood in either of these senses, Mr. Wardlaw's remark is undoubtedly just. But it is only when taken in the former sense, that it appears to have any connexion with his general argument. If taken in the latter sense, a different train of reasoning would apply.

When we admit a fact without perceiving its conformity with other facts, *we attach distinct ideas to all the terms employed.* That *want of conformity*, which constitutes *the difficulty*, must always appear *an objection* to the reality of the fact, which we receive as true. The fact must be established by other evidence, sufficient to outweigh the objection. As the want of conformity may vary *in degree*, the evidence opposed to it must always be greater *in the same*

---

\* Discourses, pp. 25, 26.

*proportion*, in order that the fact may be credible. It is the business of philosophy, by a further investigation and more minute comparison, to *discover* that conformity, which we do not at present perceive, and which, if ascertained, would increase the evidence of *all* the facts, remove the difficulty, and clear up the mystery. But when the want of conformity amounts in its degree to a *direct contradiction*, it cannot be counterbalanced by any evidence whatsoever, and it is to be concluded, that *at least one* of the alleged facts is *false*. In this case *the difficulty* passes into an *absurdity*. It becomes a Mystery *according to the first sense*, which has been noticed in the discussion of this subject.

The third sense of the term Mystery, which I have considered in my "Vindication," is the meaning annexed to it in the New Testament. The relevancy of this explanation is obvious; and its importance must be equally apparent to all who think with me, that great numbers of professed Christians are entirely ignorant upon the subject, and accustomed to consider the occurrence of the term "Mystery" in the New Testament as a reason for believing every doctrine, proposed to them by the clergy under the same name. Although Mr. Wardlaw complains of my conduct as *ungenerous* in undertaking to illustrate this sense of the term at all, he fully assents to *the accuracy* of my explanation. Against what I have written he has advanced but one objection. I have asserted, that the mysteries, or *secrets*, revealed by Jesus Christ in the gospel, which upon examination we find to be such simple and intelligible facts as the Resurrection of the dead, and the Conversion of the Gentiles, contain nothing, which is *difficult to be understood*. "How," asks Mr. Wardlaw,\* "will this be made to comport with the declaration of the inspired Apostle Peter," that in the Christian religion there are "*some things hard to be understood?*"—By reflecting, that the things "hard to be understood" are *perfectly distinct* from the disclosed secrets.

I remarked in my Vindication,† that the sentiments often advanced by Trinitarians in defending their doctrines against the

\* Unit. Incap. of Vindication, p. 43.

† Pp. 44—47.

objections of Reason tend to Universal Scepticism. I then referred to Mr. Hume's "Dialogues on Natural Religion," as containing a demonstration, that Orthodoxy and Infidelity are erected upon the very same basis, namely, the general uncertainty of the deductions formed by the human understanding, and the more than ordinary indistinctness of our ideas upon matters of religion. I shall now quote in his own words the fundamental principles of another distinguished advocate of Scepticism.\* The reader may compare them with the principles, which are avowed by Mr. Wardlaw, and which he cannot but avow, while he undertakes to defend Trinitarianism. "A *Rational* faith," says Mr. Henry Dodwell, Jun., "is always precarious; for what reason first established, the same reason must ever have the power to repeal;" and, "If a man is to be held only by his own reasonings, what is this but stamping an equal mark of necessary truth upon a thousand opposite opinions?" (*Christianity not founded on Argument*, pp. 26, 44.) "How," says Mr. Wardlaw, "are the doctrines of any pretended Revelation to be *proved irrational*? It is very manifest, that the reason of any individual man can never be assumed as the standard of reason for mankind in general, and still less of reason in the abstract." "That may be pronounced irrational by a Socinian, which may not appear so to a Trinitarian: who in this case is to decide?" (*Unitarianism Incapable of Vindication*, p. 44.) Thus do the opposers of Unitarianism and of Christianity necessarily assume the very same ground.

"But," says Mr. Wardlaw, "nothing can be more unfortunate than representing the sentiment in question as tending to Scepticism. For it is *the opposite sentiment*, that is the very principle and basis of Scepticism,—the sentiment, *that nothing is to be believed which we do not fully comprehend.*" Undoubtedly; scepticism will follow from this principle as certainly as from the opposite assump-

---

\* That such expressions are far from being confined to this particular Author, may be seen by consulting the very just and valuable observations of Mr. Dugald Stewart in his Dissertation prefixed to the Supplement of the Encyclopedia Britannica, pp. 78, 79.

tion, *that we cannot comprehend any thing.* To *each* of these false maxims we may apply the description, which Mr. Wardlaw has given of one of them only, "It is this that unsettles the mind, and throws it loose from all sure belief and stable principle." We cannot in any case *believe*, if we suppose, either that the evidence is insufficient, or that OUR MINDS ARE INCAPABLE OF ESTIMATING THE EVIDENCE. Our minds are, as we well know, liable to be misled in various ways from the attainment of truth. Let us therefore guard against the sources of error. Let us be aware of the force of prejudice and passion, worldly interest and sensual appetite. Let us, if we have leisure and opportunity, study what the ablest philosophers have written upon the right conduct of the human understanding, the various modes of investigating truth, and the different kinds of evidence upon which belief may be established. The fact is indisputable, *that whatever opinions a man holds are formed in his own mind and BY his own mind.* HIS OWN JUDGMENT he always *does*, and always *must* follow, in drawing inferences from what he sees with his eyes, in assenting to what he hears with his ears, and even in submitting to Authority, whether Human or Divine. In reply therefore to Mr. Wardlaw's queries above cited, I answer, that upon every question each individual must "decide" for himself; that to each individual his own reason is the ultimate "standard" of truth; and that each man, in estimating the evidence even of Divine Revelation, must depend upon his private judgment to determine whether it is possible, that the doctrines contained in it can be true. "But in all this," it will be objected, "he is liable to fall into errors."—Undoubtedly; into errors, many and dangerous. Let him therefore proceed with caution. Let him not cease to reason: for that is impossible; even then *he would be reasoning* against the use of reason. Let him only be solicitous to reason *modestly, carefully, dispassionately, and justly.*



## PART II.

---

### CHAPTER I.

THE serious believer in the Gospel, who wishes to ascertain what are its real doctrines, having informed himself respecting the proper rules and aids for understanding the sense of the Scriptures, will take the Bible into his hands, and open it to find what it declares, without having his mind prepossessed with any set of opinions serving as a system of interpretation, or being anxious to know whether it contains the sentiments of any particular sect. This course I have endeavoured to pursue for my private satisfaction; and, in writing my "Vindication of Unitarianism," I wished to recommend it to the practice of my readers. Having settled the most important preliminary questions, I collected from the New Testament a great variety of passages, which in general required no comment, and which I arranged under different heads, as not merely proving, but plainly stating, certain doctrines. These doctrines I expressed as much as possible in the very words of Scripture; and I had no doubt, (as I have none hitherto,) that all readers, submitting upon these subjects to the authority of the Scriptures alone, would readily admit them, because it would be evident to every such inquirer, that to deny the truth of these doctrines is to deny the truth of Scripture. Thinking the declarations of the New Testament abundantly clear and intelligible without the use of any theological system to be "*applied as the key of interpretation,*" \* I took little notice of their bearing upon the opposite sides of the controversy, but left them to make their own impression upon

---

\* Wardlaw, Unit. Incap. p. 359.

the mind of every candid inquirer. I acknowledge the charge, which Mr. Wardlaw repeatedly brings against me. In all these statements, I was "careful to leave out of sight the double view of the person of Christ maintained by Trinitarians." With that "double view" I had then no concern. The question, which I wished every reader to determine *in the first place*, was not Whether the language of the Scriptures is *conformable to this popular doctrine*? but What does the New Testament teach concerning the Person of Christ, when its words are taken *in their plain and obvious sense*? Mr. Wardlaw cannot deny, that, thus understood, they assert with incessant repetition and in the clearest terms, that he was distinct from God, sent by Him, and inferior to Him; that he acted as the delegate and servant of the Father, who is the Only True God; and that he received from Him all his knowledge and his power.

But Mr. Wardlaw is not willing, that our readers should for a moment contemplate these doctrines except in connection with certain others, which he thinks are declared upon the same authority. Hence he maintains, that to every text, which asserts them, we ought to append an explanation, bringing the other doctrines into view as modifications of their meaning. He thus gives a new face to the whole Bible, and remarks truly enough,\* that it is "in vain" for me to be bringing forward "hundreds of plain Scripture testimonies," when they may all be viewed in a light totally different from that in which they appear upon the first aspect, and be easily reduced to a consistency with the doctrines which I oppose. The Scriptures, for example, assert that "*there is one God*," and Mr. Wardlaw does not deny,† that, if taken in their obvious meaning, these words would suggest a belief in *one person only* as God: but, holding that the Scriptures in other passages teach a plurality of persons in the Godhead, he maintains that "every text, which affirms the Divine unity, must be interpreted as meaning that God is *one* indeed, but *one according to the peculiar modification of Unity which belongs to Deity*;" and hence he draws the strange conclusion, that "every text, which

\* Unit. Incap. of Vind. pp. 338, 339.

† *Ibid.* p. 303.

affirms the Unity of God, *involves an affirmation of the Trinity.*" I have produced multitudes of passages from the New Testament, which teach in the clearest manner, that the one true God is *the Father*, and Mr. Wardlaw appears to agree with me in thinking, that, if these passages were taken in their obvious meaning, they would suggest a belief, that the Father, *regarded as one Person*, is the only true God: but, in order to make them conformable to the Trinitarian doctrine, — a doctrine presumed to rest upon the same authority, he resolves the simple and obvious meaning of the title "*Father*" into two different significations, supposing it sometimes to denote "the One Supreme," and sometimes one of the three Persons, who are supposed to constitute the One Supreme. Between these two senses he makes his choice according to the circumstances of each particular case, and by this invention contrives to reconcile the assertions of Scripture, that "the Father is the only true God," and that the "Father sent the Son," with the orthodox tenet, that the Son is God equal to the Father. Again, the Evangelists in various instances inform us, that *Jesus Christ worshipped the Father*; and this Mr. Wardlaw is willing to admit \* provided it be understood with his explanatory supplement, that "*the man* Christ Jesus, worshipped the Father." Our Lord also asserted in plain terms, that "he did not know the day of judgment." Mr. Wardlaw seems to allow, † that, if the doctrine of his two-fold nature be not previously brought into view, this text must be considered "as in direct terms asserting the limited extent of his knowledge;" but he maintains, that, having assumed that doctrine beforehand, we must interpret this passage in consistency with it, and understand our Saviour's assertion as signifying only, that "the time of judgment was not among the things *communicated to him* as the commissioned messenger of the Father." Jesus asserts absolutely, that *he did not know it*: Mr. Wardlaw corrects his assertion into *he did not know it by communication*. Yet this is the man, who is often blaming the Unitarians for "perverting the Scriptures from their obvious and simple meaning," ‡ annexing to

---

\* Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 311. † Ibid. p. 323. ‡ Ibid. preface, p. viii.

every expression “a Socinian gloss,” and “forcing the Bible by racks and screws and all the instruments of torture” to speak a language agreeable to their system. How strikingly does Mr. Wardlaw’s method of explanation illustrate the conclusion, at which the pious and learned Dr. Whitby arrived towards the end of a life devoted to the study of the Scriptures; “In fine, this doctrine (meaning the Trinity) 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.”\*

In following this plan, Mr. Wardlaw has proceeded upon a principle, the adoption of which deserves particular attention, because it forms a striking feature of distinction between the modes, in which the Scriptures are studied by the Unitarians, and by their opponents. The former, as I have already endeavoured to explain, go to the Scriptures, without the assumption of any previous hypothesis, to find *what they plainly declare*: the latter begin *by assuming a particular system*, which they apply to the Scriptures as to the standard of truth, and which they profess themselves willing to abandon, if they find upon a comparison, that the Scriptures do not suit it. Upon the propriety and excellence of the latter method Mr. Wardlaw repeatedly insists, and he calls it “the *principle* of Trinitarian interpretation.”† The system, which he assumes for the purpose stated, is the doctrine, that the supposed second Person in the Trinity was united to the man Christ Jesus so as to form one person, retaining the Divine in conjunction with the Human Nature, and acting in the capacity of Mediator between God and men. He argues, that this doctrine ought to be received as true, because, if we assume it as an hypothesis, we find that it accords in a very wonderful manner with all the declarations of Scripture, however seemingly opposite, which relate to the person of Christ.

1. To this method of interpretation I object, that on its very first

\* Whitby’s Last Thoughts on the Trinity, p. 51.

† Discourses on the Socinian Controversy, pp. 45—47, 184—186; Unit. Incap. of Vind. pp. 177, 178, 237, 318, 332—339, 359—364.



aspect it appears most strange and unwarrantable. It is a method never adopted in interpreting any other writings. It is a bold affront to Holy Scripture, representing the word of God, given for the instruction of all mankind, as full of enigma and obscurity, not intelligible to the man, who goes to it with a pure, open, and candid mind; but, like the secret dispatches of a diplomatist, requiring the use of a "KEY" known only to those who are versed in the art of decyphering. There is no other book in existence, to the study of which we proceed with an idea, that we must find out its meaning by trying whether it accords with this, or that, or the other hypothesis; all that we think necessary is to understand the language, in which it is written, and then to open it and read it. In the same spirit we ought to enter upon the study of the New Testament, presuming, until some good reason is assigned for believing the contrary, that its principal doctrines lie upon its surface, and will be obvious to every unprejudiced reader.

2. To Mr. Wardlaw's plan of determining the import of the Scriptures by trying whether they will accord with a previously assumed hypothesis, I also object, that almost every man, who adopts this method of interpretation, will inevitably be guided in the choice of his hypothesis by his particular prejudices, interests, and attachments; that these will lead him to discover his doctrines where no trace of them exists, and to interpret the language of Scripture not by any rules of grammar or canons of criticism, but according to the inventions of his fancy and the dictates of his own will; and that, as fondness for his system will always have greater sway than reverence for the Scriptures, he will finally be prepared to adhere to the former, though by relinquishing the latter. Mr. Venn, a late distinguished advocate of Trinitarianism, from whom Mr. Wardlaw \* quotes with great approbation a statement of that doctrine, pursued the study of the Scriptures with a belief in the Trinity as his guide, and, always more attached to his system than to the Scriptures, declared that, if the doctrine of the Trinity should be proved false, "*he would burn his Bi-*

---

\* Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 72.

*ble.*" A follower of the late Joanna Southcott formed his religious faith upon the same general plan, only assuming a different hypothesis ; there can be little doubt, that he perceived in the Scriptures as clear and decisive proofs of all her assertions as Mr. Venn discovered of the doctrine of the Trinity, and, when her death overthrew his opinions, he adopted the very same resolution, that " *he would burn his Bible.*" What indeed is the cause of the endless diversity of sentiment among Christians, all of whom profess to follow the same guide, the Holy Scriptures, except that almost every man applies himself to the study of them with his judgment and affections pre-engaged in favour of some particular system ; and how can it be hoped, that the sacred authors should ever be rightly understood, the truth discovered, and any general uniformity of sentiment begin to prevail, until men are willing to apply themselves to the perusal of the Scriptures with minds divested of prejudice, and to judge of the doctrines contained in them from those plain and reiterated declarations, which admit of no doubt or hesitation as to their meaning ?

We have seen what is *the particular hypothesis*, which Mr. Wardlaw has adopted as *his* principle of interpretation. May we be permitted to ask, how was he induced to fix upon it ? Did he, like the industrious Kepler, when investigating the Law of the Planetary Revolutions, try one hypothesis after another in long succession, until at length he discovered a happy principle, agreeing to his inexpressible delight with all the appearances, which were to be explained and reconciled ? No, No. The system which he has applied to the interpretation of the Scriptures, was early taught to him by an " affectionate and pious Father ;" it was " imparted with tender solicitude ;" \* it was always regarded by him as the doctrine " of ninety-nine hundredths of what is called the Christian world," and therefore " presumed" to be true. † These, beyond all question, are the circumstances, which have put Mr. Wardlaw in possession of his highly valued " key, which fits all the wards of this seemingly intricate lock." ‡

---

\* Unit. Incap. of Vind. Dedication.

† Ibid. p. 62.

‡ Discourses, p. 47.

3. May we further inquire, whence has arisen the intricacy of the lock?—It was adapted to the complex structure of the key. Yes; the lock was fashioned after the pattern of the key, and not the key according to the model of the lock. The language of the New Testament, relating to the Person of Christ, was clear, simple, and consistent; but it was first *altered*, then *translated*, and last of all *interpreted* by men, whose views upon the subject were full of apparent contradiction. They imparted to the Scriptures some portion of that obscurity, which eminently distinguished their own system. They caused them, in a considerable number of passages, to reflect its image; and now Mr. Wardlaw, who has been accustomed from his childhood to the very same views, looks upon it as a most wonderful and transporting coincidence, that his system should correspond with the language of the vulgar translation.

4. If we examine the nature of this key more minutely, we find it to be of such a construction, that it cannot possibly open the avenues to TRUTH; it seems only adapted to conduct into the regions of wild fancy, appalling perplexity, and interminable error. The doctrine, assumed as an hypothesis, implies numerous contradictions. Being false in itself, it cannot possibly accord with the just interpretation of a religion, proceeding from the God of truth.

5. But, happily for mankind, no such perplexing instrument is requisite to unlock the casket, which contains the pearl of great price. It is not confined under a lock of almost hopeless intricacy; it is not confined under any lock at all. It is always open, always resplendent, always accessible. The true sense of the Scriptures is simple, plain, and obvious: but it appears so *only to the Unitarian*. He adopts the sentiments, which he finds repeatedly and clearly stated in them, because he devotes himself to the perusal with few prepossessions. He finds in the common translation *a few passages* at variance with the *obvious and prominent doctrines*; but, by appealing to the sources and rules of just criticism, he is able with ease and satisfaction to remove the inconsistency. Even with regard to the few passages, which the Trinitarian adduces to confound

him, he only asks to *have them correctly translated from a correct text, and HE RECEIVES EVEN THEM "IN THEIR OBVIOUS AND SIMPLE MEANING."*



## CHAPTER II.

IN the Seventh Chapter (Part II.) of my "Vindication," I have brought together the various passages in the New Testament, which relate to the power of Christ. I have shown, that these expressions do not leave it undecided, whether the power of Christ belonged to him by his own original nature, or whether it was communicated by, and exercised in subjection to, a superior; but that they all assert, as if with one voice, the Unitarian doctrine, that the power of Christ was given to him. Upon all these passages however Mr. Wardlaw puts the Trinitarian gloss, that it was only given to him *as Mediator, or with respect to his Human Nature*; to which I must object as a perversion of their plain and obvious meaning, which ought on no account to be allowed, until the distinction of the Divine and Human Natures in our Saviour has been established.

I divided the passages, which relate to the Power of Christ, into three classes; First, those which, *on the supposition of his pre-existence*, (a doctrine not universally received by Unitarians,) refer to the period prior to his birth of the Virgin Mary; Secondly, those which describe the exercise of his power during his ministry upon this earth; and Thirdly, those which relate to his present glorified state.

Under the First head, the first passage, which I produced, was the prayer of Jesus, "And now, O Father, glorify me with thine own self, *with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.*"\* I remarked, that the only circumstance requisite to prove the Unitarian doctrine, is established by the subsequent expressions in the

---

\* John xvii. 5.

same prayer, in which our Lord describes this glory as *given to him by the Father*.\* Upon the supposition of his pre-existence, which is an essential tenet of orthodoxy, this passage is completely decisive of his *inferiority*, not only because that inferiority is asserted in clear and express terms, but because in this case Trinitarians cannot have recourse to their usual refuge, the hypothesis of a Divine united with a Human Nature. Even the wonder-working "principle of Trinitarian interpretation" cannot explain how derived glory could belong to the Son, *before he was incarnate*. Mr. Wardlaw has been obliged to pass by this argument without the slightest notice.

I have next brought forward four passages, usually considered as proving, that Jesus Christ during his pre-existent state was employed in the creation of the world. I have shown, that the terms chosen by the sacred writers describe our Saviour as acting, not by independant authority, but as the instrument of a Superior; and that they not only assert the Unitarian doctrine in their obvious and simple meaning, but by excluding all possible reference to mediatorial inferiority. My argument is founded upon a distinction between two Greek prepositions, (HYPO and DIA,) and Mr. Wardlaw's observations imply a clear concession, that, if this distinction be just, the argument is conclusive. I have asserted,† that "when a New Testament writer employs the preposition DIA (with a genitive case) to point out the cause of any effect, he means the *instrumental* cause, and refers to some other being, either expressly mentioned, or contemplated, who is considered as the *first* or *original* cause."

To refute this statement Mr. Wardlaw ‡ produces eighteen passages of the New Testament, in which he supposes DIA to be employed for the purpose of "pointing out the cause of an effect," and yet to denote "the *first* or *original* cause." I shall endeavour to show, that of all these passages only one, which I have noticed in my "Vindication," presents any opposition to my statement. They are as follows :

Matt. xviii. 7 : "It must needs be that offences come; but woe

\* John xvii. 22, 24.

† Vindication of Unitarianism, p. 86.

‡ Unit. Incap. of Vind. pp. 231, 232.

to that man, *by whom* (properly THROUGH WHOM, δι' οὗ) the offence cometh."—"It must needs be."—Who imposed the necessity? Undoubtedly, the Almighty Creator and Governor of the universe. "Nevertheless," \* it is added, "woe to that man, THROUGH WHOM (*as his instrument*) the offence cometh." Such is the clear import of our Saviour's words, implying a view of the constitution of the moral world, which is in unison with the most correct philosophy as well as with the uniform tenor of the Scriptures, but which is lost under the looseness of our common translation.† That such a passage should be brought forward by a professed Christian, and above all by a professed Calvinist, as an instance of the *original* cause being denoted by the preposition in question is truly surprising.

Matt. xxvi. 24; Mark xiv. 21; Luke xxii. 22; "Woe unto that man, *by whom* (properly, THROUGH WHOM, δι' οὗ) the Son of Man is betrayed."—Was Judas also an "original cause"? Was then the salvation of the world by the death of Christ left to depend upon the uncontrolled power and discretion of an insignificant mortal? The Scriptures teach a very contrary doctrine. He was "*betrayed by the determinate counsel and fore-knowledge of GOD,*" and "THROUGH wicked hands," (διὰ χειρῶν ἀνομῶν,) as the instruments of God, was "crucified and slain." Acts ii. 23. Bearing in mind the true sense of the preposition DIA we clearly see the way, in which our Saviour was enabled to *foretell* this event, and the entire consistency of all that he says, especially as his words are recorded by the Evangelist Luke, "And truly the Son of Man goeth, *as it was determined,* (i. e.

\* Πλην.

† This "looseness" is to a certain extent unavoidable, since the English preposition THROUGH, though the nearest to ΔΙΑ which our language supplies, is not now sufficiently precise in its signification, and does not always suggest that *reference to a prior cause*, which ΔΙΑ in the circumstances under consideration uniformly includes. Scott and Wakefield however, in their versions of St. Matthew's Gospel, employ the word THROUGH; and the only way of conveying the full sense of the Greek preposition seems to be to translate it "THROUGH," but to add in each case an explanatory periphrasis, or rather to inform the reader, that he must *bear in his mind* the idea of mediation or instrumentality and the reference to a prior cause.

determined by the supreme power and wisdom of God;) nevertheless (πλῆγ) woe unto that man, through whom (as the instrument of God) he is betrayed."

Acts xii. 9: "And he (*Peter*) went and followed him, (*i. e. the angel,*) and wist not that it was true, which was done by *the angel.*" The correct translation is "THROUGH *the angel,*" (δια του αγγελου,) representing him as *the subordinate agent of the Lord,* in which character he is described, ver. 7, where he is called "An angel of the Lord." From the following verses likewise it appears, that Peter considered him as merely an instrument in the hands of a superior. For, "when he was come to himself, he said, 'Now I know of a surety, that the LORD hath sent his angel, and hath delivered me (*i. e. the Lord through the instrumentality of his angel hath delivered me*) out of the hand of Herod.'" Ver. 11. See also ver. 17, which equally contradicts Mr. Wardlaw's position, that the angel was the *primary* agent in this transaction.

Acts xix. 26: "They be no Gods, which are made *with hands,*" (δια χειρων,) literally, "THROUGH *hands,*" which, as Mr. Wardlaw appears to have had an indistinct suspicion,\* are the *instruments* of those who employ them.

Rom. iii. 27: "Where is boasting then? It is excluded. *By* what law? (properly, THROUGH what law?) Of Works? Nay; but *by* the law of faith;" (literally, THROUGH the law of faith;)"—"The law of faith" is represented as the *means*, through which, in subordination to the will of the Supreme Disposer of all events, "boasting is excluded;" agreeably to which view GOD is described in the whole context, as the original author of the redemption and justification of sinners.

