THE SOCINIAN Controversy Discuss'd:

WHEREIN

The CHIEF of the

SOCINIAN TRACTS

(Publish'd of Late Years here)

ARE

CONSIDER'D.

William Sutherland his book 1708

The *Word* was *God.* 1 John 1.
The *Word* was made *Flesh.* vers. 14.
The *Lord* is that *Spirit.* ii Cor. iii. 17.
Baptizing in the Name of the *Father*, and of the *Son*, and of the *Holy-Ghost.* Matt. xxviii. 19.
And these *Three* are *One.* 1 Joh. v. 7.

By CHARLES LESLIE
Chancellor of the Cathedral of *CONNOR.*

LONDON,

Printed for *G. Strahan*, at the *Golden Ball* over against the *Royal-Exchange* in *Cornhill.* New-Years Day. 1708.

PREFACE.

I *Have been perſwaded to let this firſt* Dialogue *be Publiſh'd while the reſt are a Printing. For tho' they are all one Intire Diſcourſe, yet this is ſomething Particular from the others, being not in Anſwer to thoſe Books which are Conſider'd in them, but a Subject by it ſelf; yet what I thought Needfull as a Preparation to Remove that Prejudice, which, I may ſay, only has made ſo many* Socinians, (*and on which they perpetually Inſiſt, tho' very Unreaſonably,) not to Believe what is Reveal'd of* God, *any further than our weak* Reaſon *can Comprehend.*

I pretend not to Prove *the* Myſteries *of the Holy* Trinity, *and* Incarnation *by* Reaſon. *I am fully Satisfied our Shallow* Meaſure *of it cou'd never have found them out. Which is one Reaſon I have given why they cou'd not be of* Human *Invention. But if they are not direct* Contradictions, *no other* Difficulties *can be any Obſtruction to our Belief of what we all acknowledge to be* Myſteries. *And if I have ſolv'd thoſe Popular Arguments of* Contradiction *which are Objected againſt theſe* Myſteries, *I have Clear'd the* Foundation *of that* Rubbiſh *which was Neceſſary in Order to Erect the* Building *more Firm and Regular.*

And I have Endeavour'd to do this in a Plain Familiar manner ſuited to Common Capacities, avoiding as much as poſſible the Intricate School-Terms, *but ſpeaking their* Senſe *in a way* Intelligible *to* Engliſh *Readers, and giving ſuch* Inſtances *to Explain them as are Obvious to every one, and wherein any body may object, without the help of* Art, *if he finds they come not up to the Purpoſe intended.*

I ſend out therefore this firſt Dialogue *by it ſelf. That the* Socinians *may have time to Conſider it, before I come to the* Proof *with them, which is only from the Holy* Scriptures. *And if I ſhall gain any Ground upon them in this,*

to

to Remove their Rooted Prejudice, *I doubt not of their Receiving full Satisfaction in the Consideration of those* Scriptures *which* Reveal *these Great* Mysteries.

And to Others who may rather Incline to have the whole Together, it can be but a Small Disappointment, since the Rest is in the Press and will soon follow, and then may be Bound together Without any Inconvenience, if they Pare not the Leaves of this.

And in this Busy Age, where men have so many Avocations, and wou'd grudge to Enter upon a Larger Book, or wou'd lay it by till the Vacation, *it may be more Convenient to Entertain them with small* Messes *at a time, and not to Cloy Squeamish Stomachs with the Sight of too much* Meat *at once.*

And because I have a Regard to their Time, and that this Matter is not Worth more Excuse, I conclude this Short Preface. *Reserving a Larger for the whole when it is Perfected. The* Contents *of which I have put to this, that the Reader may see what he is to expect.*

I only Add, that if any have Objections against this Dialogue, *I shall be Glad to Know them, and to Consider them by themselves, without Intermixing them with the following* Dialogues; *And chiefly for this Reason, That I put not any of the* Merit *of the* Cause *upon it, and therefore wou'd not have it suffer by it. If I have not reason'd aright, that lies at my Door, and Hurts not the Validity of what* God *has* Reveal'd. *But I hope what I have said will not Hurt it. And if it Answers the End for which I have Intended it, it will Facilitate the Conversion of Many.*

Quod Deus faustum faxit.

ERRATA.

Page 15. *l.* 4. f. find *r.* make. p. 16. Ult. *r.* the Present Case. p. 32. *l.* 31. *f.* Happly *r.* Apply. p. 33. *l.* 15. *r.* This is. p. 34. *l.* 10. *f.* come *r.* Came. p. 43. *l.* 23. *f. Seneca r. Tully.*

PREFACE.

THE *Importance of the* Socinian *Controversy shews it self, and Needs no words to Enforce it. It is no less than whether what we* Worship *is* God *or a* Creature: *Whether we* Adore *the* True *or a* False GOD, *and are the Grossest* Idolaters *in the World?*

I wish ther had been no Occasion of Reviving this Controversy, *which of a long time has lain Asleep among Us. But of late* Years *these* Socinians, *under the Name of* Unitarians, *have Appear'd with Great Boldness, and have not only fill'd the* Nation *with their Numerous* Pamphlets, *Printed upon a Publick* Stock, *and given away* Gratis *among the* People, *whereby many have been* Deluded: *But they have Arriv'd to that Pitch of* Assurance, *as to set up Publick* Meetings *in our* Halls *in* London, *where some* Preach *to them who have been Spew'd ont even by the* Presbyterians *for their* Socinianism.

It is told in the Life *of Mr.* Thomas Firmin *that he Design'd to have a Publick* Meeting-Place *set up in* London *for the* Unitarians. *And now we see it* Accomplished, *and their* Standart *set up!*

These things have made it Necessary to Appear in Defence of the Christian Faith, *that it be not Lost among us; and to give some Check to these* Socinian Pamphlets *which Swarm, through this* City *especially.*

Instead of Enlarging in a Preface, *I will here Present the Reader with a* Rarity, *which I take to be so, because of the Difficulty I had to obtain it, It is the following* Address *or* Epistle *of our* Unitarians *to the* Morocco Ambassador. *And the* Latin Treatise *Mention'd in it (of which likewise I have a* Copy) *I have seen in* Print *here in* London, *to shew the Diligence of the* Party. *I know not if it is Publickly Sold, for I only saw it in a private Hand.*

I have likewise Added two Letters *upon this Subject, one wrote in the year* 1694, *the other in* 1697. *Which may serve as a* Compendium *of what is at Large Treated of in these* Dialogues, *and* Summs *up the Merit of the Cause in a few words; which will help the* Memory, *and serve for a Ready* Answer *to* Socinians *in Discourse, that may not be at hand to give, when it is to be Collected out of a Larger* Volume.

I desire the Reader to Consider what Account the Unitarians *give of* Mahomet and his Great *Judgment in their following* Address *to the* Ambassador, *to whom they say, That* God hath Raised your MAHOMET to Defend the Faith with the Sword, as a Scourge on the Idolizing Christians— And we, for the Vindication of your Law Maker's Glory, strive to Prove, that such Faults and Irregularities (not cohering with the Fashion of the Rest of the ALCORAN Building, nor with the Undoubted sayings of your Prophet) —— were Foisted into the Scatter'd Papers found after MAHOMET's Death—— And we do Endeavour to Clear, by whom, and in what Time, such Alterations were made in the first settting out of the Alcoran.

This is the like Vindication *which they make for the Holy* Scriptures *of