Rom. v. 12: "*By* one man (*literally, THROUGH one man*) sin entered into the world, and death *by* sin," (*properly, THROUGH sin*). Here again we have cause to wonder, that a Christian, and especially a Calvinist, should ever consider sin and death as entering into the world *independantly of the appointment of God.* The clear meaning of the Apostle's word is, that sin entered into the world *by the decree of*

---

\* Page 232, Note.

God THROUGH ONE MAN AS HIS INSTRUMENT, and death THROUGH sin.

Rom. vi. 4: "Therefore we are buried with him *by* baptism, (*properly, THROUGH baptism, as the means, or instrument of burying,*) into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead *by the glory of the Father*, even so we also should walk in newness of life." The literal translation is, "THROUGH THE GLORY OF THE FATHER," meaning *the glorious power\** of the Father, agreeing with the uniform doctrine of the New Testament respecting *the efficient cause* of our Saviour's resurrection, and illustrated by the parallel expression used by the same Apostle, 1 Cor. vi. 14: "God hath both raised up the Lord, and will also raise up us *by his own power*," literally, "THROUGH *his own power*," because God *employs* "his own power" *as the instrument*, by which he effects his purposes.

Rom. xi. 36: "Of him, and through him, (*δι' αὐτου,*) and to him are all things; to whom be glory for ever."—DIA is not here intended "to point out the cause of any effect." It is used in its original acceptation, as denoting motion through a place, and corresponds in this particular with the two other prepositions (*εξ, out of, or from,* and *εις, to*) which precede and follow it, and both of which originally signify *motion in space*. The description of God, given by the Apostle in these words, is, that *all things proceed from him, go through him, and end in him*. It is one out of the various views of the imagination, and forms of human speech, employed in Scripture to represent, as far as language can, the absolute dominion, the omnipresence, and the universal providence of the Divinity. In the sublime language of our own poets, he is

"First, last, midst, and without end."

MILTON, *Paradise Lost*, v. 165.

"He fills, he bounds, connects, and equals all."

POPE, *Essay on Man*, I. 280.

"From thee, great God, we spring, to thee we tend,

PATH, motive, guide, *original* and *end*."

Dr. JOHNSON'S *Rambler*, No. VII.

---

\* See Schleusner, v. δὲξῆ, No. 6, α.



This view of the nature of the Deity would be the more readily comprehended by those to whom Paul was writing, and who lived at Rome, the Metropolis of the then civilized world, because it was perfectly familiar among all the heathen philosophers, who believed in the existence of a Supreme God. It was a maxim of the Orphic theology, that "God is the beginning, middle, and end of all things," and we find the Roman emperor, Marcus Antoninus, addressing Nature, the Supreme Deity of the Stoics, in these remarkable words, "All things are from thee, all things are in thee, all things are to thee."\*

Supposing the expression "THROUGH *him*," adopted by the Apostle to mean only that God is the efficient cause, it loses its propriety in the connection, in which it is introduced, and the whole passage is stripped of its force and beauty. But let the Metaphor, implied in the associated phrases (ἐξ αὐτοῦ and εἰς αὐτοῦ) "*Out of him*" and "*To him*," be kept up in the intermediate clause (δι' αὐτοῦ) "*Through him*," and the description is worthy of an Author, who was acquainted with the writings of the heathen poets and philosophers, and was warmed with the celestial fire of genius as well as with the Divine influences of preternatural inspiration.

1 Cor. i. 9: "God is faithful, *by whom* (literally THROUGH *whom*) ye were called unto the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord."—This is the passage which I had noticed as forming an exception, (and it is the *only* exception,) to the "universality" of my rule. But the cases which accord with the rule, are no less than *two hundred and ninety*: and, to adopt the words of a most eminent critic,† "When a rule has been established by ninety-nine examples out of a hundred, an exception in the hundredth will not overturn it." The critical evidence for the genuineness of (ὅφ) "*by*" instead of (δι') "*through*" is considerable; and, although it has not "induced Griesbach even to mark the latter as doubtful," yet we ought to bear in

\* Anton. Med. IV. 23. See Gataker's notes upon this passage, and upon Lib. ii. § 3. and Lib. xii. § 26. Also Cudworth's Intellectual System, B. i. Ch. iv. § 17, 18, 32. Eschenbach de Poesi Orphicâ, pp. 40, 68—74, 136—148, and Hermanni Orphica, pp. 447, 457, 460.

† Dr. (now Bishop) Marsh, Letters to Travis, p. 257.

mind, that Griesbach was so exceedingly cautious in departing from the text of Elzevir, then Received, that the masters of criticism in future times will probably see reason to make further emendations upon the text of Griesbach.\* It is likewise worthy of notice in this particular case, that an error might have arisen the more easily, because each of the various readings ( $\Delta\text{I}$  and  $\Upsilon\Phi$ ) consists only of two letters.

1 Cor. xii. 8: "To one is given *by the spirit* the word of wisdom."—The literal translation is " $\text{THROUGH the spirit$ ," representing *the spirit* as the means, by employing which God gave "the word of wisdom" to the first disciples. In the next verse, as Mr. Wardlaw remarks, "the expression is varied,  $\text{EN}$  being used." This preposition is often employed, as well as  $\text{DIA}$  and  $\text{HYPO}$ , to denote the Efficient Cause. But its import is more general. It does not determine that cause to be either primary or instrumental.

2 Cor. i. 19: "For the Son of God, Jesus Christ, who was preached among you *by us*, even *by me and Silvanus and Timotheus*," &c.—The proper translation is, " $\text{THROUGH us$ , even  $\text{THROUGH me and Silvanus and Timotheus$ ." The Apostle Paul, when engaged in preaching the Gospel, always considered himself, agreeably to the representation here given, as the servant and instrument of a superior.

Heb. ii. 3: "How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation, which at first began to be spoken *by the Lord*," literally " $\text{THROUGH the Lord$ ." A reference is indicated to a prior cause, and might have been fully expressed thus; "which at first began to be spoken (*or declared*)  $\text{BY God THROUGH the Lord$ ." The use of the preposition  $\text{DIA}$ , and not  $\text{HYPO}$ , determines "*the Lord*" to signify here Jesus Christ, and not the Father.

Heb. ii. 10: "It became him, for whom are all things, and *by whom* (literally,  $\text{THROUGH whom$ ) are all things."—"A very decisive passage," says Mr. Wardlaw. So it would be, if it could be proved, that  $\text{DIA}$  is here employed to represent God as the *efficient cause* of

---

\* This was fully expected by Griesbach himself. See his Prolegomena, Section II. pp. 51, 52, of the London impression.

all things. But there is no necessity for this supposition. In the preceding clause, translated "FOR *whom*," DIA is followed by the *accusative* case, in which circumstances it usually denotes the *FINAL cause*.\* Here therefore it signifies the *END* aimed at in all things, or to which all things tend, and corresponds to the *last* clause of the passage formerly discussed, Romans xi. 36, "to him are all things." Hence I conceive, especially considering how familiar this view was to the minds of the ancients, that the Writer to the Hebrews, although he states the idea less distinctly, intends by the same metaphor to represent all things as passing *through* God, and *to* him as their end.

Heb. vii. 21: "Those priests were made without an oath; but this with an oath, *by* (properly, *THROUGH*) him that said unto (*more correctly, with respect to*) him, "The Lord sware, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedec."—The quotation, here introduced, "The Lord sware," &c. is the 4th verse of the cxtth Psalm. We know from the testimony of our Saviour, (Matt. xxii. 43,) as well as from other sources of information, that the writer of this psalm was David, who consequently must have been the person intended by the words, *δια του λεγοντος προς αυτον*;) "*through him that saith with respect to him.*" The preposition DIA is used agreeably to the rule, because David wrote this psalm *by the inspiration of the Supreme Being*. To express its full meaning, the verse may be translated as follows; "Those priests were made without an oath, but this with an oath *THROUGH David*, AS THE ORGAN OF GOD, *saying with respect to him*, 'The Lord sware, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec!'"

Heb. xiii. 11: "The bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary *by the high-priest*," literally, "*THROUGH the high-priest*," as the instrument of the Supreme Disposer of all events.

1 Peter ii. 13, 14: "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake; whether it be to the King, (*that is, the*

---

\* The idea of *Motion to a place* is not expressed by the preposition itself, but by the *termination*, forming the the *Accusative case* of the noun which follows it.

Roman Emperor,) as Supreme, or unto governors, as unto them that are sent *by him* (properly, THROUGH *him*) for the punishment of evil-doers and for the praise of them that do well."—Many of the commentators have understood the words "*by him*" as obviously referring to "*the King*," which is the nearest antecedent. But Calvin, Estius, and others have objected, that the Apostle could not intend to represent a mortal, so subject to the influence of *worse* motives, as sending his Proconsuls and subordinate officers merely "*for the punishment of evil-doers and for the praise of them that do well*;" and they have therefore maintained, that "*sent by him*" means "*sent by God*." If we interpret DIA in the sense contended for, the difficulty vanishes. The phrase under consideration represents the Governors of the Provinces, who had received their commission from the Roman Emperor, as "*sent BY GOD through him* for the punishment of evil-doers," &c. This view agrees with every other expression of the New Testament upon the subject. By the world at large the Emperor was worshipped as himself a God, and a *heathen* would have said, that the Governors of the Provinces were sent (Τῆν αὐτοῦ) BY *him*. But the Apostle, with an admirable union of manliness and piety, guards against this idolatrous adulation, teaches that even the CÆSARS were only instruments in the hands of a Superior, and preserves the due distinction between the subordinate rulers of the civil world, and that Being, by whom "*every power that exists is ordained*," and who "*hath the hearts of kings in his hand, turning them whithersoever he will, as the rivers of water*."\*

The above examination of the eighteen passages, cited by Mr. Wardlaw as examples "*of DIA signifying not the Instrumental, but the Primary efficient cause*," will, I hope, satisfy the reader that they perfectly accord with my assertions.

But Mr. Wardlaw likewise appeals to the authority of ALL GREEK SCHOLARS as a proof "*that DIA with the Genitive case signifies the efficient cause, whether primary or secondary, principal or instrumental*," and he refers to Hedericus, Schleusner, Parkhurst, Stockius.

---

\* See Rom. xiii. 1—7, Prov. xxi. 1, &c.

It is true that Schleusner, Parkhurst, and Stockius, together with Schwartz and Glassius, do represent DIA in the circumstances under consideration as denoting either the Primary, or the Instrumental cause; and, as proofs that it denotes the former, they produce the four passages, supposed to relate to the creation of the world by Jesus Christ. But these authors wrote their Lexicons, &c., for the express purpose of interpreting the New Testament, and of interpreting it agreeably to the Trinitarian system. In the Lexicons, which were not written with this intention, I have been unable to find that explanation of DIA, which Mr. Wardlaw represents as "sufficiently well known to every Greek scholar." On the contrary, all that I have been able to consult, agree with my statements.\*

But, even if the Lexicographers did interpret this preposition as sometimes denoting the *Primary* cause, their authority would be of no avail in opposition to the evidence, which I have brought forward. They could only judge of the meanings of words from their use in ancient Authors, and from *the information of those, who constantly spoke and wrote in Greek*. To authorities of this kind I have appealed, to Philo, Eusebius, and Origen. Against the testimony of the first, Mr. Wardlaw offers no objection; and to that of Eusebius he only replies, that in another instance I have presumed to dissent from him myself, which we shall see hereafter is not the fact. But against the statement of the significations of DIA and HYPO, which I have quoted from Origen, Mr. Wardlaw argues as follows. Jones, in his "Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity," has quoted a passage from the writings of Origen, *which proves that he believed the Su-*

---

\* Δια, προθεσις, ὅτε μὲν συντάσσεται γενική, ὀηλοῦ μεσιτεῖαν' οἶον Δια σου ἐποίησα τὸδε, μεσιτευόντος σου δηλονοτι. "DIA, a preposition; when it governs the Genitive, it indicates *means*, or *mediation*, as, I have done this *through you*, that is, *by means of you*." PHAVORINUS. "De eo dicitur, quod vicem instrumenti præbet." STEPHENS and SCAPULA. "Notat causam instrumentalem." HEDERICUS. "Pcr." VALENTINE CURIO, SCHREVELIUS, and ROBERTSON. "Instrumentum, Ministerium, Auxilium notat." LEXICON XENOPHONTĒUM, by STURZIUS, Lipsiæ, 1801. CONSTANTINE entirely omits mentioning the use of DIA to denote the efficient cause.

*preme Divinity of Christ.* “Either then the *inferiority*, implied in the words quoted from his writings by Mr. Yates, must be of an *official* kind, or else he (i. e. Origen) flatly contradicts himself.” \* To this strange argument I reply, that the words quoted by Jones are not the words of Origen. They are found indeed in his Treatise “*De Principiis.*” † But of this treatise there remains only a Latin translation, which abounds with corruptions and interpolations, especially in what relates to the doctrine of the Trinity. These facts are perfectly familiar to the learned. “It is certain,” observes Dupin, in his account of Origen, ‡ “that in Rufinus’s Latin versions, which we have of the book *De Principiis*, and the Apology of Pamphilus, and of his other works, the doctrine of the Trinity is explained after a very orthodox manner. But we must confess, that we cannot rely upon Rufinus’s credit, who acknowledges that he added and altered several passages relating to the Trinity.”

The expressions of Dr. Cave in his account of the treatise *De Principiis* are much stronger.

“*Libri περι αρχων* IV. ante annum CCXXXIII. scripti, difficillimi sanè atque obscurissimi, qui in Latinâ Origenis Operum editione extant ex versione Rufini pessimâ fide confectâ, multis quippe omissis, multis interpolatis ac in melius mutatis, uti nec ipse dissimulat Rufinus. Haud dissimili arte in cæteris etiam a se versis Origenis libris usus est Rufinus, adeo ut vera Origenis sententia, ob Interpretis male fidi additamenta, truncationes, atque interpolationes, vix ac ne vix deprehendi possit.” §

The necessity, imposed upon me of replying to Mr. Wardlaw’s ob-

\* Unitarianism Incapable of Vindication, p. 234.

† Lib. i. p. 58, Ed. De La Rue.

‡ Ecclesiastical History, Vol. I. quarto, English Translation.

§ CAVE’S *Historia Literaria*, Vol. I. p. 83, 1st edition; p. 120, 2nd edition. The reader, who wishes to see other attestations to the fact here alleged, may consult DE LA RUE’S Preface to the Works of Origen, p. iii.; HUET’S *Origeniana*, Book iii. 2. 2; FLEURY’S *Ecclesiastical History*, Book v. § 54, Vol. I. p. 337, of Herbert’s translation in 4to.; FRED. SPANHEIM’S *Hist. Christiana*, Sect. iii. § x.; JORTIN’S *Remarks on Eccles. History*, p. 149, Vol. II. London, 1805.

jections, has led me to illustrate the use of the preposition DIA more fully than before ; which I am far from regretting, because a knowledge of its meaning is necessary in order to understand not only the four passages, which occasioned the discussion, but all the passages of the New Testament, (nearly 300 in number,) where it is used to denote an efficient cause.

In further confirmation of what I have written, I may remark, that in the most ancient of the remaining versions of the New Testament, the Syriac, this preposition (in the circumstances under consideration) is commonly translated by a phrase (ܕܒ) which signifies *by the hand of*, or *through the agency of*: in the Latin version, called the Vulgate, it is rendered by the preposition PER, which has the same meaning: \* and in the Romaic, or Modern Greek Version, it is always translated *δία μεσον*, *through means of*. †

Of the meaning of the preposition HYPO I need say little, because my argument for the inferiority of Jesus to the Father depends upon the meaning of DIA. Mr. Wardlaw, while he admits that HYPO more properly signifies the *Primary* cause, maintains that it is “sometimes used for the *Secondary*.” In proof of this he refers to *ten* passages. In two of these, Matt. xxvii. 35, and Mark xiii. 14, HYPO does not occur; ‡ and in four others, Matt. ii. 17, iii. 3, Luke v. 15, ix. 7, Griesbach has prefixed marks to express his opinion that its genuineness is doubtful. There consequently remain only *four* passages, Luke xiii. 17, xxiii. 8, Phil. iii. 12, Heb. ii. 3, in which HYPO occurs, and is certainly genuine. I mention these circumstances, because it would be improper in me to pass over without notice such persevering negligence. I before expressed my

\* “PER præpositio usitatè significat quasi medium quoddam loci, temporis, personæ efficientis, *instrumenti*.”

Concordantiæ Bibliorum, Antwerpia, Wechel, 1600.

† The following passages may be interesting to the reader as examples. Matt. i. 22: Και τουτο όλον γεγινε, δια να τελειωθη εκεινο, όπου ελαληθη ύπο του Κυριου ΔΙΑ ΜΕΣΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΟΥ, λεγωντας. John i. 3: Όλα ΔΙΑ ΜΕΣΟΥ ΤΟΥ εγινηκαν. John i. 10: Ό κοσμος ΔΙΑ ΜΕΣΟΥ ΑΥΤΟΥ εγινεν. Heb. i. 2: ΔΙΑ ΜΕΣΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΌΠΟΙΟΥ εκαμε και τους αιωνας.

‡ See Griesbach.

conviction that similar inaccuracies in Mr. Wardlaw's Discourses arose from no worse cause than "mere carelessness." At the charge of carelessness however Mr. Wardlaw took offence. Let him now inform us, did he consult Griesbach, or did he not? If he did not, was he not careless? If he did, let him explain the motives of his conduct in producing passages as Scripture, which only pass for such in the vulgar estimation.

I have stated in my Vindication, (p. 84,) that the Primary cause is denoted by HYPO. I have not said however, that this preposition is never prefixed to that, which is in point of fact a *Secondary* cause. I was perfectly aware, that the case is otherwise. But, when HYPO is used, the cause is *contemplated* as primary, that is, *no reference* is made to any thing beyond it, whereas DIA, according to the canon quoted above, (p. 41,) denotes a reference "to some other being, either expressly mentioned or contemplated, which is considered as the original cause." Of the series of causes *in the view of the speaker or writer*, HYPO always denotes the *first*, and DIA the *intermediate*. Upon this principle we may explain the language of the Evangelist Matthew, (supposing HYPO genuine,) when he represents predictions as "spoken by the Prophets;" of the Evangelist Luke, when he mentions the miracles of Jesus as "done by him;" of Paul, when he describes himself as "apprehended by Christ;" and of the Writer to the Hebrews, when he speaks of the Gospel as "declared to mankind THROUGH the Lord, and confirmed by them that heard him."

The reader is now apprized of the way, in which Mr. Wardlaw's promise, announced to the public in the Advertisement to the Second Edition of his Discourses, has been after a long suspense fulfilled by the production of arguments for the Divinity of Christ, unconsciously furnished by his opponent. "Mr. Yates," says he, "in fixing the signification of HYPO to the *Primary* efficient cause, has forged a weapon against himself."\* Mr. Yates knew then nearly all that he has brought forward now, but suppressed it, that his work might be brief, and adapted for popular use. He is happy to observe that

---

\* Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 233.



Mr. Wardlaw's objections proceed upon the supposition, that the Unitarian doctrine must be admitted to be the doctrine of the Scriptures, if his assertions respecting the sense of DIA be established, and he hopes Mr. Wardlaw will perceive it to be his duty to do all in his power in order to remove the errors and misconceptions upon the subject, which are now sanctioned by his authority.

Upon what Mr. Wardlaw has advanced in reply to the contents of my Second Part, I shall only observe further,

*First*, that although some of his observations have considerable weight, yet the generality of them appear adapted to strike an unprejudiced inquirer only as a laborious attempt to draw plain passages of Scripture from their obvious meaning :

*Secondly*, that they are for the most part directed not against Unitarianism, but against Socinianism, aiming to prove that Jesus Christ was something more than "a mere man," or, "a mere human prophet." See particularly pp. 306—310, 328—330, 354—359. Arguments, accumulated with this design, have no connection with the present controversy. By continually resorting to them at the very time when he professed to be anxious for brevity, Mr. Wardlaw shows how little he was able to advance upon those points, against which I had directed my attack, and which it was his sole business and professed object to defend :

*Thirdly*, that Mr. Wardlaw, in advancing the supposition "of the will and power of the Father, and the will and power of the Son, concurring in the production of the same effects," appears to consider this principle as peculiar to Trinitarians.\* But it is equally maintained by Unitarians. The question is, Whether the *power* of the Son is not *derived* from the Father, and his *will* exercised in *subjection* to the Father? If this be the case, the will and power of the Son *must* concur in every thing with the will and power of the Father. Mr. Wardlaw's remark appears quite unaccountable, that the assertion of such a concurrence with the Father "can be true of no one but a Divine person:"

---

\* Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 359.

*Fourthly*, that it is clear from the history of the infant Church as recorded in the New Testament, that the Apostles of Christ performed miracles by power derived from him, and as his servants and instruments. He therefore *may be considered* “ as the real author of these miracles, and his Apostles as the medium through which they were exhibited.” \* Nevertheless, the question still recurs, Did the power and authority, thus displayed by our Saviour in his glorified state, belong to him by his own underived omnipotence, or were they communicated to him by the Father? For a solution of this query, I go, as before, † to the clear declarations of the Holy Scriptures, that God the Father bestowed upon our Lord Jesus Christ those glorious endowments, by which he wrought miracles *through* his disciples :

*Fifthly* and lastly, I remark, that although the Supreme Divinity of the Holy Spirit is as essential to the Trinitarian doctrine as the Deity of Christ, yet Mr. Wardlaw has not dropt a single observation in reply to my Chapter “ On the Use of the Phrases ‘ Holy Spirit,’ &c., in the Sacred Scriptures,” in which I have endeavoured to show, that they perfectly accord with the Unitarian doctrine, that there is only one Person in the Godhead.

---

\* Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 355.    † See Vindication of Unitarianism, p. 95.



## PART III.



### CHAPTER I.

IN replying to the contents of my Third Part, Mr. Wardlaw loses entirely the calmness of a disputant, who is conscious of the strength of his cause. He does not hesitate to avow the *provocation*, the *indignant disdain*, &c., by which his mind is agitated; and it must be confessed, that here we discover little indeed of the dignity of the philosopher, the correctness of the scholar, the courtesy of the gentleman, or the mild benevolence of the Christian. Whilst I regret exceedingly, that in a controversy upon a subject of supreme importance, and from which, if properly conducted, the most valuable results might have been expected, my opponent should have had recourse to this species of warfare, I solemnly enjoin the reader to "take heed to his spirit," and to preserve his heart from any feeling like indignation or resentment either towards myself or towards Mr. Wardlaw; and I request him, in justice to myself, to read attentively what I have written in the Third Part of my "Vindication of Unitarianism," comparing my statements of Mr. Wardlaw's doctrines with what he himself has said in his "Discourses," and then to judge of the grounds for the heavy charges of "wilful misrepresentation" and "provoking disingenuousness," which in his present work he has advanced against me.

Mr. Wardlaw, writing in the treatise before us upon the doctrine of the Trinity, repeats what he had asserted in his "Discourses," that he "believes *the fact*, although he is ignorant respecting *the mode* or *manner* of the fact."\* What we are to understand by "*the*

---

\* Unit. Incap. of Vind. pp. 63—75.

*mode or manner of the fact,*" I have never been able to determine : the phrase appears to me to belong to the number of those, which darken counsel by words without knowledge. It is clear, however, that Mr. Wardlaw asserts *a fact*. The fact, stated in his own language, is this ; that " in the Unity of the Godhead there are three distinct Subsistences or Persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit." This fact he wishes me to believe. Before assenting to it, I am desirous, as in every other case, to understand the meaning of the proposition.—" You repeat to me a fact, which you say is of superlative importance ; before I can believe it, I must know what it is : you announce a proposition, I wish to be informed what ideas you annex to the terms of the proposition."—To this query Mr. Wardlaw appears to me to return two different answers, varying his explanations according to the purpose, which he has in view in each particular case.

In the first place, he replies, that " the subject is so completely removed beyond the view of the human understanding, that it is impossible for us to form upon it any clear or accurate conceptions.—" Of the precise import of the terms '*Unity,*' '*Distinct,*' '*Person,*' and '*Subsistence,*' which are employed in the proposition, I shall not attempt," says he, " to convey to your mind any clear ideas. I cannot impart to you what I do not possess myself. I however assert, that the proposition contains an important truth, because that truth is declared by Divine authority."\*

I answer, " Show me that it is declared by Divine authority, and I shall assent to it with the most submissive reverence. But observe, that, in order to do this, you must show me in the word of God the identical proposition, which you have announced. For, since no distinct ideas are annexed to the terms of the proposition, we cannot *prove* its truth by any comparison of those terms with other phrases, to which distinct ideas are attached."†

" If," says Mr. Wardlaw, " *the terms themselves are unintelligible,*

\* Discourses, pp. 11, 19—26, 30 ; Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 63.

† Viud. of Unitarianism, pp. 41—44, 129—132.

you are clearly right ; for in that case it would be impossible for us to substitute *other* terms, with any degree of certain assurance that we were enunciating the same doctrine. The man, who knows not at all the meaning of the words *Ellipse*, *Conic*, and *Sections*, would in vain attempt to convey in other terms than those, in which it has been announced to himself, the proposition that *an Ellipse is one of the Conic Sections*. He must satisfy himself with repeating the *ipsissima verba*.\*

“ Show me then in the word of God the identical proposition, which you have announced.”—At this point of the argument Mr. Wardlaw changes his ground. The proposition in question, he knows, does not occur in the Scriptures ; he is therefore obliged to maintain only, that it may be PROVED from the Scriptures. But *proving* implies DISTINCT IDEAS ; and hence he is under the necessity of representing the proposition as not merely true, but intelligible, and the ideas suggested by it so clear, the conceptions so accurate and distinct, that the truth of the proposition may be inferred with absolute certainty from a great variety of phrases and declarations contained in the Sacred Scriptures, all of which may be shown to have a manifest bearing upon the subject, and to contribute testimony, more or less abundant, in support of the proposition.

“ The terms themselves,” says he, “ are NOT unintelligible. The *fact*, stated in the proposition, is revealed, although the *mode* of the fact is not revealed. *Reasoning* from the Scriptures is therefore the proper mode of establishing the fact, or proving the truth of the proposition.”†

“ With the *mode* of the fact,” I answer, “ we have, as is admitted on all hands, nothing to do. The Scriptures, you say, assure us of a *fact* ; and you now maintain, that the terms of the proposition, in which you announce that fact, are intelligible. Permit me therefore to repeat the request, with which I set out, and to ask again, *What ideas do you annex to the terms of the proposition* ? In the first place,

---

\* Unit. Incap. of Viud. p. 52.

† Ibid. pp. 52, 53.

what do you mean when you assert ‘THE UNITY OF THE GOD-HEAD?’”

“I mean,” replies Mr. Wardlaw, “that the universe is subject to one simple and undivided Mind, one all-wise Designer, who is uncreated, unchangeable, and everlasting, sufficient without the aid of any counsellor, assistant, or associated God, for the production of every effect, which is exhibited throughout endless time and infinite space.” \*

“What do you mean by the term PERSON, or Subsistence?”

(Mr. Wardlaw.) “By a PERSON I mean that which possesses *personal properties*.” †

“Of course; that is no more than saying, that a PERSON is a PERSON. But what are ‘personal properties?’”

(Mr. Wardlaw.) “‘Personal properties’ are the properties which constitute personality. Now *that which can contrive, which can design, is a person*. These capacities constitute personality.” ‡

“What do you mean, when you maintain that *the Holy Spirit is a Person?*”

(Mr. Wardlaw.) “I mean, that he is not a mere attribute, or power, or influence, but AN INTELLIGENT AGENT.” §

“When you affirm, that in the Unity of the Godhead there are three *Persons*, do you mean, that in the unity of the Godhead there are three *Intelligent Agents?*”

(Mr. Wardlaw.) “I employ PERSON and INTELLIGENT AGENT as synonymous expressions.” ||

“You have now explained sufficiently the meaning of the proposition, which you wish me to believe. My answer is, that I could not believe it, even though I found it clearly stated in the Scriptures; because *its intrinsic absurdity* would be stronger evidence against it than any evidence in its favour, which could possibly be exhibited.” ¶

\* Vind. of Unit. p. 51, compared with Unit. Incap. of Vind. pp. 62, 301, 302.

† Discourses, p. 281.

‡ Ibid. p. 282.

§ Ibid. p. 286.

|| Ibid. p. 286, line 14.

¶ Vind. of Unit. pp. 39, 40, 128, 129.

“ I allow,” replies Mr. Wardlaw, AGAIN CHANGING HIS GROUND, “ that a doctrine clearly self-contradictory could not be proved even by the testimony of the Scriptures. But the doctrine, which I have stated, cannot possibly be proved to be self-contradictory, because it is a subject, on which we are left *in total ignorance*, and, unless we have *some notion* of the thing itself, on what principle can we possibly make out the contrariety ?”\*

Presuming to urge the discussion a little further, I observe, “ You just now explained yourself as meaning by ‘ the Unity of the Godhead,’ that the order of events in the universe is entirely directed by the will and agency of one simple and undivided Mind.”

“ I did.”

“ But you asserted that there have existed from all eternity in the unity of the Godhead three Persons, and you have explained yourself as meaning by a Person *an Intelligent Agent*. Your doctrine appears therefore to imply, that three distinct Intelligent Agents form one simple and undivided Mind, which is a direct contradiction.”

“ I have explicitly declared,” answers Mr. Wardlaw, “ that when I used the term ‘ *person*,’ and others employed in the proposition, I would not be understood as pretending to any precise and definite conception of the nature of that distinction in Deity, which these terms import. Was it an unreasonable expectation, that you should carry this declaration along with you through the remainder of our discussion, and that, when the same terms were used again, they should be used with the qualification previously affixed to them ? A generous disputant would certainly have felt himself bound to proceed on this reasonable principle.”†

“ You said, that when you asserted the unity of God, you meant that all things are made by the power of one Designer. But you also asserted, that in the unity of God there are three persons, and that by a ‘ *person*’ you mean ‘ that which can contrive or design.’ Does not your doctrine then imply, that *three* Designers are *one* Designer ?”

\* Discourses, p. 23.

† Unit. Incap. of Mind. p. 65.

“ I employed the term ‘ *person* ’ in compliance with established usage, and because I do not know that another can be devised more appropriate. But of its precise import, as applied to a distinction in the Divine essence, I have professed my own incompetency and my conviction of the incompetency of others, to form any clear conception. Justice and generosity alike required, that you should have taken along with you the qualifying explanation, which I gave in the outset, and which I certainly intended should accompany to the close of our discussion my use of the terms *distinct*, *subsistences*, *persons*, and *personality*, in their application to Deity.”\*

“ You are now losing your temper : and without calmness of judgment on both sides I am of opinion, that a prolongation of our discussion would be both useless and indecorous.”

Such appears to me to be the exact state of the controversy, as it has been carried on between Mr. Wardlaw and myself, respecting *the nature* of the doctrine of the Trinity, and *the evidence* requisite to prove it, which are the subjects discussed in the First Chapter of my Third Part. With the agility of the most expert equestrian he leaps from one position to another, so that it is impossible to find him maintaining any fixed opinion. By this elusive rapidity he convinces many of his readers, that a man may hold the doctrine of three persons in one God, and not forfeit his claim to the character of a rational Christian. But every one, whose eye-sight is moderately acute and clear, and who will attend to the swift rotation of Mr Wardlaw’s principles, will perceive that his proposition must either mean, that three Intelligent Agents are one Intelligent Agent, or have no distinct meaning at all ; that, if it means that three Intelligent Agents are one Intelligent Agent, it is a direct contradiction, and therefore ought not to be assented to, although it were contained in the Scriptures ; and that, if it convey to us no distinct meaning, we ought not to receive it as sanctioned by the authority of Scripture, unless we find it stated in the very terms, in which it is announced by Mr. Wardlaw as a part of Divine revelation.

---

\* Unit. Incap. of Vind. pp. 67, 68.



Mr. Wardlaw finds great fault with me for “having endeavoured to fasten on him the view of Dr. Sherlock as to the Holy Spirit being a distinct Mind, or Intelligent Being.”\* He however himself calls the Holy Spirit “an Intelligent Agent,” and maintains that it is *distinct*.† But he objects repeatedly to the use of the word “Being.”‡ I have always thought, that to *be* is to *exist*, and that every thing which exists is a Being. Indeed, language supplies no other term more general and extensive in its application. The word “Agent” is included under it. Every Agent is a Being, inasmuch as every thing which acts, exists. Every “Intelligent Agent” must therefore be an “Intelligent Being;” and Mr. Wardlaw’s explanation is even more particular than Dr. Sherlock’s, to which he objects as “gross and revolting.”§



## CHAPTER II.

I PROCEED to consider Mr. Wardlaw’s objections to my account of the evidence for a *plurality* of Persons in the Godhead.

1. “In the first place,” as I have asserted, || “Mr. Wardlaw objects to the proof of the Unity of God derived from the appearances of the material creation. He denies, that these appearances prove the existence of ‘only one Designer,’ since ‘unity of counsel may subsist among a plurality of counsellors.’”

I have expressly stated, ¶ that “by the Unity of God, Unitarians do not understand merely a *unity of counsel*, or that there is no distraction of plans, or opposition of inclinations, manifested by the course of nature.” According to the sense, therefore, in which *we* understand the Unity of God, Mr. Wardlaw denies that it can be

\* Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 68.

† Discourses, p. 286.

‡ Unit. Incap. of Vind. pp. 104, 325, 331, 360.

§ Ibid. p. 66.

|| Vind. of Unitarianism, p. 133.

¶ Ibid. p. 51.

proved from the light of nature at all. To prove a mere unity of counsel, we consider as upon this subject proving nothing. The argument only advances as far as the premises, and stops short of the conclusion. I have endeavoured in my chapter "On the Evidence for the Unity of God from the Light of Nature," to go beyond the point at which Dr. Paley and Mr. Wardlaw stop, and to carry forward the mind of the reader to the inference, that the universe is and always has been subject to but one Intelligent Being.

Differing so materially from Mr. Wardlaw, it would have been improper to have left the difference unnoticed; nor can I see any just cause for his "surprise" and "indignation."\* *His* representation appears evidently favourable to the reception of Trinitarianism, *mine* to the establishment of Unitarianism.

Mr. Wardlaw had asserted, that the inconclusiveness of the argument from the light of nature was "admitted by the best writers on Natural Theology:" † mentioning, however, no other author except Paley. Although I have signified my curiosity to know who the other writers are, Mr. Wardlaw observes a total silence.

II. "In the second place, Mr. Wardlaw argues a plurality of Persons in the Godhead from the plural termination of ALEIM, ADONIM, and other Hebrew names for God."

To this argument I replied, first, that "if the plural termination indicates plurality at all, it denotes a plurality of GODS." Mr. Wardlaw answers, "The only inference that *can* be drawn, if any is to be drawn at all, from the plural name for God, is, that this unity is a unity of such a nature as admits of distinction." ‡—"If any is to be drawn at all!" Does Mr. Wardlaw then concede, that this argument authorizes no certain conclusion? It is at any rate certain, that no such inference as that here proposed can be drawn. It is a general rule in all languages, and constitutes the proper distinction between the singular and plural sense of nouns, that, if a noun singular denotes a single being of any kind, the same noun, put into the plural, denotes (*plures, i. e.*) two or more beings of the

\* Unit. Incap. of Vind. pp. 76—81.

† Discourses, p. 9.

‡ Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 82.

*same kind.* There is no rule of Hebrew Grammar by which the plural number can be understood to denote what Mr. Wardlaw calls a "plurality consistent with unity," or "unity of such a nature as admits distinction." Unless, therefore, we understand the plural termination of ALEIM as denoting *a plurality of Gods*, we must interpret it upon the only other principle, which is sanctioned by the usages of the Hebrew language, namely, as expressing *eminence*, or (to borrow the words of Wilson) "*dominion, dignity, majesty.*"

In opposition to this explanation, however, Mr. Wardlaw argues at great length. The following observations may suffice as an answer to his remarks.

1. "The only instances," says Mr. Wardlaw, "of BOL, when it signifies *a husband*, occurring in the plural, are, so far as I have been able to discover, *two* in number, viz. Isa. liv. 5, already quoted, and Jer. xxxi. 32, in both of which it is rather singular, the application happens to be to *Jehovah.*"\* In the latter of these passages, "it is rather singular," the substantive BOL does not occur at all, but the verb BOLTI, (First person sing. Preter tense,) which is properly translated in our common version, "*I was an husband.*" If, in a case where he professes to have used some diligence, Mr. Wardlaw cannot distinguish between a noun and a verb, he ought at least to be extremely cautious and diffident in opposing the decisions of all the most celebrated orientalists.

2. Mr. Wardlaw however thinks otherwise. "The rule, (quoted from Wilson,) supposing it to *be* one, is, beyond all doubt, stated in terms by far too general. If it were a rule of any thing like *common* application, one should expect to find it in all the Hebrew Grammars. Now, although I find it in Wilson and in Robertson, I do *not* find it in Parkhurst, nor in Pike, nor in an anonymous grammar used by the teacher from whom I got the rudiments of the language." †

Mr. Wardlaw's description of the last of the three Grammars to which he appeals, proceeds upon one out of these two suppositions; either, that all the world knows who taught him Hebrew, and what

---

\* Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 84.

† Ibid. p. 83.

grammar his teacher used, or that the grammar is so insignificant, that scarcely any one would have recognized it from the statement of its proper title. The mention of this "anonymous grammar" may however serve to introduce us into the secret of Mr. Wardlaw's incompetency upon these subjects. Inferior teachers are often fond of using trifling novelties in grammar instead of employing the MASTERS of the language, and their suitableness to the defence of such a doctrine as the Trinity is frequently their chief recommendation.

Leaving Mr. Wardlaw among the Pikes and the Parkhursts, I shall quote a fuller exemplification of the rule than I have before given from MASCLEF, (Vol. I. p. 289,) whose grammar during nearly a century has been held in the highest reputation.

"Observandum multa nomina verè pluralia, et a nomine singulari descendunt, sumi nihilominus singulariter, jungique adjectivis, pronomibus, ac personis verborum singularibus. Talia sunt אלהים, אדונים, בעלים, בהמות, חכמות, חכמות, &c.

אלהים בראשית ברא אלהים Genesis i. 1: *In principio creavit Deus.* הוא Josh. xxiv. 19, et alibi; ad verbum *Quia Dii sancti ipse est*, id est, *Quia Deus sanctus ipse est.* מלך אשור אדניו 2 Reg. xix. 4: *Rex Assur Dominus ejus*, ad verbum, *Domini ejus.* גם בעליו יומת Exod. xxi. 29: *Etiam Dominus ejus morietur.* וְתוֹרַךְ שאל נא בהמות ותוֹרַךְ Job xii. 7: *Interroga nunc jumentum, et docebit te.* ביתה בנתה חכמות Prov. ix. 1: *Sapientia edificavit domum suam.* בתהמות רבה Ps. lxxviii. 15: *In abyssu magna.* יהוה לבית) בבית) mss.) בית להיות פקדים Jer. xxix. 26: *Ut sis præfectus domus Domini.*—Aiunt Grammatici id fieri ad denotandam rerum istarum magnitudinem et excellentiam."

A still greater variety of instances may be found in the "Essays on the Language of Scripture," by the late learned and accurate Mr. SIMPSON of Bath, (London, 1812,) Essay VI.; "A Sketch of the different modes in which the Hebrews express a great degree, or the superlative degree," pp. 491, 492, and Addenda, p. xxiii. The interpretations are in English. The author quotes from SELDEN, one of the most distinguished Hebraists, the remark that among the Jews especially, the plural number "is used of one person only, as

a mark of greatness." This Hebraism is not uncommon in the Greek of the New Testament. Thus *a Sabbath* is called a *SABBATHIS*, to express its sanctity. (See Matt. xii. 1, and ROSENMULLER AD LOCUM.) The explanation upon this principle of the well-known phrase "*Urim and Thummim*," may be interesting to the English reader. "The judgment of the high-priest," observes DR. SAMUEL CHANDLER, "was called Urim and Thummim, *LIGHTS AND PERFECTIONS, perfectly clear, precise, and full*; the plural number being frequently used in the Oriental Languages to denote the excellency and perfection of any thing." (Life of David, Vol. I. p. 8.)

The reader who wishes for further testimonies to the existence of this rule in Hebrew, may find ample satisfaction by consulting the following authorities: PAGNINI Thesaurus Linguæ Sanctæ, v. אָל, p. 106, and Institutiones Hebraicæ, L. ii. C. iv. p. 79; CASTELLI Lexicon Heptaglotton, v. אָל; SIMONIS Lexicon Hebraicum, v. אָל; J. D. MICHAELIS Supplementa ad Lex. Hebraica, Vol. I. p. 88; ROBERTSON, Gram. Hebræa, L. iv. C. i. Ed. 2nda, p. 294; BUXTORFII Thes. Grammaticus Linguæ Sanctæ Heb. L. ii. C. ii. p. 326, Ed. 6ta, Basilæ, 1663; GUARINI Gram. Heb. p. 476; SCHROEDERI Institutiones ad fundam. Ling. Heb. Reg. C. § 25; STORRII Observ. ad analog. et syntax. Heb. pp. 97—99; GLASSII Philologia Sacra, Canon. xxiv. xxv. and DATHE ad loc.; GROTIUS on Rom. xii. 1; LE CLERC on Joshua xxiv. 19, and Prov. xxvii. 18; ROSENMULLER (the younger) on Gen. xxiv. 9, and Isa. xix. 4; BISHOP CHANDLER'S Defence of Christianity, 2nd Edition, p. 77, Note.

3. Immediately after the remarks, above noticed, on the occurrence of the word *BOL*, in the sense of *a husband*, Mr. Wardlaw adds the following: "As to the same word, when used to signify *a master* or *owner*, the instances of its occurrence, when considered as exemplifications of *dominion, dignity, and majesty*, are somewhat curious. It is applied, Exod. xxi. 28, xxii. 11, to the 'owner' of an ox, or an ass, or a sheep; and in Isa. i. 3, to the 'master' of an ass: in which places it is in the plural number. I am not sure that the plural form of it occurs in this acceptation any where else."

The real state of the case is this. In Exod. xxi. 28, BOL does not occur in the plural, but in the singular. In *three* passages, however, of this chapter, (vers. 29, 34, 36,) and in *four* passages of the next chapter, (vers. 10, 11, 13, 14, in the English, 11, 12, 14, 15,) it occurs in the plural, and is translated "*owner*," as if it were singular. I am averse to repeat my former charge of "*carelessness*," because in the volume before me I have such frequent and lamentable proofs, that it only incites to resentment, but not to accuracy and diligence.

4. Mr. Wardlaw advances the supposition, that in these chapters BOL in the singular, and BOLIM in the plural, may be used promiscuously, because the ox, ass, or sheep, might "*be the property either of one owner, or of more than one.*" To vindicate the common translation, and to prove that BOLIM denotes but *one owner*, it is only necessary to observe, that it is joined with a *verb singular*. See in the Hebrew, Exod. xxi. 29, 36 ; xxii. 11.

5. The word ADNIM, in what Mr. Wardlaw calls "*its complete and decidedly plural form*," occurs in the Hebrew Bible at least seven times. In *three* of these passages (Deut. x. 17 ; Psalm cxxxvi. 3 ; Isa. xxvi. 13,) it is plural in sense, as well as in termination, and in the common version is properly translated "*Lords.*" In Isa. xix. 4, ("*The Egyptians will I give over into the hand of a cruel lord, and a fierce king shall rule over them,*") it is certain that ADNIM means one person only, because it is united to an adjective, (translated "*cruel*,"") which is in the singular number, and because it is explained by the phrase, "*a fierce king*," in the latter versicle. In 1 Kings xxii. 17, and 2 Chron. xviii. 16, ("*These have no master*,"") although the circumstances are not so decisive respecting the singular sense of ADNIM as in the last instance, yet, as "*the expression refers to the fall of Ahab*," it is almost impossible to understand it in any other sense. Lastly, ADNIM occurs in the passage so often quoted in proof of the Trinity, Mal. i. 6 : "*If I be a master, where is my fear?*" Such are the facts. In *one* instance ADNIM is applied to Jehovah, and in *three* to a single individual among the human race. These numbers Mr. Wardlaw has reversed, (*I must not say through carelessness or*

ignorance,) so as to make the representation more favourable to his purpose. "THE ONLY INSTANCE," says he,\* "in which I find *Adnim* in its complete and decidedly plural form, and yet translated by the singular, (with exception of THOSE which relate to Jehovah,) occurs in 1 Kings xxi. 17," (he intended 1 Kings xxii. 17,) "These have *no master*, Heb. *masters*."

6. We come to Mr. Wardlaw's last resource, which is a conjecture, supported by the authority of the learned Gousset, that where the final M is wanting, as is usually the case, the pronominal affix being subjoined, the Jod may be paragodic.

In reply to this conjecture, I observe, in the first place, that the doctrine of the Scriptures must be determined by appealing to the established principles of grammar, drawn up without reference to any theological system, as exact descriptions of those languages, in which the Scriptures are written. But an argument is particularly suspicious, when "*a long and ingenious defence*," such as that of Gousset, is necessary to prove its consistency with the principles of grammar.

Further, this supposition cannot affect the General Rule respecting the use of the Plural Number to denote eminence, because it does not at all apply to *feminine* nouns, whose plural ends in UT, or OTH, and of which we have an example in the word BEHEMOTH, (Job xl. 15,) literally *Beasts*, meaning *a single beast of great distinction*.

Lastly, this conjecture tends to annihilate the argument, which it is brought to support. In the passage (Isa. liv. 5,) where BOL is applied to the Supreme Being, it is followed by the pronominal affix, as well as in the passages where it denotes the owner of an ox, an ass, or a sheep. If the final Jod be supposed to be added "*euphoniæ causa*," for the sake of the better sound, in the latter cases, why may we not be consistent, and interpret it so in the former? By having recourse to such conjectures, Mr. Wardlaw may, no doubt, abridge the number of examples which illustrate and establish the General Rule; but in exactly the same proportion he

---

\* Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 86.

abridges the cases of the application of decidedly plural names to the Supreme Being.

III. Mr. Wardlaw in his Discourses further argued “for a plurality of Persons in the Godhead from the construction of the Hebrew names for God with *verbs* sometimes in the singular number, and sometimes in the plural.” In his present work,\* he appears to retract this argument on the authority of Kennicott, who maintains that the three instances of plural verbs annexed to the name of God are “unquestionably corrupt readings.”

IV. In the fourth place, Mr. Wardlaw referred to three passages, in which the plural pronouns *us* and *our* are used to represent God speaking of himself. He represented these and similar expressions as “utterly unaccountable,” except on the supposition of a plurality of Persons in the Godhead.† But in the work now before us, ‡ he appears to consider them in no higher a view than as “corroborative proofs,” supposing the doctrine to be previously established by other evidence. He admits that his reasoning in opposition to the Unitarian explication of these passages as containing the language of majesty, was in more than one particular inaccurate; and he grants, (what he before denied,) that the Scriptures contain an example of an earthly king employing the same mode of expression. He objects however, that no *other* examples can be produced of the *Divine Majesty* employing this style. But, supposing they could be produced, would not these be interpreted by Mr. Wardlaw upon exactly the same principle, and a demand be made for *other* examples without end?

Mr. Wardlaw had asserted in the most positive manner, that the use of plural pronouns to express majesty, though customary in all subsequent times, “was not however the style of the kings of the earth *in the age of Moses*.” I inquired, what documents were in his possession, by which he could establish this assertion? He replies, The writings of Moses himself. Is then the absence of the style in

---

\* Unit. Incap. of Vind. pp. 89—91.

† Discourses, p. 12.

‡ Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 95.



the small number of examples, contained in the writings of Moses, a proof that it was never used at all in his time? I must be permitted to repeat what I have said already, that, in the absence of more complete information upon the subject, "we must judge from the evidence that now lies before us, and presume, that the kings of the earth occasionally used in that age the same style, which we know them to have used in all ages, with which we are more familiarly acquainted."

To a considerable portion of my remarks upon these passages, Mr. Wardlaw has offered no reply. Among the rest I observed, that by bringing forward these passages, Mr. Wardlaw acknowledged, that the number of Persons in the Godhead is indicated by the personal pronouns employed in speaking of the Godhead; that he ought consequently to admit, that the almost perpetual use of *singular* pronouns denotes that God is *one Person only*; and that, although a single person may employ plural pronouns to express his dignity and authority, there is no rule, by which a plurality of persons can employ, in speaking of themselves, pronouns of the singular number. To this observation Mr. Wardlaw replies by charging me with arrogance and impiety,\* which I presume he would not have done, if he could have invented any *argument* that would have been satisfactory even to his own mind.

V. Lastly, Mr. Wardlaw argued from the expression, "The man is become *as one of us*."

Believing in the existence of Angels, (as I apprehend, notwithstanding Mr. Wardlaw's insinuation to the contrary, that all other Unitarians do,) I interpreted this sentence as addressed to them, and referred to the 5th verse of the same Chapter, "Ye shall be *as gods*," in support of my explanation. Mr. Wardlaw however maintains, that this passage is "decisive in favour of the opposite." To prove his point, he argues, that the translation ought to be "Ye shall be *as God*," and appeals to my own judgment for the propriety of this version. I am of opinion, that different persons will under-

---

\* Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 99.

stand this passage differently according to the interpretation, which they adopt of the other expression “*one of us.*” They, who understand this phrase to mean one of the three Persons in the Trinity, will translate with Mr. Wardlaw “*Ye shall be as God.*” Those on the other hand, who think with me, that “*one of us*” means *one of the heavenly host*, will adhere to the common version, which is in itself perfectly correct.

Mr. Wardlaw’s strong language upon the *decisiveness* of the last text was perhaps suggested by the fear of appearing to give up the whole of the proofs considered in this chapter. He seems still to consider this passage as sufficient by itself to prove a plurality of Persons in the Godhead. The others he thinks may be interpreted as referring to such a plurality, *if it be proved by previous evidence*. But, although he does not now maintain, that *any one of them taken singly* presents evidence in proof of his doctrine, yet he thinks that a powerful argument arises from viewing them *in combination*, \* which is to imagine, that a positive quantity may be formed by adding up a column of cyphers.



### CHAPTER III.

SINCE a very erroneous impression is likely to be produced upon the mind respecting the amount of that evidence, which is magnified in appearance by being discussed at great length and diffused through a long succession of pages, I thought it proper before entering upon a critical investigation of each text, to bring together into one view, (as I had done with regard to the proofs of my own tenets,) all the passages alleged as *direct proofs* of a Trinity of Co-equal Persons in the Godhead. That Mr. Wardlaw should be greatly incensed at my representation, gives me no surprise, and occasions me but little

---

\* Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 81.

uneasiness. If it be fatal to his system, the fault is not mine. I have only given a plain statement of the real fact. Mr. Wardlaw complains, that I ought to have introduced into this catalogue all the passages, which are supposed to prove separately the Divinity of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Do these passages then correspond to the description, by which I professed to be guided in drawing up the catalogue? Do they “*contain*” the doctrine of the Trinity? I entitled my catalogue “*A list of all the passages of the Old and New Testament, which assert, in terms more or less direct and express, that in the Unity of the Godhead there are three distinct Subsistences or Persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.*” Mr. Wardlaw has not shown, that the list is incomplete. He has not produced another passage from the whole Bible, which could have been added to it as containing a statement of the doctrine of the Trinity. To this list I subjoined Mr. Wardlaw’s own concession, that the leading articles of the Christian Revelation, of which he supposes the Trinity to be one, must be “*plainly stated,*” taught in clear, explicit, and determinate language, in the books which contain the records of that Revelation. Mr. Wardlaw has not retracted this concession. In reference to this maxim I asked, “*Where is the passage, which, if presented to any person, not previously trained up and instructed in the doctrine, would suggest to his mind the notion of three distinct agents, equal and infinite in every Divine perfection?*” To this question Mr. Wardlaw for an obvious reason makes no reply. But, until he shall either produce such a passage, or prove the fallacy of the principle, which he has laid down, he ought by his own showing to renounce the doctrine of the Trinity as indefensible.

In Isa. xxxiv. 16, I have objected to the translation “*MY mouth*” as not authorized by the original. Lowth, Stock, and Dodson all translate the passage, “*the mouth of JEHOVAH hath given the command.*” Lowth’s Note is as follows; “*For יהוה, five MSS. (three ancient) read יהוה, and another is so corrected. So likewise LXX.*” A reading, supported by considerable evidence, (see Kennicott, De Rossi, and Rosenmuller ad locum,) is this, “*For his mouth hath given the command.*” But there is no sufficient reason to doubt, that the true representation of the original words of the prophet is

that given by Lowth, Stock, and Dodson, and which would in all probability have been given by the learned authors of the common version, if they had had access to the various sources of information, which have been placed within our reach in the course of the last two hundred years.

Mr. Wardlaw's comment upon Isa. xlvi. 16, is as follows; "Let the reader consult the passage with its context. He will find a greater than the prophet evidently the speaker: and yet HE speaks of himself as *sent* by JEHOVAH, and by the SPIRIT of Jehovah."\* — In the *context* it is evident, that *Jehovah* is the speaker; but nothing opposes the supposition, that in this verse "the prophet Isaiah," as I have said before, "speaks in his own person." Being on the point of solemnly calling his apostate countrymen to repentance and obedience, (see the two next verses,) he in the first place demands their serious attention, and declares his authority as the inspired messenger of God, "And now the Lord God, and his Spirit, hath sent me;" and he then addresses his countrymen, "Thus saith the Lord, thy redeemer," &c. We find the Prophet Jeremiah in the same circumstances adopting a similar course; Jer. xxvi. 12, 13: "The Lord sent me to prophesy against this house and against this city all the words that ye have heard. Therefore now amend your ways," &c. Mr. Dodson's Note upon the passage in Isaiah is this; "The words seem not to be the words of Christ, but of the Prophet, as the Chaldee understands them, inserting before them, 'Dixit Propheta.' This interpretation is strongly confirmed by Zech. vii. 12." The Prophet is also supposed to be the speaker by Le Clerc, Dathe, and Rosenmuller. The words of the last-mentioned critic are, "Ait igitur vates, se ab initio, cum vaticinari cœpit, egisse verbis non obscuris et implexis, aut in recessu et latebris, ut gentium oracula assolent, sed palam et apertè. Quod sanè non auderet, nisi afflatus esset ab eo, qui nec fallere alios, neque ipse ullo modo possit falli."

We now come to a passage, (Matt. xxviii. 19,) which has been

---

\* Unit. Incap. of Viud. p. 109.

commonly regarded as one of the main supports of the Trinitarian doctrine, but which, even by Mr. Wardlaw's account, is giving way.

Mr. Wardlaw's argument from this passage proceeded upon the supposition, that *to be baptized into the name of any being* implies, that that being is made *the object of Supreme worship*. I have shown that the expression only implies, that such a being is made *the subject of faith*; and from a variety of concurring circumstances, but chiefly from examining the language of the Scriptures in other passages, I have endeavoured to prove, that the command to "baptize into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," was a direction to administer baptism *as a testimony of faith* in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

As the first step in my explanation of the passage, I observed, that "*the name*" of a person is an expression often used to signify *the person himself*, serving only for a title of respect, as when we say in English "*the King's majesty*,"\* and that the same meaning would consequently have been conveyed, if our Lord's words had been, "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, *baptizing them into the Father, and into the Son, and into the Holy Spirit.*"

But Mr. Wardlaw objects, that I have produced no example of "*the name*" of a THING being used as a phrase for *the thing itself*, and that I have thus left the question unanswered, "What are we to make of the phrase '*name of the Holy Spirit*,' if the Holy Spirit means an attribute, or a power, or influence?" †

This objection evidently tends no further than to prove the *personality*, and not the *Divinity*, of the Holy Spirit. Nevertheless I

\* In making this remark I had in view the observation of Schultens, who derives  $\text{נשׂ}$  from the Arabic verb  $\text{נשׂ}$ , *to be high, elevated, eminent*; and also the occasional use of the word in Hebrew to signify *distinction* or *renown* in the abstract. According to this view, the remarkable expression in Rev. xi. 3, "There were slain *seven thousand NAMES of men*," means "There were slain *seven thousand EMINENT men*." The English word "*name*" does not appear to me at all suited to convey the force of the Hebrew  $\text{נשׂ}$  in the circumstances under consideration, since the intention of the word is to express the *sanctity, greatness, or excellence* of the subject, to which it is applied.

† Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 110.

admit, that to render my proof of the Unitarian interpretation of the passage absolutely complete, I ought to have added such an example as Mr. Wardlaw requires. I find one in Jer. xxxiii. 9: "And it (*Jerusalem*) shall be to me a name of joy, (that is, an exceeding joy,) a praise, and an honour before all the nations of the earth." The expression "*his holy name*," which occurs 1 Chron. xvi. 35, xxix. 16; Psalm ciii. 1, and in several other places, is literally "*the name of his holiness*," that is, THE NAME OF THE HOLINESS, OF THE TRANSCENDANT HOLINESS, of the great Supreme. In the same manner our grammars and lexicons demand that we resolve the phrase "*his glorious name*," which is literally "THE NAME OF THE GLORY OF God." "*The name of the Spirit of God*," supposing his Spirit to mean *his Influence*, would not be a more extraordinary phrase than "*the name of his Kingdom*." But the latter was extremely common among the Jews. It was a custom with them, as often as the High-priest pronounced the name of God in the sanctuary, to utter this ascription of praise, "Blessed be *the name of the glory of his kingdom* for ever and ever."\* But the most striking exemplification of this periphrasis, as applied to *things*, is the fact stated by Schoettgen, † that "the Samaritans circumcised their converts *into the name of Mount Gerizim*." Here we have an example of "*the name*" of a *thing* meaning *the thing itself*, and it occurs in the account of that initiatory rite, practised by the Samaritans, which corresponded to the rite of Baptism among Christians. What can be the meaning of circumcising proselytes "*into the name of Mount Gerizim*," but circumcising them *in testimony of their faith in Mount Gerizim*, as the place where the worship of the true God was to be performed? In support of my interpretation of the word "*name*" as denoting not only *persons*, but *things*, I may quote the opinions of Schleusner and Suicer. It is interpreted by the former "*Ipsa persona et RES, quæ aliquo nomine insignitur*;" and by the latter it is said to be used "*pro RE et persona*."

Mr. Wardlaw commences his additional remarks upon the text under consideration with the following words: "I am disposed to

\* Hammond on Rom. ix. 5.

† See Newcome on Matt. xviii. 19.

admit, that my language in affirming that this passage *necessarily* implies an act of worship, was too strong and unqualified. That it *does* I still have no doubt. But I am satisfied that this arises, in a considerable degree, from my views of the nature of the ordinance of baptism, *along with my previous conviction of the doctrine of the Trinity.*\* This is a clear and candid admission, that to a person *not previously convinced upon other grounds*, this passage would present no satisfactory evidence of the doctrine of the Trinity. In his subsequent observations also Mr. Wardlaw signifies his assent to my interpretation of the formula as denoting that converts should be baptized *in testimony of their belief in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit*. But he observes, that this interpretation is “consistent with their holding this faith in the Father, Son, and Spirit, as faith in *one God, subsisting in three Persons.*” This I have not denied. I have however maintained, and, I think, fully proved, that the words of our Lord afford *no evidence* of a Trinity of co-equal Persons in the Godhead, although, if the doctrine of the Trinity were previously established, we should of course understand the words “*Father,*” “*Son,*” and “*Holy Ghost,*” as *names of the three co-equal Persons.*

I could not expect that Mr. Wardlaw should notice every argument, which I advance in support of my interpretations of Scripture, and am therefore satisfied that he should pass them by, as he repeatedly does, without either assent or objection. But I did expect, that he would avoid gross misrepresentation. In commenting upon 2 Cor. xiii. 14, I observed that the “phrase ‘*Communion of the Holy Spirit*’ implies, that ‘*the Holy Spirit*’ does not *in this instance* signify God or any person.” † Mr. Wardlaw represents me as “affirming confidently and scornfully, that the expression disproves *the personality of the Holy Spirit,*” ‡ that is, disproves that the phrase “*Holy Spirit*” denotes a person in *ANY* instance. The assertion, which I *have* made is supported by the remark, that “we may enjoy a communion *or gifts*

---

\* Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 109.

† Vind. or Unit. p. 156.

‡ Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 116.

WITH *persons*; but a *participation of a person* is an idea, which cannot enter the mind." Mr. Wardlaw observes in reply, that St. Paul "speaks of Christians as 'being made *partakers of Christ*.'" I answer that St. Paul (or rather, the Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, for the expression occurs nowhere except in Heb. iii. 14) here uses a metonymy, and that "*partakers of Christ*" means *partakers of the INSTRUCTIONS, ENDOWMENTS, and SUFFERINGS of Christ*. To employ the language of my former remark, "*partakers of Christ*" implies, that the word "*Christ*" does not in this instance signify Christ himself, or any *person*; for we cannot possibly *partake of a person*, although we may partake of powers, influences, and gifts. The phrase is illustrated by Eph. iii. 6; Col. i. 12; Heb. iii. 1, vi. 4, xii. 10; 1 Pet. iv. 13; 2 Pet. i. 4; where Christians are said to be "*partakers of the promise of God in Christ*," "*partakers of the sufferings of Christ*," "*partakers of the holy spirit*," "*partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light*," "*partakers of the heavenly calling*," "*partakers of the holiness of God*," and "*partakers of the Divine nature*."

In support of his views of the Apostolic benediction, Mr. Wardlaw quotes a long passage from his 11th Discourse, (p. 343,) which he says I had "overlooked." On the contrary, I had referred to it particularly,\* and in different parts of my work had stated what I conceived to be the true explanation of almost every passage of scripture contained in it. There is indeed only one of these passages, in which the language is at all similar to the phrase under consideration. It is 1 John i. 3. "That which we have seen and heard, declare we unto you, that ye also may have *fellowship with us*: and truly *our fellowship is with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ*." The word (κοινωνία) translated "*fellowship*" signifies literally a *partaking, a participation, a communion*. By the last term it is rendered in 2 Cor. xiii. 14, and so it ought to have been rendered here. The meaning is, "We declare unto you that which we have seen and heard, in order that you may partake with us, (*lit-*

---

\* Vindication, p. 154.



rally, have participation or communion with us,) in the holy desires and exalted views which we entertain: and truly we partake in these views and desires with God himself and with his Son Jesus Christ." The description here given of Christians strikingly agrees with that above quoted from the Apostle Peter, in which he calls them "partakers of a Divine nature." In employing this language, the Apostles "*associate*" themselves and their fellow-believers with God and with Jesus Christ. Yet Mr. Wardlaw maintains, that, when our Saviour "associates himself with his Father" in the words, "we will come unto him, and make our abode with him," he is chargeable, *if he be a mere created messenger of God*, with "the most offensive presumption."

In reply to Mr. Wardlaw's argument from the *coupling together* in the Apostolic benediction of "*the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ*" and "*the love of God*," I referred to the conclusion of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, where St. Paul says, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you. My love be with you in Christ Jesus." Mr. Wardlaw's severe and reiterated censures of my accidental substitution of a semicolon for a period in quoting this passage, remind me of the description of a certain character by the prince of modern critics, when he says, "A sophist abhors mediocrity; he must always say the greatest thing, and make a tide and a flood, though it be but in a basin of water."\* But as there seems to be some reason to maintain with Socinus, (as quoted by Mr. Wardlaw,) that the latter of these two sentences ought to be translated, not "My love *be*," but "My love *is* with you all in Christ Jesus," I leave the reader at liberty, if he sees fit, to cancel the whole paragraph, in which I have quoted and applied the passage. Still my principal observation remains unrefuted. I have conceded, that the benediction of the Apostle may reasonably be understood as including *a petition*. But I have added, and added without receiving any answer, "To whom is this petition addressed? By all who entertain just views of Scripture truth, it is addressed to the one true God, our Heavenly Father, who is able to

---

\* Bentley's Dissertation on Phalaris, p. 90.

do for us above all that we can ask or think. We may therefore reasonably consider the words of the Apostle as implying not only a benevolent wish, but also a devout prayer *to the Father of mercies*, that the disciples at Corinth might enjoy the favourable regards of the Lord Jesus Christ, the head of the Church; that they might continue to be approved and beloved by God; and that they might possess, in common with the whole body of Christians, a portion of the holy spirit."

Upon the last passage in the list, (Rev. i. 4, 5,) Mr. Wardlaw had said, "that '*the seven spirits of God*' is evidently an emblematical expression for *the Holy Spirit*." In the work now before us he produces the reason for this assertion, which he expresses by asking, "If St. John did *not* mean this, then what *did* he mean?" I answer by transcribing the note of Archbishop Newcome upon the passage; "The seven spirits. See ver. 20, iii. 1, iv. 5, v. 6, viii. 2, 6, xv. 1, 6, 7, xvi. 1, xvii. 1, xxi. 9. They seem to be those seven ministering spirits, whom St. John saw discharging separate offices in subsequent revelations made to him."

Mr. Wardlaw is in great triumph, because I have spoken of the Holy Spirit as "a *person*, receiving from God the Father power to bestow certain favours and gifts." My statement was evidently hypothetical. This was indicated with sufficient clearness by the introductory clause of the sentence, "*Allowing it to be as evident as Mr. Wardlaw asserts.*"



#### CHAPTER IV.

BEFORE considering the evidence for the Supreme Divinity of Jesus Christ, I have endeavoured to settle the previous question, whether this doctrine is such as can be proved by the testimony of the Scriptures. With this view I considered what is implied in the assertion, (*supposing the terms of it to be intelligible,*) that "in the

person of Christ there existed a union of the Divine and human natures." I observed, (Vindication, p. 160,) that "by the '*nature*' of any thing we always mean its *Qualities*. When, therefore, it is said, that Jesus Christ possesses *both a Divine and a human nature*, it must be meant that he possesses *both the QUALITIES of God, and the QUALITIES of man*. But, if we consider what these qualities are, we perceive them to be *totally incompatible with one another*." I have then stated and contrasted these qualities, and have thus endeavoured to prove that the doctrine, which asserts *their union in one person*, is utterly *absurd and self-contradictory*, and therefore *incapable of being proved even by the clearest declarations of the Scriptures*.

After quoting the passage at full length, Mr. Wardlaw remarks, "In all this I have the happiness of most entirely and cordially agreeing with my opponent. If the orthodox doctrine be what he here represents it, let it be rejected and proscribed as it deserves, and branded with every epithet that implies impiety and folly. But *it is not so*. And what is more, Mr. Yates *knows it is not so*; and knew it at the moment when he was sketching and filling up this most hideous picture."\*—In order to prove, that I have misrepresented, and "*wilfully and deliberately*" misrepresented, the orthodox doctrine, Mr. Wardlaw alleges a fact, which I knew and had stated, but which, instead of proving the charge brought against me, appears to me now, as it did then, to be the very circumstance, which justifies my representation. The fact is this; that, according to the orthodox doctrine, as finally determined at the Council of

\* Unit. Incap. of Vind. pp. 124, 125.—The opinions, which I have stated as to the best of my knowledge included in the doctrine of Christ's Divine and human natures, are here reprobated by Mr. Wardlaw in the strongest terms as *disgusting and hideous*, "*the monstrous production of a malicious fancy*." But, in a subsequent part of the same volume, (p. 243,) he himself calls them "*the peculiarities of Trinitarianism*." "On the peculiarities of Trinitarianism," says he, "Mr. Yates could pronounce with dogmatism enough;" and in proof of this assertion, he immediately quotes my remarks on the incredibility of the opinions now brought under review.

Chalcedon, the Divine and human natures in the person of Christ continue “*distinct*,” that is, “*not confounded*,” the Divine not being transmuted into the human nature, nor the one blended with the other.\* Now, if the Divine and the human natures had been supposed to be altered and blended, so as to form a *mixed nature* between the Divine and the human, the doctrine might not have been self-contradictory; for the new properties, formed by the mutual communication, might exist *in one and the same person*. But this view is decidedly rejected by the orthodox; and the precise circumstance, which constitutes the absurdity of their doctrine, is, that they represent *the Divine and human natures*, though belonging to *one person*, as remaining **DISTINCT**, and **NOT BLENDED OR CONFOUNDED**.

Mr. Wardlaw, in speaking of my argument, says, “He has enumerated the properties of God and the properties of man; and then, instead of keeping them *distinct*, he has represented the system of Trinitarians as ascribing these opposite and incompatible properties to the *same mind*.”—Does Mr. Wardlaw then believe, that the *one person* of Christ includes *more MINDS than one*? If one person involves not only one mind, but even more, how little merited were his censures against me † for representing the doctrine of *three persons in the Godhead* as implying the supposition of *three minds*!

Mr. Wardlaw proceeds;—“as if they held the doctrine of the *human soul* of Jesus possessing the attributes of his *Divine nature*, or his *Divine nature* the qualities of his *human soul*!” Here is

\* Dr. Barrow explains the determination of the Council of Chalcedon by saying, that the Divine and human natures were united in the person of our Lord, *Ασυγχυτως*, “Without commixtion or confusion, for that would induce a *third nature* different from both, such as results from the composition or con-temperation of the elements into a mixed body; so that he should be neither God nor man, but I know not what other kind of being, without any ground or authority to be supposed, that would destroy, diminish, or alter the properties belonging to each.”—Exposition of the Creed, Works, Vol. I. p. 525.

† Unit. Incap. of Vind. pp. 65—75.

strange confusion, "*the Divine nature*" not being distinguished from the *Person*, to whom that nature belongs. Mr. Wardlaw has avowed his "entire and cordial agreement" with that part of my work, in which I have defined the "*nature*" of a thing to mean its *qualities*. Let the reader therefore substitute the word "*qualities*" in place of "*nature*" in the sentence just quoted, and then let him, if he can, make out of it any sense at all. Perhaps Mr. Wardlaw meant to have said, "as if they held the doctrine of the *human soul* of Jesus possessing the attributes of his *Divine PERSON*, or his *Divine PERSON* the qualities of his *human soul*." If this was his meaning, he adheres to the decree of the Council of Chalcedon by rejecting that of the Council of *Ephesus*, which determined that the two opposite natures belong *to one person only*. If Mr. Wardlaw maintains, that Jesus Christ not only possesses two distinct *natures*, but consists also of two distinct *PERSONS*, a *Divine* and a *human*, his doctrine may escape the imputation of absurdity, but it must equally resign the character of orthodoxy.

In the argument now considered, I have proceeded upon the supposition, that *the terms*, in which the doctrine is stated, *are intelligible*. After dismissing it, I considered in my former work the supposition, that its terms are *not intelligible*.\* Here a different train of reasoning is of course adopted. Agreeably to the principles repeatedly stated, I have said, that, if I could find in the Scriptures the unintelligible proposition, that "*in the person of Christ a Divine is united with a human nature*," *expressed in these terms*, I should, in submission to the authority by which it is declared, believe it to contain a truth. Mr. Wardlaw has confounded together the two cases, and represented my observations respecting the latter, as if they were intended to be applied to the former.†

In the latter part of the Chapter, to which these remarks refer, I combated Mr. Wardlaw's representation of the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ as supported by numerous passages of Scripture, which have been supposed to teach that doctrine by all translators

\* Vind. of Unit. p. 161.

† Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 127.

and commentators in all countries and all ages, *with the exception of the very few, who have denied the doctrine altogether.* I entreat Mr. Wardlaw to ask himself, whether the principle of integrity did not require that he should retract this statement. Instead of so doing, he only objects to the list of eminent Unitarians, the production of which he had forced upon me, *First*, as inaccurate in point of fact, and *Secondly*, as “an attempt to give authority and weight to my cause by mustering a host of imposing names.” \*

The *first* charge is stated in these terms ; “ It cannot fail to strike the considerate reader, what an anxiety there is to swell the list, not only by including Sabellians, Arians, Semi-arians, and Socinians, in all their variety of degrees, but by pressing into the service every one, in whose writings any thing is to be found that could attach to them the slightest suspicion of their verging towards a doubt of the ordinary doctrine of the Trinity.”

Of the “ anxiety ” here described, I was never conscious ; and as it includes simple *names* without any remarks annexed, the reader, who is “ struck,” as Mr. Wardlaw represents, can only experience such an impression from the influence of his own fancy. The list manifests, says Mr. Wardlaw, “ an anxiety to include *Sabellians, Arians, Semi-arians, and Socinians*, in all their variety of degrees.” I ask, *Where are the Sabellians ?* I know of none. Again, *Who are the Semi-arians ?* I have, I believe, included no other except Dr. Samuel Clarke, who, as is evident from his celebrated “ *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*,” would have assented, had he lived in the present day, to every tenet and probably to every interpretation of Scripture contained in my “ *Vindication of Unitarianism*.” Was I not right in including both *Arians*, and *Socinians*, who equally assert the principles, which I was employed in defending ? I have not introduced the name of an individual, whom I could not prove by clear and decisive evidence to have been, at least during the latter part of his life, a *Unitarian* in the sense, in which I have always used the term, and in which I was under the necessity of

---

\* Unit. Incap. of Vind. pp. 19—22.

using it in replying to a representation worded so as to cast contempt not upon Socinians only, but upon all who have denied the Supreme Divinity of Christ.

Besides this general charge, Mr. Wardlaw has specified two names as particularly improper to be introduced into a catalogue of Unitarians. These are *Dr. Whitby* and *Dr. Watts*.

Of the former Mr. Wardlaw asserts, that “*the whole tenor of his works* justifies us in questioning his right to the place assigned him in the Unitarian brotherhood.”

Perhaps Mr. Wardlaw never heard, that Dr. Whitby towards the end of his life renounced the Trinitarian doctrine, which he had before defended, and wrote a solemn retractation of his errors under the following title : “*ΤΥΣΤΕΡΑΙ ΦΡΟΝΤΙΔΕΣ* ; or, *The Last Thoughts of Dr. Whitby, containing his correction of several passages in his Commentary on the New Testament ; London, 1727.*” In the Preface he expresses himself in these admirable and edifying terms :

“ 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, (see Dr. Clarke, Mr. Jackson, and others,) that I own I 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.”

Then, after quoting the examples of Cyprian and Austin, he proceeds :

“ 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 sup-

posed to extort such a Retraction 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 authority ?”

Again ;

“ 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 such an answer is attempted with angry invectives and haughty sophistry, aiming to be wise above what is written, I must say, ΜΕΝΩΜΕΝ ὡσπερ ἔσμεν, i. e. *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.”

From the latter part of this Preface it is evident, that Dr. Whitby intended to publish the work before his death. He died in 1726. It was published the year following “ *by his express order.*” It consists of a defence of the general principles of Unitarianism ; and, as a circumstance which strongly justifies me in introducing the name of Whitby as I did, I may remark, that I have met with no other work, which *in its general scope and object* so much coincides with my own “ Vindication of Unitarianism.”



Dr. Whitby's publications were *forty-one* in number. With all of these Mr. Wardlaw ought to have been in some degree acquainted, in order to be qualified to make the assertion which he has advanced, that Dr. Whitby's orthodoxy is proved "*by the whole tenor of his writings.*" In the catalogue of them I observe a great variety of works, which, judging from their Titles, I have no doubt, oppose the sentiments, by maintaining which the Orthodox differ from Unitarians. Such for example is "*A Sermon proving, that Reason is to be our Guide in the choice of our Religion, and that nothing ought to be admitted as an article of Faith, which is repugnant to the common principles of Reason, or is unintelligible to the Human Understanding; with an Appendix in Vindication of it; London, 1714.*"

Respecting the *last* sentiments of Dr. Watts we have not equally minute information, because the papers, which he had written to explain "*his new thoughts concerning the person of Christ, and their great importance,*" were destroyed soon after his death by his Executors. Some curious particulars relating to this transaction may be seen in Mr. Belsham's *Life of Lindsey*. But to prove, that Dr. Watts was during the latter years of his life *a decided Unitarian*, in the sense in which I have always used the term, I appeal to the same authority, to which Mr. Wardlaw has himself referred.\*

The late Mr. Samuel Palmer, minister of an Independent Congregation at Hackney, published in 1785 *Johnson's Life of Watts*, with Additions, among which is a dissertation entitled "*An authentic account of his last sentiments on the Trinity.*" Mr. Palmer says, (Preface, p. iv.) that the doctrine of the Trinity "employed his thoughts and his pen more than any other disputed point in theology;" that "in the younger part of life he seemed to embrace the doctrine as it had been commonly stated, and had no objection to the usual modes of expression in relation to it;" but that "as it was not his character to take any thing upon trust, he indulged a freedom of inquiry with respect to this subject of debate as well as every other, and the consequence was, he saw reason to alter his

---

\* Unit. Incap. of Vind. Preface, p. xiii.

views concerning it" (p. 44); that "within about two years of his dissolution he published the result of his inquiries" in two works entitled "*Useful and important Questions concerning Jesus Christ the Son of God,*" and "*The Glory of Christ as God-man displayed*" (p. 54); that these works were "the product of that part of his life, when his powers of mind and body were in full vigour" (p. 58); that he appears in them to reject the doctrine of the Trinity as held by Athanasians, maintaining *the perfect simplicity of the Divine nature* (p. 95); that he believed God to be *One Infinite Being*, the same who is often characterized in Scripture as *the Father*, and Jesus Christ to be *another being or person, in himself inferior to the Father and derived from him* (p. 124); that his idea of the *Divinity of Christ* was, that "*the Godhead, the Deity itself, personally distinguished as the Father, was united to the man Christ Jesus, in consequence of which union, or indwelling of the Godhead, he became properly God;*" and, (p. 62,) that with respect to the Holy Spirit, "he did not hold the common notion of *his real personality as distinct from the Father, but supposed it to mean the Divine power or influence, or God himself as exerting his influence.*"

The zeal of Trinitarians to maintain the orthodoxy of Dr. Watts probably arises in a considerable degree from their use of his Psalms and Hymns in public worship. They ought however to be informed, that the Doctor himself afterwards disapproved of the inconsiderate expressions suggested in his early youth, when, to use his own expression,\* "he believed in scholastic orthodoxy," and would have corrected his devotional poetry, had not the pecuniary interest of the Bookseller opposed a revisal. The following conversation upon the subject is recorded by Mr. Palmer (p. 28):

"Mr. Grove remarked to the Doctor, that several of the Hymns

---

\* Dr. Watts employed this expression in speaking of his "*Christian Doctrine of the Trinity,*" which Mr. Wardlaw quotes in terms of great respect; Discourses, p. 41. "When I wrote the book," says Dr. Watts, "*I believed in SCHOLASTIC ORTHODOXY; and yet now I would argue,*" &c. &c. Correspondence between the Rev. Dr. Isaac Watts and the Rev. Martin Tomkins concerning the worship of the Holy Spirit, &c., London, 1803, p. 24.

laid the stress of our redemption on the compassion of Christ rather than on the love of God, and expressed his wish, that he would alter them in this respect, and make them more conformable to the scripture doctrine. The Doctor replied, that he should be glad to do it, but it was out of his power, for he had parted with the copy, and the Bookseller would not suffer any such alteration." In an "*Appendix*" to the above-mentioned work, (London, 1791,) Mr. Palmer also informs us, that, when urged by Mr. Tomkins, an Arian minister, to declare publicly his disapprobation of the *Doxologies*, which he had composed to the Holy Spirit as a distinct person from the Father, Dr. Watts wrote the following reply : \* " I freely answer, I wish some things were corrected. But the question with me is this : as I wrote them in sincerity *at that time*, is it not more for the edification of Christians and the glory of God, to let them stand, than to ruin the usefulness of the whole book by correcting them now, and perhaps bring further and false suspicions on my present opinions? Besides, I might tell you, that, of all the books I have written, that particular copy is not mine. I sold it for a trifle to Mr. Lawrence near thirty years ago, and his posterity make money of it to this day; and I can scarce claim a right to make any alteration in the book, which would injure the sale of it." This was written about ten years before the death of Dr. Watts.

Much more copious evidence, if necessary, might be produced to prove, that Dr. Watts in the latter part of his life was a *Unitarian*, that is, (for in this sense I have always used the term,) that he firmly held the simple unity of God *as one person*, maintained that one person to be the same, who in the Scriptures is repeatedly called *the Father*, regarded "*the Holy Spirit*" as either *another name* for the Father, or as *his influence and energy*, and considered Jesus Christ, though intimately united with him, as *distinct from him, created by him, and wholly dependant upon him*.

If I have shown, that I was accurate in point of fact, when I in-

---

\* The passage may likewise be seen in the "*Correspondence*," referred to in the last Note, p. 31.

troduced the names of Watts and Whitby into the list of eminent Unitarians, it will not surely be objected, that they held these sentiments only during the latter part of their lives. Their *last* thoughts, formed after the most attentive, serious, and deliberate study, must be considered as the sentiments, which they have sanctioned by their approbation : and it must strike every one as a considerable presumption in favour of Unitarianism, that men so able and so upright as Dr. Whitby, Dr. Watts, and Mr. Robert Robinson, who had gained from the world the highest applause by publishing works in defence of the orthodox system, should afterwards declare their solemn conviction of its falsehood, when their understandings were most improved, their devotion become most fervent and habitual, and their views fixed upon the awful account to be rendered by them at the day of universal judgment.

But, whilst I now for the first time direct the attention of the candid reader to this presumptive and accessory consideration, I again deny, that I introduced my catalogue of Unitarian worthies “for the sake of an empty boast, or to decide the question in dispute by great human authorities.” Mr. Wardlaw had represented the advocates of the doctrine of the inferiority of Christ to the Father, as a small and insignificant set. To have made no reply to his representations would have been universally considered as an admission of their truth. I therefore replied ; and I replied in the simplest and plainest manner that was possible, not making any parade of my authorities, but merely presenting them as a list of names.

“ Mr. Yates,” says my opponent, “ is well aware, what a mighty army of ‘ illustrious and venerated names ’ could be set in array on the opposite side.” I acknowledge it with pleasure. Had I ever spoken of the adherents to the doctrine of the Supreme Divinity of Christ in the same contemptuous language, which Mr. Wardlaw has employed towards Unitarians, he would have been right in following the course which I have taken ; and I hope I should have been more generous and more just, than to insult him for doing what I had myself forced upon him, and to tell the world, that he no doubt

“felt a secret elation of mind in the list he had made out, an inward self-gratulation in mentally appending his own name to so honourable a roll.”

Such however, in the present state of public opinion, is the unavoidable fate of Unitarianism. Its advocates are decried as few and contemptible in point of numbers ; blind, ignorant, and infatuated in point of understanding ; and malicious, blasphemous, proud, obstinate, and deceitful in point of character. If, instead of silently submitting to hear these charges repeated again and again without refutation, they venture to say, that they have endeavoured to examine the word of God with serious and honest minds, that they do not think themselves worse men than their fellow-christians of other denominations, and that their doctrines have been espoused and defended by many writers of the greatest learning and reputation, they are immediately checked by the cries of arrogance, presumption, inconsistency, and imposition. But, amidst the clamour of worldly passions and the collision of worldly interests, “*Wisdom,*” we rejoice to believe, “*is justified of her children.*” True Religion pursues her steady course, as sounds pass through the agitated air. If, in the present age of the world, her followers be doomed to endure bitter scorn and enmity, they know that *their* trials are small compared with the tribulation sustained at the beginning of the Gospel in the same cause ; and, although by every person of spiritual views and a heavenly temper an attack upon his *character* must be felt much more keenly than any injury done to his *property* or his *person*, yet he is enabled to possess his soul in patience by reflecting upon the sublimity, the joyfulness, and the unshaken security of those encouraging and sustaining doctrines, for professing which he is exposed to reproach : though “the world be not his friend, nor the world’s law,” he can turn with serene composure from the fallible tribunal of men to the just judgment of God, and rejoice in the hope of the glory, that shall be revealed. May the Unitarians of modern times resemble those of the first ages not merely in being the subjects of contemptuous defamation, but in returning at all times the language of gentleness and kindness, of unremitting and invincible benevolence, and be able to describe

themselves, without the exception of a single particular, in the words of the Apostle, \* “ Being reviled, we bless ; being persecuted, we suffer it ; being defamed, we entreat ; we are made as the filth of the world, and are the off-scouring of all things.”



## CHAPTER V.

MY remarks against considering the term “ *God* ” as a title belonging *exclusively* to the Supreme Being have obtained from Mr. Wardlaw a concession, (p. 134,) that this word only indicates Supreme Divinity, when used in its “ *highest acceptance,*” and consequently, (as we may presume,) that the application of it to our Saviour would only be conclusive respecting his equality with the Father, if “ there were *some particular circumstances in the mode of application,* which pointed him out as THE SUPREME GOD, THE ONE LIVING AND TRUE GOD, OR THE GOD WHO IS ABOVE ALL.” † These are “ *titles, belonging exclusively* ” to Jehovah. If Mr. Wardlaw could have proved, that they are ever applied to Jesus Christ, his remarks would have been pertinent to the occasion. But few of his observations in reply to mine are directed into the line of argument, which properly belonged to him, the consideration of the *circumstances*, in which the term “ *God* ” is used concerning our blessed Saviour. I have given it as my opinion, that there are only *three*, or perhaps *four* passages, (*viz.* John i. 1, xx. 28 ; Heb. i. 8, and perhaps Isa. ix. 6,) in which the name “ *God* ” is applied to our Saviour at all. That in these it ought to be taken in its *lower* acceptance, I have asserted upon two different grounds :

*First*, Upon the general principle, ‡ that, whenever a word used in the original bears two different senses, that sense ought to be

---

\* 1 Cor. iv. 12, 13.

† See Vindication of Unitarianism, p. 169.

‡ Vind. of Unit. pp. 34, 169, 175, 179.

taken, which agrees with the previously ascertained doctrine of the Scriptures, rather than that, which would lead to the establishment of a doctrine not yet proved by other unambiguous passages :

*Secondly*, Upon the consideration, that this is the sense of the term “*God*,” according to which our Saviour indicated the propriety of its application to himself.

To the former of these arguments Mr. Wardlaw makes no reply whatever : his silence must be considered as a strong presumption of its conclusiveness. The latter he endeavours to obviate by a variety of intricate remarks, which may be best answered by an explanation of the passage in St. John’s Gospel to which they refer.

Our Lord had repeatedly called the Supreme Being HIS FATHER. (See John x. 15, 17, 18, 25, 29, 30.) The name, and still more the relation, were by no means familiar to the minds of the Jews, who regarded God rather as the King, the Creator, the Governor, than the Father, and were accustomed to connect with the contemplation of him such sentiments of profound and even superstitious awe, that for centuries they had esteemed it a profanation to utter his peculiar title **JEHOVAH**, and the very sound of that word was supposed to be lost.\* It is not surprising that men, who, though addicted to evil speaking and all malice and guile, started with horror at the very idea of pronouncing the sacred Tetragrammaton, and who were eager to catch at every action and every word of Jesus, which they might construe into a crime ; it is not surprising that such men should be enraged against him as an impious blasphemer, when they observed the frequency and, as it appeared to them, the free familiarity with which he called God “*his Father*,” and especially when they heard him add, (ver. 30,) “*I and my Father are*

\* Hence in the Greek translation of the Pentateuch made 280 years before Christ, and in all the other parts of what is called the Septuagint Version, made about 100 years later, **JEHOVAH** is uniformly translated *ὁ Κύριος*, THE LORD. Likewise, in reading the original Hebrew, **יהוה** was also substituted for **יהוה**. For an account of numerous other superstitions, designed to express their profound veneration, whether real or pretended, for the name of the Almighty, see BUTLER’S *Horæ Bibliæ*, Vol. I. ; BUXTORFII *Lexicon Talmudicum*, &c. v. **דש**, p. 2433, and DRUSII *Tetragrammaton*.

one." Blind with indignant disdain, and hurried on to exaggerated views of our Saviour's language, they prepared to stone him, charged him with blasphemy, and assigned as their reason that, "although a man, he made himself God." (Vers. 31, 32, 33.) That this is the true account of the origin of their scorn and rage, is evident from the language used in a former passage of the same Gospel, (John v. 18,) where it is said, "Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the sabbath, but said also that God was HIS FATHER, making himself equal with God." To prove that he had been guilty of nothing impious, nothing unsuitable to his real character, he appeals to a passage of their own Scriptures, showing that all persons are entitled to call themselves "*Sons of God*," and consequently to call God "*their Father*," who are visited with extraordinary testimonies of his favour in the gifts of inspiration. (Vers. 34—38.) The passage is the 6th verse of the 82nd Psalm; "I have said, Ye are gods, and all of you children of the Most High." Here "*gods*" and "*children of the Most High*" are synonymous expressions. They are both used to denote persons "*to whom the word of God came*;" and, although in the passage of St. John's Gospel, which we are considering, our Saviour is represented as having recited only the first clause, "I said, Ye are gods," yet we ought, I conceive, to consider him as intending, agreeably to a practice of the Jews when quoting the Old Testament,\* to direct the attention of his hearers to the whole verse. The pertinency of the reference, and the justice of the vindication, are obvious. If in the Scriptures those persons are called "*gods*" or "*sons of God*," to whom the word of God came, and if Jesus was of this number;—if, to use his own language, he was a person, "*whom God had sanctified and sent into the world*," it was most unwarrantable to charge him with blasphemy, because he described himself as "*the Son of God*," or called God (*πατερα ιδιον*) "*his own Father*."

---

† "*Interdum principia versuum tantum adducuntur sine formulâ allegationis, idque brevitatis ergo, etiamsi scriptor ad integros respiciat,*" &c.

SURENHUSHI *Biblos Katallages*, L. ii. De modis allegandi Scripturas Sacras, Thesis VIII. and X.



The interpretation here given appears to me to make the sense of the whole passage not only plain, but consistent and connected. It likewise affords a ready solution to all Mr. Wardlaw's difficulties.—How came it to pass, that, so far as we learn, no former prophet ever led his hearers to adopt the supposition, that he claimed equality with God, by calling him *his Father*?\* Because no former prophet exhibited the same view of the *character* of God; Jesus came to introduce a new dispensation, under which the Almighty was to be contemplated with love rather than fear, and men were invited to approach him not only with reverence, but with reliance and filial affection.—Why did not the humble and holy Jesus most anxiously guard against every expression, which could possibly suggest the idea of his familiarly associating himself with the Most High? Why did he not manifest that awful sense of distance, which, instead of diminishing, must increase in the direct ratio of the elevation and holiness of the creature, by whom it is felt?† Because the Jews already carried that sentiment to an absurd and pernicious extreme; there was no occasion to warn them against adopting language, which would represent themselves as friends, associates, and fellow-workers with God; it was much more necessary to impress upon them those views of his condescending love and mercy, which would lead them to contemplate him as intimately united to his whole rational creation, and tenderly concerned for the advancement of every individual in holiness, virtue, and happiness. “Beloved,” said the apostle John to his fellow-christians, “now are we *the Sons of God*.” (1 John iii. 2.) Under the Law, few were conscious of that endearing relation. The title “*Father*,” by which God is continually designated in the New Testament, is never applied to him in the Old except in a very few cases; there it is commonly employed as a Metaphor, and to enforce an argument, but not as an established designation of the Deity; (see Mal. i. 6, ii. 10; Psalm lxxxix. 26;) and, although there are various instances in which the term “*god*” is applied to persons “to whom the word

---

\* Unit. Incap. of Vind. pp. 138, 139.

† Ibid. p. 147.

of God came," I doubt whether there is another example of their being called "*Children of the Most High*," or "*Sons of God*," so that our Saviour was restricted to the use of the very passage which he quoted, in order that he might at once vindicate himself from the unjust accusation of the Jews, and illustrate the grace and truth, which he came to introduce.—But could any thing have been more easy than to give a plain and distinct denial of the charge, that he made himself God? \* He did give such a denial. It was clearly implied in the argument by which he justified himself. They were exasperated, because he had called God "*his Father*," thus placing himself, as they conceived, on an equality with the Supreme Being. Had he really been God equally with the Father, he would not have shrunk from the avowal of it; but he vindicates himself upon a different plea, viz. that in the Scriptures those persons are called "*gods*," and "*sons of God*," to whom the word of God comes; and being one of those so favoured and distinguished, he maintains that he was right in calling God "*his Father*." His argument was not only decisive in reply to the cavil of the Jews, but should convince all who believe him to have been incapable of timidly concealing the truth, that he was not the Supreme God.

Mr. Wardlaw objects to this interpretation, that the persons addressed in the passage, which our Saviour quoted, were not prophets, but "*the Jewish rulers, the judges of Israel*." † But Jesus Christ, considered merely as a Jew, who lived at the beginning of the Christian æra, was incomparably better qualified to describe the inferior signification of the term "*god*" than any of us; and as one, to whom "God gave the Spirit without measure," I believe him to have been free from the possibility of deception. He says that "*the scripture calls those 'gods,' to whom the word of God comes.*" That *Prophets* are included under this designation is allowed by Mr. Wardlaw. "The inspired communications made to *the holy Prophets*," says he in a subsequent part of his volume, "are almost always introduced in similar terms, 'The Lord said unto me,' '*The word of the Lord came unto me.*'" ‡ The circum-

---

\* Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 139.

† Ibid. p. 140.

‡ Ibid. p. 265.

stance, stated by him, that *the Jewish rulers* are called "*gods*," does not militate against the correctness of the definition. The Jewish rulers, the judges of Israel, were also persons, "to whom the word of God came," and it was for this reason that they were called "*gods*" and "*children of the Most High*." At the first appointment of the *Seventy Elders* to be the assistants of Moses in the administration of the Law, (Numbers xi.) God said, "I will take of the spirit, which is upon thee, and will put it upon them." The sacred history represents the qualifications of *Joshua* to succeed Moses by describing him as "a man, in whom was the spirit of God," and we are informed, that after the death of Moses, "the Lord spake unto Joshua," giving him similar commands and directions. The *Judges*, who judged Israel after the death of Joshua, are repeatedly described as having similar endowments, and the same was the case with Saul, David, and the race of *Kings*. It was as a symbol of the effusion of the spirit, that rulers upon entering on their office were anointed by having oil, which was the emblem of richness, poured over them. If then the Jewish rulers were persons, "to whom the word of God came," or who, as I have explained the phrase, "were authorized, commissioned, and inspired, to declare the will of God to mankind," we see the perfect aptitude of the quotation to our Saviour's purpose, and we cannot reasonably doubt, that he intended to claim to himself the titles of "*a god*" and "*a son of God*" in the same sense, in which they are given to the prophets, and also in that passage to the Judges of Israel.

Since Mr. Wardlaw allows, that the term "*god*" is sometimes used in an inferior sense, there was no reason, why he should be anxious to reduce the number of instances. The examples, which remain by his own concession, are amply sufficient for our purpose. I cannot however admit the justice of the criticisms, by which he endeavours to set the rest aside. Some of them appear to me to do great violence to the sense. Thus, in Deut. x. 17, Jehovah is called *GOD of GODS*, that is, according to Mr. Wardlaw's explanation, \*

---

\* Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 135.

*God of Idols*, or, as he ought to have explained it *in consistency with the uniform force of this species of superlative, Idol of Idols, or the greatest of Idols*. Even supposing the word “*God*” to be used here *in two different senses*, and to signify, that Jehovah is, in the highest sense of the word, *God of Idols*, the absurdity is scarcely abated, the praise consisting only in declaring, that the Supreme Creator and Governor of the Universe rules over Idols, that he is “*infinitely superior*” to non-entities, or to stocks and stones. The title “*GOD OF GODS*” is followed by the similar title “*Lord of Lords* :”—“*Jehovah, your God, is God of gods, and Lord of lords.*” Are not the expressions parallel, and to be interpreted upon the same principle? But, if “*GOD OF GODS*” signifies *God of Idols*, what is meant by “*LORD OF LORDS*?” Submitting these remarks to Mr. Wardlaw’s candid consideration, I shall only say, that the word “*god*,” applied metaphorically to Jehovah, is in this passage to be considered as equivalent to the word “*king*,” kings being called *gods*, because they were regarded as persons, “*to whom the word of God came.*” The title, by which Moses designates the Almighty, is therefore precisely equivalent to that employed by the apostle Paul, (1 Tim. vi. 15,) where he calls the Supreme Being “*KING OF KINGS and Lord of lords.*” The description is intended to represent Jehovah superior in power and dominion to all kings and lords, as they are superior to all their subjects.

I might object upon equally strong grounds to others of Mr. Wardlaw’s criticisms on the instances, which I have produced, of the inferior sense of the term “*god*.” Among all the passages to which he makes exceptions, there is only one where I see reason to allow the force of his remarks. This is 1 Sam. ii. 25, which ought perhaps to be translated, as Mr. Wardlaw proposes, “*If one man sin against another, God shall judge him.*” To make amends for this defalcation, (supposing it to be required,) I beg to add the following passages to my former collection of instances, in which “*those are called gods, to whom the word of God came.*”

Joshua xxii. 22. “*The Lord, GOD OF GODS, the Lord, GOD OF GODS, he knoweth.*”

1 Chron. xxiv. 5. “*The governors of the sanctuary, and the go-*

vernors *of the gods*, were of the sons of Eleazar, and of the sons of Ithamar." The supplement given in the common version, "*of the house of God*," is totally unauthorized by the original. The *gods*, here spoken of, were the Priests and the Prophets, so called because they were favoured with a portion of Divine inspiration. See Grotius ad loc., and Blayney on Jeremiah xx. 1.

Ps. I. 1. "THE GOD OF GODS, even Jehovah hath spoken." In our common version, the expression is, "THE MIGHTY GOD;" an accommodation to the English idiom, which is not objectionable, if it be borne in mind, that the word "*god*" must still be understood in its inferior sense, and the phrase regarded as equivalent to "the mighty *king*."

Psa. lxxxix. 6. "*The heavens* shall praise thy wonders, O Lord; thy faithfulness also (shall be praised) in *the congregation of the saints*." Ver. 7. For who *in the heavens* can be compared unto Jehovah? who among *the sons of the gods* can be likened unto Jehovah?" The reader will observe the parallelism of the clauses in these two verses. "The sons of the gods," mentioned in the latter clause of the *seventh* verse, are the princes, the priests, the prophets, and other favoured individuals, who composed "the congregation of the saints," mentioned in the latter clause of the *sixth* verse.

Ps. xcv. 3. "For Jehovah is a great God, and a great king *over all gods*," i. e. *over all the princes of the earth*, not surely over molten images, which were only "wind and confusion." (Isa. xli. 29.)

Ps. cxxxv. 5. "For I know, that Jehovah is great, and that our Lord is *above all gods*."

Ps. cxxxvi. 2, 3. "O give thanks unto *the God of gods*, (that is, unto the greatest of gods, the mighty king;) for his mercy endureth for ever. O give thanks unto *the Lord of lords*, (that is, unto the mightiest of lords,) for his mercy endureth for ever."

Ps. cxxxviii. 1. I will praise thee with my whole heart; *Before the gods* will I sing praise unto thee;" that is, I will praise thee before the assembly of the priests and the prophets, the saints and the anointed princes.

Isa. xli. 23. "Shew the things that are to come hereafter, that we

may know that ye are *gods*," that is, *inspired prophets*. The persons addressed were the priests of the heathen ; see vers. 21—29.

The additional remarks now offered will, I trust, suffice as a reply to all that Mr. Wardlaw has written upon the inferior sense of the term "*god*," and our Saviour's application of it to himself. Mr. Wardlaw, I must repeat, has not attempted to subvert *the general principle*, which I have laid down as our proper guide to the sense of passages, which are in themselves ambiguous. That principle however is one of universal application, and universally applied in the study of all books except the Bible. I shall illustrate this by an example, which, I hope, Mr. Wardlaw will not censure for "impiety," though it be from the works of a heathen. In Plutarch's Essay on the Means of preserving Health, we find a passage, which may be literally translated, "They say, that *the brain of the Phœnix*, (*τον εγκεφαλον του φοινικος*;) being extremely sweet, causes the head-ache." In this sense the words are rendered by Poole,\* and by the French translator, Amiot : † so they were probably understood by Erasmus, ‡ and the same idea, (though corrected in his *Notes*;) is expressed in the Latin version of Xylander. § But the same words may, in perfect consistency with grammar, be translated so as to denote an article of diet in Eastern countries, called "*the cabbage of the palm-tree*;" and this is not only a much more *rational* idea, but, as we learn from Xenophon, Theophrastus, and Pliny the Natural Historian, it was familiar to the minds of the ancients before the time of Plutarch. All the more recent commentators have accordingly adopted "this simple and reasonable interpretation." In reading the classics, we are happily free not only from the trammels of Subscription to Articles, requiring us to construe them agreeably

\* "Though the brains of the bird they call a Phœnix be very sweet, yet they say they'l cause the head-ache." Plutarch's *Morals*, translated by several hands, London, 1691, Vol. I. p. 322.

† Jortin's *Life of Erasmus*, Vol. II. pp. 229, 230.

‡ Plutarchi *Opera*, Gul. Xylandro Interprete, Francof. 1620, Vol. II. p. 133; Annot. p. 6.

to a certain system, but from the heavy chains of prejudice and the seductions of interest. Here therefore we ask no "*key of interpretation*," except the knowledge of the language, the use of a correct text, the dictates of our own judgment and common sense, and the established rules of sound criticism. Were we equally free from every false bias in the study of the Scriptures, we should be at no loss, with respect to those passages where our Lord is simply called by the ambiguous term "*god*," to determine, whether they prove him to have been the Almighty Jehovah, or describe him as a person commissioned and inspired to declare the will of Jehovah to mankind; that is, whether, supposing the Deity of Christ not yet proved by other evidence, we ought to establish upon these ambiguous passages a doctrine allowed to be most mysterious and incomprehensible, or to adopt a sense, consistent with what we already know to be the doctrine of the Scriptures.

Before dismissing these passages, I wish to offer a few remarks merely in my own vindication, not that I am solicitous for the good opinion of the public *on my own account*, but because I think it requisite to the support of the great cause, in defending which I have been "*counted worthy to suffer shame*."

Upon Isa. ix. 6, Mr. Wardlaw asks, whether I am myself sensible of the difficulties, which I have said are noticed by the most eminent critics. I certainly am. For the reason, which I have assigned, I have some doubt whether AL be a genuine part of the Hebrew text. To prove that this word sometimes signifies *a ruler*, which I never before knew to be questioned, it is sufficient to recur to the foregoing part of this chapter: but those who wish for additional evidence may consult LE CLERC on Ps. xxix. 1, ROSENMULLER on Isa. ix. 6, TAYLOR'S CONCORDANCE, CASTELL'S LEXICON, v. לֵיָא, and the other lexicons as usual. I think also that some consideration is due to the opinion of those learned critics, *Christian* as well as "*Jewish*," (see Rosenmuller,) who refer the passage to Hezekiah; nor ought it to be concealed, that some of the most eminent *Trinitarian* commentators, among whom are Grotius and Le Clerc,

separate AL from GEBER, and connect it with the preceding clause, translating the phrase “*a consuler of God.*”

Mr. Wardlaw maintains, that although the words GEBER and AL, (*mighty and God,*) taken singly, would neither of them prove the Supreme Divinity of the person, to whom they were applied, yet, when they occur together, they form a title, which is decisive of the question, because belonging only to the One True God. But the occurrence of the expression AL GEBER, as a name of the Deity, in a single instance only, is far from being sufficient to establish Mr. Wardlaw’s assertion, “There can be no doubt, that this is a *characteristic designation* of the True God.”

John i. 1.—Mr. Wardlaw does not deny, that the original may with perfect propriety, so far as respects *grammar*, be translated “*the Word was a god;*” and, except that he quotes the opinion of Griesbach, the whole amount of his observations is, that the word THEOS may be here understood in its highest sense, *if the Deity of Christ be previously established on other evidence.* To this remark every Unitarian will readily assent.

Though by no means necessary to the support of my argument, I thought it proper to vindicate Origen and Eusebius from the charge, brought against them by Mr. Wardlaw, of “an ignorance of the ordinary rules of Greek syntax.” On this occasion I departed from the usual spirit of my remarks, because I thought that presumption ought not to be passed over wholly without notice, and because I could not conceive of greater presumption than that of the Minister of Albion Street Chapel, Glasgow, who only knows Greek imperfectly from having learnt it at school or at college, in bringing such an accusation against Origen, the Catechist of Alexandria, and Eusebius, the Bishop of Cæsarea, who spoke and wrote in Greek all their lives, and to whom during more than a thousand years the whole Christian world has been under the most important obligations. I was however totally free from every such sensation as Mr. Wardlaw, judging probably of my feelings from his own, has imputed to me.\*

---

\* Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 2.



May I inform him, that to indulge "scorn" and "indignant disdain" upon any occasion, does not seem to me consistent with that religion, which requires us to put away pride, anger, malice, and all uncharitableness.

But Mr. Wardlaw asserts, that I have presumed to differ from the same authorities myself, and so positive and triumphant is his language, that his readers, of whom not one in ten will read what I am writing in reply, will in general yield their humble and undoubting assent. The fact is simply this: Eusebius (not as Mr. Wardlaw represents both *Origen* and Eusebius) has said, that a certain sentiment might have been properly expressed by the words, 'Ο Θεος ην δ λογος. I have said, that they might have been properly expressed by the same words arranged thus, 'Ο λογος ην δ Θεος; which is exactly the same thing as if Eusebius had said, "Sweet is the breath of morn," and I had said, "The breath of morn is sweet." I asserted that the arrangement, which I gave, was "indisputably correct and grammatical." I now say the same of that given by Eusebius, and ask, Where is the opposition between us?

John xx. 28.—My explanation, though treated with levity by Mr. Wardlaw, stands good, until some valid objection is brought against the general principle, upon which it is founded.

Heb. i. 8.—In making a few observations respecting the Greek Article solely with a view of doing justice to the insulted characters of Grotius, Clarke, and Peirce, I have said that the reader may consult Dr. Middleton's work on the Article, "if he pleases." I do not wish to plunge again into that quagmire. I once read the book with attention. I saw that its first principles were erroneous, the original design and nature of the Definite Article being entirely misapprehended. I observed likewise, that the author had examined every passage of the New Testament in reference to his system, and had found, as was to be expected, innumerable examples which seemed to oppose it; but that, as the fundamental principle of the system was in the highest degree abstruse and intricate, it was easy to frame some very abstruse and intricate *reason* for each exception, and that by the extreme obscurity of the whole doctrine these reasons were tolerably shielded from liability to refutation. I likewise

read a masterly subversion of the doctrine in the Monthly Review, (N. S. Vol. LXII.) and I have never been able to learn, that the book is esteemed as a work of solid and valuable information by any eminent scholar, with the exception of such as Dr. Burgess, whose better judgment is absorbed in zeal for orthodoxy. Such being my opinion, formed with care and deliberation, I did not see the propriety of burthening my memory with any of the endless rules and exceptions to rules, with *reasons* for the rules and the exceptions, which, if I rightly recollect, fill more than six hundred octavo pages. Hence the two instances, which I had quoted,\* of the use of the Article in the predicate of a proposition, turn out to be provided for by Dr. Middleton under the head of *Convertible Propositions*. It is fortunate for me, that Dr. Middleton did not go through the *Septuagint* as well as the Greek Testament. The former furnishes “a parallel form of Greek construction,” which may determine in a moment what could only be settled by an attempt to read and understand Middleton in a month. I shall place the two passages in parallel lines, that the reader may observe their similarity. The object is to prove, that Heb. i. 8 may with perfect propriety, *so far as respects the grammatical construction*, be translated “*God is thy throne for ever.*”

Ps. lxxiii. 26. Ἡ μερίς μου ὁ Θεὸς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

Heb. i. 8. Ὁ θρόνος σου ὁ Θεὸς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

If the former signifies “*God is my portion for ever,*” the latter may, without violating *grammar*, be translated “*God is thy throne for ever.*”

Thus does it still appear to me that Grotius, Clarke, and Peirce were correct in the remark, which induced Mr. Wardlaw to charge them with ignorance of Greek. I have never expressed any difference of opinion from them. On the contrary, I have said, that “*there is no disputing the truth of their observation.*” Yet we find Mr. Wardlaw, in reference to what I have said on this subject,

---

\* Vind. of Unit. p. 185.

adopting the following language : “ It is amusing to observe, how Mr. Yates puffs off his high authorities against me, and then,

“ ‘ With hesitation admirably slow,’

humbly presumes to differ from them himself.”

We proceed to the consideration of the passages, in which I have given it as my opinion, that the title “ *God*” is not applied to Jesus at all.

Isa. vii. 14.—Mr. Wardlaw commends the justice of my observations on the nature and use of Hebrew proper names, and candidly concedes, that the application of the title *Emanuel* to our Saviour is not a *proof* of his Divinity. “ I frankly admit,” says he, \* “ that the mere circumstance of the Messiah being called by this name would not of itself, in absence of other evidence, be at all a conclusive proof of his Divine dignity.”

Rom. ix. 5.—I have translated the last clause, “ God who is over all be blessed for ever.” I have endeavoured to show, that the language of the original is in every respect suitable to express this sense. I know of no other combination of Greek words, which would have been equally clear and unambiguous, and at the same time conformable to the usages of Scripture language. On the other hand, the sense given in the common translation might have been expressed without ambiguity and in the style of the Greek of the New Testament, thus : ‘Ουτος εστιν ο επι παντων Θεος ευλογητος εις τον αιωνα.†

I have asserted, “ that such ascriptions of praise as that, which I suppose to be uttered in this instance, are very frequent in the

\* Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 150.

† Or it might have been, ος εστιν ο επι παντων, &c. It is remarkable, that Dr. John Wallis, while contending for the Supreme Divinity of Christ, maintains that ο ων ought not to be translated, “ *who is,*” but “ *he that is.*” His words are, “ What we render ‘ *who is,*’ is in the Greek not ος εστι, but ο ων, ‘ *he that is.*’” See his Third Letter on the Trinity, p. 57, Note; his Fifth Letter, p. 11; his Three Sermons, p. 75; and “ Observations on Dr. Wallis’s Four Letters,” p. 19.

writings of the Old and New Testament, and in all Jewish compositions." Mr. Wardlaw says, *he does not recollect them*; and then, instead of proceeding to ascertain, whether his memory is accurate, he immediately adds, "At all events, they are nothing like so frequent as the texts, which affirm or imply our Lord's Supreme Divinity." *I recollect* being struck with the frequency of such ascriptions in all the Rabbinical books, which I ever saw; and with regard to the Scriptures, I recollect, that a great number of instances, perhaps forty or fifty, are brought together in Kircher's Concordance under the word  $\gamma\eta\rho$ .

In the clause under consideration, every word is placed in the situation, which we should expect it to occupy in order to express the sense, which I have defended. In the first place, the uniform practice of the Sacred Writers decides, that the words  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \alpha\iota\omega\nu\alpha$ , "*for ever*," must come at the end of the sentence. In the second place,  $\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$ , "*blessed*," ought to come immediately before them, because they qualify its signification, and because, if it were not so placed, a different sense would be conveyed, viz. "Blessed be God, who is for ever over all,"—at least the meaning would be ambiguous, as may be seen in the corresponding English, "BLESSED BE GOD WHO IS OVER ALL FOR EVER."\* Hence it would follow, in the third place, that  $\text{Ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός}$ , "*God who is over all*," which Mr. Wardlaw admits † to have been one of the established and peculiar designations of the Supreme Deity, must form the commencement of the sentence. The Substantive Verb, according to the usual practice, being omitted, the sentence would stand exactly as we find it in the writings of Paul,  $\text{Ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός εὐλογητός εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα}$ , "*God who is over all be blessed for ever*."

In my concluding remarks upon this text, ‡ I have been so far unfortunate as to misrepresent Mr. Wardlaw by supposing his animadversions to refer to the last part of the verse, and not to the

\* In the four passages, to which Mr. Wardlaw refers in confutation of this remark, "*blessed*," is detached from the last words, there being no other participle to create ambiguity.

† Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 161.

‡ Vind. of Unit. p. 184.

clause, “*as concerning the flesh.*” I should have said, “He affirms, that, if this translation be adopted, the clause ‘*as concerning the flesh,*’ is ‘deprived of all force and meaning whatever.’” Mr. Wardlaw has remarked with justice, that the phrase “*according to the flesh*” refers to something, which Christ was *not according to the flesh*. For an explanation of the thing contrasted, we are not left to conjecture. It is expressed by St. Paul at the commencement of this same epistle, where he says, that Jesus Christ was “*of the seed of David according to the flesh, but declared to be THE SON OF GOD, with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead.*”—*As concerning the flesh, (κατα σαρκος, that is, by natural descent, as some Unitarians will interpret it, or with respect to his human nature, as it will be explained by others,) Jesus was THE DESCENDANT OF DAVID; but by the possession of supernatural power, by the Holy Spirit poured out upon him, and by his resurrection from the dead, he was displayed to mankind as THE SON OF GOD.*

1 John v. 20.—Supposing the words *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* to be spurious, which Griesbach marks *doubtful*, although Mr. Wardlaw affirmed, *that they are not in the slightest degree touched by him*, the literal translation of the passage will be, “*We are in him that is true, even by the Son of Him. He is the True God and the eternal life.*” As an *English* reader would naturally suppose “*Him*” and “*He*” to denote the same person, so would a *Greek* reader conclude respecting *αὐτοῦ* and *ἑαυτοῦ*, the corresponding and contiguous words in the original.

But further, the chief object in this verse, “that which would have the greatly preponderating emphasis in the mind of the writer,” is “*He that is true,*” the knowledge of whom is here said to have been communicated by his Son, and is contrasted with the worship of idols. (See ver. 21.) To this antecedent therefore the pronoun would be referred, even though the words “*Jesus Christ*” were genuine: and this would take place with the greater certainty, because the primitive Christians, to whom the epistle was addressed, had not the most distant conception, that the clause “*This is the true God*” could refer to Jesus Christ. That this was the case, I

have a right to presume, until evidence is produced to the contrary. Mr. Wardlaw asks, "Do these scriptures affirm Jesus Christ to be God, or do they not?" I reply, That is the very question in debate. In this controversy therefore, Mr. Wardlaw cannot with propriety interpret ambiguous expressions as descriptive of *the Deity of Christ*, until that doctrine is proved by separate evidence. On the contrary, since the humanity of Jesus and his inferiority to the Father are in some sense admitted on all hands, the just interpretation of every ambiguous passage of Scripture ought *rather to be presumed* to be that, which is most obviously consistent with these undisputed truths. Mr. Wardlaw further asks, in reference to one of my illustrations, Whether it is my "*bonâ fide* conviction, that there is just as much evidence in the Bible, that Jesus Christ is a deceiver and an antichrist, as there is that Jesus Christ is God?" Happy to bear witness to the truth, I answer, "It is my *bonâ fide* conviction; for in the Bible there is no evidence at all of either."

Mr. Wardlaw, dreading "the imputation of repetition and tediousness," states the necessity he is under of being brief in his subsequent remarks. For the same reason, I shall omit saying any thing more upon this text, and also upon the arguments derived from the use of the Definite Article further than by observing, that what I have already written, (*Vindication*, pp. 189—193,) appears to me upon a careful revision to be conclusive and unobjectionable.

We proceed to the supposed instances of the application to Jesus of "*Jehovah*," the peculiar and incommunicable name of the Supreme God.

1. To the first argument of this class I had objected as *complicated*. To prove that it is not so, Mr. Wardlaw gives it in a condensed form,\* so that the statement of it occupies not much more than a page. He then gravely adds, "I appeal to the impartial reader, if this be a 'remote deduction,' or a 'complicated argument;'" on which occasion I might almost be allowed to indulge myself with a note of admiration.

---

\* *Unit. Incap. or Vind* pp. 187, 188.

With respect to the refutation, which I had opposed to the reasoning as *fallacious*, Mr. Wardlaw acknowledges himself at a loss to say any thing in reply, not however confessing his inability in the spirit of one, who thinks it possible, that he may have been in error, but assigning as a reason, that “there is the same difficulty in refuting a self-evident absurdity as there is in demonstrating a self-evident truth,” and altogether evading the observations, by which I had maintained, that John the Baptist might be contemplated as going before *Jehovah*, and also going before *Christ*, without necessarily leading to the conclusion, *that Christ is Jehovah*.

2. Heb. i. 10.—This passage informs us, that the Scripture “*with reference to the Son*” employs a certain address *to Jehovah*. Since the words quoted are *an address* and are used *with reference to the Son*, Mr. Wardlaw infers, that they must be addressed *to the Son*, and hence concludes *that the Son is Jehovah*, proceeding upon the principle, that no language can be considered as an address to any being, unless it is also addressed to all those beings, to whom it relates. Let Mr. Wardlaw establish this as a general principle, and I shall willingly grant the validity of his reasoning.

3. In opposition to my remarks upon the assertion of the Evangelist John, (ch. xii. 41,) that Isaiah uttered two portions of his prophecy quoted by the Evangelist, “*when he saw the glory of Jesus*,” Mr. Wardlaw urges only one *argument*. I have represented that glory as consisting in the display of miraculous powers by our Saviour at the promulgation of the Gospel. Mr. Wardlaw objects,\* “that this is a glory, which the Prophet does not in the passage” (*he should have said “the passages,” for there are two*) “represent himself as having seen at all.” *The Evangelist* however asserts, that these prophecies had a reference to that glory, and he makes no mention of any other glory. He introduces them by saying, that, “*although Jesus had done so many miracles before the Jews, yet they believed not on him, that the saying of Esaias the prophet might be fulfilled*,” &c.

4. Jer. xxiii. 6.—Notwithstanding what I had advanced to the

---

\* Unit. Incap. of Viind. p. 192.

contrary, (Vindication, p. 199,) Mr. Wardlaw has not attempted to prove, that this passage refers to Christ. I incidentally expressed my opinion, that the name of the individual here described, which in the common version is rendered "JEHOVAH OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS," might be "*more correctly*" translated JEHOVAH IS OUR PROSPERITY. I proposed the latter as a *more exact* representation of the original than the former; for I was aware of the impossibility of finding any English word corresponding to the Hebrew *Tsedike*, (קדוּשָׁה,) so as to give the sense without a periphrasis. I have since observed, that Bishop Lowth felt himself pressed by the same difficulty. "The word קדוּשָׁה, *Righteousness*," says he, "is used in such a great latitude of signification, for *Justice, Truth, Faithfulness, Goodness, Mercy, Deliverance, Salvation, &c.* that it is not easy sometimes to give the precise meaning of it without much circumlocution."\*

My argument however in reply to Mr. Wardlaw, as I have clearly intimated, did not depend upon the adoption of the word "*Prosperity*" instead of "*Righteousness*," but upon the translation of this name *as a sentence*. Referring to the account, which I had given of the composition and use of Hebrew proper names, and to the justice of which Mr. Wardlaw yields his assent, † I observed that the name only implied, that at the appearance of the person, for whom it was intended, Jehovah would signally bless (or justify) his people.

5 and 6. Zech. xi. 12, 13; xiii. 7.—Mr. Wardlaw, in his present work, relinquishes these passages, granting that they are not decisive instances of the application of the title "*Jehovah*" to Jesus.

7. Rom. xiv. 10, 11.—In this Chapter, the Apostle is aiming to show, that Christians ought not to exercise dominion over one another respecting matters of indifference. *First*, he maintains, that by so doing we require a brother to serve ourselves, although he is only bound to serve Jesus Christ, whom he obeys whether he practises or neglects the rule, upon which we insist (vers. 4—9); *Secondly*, he argues, that we ought not to judge our fellow-christians, because

\* Note on Isa. li. 5.

† Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 150.



they are to have their actions tried at the same infallible tribunal with ourselves,—because (ver. 10) “we must all stand at the judgment-seat of Christ,” that is, as explained in numerous other passages, “of Christ” *as the authorized representative of God*. “For,” adds the Apostle, (ver. 11,) in confirmation of the doctrine that God will judge the world through Christ, “it is written, ‘As I live, saith Jehovah, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God.’” Mr. Wardlaw maintains, that, unless Christ be God, this quotation does not answer the purpose, for which it is brought, because it only proves, that *God* will judge the world, not that he will judge it *through Jesus Christ*. I answer, that to insist on the latter circumstance was not in the least degree necessary to the Apostle’s argument. His argument required only, that he should represent that tribunal before which we must all appear, as august, solemn, and infallible.

8. 1 Cor. i. 30, 31.—To my comment on this passage Mr. Wardlaw objects, that Christ is here designated as our “*righteousness*,” that is, our *justification*, and that Isaiah in the passage referred to says, “*In Jehovah shall all the seed of Israel be justified.*” Hence he infers, that Christ is Jehovah. I only need repeat the Apostle’s real assertion, which is, that “*Christ is made unto us justification BY GOD,*” implying that God justifies us through his mediation.

At the close of his reasoning on the supposed Divine TITLES of Jesus, (Discourses, pp. 83, 84,) Mr. Wardlaw mentioned the words of David, Ps. cx. 1, “*Jehovah said unto my Lord,*” as a decisive proof of the pre-existence of Christ, adding, that the expression could not be satisfactorily explained except on the supposition of his *Divinity*. In the present work Mr. Wardlaw says, that, “although particularly noticed by him, I have passed it over *sub silentio*.” And I must continue to do so, until Mr. Wardlaw shall *explain how* it affords evidence for the Supreme Divinity of Christ; for its bearing upon the question of his mere pre-existence is nothing to our present purpose.



## CHAPTER VI.

WE come to the passages, in which Mr. Wardlaw supposed the *peculiar* ATTRIBUTES of Deity to be ascribed to our Saviour.

## I. ETERNAL EXISTENCE.

1. As Mr. Wardlaw in his reasoning upon John viii. 58, (Discourses, pp. 85—89,) did not represent that passage as a *proof* of the eternal existence of Christ, and only remarked that it might *not improbably* refer to his Divine nature, I passed it over with little notice. In his rejoinder however, he insists that it is a *proof* of our Saviour's Supreme Divinity. His argument is this (Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 200): "The Jews conceived our Lord, in using the words, to be guilty of *blasphemy*. This is clear from their taking up stones to stone him." But what proof is there, that the Jews in "a *paroxysm of rage*," as Mr. Wardlaw elsewhere properly calls it, (Discourses, p. 89,) would "take up stones" on no other account except because they supposed Jesus to be guilty of *blasphemy*? And, supposing their minds were impressed with this conviction, what reason have we to place such confidence in their decision as to conclude, that, unless Jesus was the Supreme God, his language and manner justified that imputation? From the preceding parts of the Chapter we learn, that Jesus had openly and in the strongest language told the Jews of their malice and hypocrisy. (See vers. 37—44.) These accusations were sufficient to inflame their minds without the addition of supposed blasphemy, nor does it appear from the history, that this charge was brought. The accusations, which they did bring, are expressed in the following terms, ver. 48: "Say we not well, that thou art a Samaritan, and hast a demon?" and ver. 53: "Art thou greater than our father Abraham? Whom makest thou thyself?"

2. Heb. i. 10.—The sacred author informs us, that the Scripture employs a certain address to Jehovah *with reference to Christ*. Mr. Wardlaw objects, (Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 191,) that "to the

government of Christ there is, *in the words themselves*, no sort of reference, direct or remote." But, if the author of the Epistle plainly states, that the words are used "*with reference to the Son,*" (*προς τον υιον,*) I have sufficient respect for his authority to prefer it to Mr. Wardlaw's opinion, however positively stated to the contrary. In proof of this opinion Mr. Wardlaw asks, "How is a declaration, that Jehovah created the heavens and the earth, that he is immutable and everlasting, to be made to bear upon" the point in question, which is the superiority of Jesus Christ to angels?—I have already said, that the eternity and immutability of Jehovah are a pledge of the perpetuity of the reign of Christ, because Christ is endowed with all his authority, and supported in all the power and dignity of his office, by the will and decree of Jehovah; and the perpetuity of his reign is one circumstance, which proves his superiority to angels.

3. Col. i. 17. "He is before all things."—Taking for granted, first, that "*He is*" means "*He was*;" secondly, that "*before all things*" denotes pre-existence *in time*, and not pre-eminence *in dignity*; and thirdly, that "*before all things*" means "*before all CREATED things,*" Mr. Wardlaw infers, that this passage proves our Saviour to have been uncreated and eternal. The former positions I might allow, as immaterial in the present controversy. But I cannot grant the third. The passage, as I have already said, can only prove at the utmost, that our Lord "*existed before all things except himself and God.*" Why? Because the common sense of every reader leads to this exception. That *God* must be excepted, Mr. Wardlaw admits. But the argument is yet stronger for the necessity of excepting *himself*. St. Paul, after quoting the passage, "*God hath put all things under him,*" observes, "*It is manifest, that he is excepted, who did put all things under him,*" so that the passage implies, "*God did put all things except himself under him.*" On the same principle we say, *It is manifest*, that the expression, "*He is before all things,*" means, "*He is before all things except himself.*"

4. Rev. i. 8.—Mr. Wardlaw allows, (Unit. Incap. pp. 34—36,) that the verse, as corrected by Griesbach, may be translated thus:

“ I am Alpha and Omega, saith the Lord God, who is and who was, and who is to come, the Almighty.” The sole tendency of his observations is to show that the words may be considered as spoken by Christ, *supposing it to have been previously proved that he is THE LORD GOD.* This is readily granted. But let not this *supposition* be converted into *an established truth.*

5. Rev. i. 17 ; xxii. 13.—Mr. Wardlaw denominates my explanation of the phrase, “ *the first and the last,*” a specimen of “ *Soci-nian ingenuity.*” I however gave it as the interpretation of *Le Clerc*, who was a *Trinitarian*, and one of the greatest ornaments of his party, only adding that the phrase ought, for the sake of consistency, to be understood in the same sense, whether applied to God or to Jesus Christ. According to that Author, it does not imply eternity, when given to *God* ; I only subjoined, as an obvious inference, that it cannot prove *Christ* to be eternal.

Mr. Wardlaw confesses “ the difficulty of suppressing indignation at the singular disingenuousness” of some remarks, in which I have contended, that, in both these passages from the Revelation of John, “ the application of the words ‘ first and last’ to our Lord is so guarded, as to exclude the idea of his Supreme Divinity.” All that I have done, for which I am charged with “ disingenuousness,” was, not taking for granted the doctrine of the hypostatic union, which was to be proved, but stating the sense of these passages, which would strike every reader who came to them with an unprejudiced mind.

6. Micah v. 2.—Mr. Wardlaw has taken no further notice of this text, from which it may be presumed, that he had no material objection to urge against my remarks.

## II. OMNIPOTENCE.

Nearly all that Mr. Wardlaw advances under this head has been obviated in preceding parts of the present work. I may add, in confirmation of my remarks on Isa. ix. 6, (“ the mighty God,”) that, when we find the Supreme Being called by Isaiah “ THE MIGHTY ONE of Israel,” we have no reason, as Mr. Wardlaw asserts, (Unit. Incap. p. 152,) to consider the term “ *mighty*” as implying the same

with “*Almighty*.” There is no less a difference between the significations of these two words than between *power* and *ALL power*. But the idea of super-eminent power is expressed by the *comparison*, which is implied in calling this Being “*THE mighty ONE*.”

### III. OMNIPRESENCE.

Matt. xviii. 20, xxviii. 20.—I represented these passages, as describing “the virtual \* presence of Christ with his disciples in every part of the world.” Hereupon Mr. Wardlaw remarks, (Unit. Incap. of Viud. p. 210,) “Mr. Yates may say what he will about *mysteries*; but this is a mystery, and a pretty considerable one too.” Let the reader call to mind the principles, which I have laid down respecting mysteries, and judge whether I am chargeable with the inconsistency, which my opponent would insinuate against me. I have stated two senses of the term “*mystery*,” besides that annexed to it in the New Testament. I have supposed it to signify, First, a *self-contradictory* proposition; Secondly, a proposition, which is *unintelligible*, or to the terms of which distinct ideas are not attached. In which of these two senses is the doctrine just stated a *mystery*? What is there in it absurd or self-contradictory? Or, to which of its terms are we at any loss to attach distinct ideas? Even, if we adopt *Mr. Wardlaw's* definition of a mystery, the doctrine now under review does not correspond to it. It is neither “difficult to be understood,” nor “entirely incomprehensible.”

John iii. 13.—Mr. Wardlaw says nothing in reply to my observations on this text, although it was incumbent on him to correct his assertion, that the words “*who is in heaven*,” marked as *doubtful* by Griesbach, are “not in the slightest degree touched by that high and vaunted authority.”

---

\* “*Virtual*,” as the word is commonly understood, and as it is explained in my Vindication, pp. 46, 207—209, is opposed to *Actual*. A person is said to be *virtually* present in any place, when his power and knowledge are exercised with respect to what passes in that place, *as if* he were *actually* present.

## IV. OMNISCIENCE.

Rev. ii. 23.—In consideration of a certain *Hebraism*, I have represented the phrase, “*I am he that searcheth*,” as equivalent to “*I search*.” Mr. Wardlaw replies, “Mr. Yates has done nothing to his purpose, when he has merely shown, that the mode of expression in question accords with the idiom of the *Hebrew* language, unless he had at the same time shown, that it is *not consistent with the ordinary idiom of the Greek language*.” (Unit. Incap. p. 215.) This passage seems to imply, that I can never be justified in interpreting an *ambiguous* expression agreeably to the principles of Unitarianism, unless I show, that it could not without violating grammar be interpreted in any other way; whereas Mr. Wardlaw may persist in maintaining, that the expression “*evidently proceeds upon the express assumption*” of his doctrine, although he allows, that it may with equal propriety, so far as respects the construction and idiom of the language, be understood in a different sense.

This text relates to the office of our Saviour as the judge of mankind. “What,” asks Mr. Wardlaw, (Unit. Incap. p. 217,) “is implied in all the knowledge of men’s thoughts and dispositions necessary to qualify for the office of Judge? Certainly,” he continues, “nothing short of a complete and unerring acquaintance with all the thoughts of all the countless millions of mankind, that shall have existed from the beginning to the end of time; with all the dispositions and desires, permanent or momentary, of all their hearts; and with all the most secret motives of all their words and all their actions. If the reader can suppose such knowledge to be *communicated to a creature*, he is prepared for being a Unitarian;”—if, in other words, the reader believes the Creator and Governor of the universe to be omnipotent, and that “with God all things are possible;” if his ideas of the Great Supreme be clear, correct, and exalted, he is prepared to become a Unitarian; and happy, thrice happy will he be, if no regard to worldly losses, no fear of human censures, and no timidity to embrace the truth, shall interfere to cut off his progress to that ennobling and sanctifying doctrine. The

fact under consideration ought not to be regarded as presenting any obstacle to its reception. The knowledge, which has been described as essential to the character of the judge of mankind, implies nothing self-contradictory, nothing even unintelligible. Every "Rational Christian" may therefore *rationaly* believe in it, if its reality be asserted or implied in Holy Scripture.

John ii. 24, 25.—Every attentive reader of Mr. Wardlaw's additional remarks on this text, (Unit. Incap. pp. 217—220,) will perceive, that they totally fail of reaching the point originally aimed at, which was to prove that the knowledge of Christ is both *universal* and *underived*. They only tend to prove, (what Unitarians maintain,) that Christ was endowed by the Father with a knowledge of all the thoughts and dispositions of men's hearts.\*



## CHAPTER VII.

MR. WARDLAW, after quoting my remarks on his arguments from our Lord's *manner* of performing some of his miracles, speaks (p. 224) of my representing them as "*the best, the most forcible,*" on the point in debate. This I never said, and never thought; I have always esteemed them equally fallacious with the rest. I only expressed my opinion, that they were "*the most ingenious and eloquent* pieces of reasoning in Mr. Wardlaw's volume."

In entering on the discussion of the passages, which relate to the offices of Christ as the Governor and Judge of mankind, I complained of Mr. Wardlaw for asserting, that *all Unitarians without exception* doubt or deny, that he is appointed to execute these offices at all, though so far as my knowledge extends, it has been *denied* by none, and *doubted* scarcely by one in a thousand. In his present work,

---

\* In reply to Mr. Wardlaw's remarks in p. 222, it is sufficient to repeat what I have said above, pp. 31, 32, "Even with regard to the few passages, &c."

Mr. Wardlaw is so far just as to allow, "that his language ought to have been qualified." (Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 236.)

In the next page Mr. Wardlaw remarks respecting the *hypothesis*, which he has adopted for the interpretation of the Scriptures, "It is curious to observe, how cautiously Mr. Yates avoids grappling with this great general principle of the double view of the person and character of Christ, held by Trinitarians as the principle, and the only satisfactory principle, of harmony between seemingly discordant passages." The same observation is often repeated. Once for all I remark, that it is entirely groundless. In the Third part of my "Vindication," Ch. iv., I argued against this principle, as utterly inadmissible even in an *hypothesis* respecting the doctrines of Scripture, because it is in itself absurd and self-contradictory, so that it cannot possibly be a guide to the just interpretation of Divinely inspired writings; and in the five following chapters I endeavoured to show, that *there is not the least occasion* for such an hypothesis, because, if the Scriptures be correctly translated, and interpreted according to the established rules of criticism, *the seeming discordance vanishes*. I have however, in this Sequel considered more particularly the propriety of assuming beforehand a particular view of the person and character of Christ as an hypothesis, instead of simply opening the Scriptures to read them and find what they declare.

Mr. Wardlaw (p. 240) re-states the amount of the knowledge, which is necessary to qualify Jesus Christ to judge mankind. He then argues, "Is it possible, that *this* knowledge can belong to any being, and that being *not be God*? When we infer from the works of creation which we see, that their Maker is *infinite in wisdom*, our *data* are *limited*, and yet our inference is *unlimited*. Is it then admitted to be fair, to conclude from a part to the whole? from what we see and know of the universe to the universe itself? and then, from an effect which must, from the nature of the thing, be *limited*, to deduce the *unlimited*, or *infinite*, wisdom of the CAUSE?" I reply, that according to the data, which we have, and without going at all beyond the data, the knowledge of God exceeds the knowledge of Christ in a degree so far surpassing all that we can express in language or conceive in thought, as to be properly called *infi-*



nite,\* while the other is still denominated *finite*. We have no evidence, that the knowledge of Christ as the judge of mankind will extend beyond the history of our world. But we have evidence, that the minute and entire knowledge of our world, compared with the knowledge belonging to God, is less than a drop of water compared with the whole ocean. Among “the works of creation, which we see,” (for Dr. Herschel has seen them,†) are some so remote, that the light emitted from them, though travelling at the enormous rate of 200,000 *miles in a second*, has been nearly 2,000,000 *years* in passing from them to us. Such is the immense extent of the universe, which by a chain of reasoning admitted by Mr. Wardlaw to be unobjectionable,‡ is proved to be entirely created and governed by a single Intelligent Being. Our globe is but a minute speck in this universe; and the supposition, which Mr. Wardlaw has stated, grand and awful as it is, only implies that God imparts to his Son an inconceivably small portion of his own knowledge,—a portion far less than the wisest parent communicates to his child, when he tells him the sound of the first letter in the alphabet. Yet Mr. Wardlaw asks, “Is it possible, that *this* knowledge can belong to any being, and that being *not be God?*” The question illustrates the tendency of Trinitarianism, after uprooting the fundamental principle of the *Unity of God as one person*, to lead the mind to judge of him according to the standard of human ignorance and imperfection, and gradually to deprive him in imagination of all his infinite and essential glories.

\* The only idea, which we have of *infinite*, is, that *it exceeds any assignable limit*. If the extent of any thing be such, that whatever point you fix upon, it goes beyond it, that thing is infinite.

† DR. VINCE’S *Confutation of Atheism*, p. 29; and DR. HERSHEL in the *Philosophical Transactions* for 1802, p. 498.

‡ See *Vindication of Unitarianism*, Part ii. Ch. i.



## CHAPTER VIII.

WE now come to the re-consideration of the important question, whether the New Testament any where authorizes the SUPREME WORSHIP of Christ.

Against the opinion, which I have advanced, that the Angel, who refused worship from John (as related Rev. xix. 10, xxii. 9) was Jesus Christ, Mr. Wardlaw urges a variety of objections.

1. "In the beginning of ch. xvii.," says he, "John tells us, 'There came *one of the seven angels*, who had the seven vials, and talked with me.' It requires only to read forward thence to ch. xix. 10, to satisfy any person, that *this* was the angel, before whom John fell down to worship."

This is far from being clear. New speakers are repeatedly introduced, (see ch. xviii. 1, 4, 21; xix. 1, 5,) and the Angel, who speaks in ch. xvii., seems to disappear entirely at the conclusion of what is contained in that chapter. Mr. Wardlaw admits, that there are in this book sudden changes of the speaker without any express notice being given. This appears to me to be the case in the 9th verse of ch. xix.; and, unless the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ be previously assumed, we may suppose him to be the speaker introduced, with at least as good reason as any other person.

2. Mr. Wardlaw further objects: "Although Jesus, in his state of humiliation on earth, is called *the servant of God*, he is no where else in Scripture, *even in reference to that period*, called a *fellow-servant* with the Apostles and Prophets. Far less is he so called, when exalted to glory in heaven. There his language is; 'I am the first and the last, and the living one; and I was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore, and have the keys of hell and of death.' Is this the same person who is supposed to say, 'I am a *fellow-servant*, with thee and with thy brethren?'" (Unit. Incap. p. 249.)

There is no inconsistency in the supposition, not even upon the principles maintained by Mr. Wardlaw, who, speaking elsewhere of the views of our Saviour's exaltation entertained by Trinitarians,

employs the following language: (Discourses, p. 116, and Unit. Incap. p. 360 :) "Believing him to be represented in the Scriptures, as voluntarily assuming the form, and acting in the capacity of a servant, they are not startled at finding this representation *consistently maintained throughout.*" That Mr. Wardlaw should at last begin to be *startled*, as the above objection seems to indicate, and think it incredible, that the same person can be both God, and the *fellow-servant* of God with the prophets, is a sign that the clear dictates of the understanding will sometimes force their way in opposition to the most deeply-rooted prejudices. The reader will recollect, that Unitarians have no difficulty upon the subject, because they consider Jesus as a *servant of God* from his first creation to the end of time, and consequently a *fellow-servant with the Prophets.*

3. The account of the refusal of worship from John, (Rev. xix. 9, 10,) is immediately followed by the description of a vision, representing "Jesus in all the majesty of dominion and power." Here again Mr. Wardlaw appears *startled*, and asks, whether this is still the angel, who was the fellow-servant of God with John? But, at the beginning of the Chapter immediately preceding, *another servant of God* is described in terms, which certainly admit of comparison with those here employed: "*I saw another angel come down from heaven, having great power, and the earth was lightened with his glory.*"

4. With respect to the second instance, Rev. xxii. 9, Mr. Wardlaw maintains, that reading forward from ch. xxi. 9, where *one of the seven angels with the seven vials* is again mentioned, the reader will be convinced, that *this is the angel*, before whom John prostrated himself to worship.

On the same grounds *I* might maintain, that, reading forward to the end of the book, the reader will be convinced, that this angel is the same person who says, "Behold, I come quickly, and my reward is with me," and "I Jesus have sent mine angel." A transition is made from one speaker to another, but without being expressly marked. Mr. Wardlaw supposes it to take place at ver. 10. As a Trinitarian he must do so. But a critic, not interested in the sup-

port of a system, would see reason to place the transition nearer the beginning of the Chapter. When the angel is introduced in Ch. xxi. 9, he says to John, "Come hither, I will shew thee the bride, the Lamb's wife." Now *the bride of the Lamb*, in the figurative language of Scripture, is *the Christian Church*, or *the New Jerusalem*. Accordingly this angel is described as showing to John the New Jerusalem *in the remainder of the 21st and the five first verses of the 22nd chapter*. But the description of the Holy Jerusalem, the bride of the Lamb, extends no further. Here this vision terminates; and here consequently we may suppose the introduction of another speaker to take place. But that speaker is evidently Jesus Christ, for he uses his appropriate and characteristic language, "BEHOLD I COME QUICKLY." See ver. 7.

5. In support of the opinion, that Jesus begins to speak at the 10th and not at the 6th verse, Mr. Wardlaw quotes a passage from Grotius, "whom," says he, "Mr. Yates will admit to be an impartial authority."—By no means; though of him I would always speak with the greatest respect. He was a Trinitarian. To have placed the division at the 6th verse would have presented an obvious and probably an insurmountable objection to his system. Grotius was not only a learned and judicious critic, but an honest man. Submitting to the just and established rules of criticism, he unavoidably "set aside" most of those passages, which are usually considered as proofs of the doctrine of the Trinity. On this account he was cruelly harassed and calumniated by the zealous partisans of his own system, and charged with being a masked Socinian.\* In these cir-

---

\* Precisely the same has been the fate of many of those, who in learning and talents, as well as in piety and goodness, were the brightest ornaments of the Trinitarian party. Among the rest it was the fate of the celebrated Le Clerc, whose dignified defence of himself, breathing throughout with the expression of that supreme regard to TRUTH and DUTY, which elevated his mind above the clamours of ignorance and the malice of bigotry, will do great good to any student of theology, who will take the trouble, or rather enjoy the sublime pleasure, of reading it. See his "Epistolæ Criticæ," forming the third volume of his "Ars Critica," Ep. x.

cumstances it is evident, that his authority is of great weight indeed, when given *against* the orthodox interpretation of a disputed passage, because such an opinion could not possibly be formed under the influence of prejudice. Nevertheless, we have no reason to imagine, that he was *entirely free* from prejudice, and consequently, when he merely gives an opinion favourable to his own system, without assigning any reason for it, we cannot follow him as “an impartial authority.”

6. The literal translation of Rev. i. 1, is as follows: “The revelation of Jesus Christ, *which God gave unto him*, (ἣν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ Θεός,) to show unto his servants the things which must shortly come to pass, *and sent and signified* (καὶ ἐσημαῖεν ἀποστείλας) through his angel to his servant John.” The two verbs “*gave*” and “*signified*,” which are coupled together by the conjunction “*and*,” exactly agree in voice, mood, tense, number, and person. They unquestionably belong to the same nominative case, ὁ Θεός, “*God*.” Mr. Wardlaw says, “he would not be positive, as it is a matter, about which commentators differ; but that it seems to him *more natural* to connect the words ‘sent and signified’ with *Jesus*.”

7. Mr. Wardlaw objects, that I am inconsistent in maintaining that Jesus refused worship from John in this instance, although I admit that he received it from Stephen and Paul. I answer, that our Saviour might see cause to decline being worshipped more explicitly and peremptorily in some cases than in others. It might be carried by John beyond the proper limit, and encroach upon the kind of homage due to God alone.

8. “*Lastly*,” says Mr. Wardlaw, “the notion that Jesus was the angel, who refused the worship offered by John, is opposed by all the other evidence of his being the proper object of worship, and by the whole mass of proofs that he is the true God.”—Our author here takes for granted the very doctrines, which he ought to prove. He cannot be persuaded to bear in mind, that, in a controversy upon the question, *Whether Christ is the True God*, no argument can be admissible, which proceeds upon that assumption.

After endeavouring to weigh impartially these objections, and carefully reviewing what I wrote upon the subject in my Vindication,

I see no reason to change my opinion, that Jesus was the angel, who commanded John not to worship him.

Respecting the meaning of the passages, which (in the common version) speak of Christians as *calling on the name of Jesus*, I expressed myself with much hesitation. Mr. Wardlaw's observations do not enable me to dispel my doubts, although I am conscious, that the discovery of the truth is my only object.

Upon Rom. x. 8—14, I have said, that "*the train of St. Paul's reasoning* affords no ground to believe that he makes mention of the worship of *Christ*." This Mr. Wardlaw denies, and says, the best refutation is simply to read those verses. I have attentively read the whole chapter. I find, that the object of the Apostle from its commencement is to illustrate the difference between "the righteousness which is of the law," arising from the performance of *external acts*, and "the righteousness which is of faith," arising from the exercise of *the understanding and the heart*. This difference the Apostle exemplifies, first, by the profession of *faith in Jesus Christ*, vers. 6—11, and secondly, by the *worship of God*, vers. 12—14.

I quote the following argument from Mr. Wardlaw, because it appears to me to have great force. The reader may form his own judgment by comparing it with what I have written in my "*Vindication*," p. 228.

"The phrase used in the passages in question is the customary phrase in Scripture for *invoking*, or *calling upon the name of the Lord*: whereas in every instance, in which *being called by the name of the Lord* is clearly intended, the phraseology employed is *different*. There is, therefore, every reason to conclude, that, in the instances in dispute, had it been the intention of the writers to express the idea of '*being called by the name of the Lord*,' their phraseology would not have been what it is."\*

In arguing from 1 Thess. iii. 11—13, Mr. Wardlaw had laid some stress upon the occurrence of the word "*Lord*" in the 12th verse.

---

\* Unit. Incap. of Viind. p. 257.

He had solemnly affirmed of this, as of various other passages, that it was not "*in the slightest degree touched*" by Griesbach. I observed that the word "*Lord*" was marked *doubtful* by Griesbach, and charged Mr. Wardlaw with having made the above-mentioned affirmation "without taking the trouble to examine whether it was true or false." He is now obliged to admit, that Griesbach has marked the word *doubtful*, though less doubtful than another class of readings, to which he prefixes a different mark. But he maintains, that he was not "guilty of even the slightest degree of inattention," because he proceeded "upon the principle, that whatever Griesbach retained was *Griesbach's text*." Did Mr. Wardlaw then really think himself justified in telling an audience, ignorant upon the subject, and incapable of detecting the fallacy of his assertions, that a number of expressions were "*not in the slightest degree touched*" by Griesbach, only because Griesbach had not absolutely thrown them out of the text, although he had expressly stated his opinion, that considerable evidence might be advanced against their genuineness? The instances of inattention to Griesbach's emendations, which I noticed in my Vindication, because I was commenting upon the passages where they occur, are not the only examples, which I might have brought forward. What will Mr. Wardlaw say of his conduct in choosing a TEXT for one of his Discourses, of which nearly the latter half is rejected as spurious by "that great critic," whom he here professes to look up to as "infinitely better qualified to weigh the claims of different readings than himself"?

Mr. Wardlaw had asserted, that, in the fifth Chapter of the Revelation, our blessed Saviour is "represented as occupying the same throne with the Eternal." He acknowledges, (Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 268,) that this assertion was groundless. But he maintains, that Jesus is "plainly and unequivocally" so described in *other* passages, namely, in Rev. iii. 21, vii. 15—17, xxii. 1, 3. It will be sufficient to quote the first of these passages, in order to perceive the import of them all. "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne." Here Jesus "plainly and unequivocally"

affirms, that those of his followers, who overcome the various trials and temptations that surround them, shall be rewarded by him with power and glory, which reward is described as *sitting with him upon his throne*, as he is already rewarded by God with power and glory, which are in like manner represented by saying, that *he sits upon the same throne with his Father*. These passages therefore are in perfect and obvious accordance with those, which depict the dominion of our Saviour in his present glorified state as *conferred* by the Supreme Being. They consequently afford no evidence of his Supreme Divinity.

I close my observations upon the texts, which ascribe worship to Jesus, with one general remark, including, as it appears to me, the substance of the present controversy so far as it depends upon these passages. This remark may be found in my Vindication, although scarcely noticed by Mr. Wardlaw. It is, that these texts cannot furnish evidence of the Supreme Divinity of Christ, unless they contain not merely the language of worship, but of SUPREME worship. Praise and supplication are addressed to all persons, who are conceived to possess attributes *deserving* of the praise, and powers, which enable them to *grant* the supplication. In the daily course of life, praise and supplication are addressed to men; and in different language to different orders and descriptions of men, according to the views entertained of their qualities and powers. The expression of sentiments and desires, similar in *kind*, but which ought, if possible, to be *infinitely superior in degree*, is dictated, upon the same general grounds, towards the Supreme Being; and, as a universal rule, it appears reasonable to conclude, that the feelings of gratitude, love, and veneration, and the expressions of admiration, thanksgiving, and petition, may be consistently employed in addressing any Intelligent Agent, if always regulated by a regard to his real nature and true character. It appears only necessary, that the *degree* of the affection, and the *extent* of the prayer, should correspond to the *degree* in which the powers, dispositions, and properties, the supposition of which is implied in the prayer, belong to the person addressed.—“ Does Mr. Yates then agree with Socinus, in thinking



Christ a mere man, and yet a proper object of invocation ? or does he agree with Dr. Clarke and the high Arians ?" (Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 267.) Mr. Yates has not been used to answer such questions. He knows, that among strict Trinitarians a man is commonly so hedged round by jealous suspicions of the evil tendency of his opinions, or the unsoundness of his principles, if a layman, so priest-ridden, and if a minister, so people-ridden, that upon subjects of this kind he can seldom venture either to doubt or to inquire. When questions such as these are proposed, he *must* answer them, and answer them *agreeably to the Westminster Confession*, or be excluded from his religious connexion. If he is a candidate for the ministry, instead of being allowed that reasonable delay, and those opportunities for deliberation and inquiry, which appear requisite in order to determine questions, that have divided the sentiments of the most candid, able, and learned men, he is given to understand, that he must either decide immediately what course to take, or be disqualified to hold the situation, or to answer the purpose, for which he is designed. Could Mr. Yates consent to have either his real faith, or his assumed profession, determined by such a summary process, he would rank neither with Socinus, nor with Dr. Clarke, both of whom devoted their extraordinary powers to the investigation of religious truth, undismayed by the fear, and unbiassed by the authority, of man. Like them, he "calls no man master upon earth," and would be as little discomposed by the anathemas of the reputed Head of the Catholic Church at Rome, as he is at being catechized by the Minister of a Dissenting Chapel at Glasgow. He is however always happy, either to communicate whatever knowledge he has acquired upon religious subjects to those who are desirous of receiving it ; or, by attending to the superior information of others, to have his own doubts removed, or his own ignorance instructed. In this spirit, with these ideas of the paramount importance of Religious Truth, and of the proper method of pursuing it, he has arrived at the firm belief of the Unity of God as one person, and of the natural and original inferiority of Jesus Christ. If there be passages of Scripture, which represent Jesus as the object of

praise and supplication to his disciples, (a question, the decision of which does not belong to the present controversy,) he is convinced that they do not oppose these fundamental principles, because he thinks it perfectly evident, that all addresses of that nature, which are contained in the New Testament, were offered solely out of regard to the high rank, to which the Saviour of Mankind has been exalted by his Father, in order to reward him for his privations and sufferings, and to fulfil the purposes of Sovereign grace and wisdom. \*



## CHAPTER IX.

WE proceed to the re-examination of the remaining arguments for the Supreme Divinity of Christ, which are produced by Mr. Wardlaw.

John x. 30.—Nothing need be added to what I have said upon this text in my *Vindication*, pp. 240—242, and in the present work, pp. 83, 84.

Phil. ii. 6.—My “*Vindication of Unitarianism*” being intended for popular use, I there only expressed my conviction, that this text does not admit of being translated as it is in the common version, and that the literal rendering is, “Who, being in the form of God, did not esteem it a prey to be as God.” This I have found to be the opinion of almost all commentators of any note, whether orthodox or heterodox. The question ought indeed to be regarded as settled; but, as Mr. Wardlaw insists upon the propriety of the common translation, it becomes necessary to state the reasons for

---

\* In my *Vindication*, p. 233, I have probably laid too much stress on the circumstance of Jesus being visibly *present*, when Stephen and Paul addressed him in prayer.

departing from it. What then is the meaning of the phrase, Ουκ ἀρπαγμασιν ἠγγισατο? Although it is not found in this precise form in any other Greek author, we are at no loss to discover its meaning.

1. In the first place, we know the signification of the verb Ἀρπαζω. It signifies *to seize hastily, greedily, or violently*, as when a bird *snatches* a grain with its beak, or a ravenous animal *seizes* upon its prey. In the common version of the New Testament, it is translated "*to take by force*," Matt. xi. 12; John vi. 15; Acts xxiii. 10; "*to pull*," Jude 23; "*to pluck*," John x. 28, 29; "*to catch*," and "*to catch away*," Matt. xiii. 19; John x. 12; Acts viii. 39; 2 Cor. xii. 2, 4; 1 Thess. iv. 17; Rev. xii. 5. These are all the places, in which it occurs. They fully and clearly express the meaning of the verb, in which, so far as I have been able to discover, the idea of *robbery, usurpation, or stealing* is never included. Ἀρπαζω is no doubt often used in cases, where *robbery is in point of fact* committed, because, when men rob, they commonly *seize their prey with haste and violence*. But the verb, which denotes this act, does not include in its own import any notification, that the thing seized is the lawful property, not of the person who seizes it, but of some other, from whom it is taken without his wish and consent. Or, if this additional idea is ever intended, it is by a secondary sense, and a departure from the original signification of the word.

2. From the perfect passive, ἠρπαγμαι, are formed, agreeably to the analogy of the language, two verbal nouns, ἀρπαγμος and ἀρπαγμα. According to the established principles of the derivation of verbal nouns, they signify, primarily, *the act* denoted by the verb, that is, *the act of seizing or catching* any thing *hastily, greedily, or violently*; and, secondarily, they denote *the thing so seized or caught*. Mr. Wardlaw however gives a different account of this matter. "However similar," says he, "the words may appear, the precise difference between them is, as every Greek scholar knows, that the latter signifies a *prey or plunder*, the former the *act of preying or plundering*." (Unit. Incap. p. 279.) The reader must have learned long ago, how to estimate Mr. Wardlaw's assertions about the authority of *all Greek scholars*. He will not therefore be surprised at the following remarks of one, who, though he resigned the splen-

did emoluments and honours of the Church of England, because he disbelieved the doctrine of the Trinity, will probably be acknowledged by Mr. Wardlaw to have been a "Greek scholar."

"Non adhuc, quod sciam, reperta est hæc vox ἀρπαγμος apud aliquem probatum scriptorem, si *Plutarchum* excipias: nec tamen de accuratâ ejus significatione nobis hariolandum est; nam prorsus idem valet cum alterius formæ substantivo ἀρπαγμα. 'Ἀρπαζειν vero est aliquid *avide et violenter arripere, ut tibi vindices, et tuum facias,*' &c.

"Diximus autem nihil interesse vocabula ἀρπαγμον et ἀρπαγμα. Et hoc nullo negotio stabilire possem, multis undique corrasis vocibus: sed hujusce tædium laboris tum eruditi omnes, tum *Eustathius* nobis excusatum dabit. En! tibi nostri grammatici auctoritatem! In II. p. 1386: 'Ὡς δε ξεσμος, ξεσμα' οὕτω δεσμος, δεσμα. Et p. 1425: Ρωχος δε και ῥηγμα, ταυτα εστιν' ὡς και βρεχος και βρεγμα, και πλεχος και πλεγμα.'" *Wakefield, Silva Critica*, Vol. III. § 142.\*

3. That ἀρπαγμος and ἀρπαγμα have the same signification, each of them denoting sometimes *the act of seizing*, and at other times *the thing seized*, is manifest not only from the analogy of the language, but from their actual use in Greek authors. For numerous instances of ἀρπαγμα denoting both the *act* and the *thing*, it is sufficient to refer to *BIEL'S* Lexicon, *KIRCHER'S* or *TROMMIUS'S* Concordance, and *WETSTEIN'S* Note on the passage under consideration. The other

\* "Ἀρπαγμος has not, so far as I know, been found in the writings of any Classical Author except Plutarch. We need not however form conjectures respecting its exact signification; for it has the very same meaning with a substantive of another form, ἀρπαγμα. But ἀρπαζειν signifies *to seize any thing greedily and violently in order to make it one's own,*" &c.

"I have said that there is no difference between ἀρπαγμος and ἀρπαγμα. And I could easily prove it by collecting a multitude of words from every quarter. But I shall be absolved from such a long and tedious task both by all the learned, and by Eustathius."—He then quotes two passages, in which Eustathius remarks respecting several words, which differ in the same manner with ἀρπαγμος and ἀρπαγμα, that they mean the same thing.

Schleusner says, that ἀρπαγμος properly signifies *the act of snatching* or *seizing*, but secondarily, *the thing snatched*, or *the thing to be greedily seized*.

form ἀρπαγμος, is of much more rare occurrence. But in the few instances where it occurs, we find both meanings exemplified, notwithstanding Mr. Wardlaw's assertion, that "no instance has yet been produced of the original word ἀρπαγμος signifying a *prey* or *spoil*." Besides quotations of the words of Paul, Wetstein has produced *three* instances of the occurrence of the word in Greek authors. *One* is from Plutarch, (De Liber. Educ.,) where ἀρπαγμος signifies *the act of seizing*. In the other *two*, it signifies *the thing seized, a prey*. They are as follow: Καὶ οὐχ ἀρπαγμον τὴν παραιτησιν ὡς ἐξ ἀδρανούς καὶ ἰδαρεστερας ἐποιεῖτο φρενός,—"and did not make the refusal a prey, (that is, did not eagerly desire the refusal,) as if from a weak and fluctuating mind." *Cyrrillus de Ador.* Ὁ δὲ γε Σωτὴρ θεραπεύει αὐτοὺς —τῷ δείξαι, ὅτι οὐκ ἐστὶν ἀρπαγμος ἢ τιμὴ, τῶν ἐθνῶν γὰρ τοιοῦτον.— "The Saviour ministers to them, to show that honour is not a thing to be eagerly seized; for such is the practice of the gentiles." *Catena in Marc.* x. 42.

4. The meaning of St. Paul's language is further determined by the circumstance, that the phrase which he employs was, with several inconsiderable variations, in common use among the Greeks. Instances, almost innumerable, are quoted by Wetstein and other commentators, which prove that, whether the terms be ἀρπαγμος or ἀρπαγμα, whether ἡγήσατο, which Paul adopts, or ἐποιεῖτο, which is employed by other writers, and whether the phrase be expressed in Greek, or translated by the Latin words "*prædam ducit*," the idea is exactly the same, that of *considering a thing as a prey to be greedily caught at*. "It plainly signifies," says Whitby in his *Commentary*, "to covet earnestly, or to look upon a thing as much to be desired and snatched at."

These remarks will, I trust, satisfy every reader, who understands Greek, of the propriety of the translation which I have given of this celebrated passage in conformity, I believe, with the opinion of the learned Christian world, and will spare me the trouble of wading through the mass of confused argumentation, which Mr. Wardlaw has distributed under no less than thirteen different heads.\*

---

\* Unit. Incap. of Vind. pp. 276—288.

In reply to my remarks on Mr. Wardlaw's "*general considerations*" in proof of the Divinity of Christ, which I thought much too vague to be introduced, where the direct and explicit testimony of Scripture would be sufficient and *all-sufficient*, my opponent observes, "There is such a thing as *argumentative declamation*; and it seems to me the only suitable style for proofs of the kind in question."\*—I think so too. The evidence, stated in naked plainness, would appear so feeble as to confute itself. The prejudices of the reader must be strongly worked upon, his feelings roused, and the want of inward solidity in the reasoning compensated by the external trappings of an adorned and vehement oratory. If any additional reasons were wanting to prove the impropriety of Mr. Wardlaw's mode of writing on this part of his subject, it would only be requisite to observe the injustice, into which the tempest of his mind betrays him, when, in defending that mode,† he says not only that *the Socinians shiver amidst eternal snows, and are under the greatest alarm lest their devotional feelings should ever rise above the point of freezing*, but that "*they exert all their ingenuity in finding out plausible reasons for their anti-devotional coolness.*"—The Socinians are the disciples of one, "who, when he was reviled, reviled not again, and (instead of pronouncing an eulogium or vindication of himself) committed his cause to God, who judgeth righteously." I trust, they will bear in mind the example of their Master, upon the present occasion. But, in this controversy, it may be proper for me to remind the reader, that, whilst I objected to the *manner* and *occasion* of introducing these general considerations, I also maintained that the argument founded upon them was *inconclusive*, BECAUSE THE UNITARIAN SYSTEM JUSTIFIES AND EXCITES THE SAME ARDENT EMOTIONS OF GRATITUDE, VENERATION, AND LOVE, which Mr. Wardlaw represents as the exclusive result of a belief in Trinitarianism.

The last evidence adduced by Mr. Wardlaw for the Supreme Divinity of Christ was the account of the Miraculous Conception. Mr.

\* Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 289.

† Ibid. pp. 290, 291.

Wardlaw asserted, that it "cannot be made to comport with the Unitarian creed." He did not however attempt to *prove* this assertion, and I denied that it could be proved. Mr. Wardlaw still abstains from entering on the subject, when integrity required retraction.

Respecting Mr. Wardlaw's treatment of Mr. Belsham I shall say little; first, because the refutation of his remarks would lead to a long discussion, remote from the design of the present controversy; and, secondly, because Mr. Wardlaw asserts, (p. 298,) that nothing will convince him except an explicit declaration from Mr. Belsham himself. As to Mr. Wardlaw's appeal to me, accompanied with "certain inward risings of the pride of indignant scorn," whether I *reckoned him capable* of the misrepresentation, which I imputed to him, I have only to say, that I stated in simple terms *a simple fact*, which was, that Mr. Wardlaw introduced a certain passage *in the form of a quotation from Mr. Belsham's pamphlet, although the pamphlet contained no such words and no such sentiment*; that, although Mr. Wardlaw endeavours to vindicate himself by pointing out a trifling distinction in the use of his inverted commas *in that particular Note*, yet whoever will examine *the other Notes*, will find that my statement is still perfectly correct; and that Mr. Wardlaw knows, that I never in any instance attributed such misrepresentation on his part *to deliberate malignity*, but always, at the expense of incurring his "indignation," *to carelessness and overheated zeal*.

Mr. Belsham's Tract, as stated in its title-page, was *published by the GLASGOW Unitarian Fund*, which is only one out of numerous similar Societies, established in different parts of the kingdom, and one of the most inconsiderable both in duration and in extent. It was *reprinted in the Monthly Repository*, a work principally supported by Unitarians, but open to the defence of every variety of religious sentiment, and which no Unitarian looks upon as containing any rule of faith, although by many of that denomination it is highly valued as a vehicle for free inquiry and religious intelligence. These two facts have been lately magnified and misrepresented by

Dr. Magee in terms, which will astonish any reader not familiarized to the frauds of controversy. Speaking of the above-mentioned Tract, Dr. Magee affirms :

“ *The body of English Unitarians* have attributed to it (trifling as it is) so high a value, that, not content with printing and circulating it *at the expense of their public fund*, they have superadded the publication of it *in their Magazine*, thus securing to it every degree of currency and credit, that it is in the power of *the entire body* to bestow. Recognized and adopted in this manner *by the whole community of Unitarians*, (who appear now to be consolidated and organized in a manner somewhat approaching the system of the Wesleyan Methodists,) it is of course to be viewed as *their own authenticated and deliberate defence of their version*.”—Magee on Atonement and Sacrifice, Fourth Edition, Vol. II. Part ii. p. 9.

In this passage, which Dr. Magee has written with the Pamphlet in his possession, (for he quotes it, and indeed professedly introduces this account in order to show the great expediency of replying to it,) *every particular* is, either entirely without foundation, or greatly exaggerated. I request the reader to observe the method, which the most applauded of the opponents of Unitarianism finds it necessary to adopt in order to bring that doctrine into disrepute. I request him to contemplate the simple fact, and to draw the obvious inference ; but not to permit the entrance of anger or disdain, emotions, which the Gospel forbids, and which disqualify the mind for the reception of God's holy truth.

For the subversion of the Unitarian doctrine it is no less requisite to prove the Divinity of the Holy Spirit than the Divinity of Jesus Christ. By omitting to maintain the former, the Trinitarian would relinquish half of his peculiar tenets. It is therefore not a little ominous of the fate of Mr. Wardlaw's system, that, in reviewing the Third as well as the Second Part of my book, he has passed over without any notice my explanation of those passages, which speak of “ *the spirit*.”

Instead of entering upon this subject, Mr. Wardlaw occupies a



whole Chapter of his new work, (Pt. iii. Ch. iv.,) with additional arguments from Scripture, intended to prove the Supreme Divinity of Christ. He explains his motive for adducing them in the following terms: "My sole object," says he, (p. 365,) "is to show, that what Mr. Yates alleges about our stock of proofs being exhausted, is not true."—I never said, that they were exhausted.\* Mr. Wardlaw might therefore have spared himself the trouble of bringing forward these arguments, as I shall spare myself the trouble of answering them.



## CHAPTER X.

ALTHOUGH professing to establish his sentiments upon the testimony of the Scriptures alone, Mr. Wardlaw had, in numerous passages of his Discourses, represented them as sanctioned by the authority of the Christian Church during the first ages. This assumption I could not allow to pass unnoticed. The most *direct* method of refuting it would have been to have entered into an examination of the evidence, supplied by the Christian writers of the four first centuries. But this inquiry would have filled volumes; it would have been *superfluous*, because the same thing has been often done before, and *useless*, because scarcely any readers, unless previously convinced of the truth of Unitarianism, would have travelled through such a long, learned, and unpopular discussion, and because, if any besides Unitarians had entered upon it, they would probably have considered it a sufficient reason for refusing to admit my statements, that I was incompetent to such an undertaking, and biassed throughout the inquiry by an avowed partiality to a particu-

---

\* For what I have said, I beg leave to refer the reader to p. 5 of this Sequel.

lar system. For these reasons, I preferred merely to state the conclusion, at which other authors had arrived, whose qualifications for the inquiry are universally admitted. I quoted the decisions of MOSEIM, FLACIUS ILLYRICUS, JURIEU, and PETAVIUS. These were men, profoundly versed in the knowledge of Christian antiquity; and the circumstance, which must liberate them from all suspicion of partiality, is, that they were zealous advocates of *Trinitarianism*. Their judgment is therefore free from every objection, which could have been urged against mine. They declare, that the doctrines of the Supreme Divinity of Christ, and of three Co-equal and Co-eternal Persons in the Godhead, do not appear to have been received in the earliest ages of the Christian Church. Every reflecting reader will admit the force of their testimony, nor will his opinion be shaken by Mr. Wardlaw's sole reply, that "this is one of the flimsiest portions of my volume." \*

Upon Mr. Wardlaw's observations, relative to the Reports of the Annual Meetings of the "Scotch Unitarian Association," I have only to remark, that I have myself attended all the Meetings, which have hitherto been held, and that those Reports, so far as I know, contain nothing but the truth. I am convinced, that the "Association" was instituted under the influence of sincere piety and benevolence; I highly approve of its constitution, as well as its design; and I indulge the pleasing hope, that the efforts of its members will be rendered efficacious by the Divine blessing, and that, in its sphere of operation, it will be eminently conducive to the glory of God, to the honour and success of the Gospel, and to the best interests of mankind.

Of the certain and steady progress of Unitarianism in Scotland, as well as in the world at large, I entertain not the smallest doubt. Such is the native energy of Truth, such the mighty force of the Word of God, and so clear and abundant the proofs which it contains of the Unitarian doctrines, that they must finally prevail over

---

\* Unit. Incap. of Viud. p. 385.

all those obstacles, which to every eye except that of Christian Faith will appear insurmountable. These doctrines will first assert their benign dominion over the hearts of candid inquirers, and will at length rise in awful majesty above the opposition of the most inveterate prejudices, the worst passions, and the most powerful interests.

It is true, that the pure and holy principles of the unadulterated Gospel will continue to meet with the most formidable obstructions not only from the manners and maxims of the world, and from the prejudices of those who have been educated to the profession of orthodoxy, but also from the influence of those passions and inclinations in the hearts of its own adherents, which it was intended by Almighty wisdom to subdue and eradicate. And not only will Unitarians discover in their own case a warfare between the spirit of the Gospel and the depravity of human nature; but they will find themselves exposed to *peculiar trials* from the very circumstances of their recent conversion. I would again employ all the influence I possess to call their most serious attention to this point. I know the use, which our adversaries will make of my remarks; I expected it, when I before advanced them. But no reader of reflection will be convinced by Mr. Wardlaw's argument, that Unitarianism is false, because the reception of it is likely to be attended with certain dangers and evils, arising from the too careless employment of the understanding in theological speculation. It is evident, that the remark which I offered respecting the description of men, who will be most apt to embrace Unitarianism,\* is equally applicable to the history of all other religious sentiments. Among the varieties of the human character, we observe some men prone to curiosity and eager in the pursuit of truth, whilst we see others simply intent upon the practical application of whatever principles they already hold.

---

\* " Many of those who embrace Unitarian principles will be men more disposed to inquire after truth than to apply it steadily to practice when found." Vindication of Unit. p. 274.

*Every rising sect*, however influential its doctrines may be in themselves, will contain an undue proportion of the *former* class of professors. Also, the exercise of the understanding in religious inquiry, laudable and necessary as it is, tends, unless conducted with caution, to abate the ardour of the devotional affections; to which it may be added, that the character, if not greatly invigorated and exalted by the trial, can scarcely fail to be injured by the bitter animosity of the adherents to opposite opinions. The danger of a deficiency in practical religion may therefore in such a case be inferred *from the nature of the human mind*, if not *from experience and observation*. Upon the former basis much more than upon the latter I founded the remarks, which Mr. Wardlaw has employed to prove the falsehood and inefficacy of Unitarianism. What will he say, when I call to his mind the fact, of which he can scarcely be ignorant, that the patrons and professors of his own system strikingly illustrated by their conduct the truth of my general observation? At the time of the Reformation from Popery, many of the sincere converts to the newly established sect of Protestant Trinitarians were notorious, not only for a murderous spirit of persecution, and for wild and furious rebellion against civil authority, but for the general corruption and profligacy of their manners.\* Were their *principles* then more hostile to piety and purity of morals than the tenets of the Papists? Or shall we not rather look to the operation of causes, which endanger the character of all *converts*, and which therefore ought to be cautiously guarded against, steadily faced, and vigorously combated?

In the rising sect of *Unitarians*, the case is indeed very different from what it was among the Trinitarians, when they were in the same situation. So superior in its practical influence is Unitarian-

---

\* This circumstance was the principal plea advanced by Erasmus for refusing to join the Reformers. He used to say, "I am stunned with the cry of *Gospel, Gospel, Gospel*; I want Gospel manners." Upon this subject I beg leave to refer the reader to the judicious observations of Dr. Robertson, *History of Charles V.* Vol. II. pp. 335—340, and Vol. III. pp. 71—85.

ism to Orthodoxy, that the former effects what the latter could not accomplish. It counteracts the injurious operation of a roving inquisitiveness and inordinate love of novelty, and in general makes its converts not worse, but far better men, than they were before. This, I believe, is its usual effect ; and, although I wish to avoid the very appearance of arrogance and boasting, although I regret being called upon to make any comparison at all, and refuse altogether to give the *preference* in point of piety and goodness to either side, I have no hesitation in saying, that, so far as my observation has enabled me to form an opinion, the sincere and well-informed believers in Unitarianism are *not inferior* in the dispositions and habits of holiness, penitence, and universal virtue, to the sincere and well-informed believers in Calvinism.

Of what Unitarians *are*, I shall say nothing more. But I must be permitted to impress upon them the consideration of what they *ought to be*. They must be aware of the superior force of those holy and happy principles, which the unspeakable goodness of the Blessed God has brought them to embrace ; and, with superior advantages, they must be conscious of the obligation to be not *equally*, but *much more* devout, benevolent, and exemplary, than the rest of the Christian world. Let them consider, to how false a standard they apply, when they satisfy themselves with saying, that they are not as other men, or that they do not fall below other denominations of Christians. They must be aware, *and the best of them will be the most ready to confess*, that they lamentably fail in the uniform practice of that entire dedication of themselves, with all the powers of their bodies and all the faculties of their souls, to the glory and service of God, which is no less their duty than it would be their honour and their happiness. Among other means, which the wisdom and goodness of God supply, let them employ *the reproaches of their adversaries* as incentives to greater ardour and perseverance in well-doing. To the following questions, I know that they could return answers, honourable to the Uncorrupted Gospel. But I extract them from Mr. Wardlaw's publication, to induce them to labour *more and more abundantly*.

“ Where are the hardened sinners whose consciences it has awakened? Where are the profligates whom it has reclaimed? Where are the worldlings whom it has spiritualized? Where are the Jews, the Deists, the Infidels, whom it has brought to the faith and obedience of the truth? And, even with regard to those who have, from time to time, gone over to its adherents from the various denominations of professing Christians, what improvement, we may ask, has the transition produced? Has it increased their humility? Has it warmed and elevated their devotion? Has it purified their affections from the debasing alloy of the world, and made them more heavenly-minded? Has it enlivened their delight in communion with God, and heightened their attachment to the exercises of the closet, the family, and the sanctuary? Has it rendered them more thankful in prosperity, more resigned and patient in adversity? Has it enlarged their practical benevolence? Has it made them more ‘ fervent in spirit’ for the glory of God, and the good of men?—more ‘ sober, just, holy, temperate?’—better husbands and wives; better parents and children; better brothers and sisters; better masters and servants; better members of society;—in a word, *better men* than they were before?”

Let me entreat every individual among my readers, whose faith in Unitarianism may incline him to attend to my exhortation, here to make a solemn pause, to consider each of the above questions in reference to his own particular case, and to examine, with an humble, serious, and prayerful spirit, what improvement he has made of the peculiar privileges and advantages, with which he has been favoured as a believer in the strict Unity of God. The review can scarcely fail to produce in him a consciousness of the great disproportion of his efforts and attainments to his advantages, accompanied by that godly sorrow, which “ worketh a repentance not to be repented of;” he will smite upon his breast with an affecting, but renewing and enlivening sense of his unworthiness to receive such truth and grace, and of his ingratitude in living so little under its influence; and, whilst he solemnly repeats the consecration of himself to his Almighty Benefactor and Preserver, and renews his vows of fidelity

to his merciful Saviour, he will renounce the world, hate its pollutions, and pity its vanity, and resolve, that the life which he is hereafter permitted to live in the flesh, shall be regulated by faith in the Son of God, who loved him and gave himself for him.

NOW TO THE ONLY GOD, OUR SAVIOUR THROUGH JESUS CHRIST OUR LORD, BE GLORY AND MAJESTY, DOMINION AND POWER, BOTH NOW AND FOR EVER. AMEN.

FINIS.

1100

1100

1100





Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 01029 2631



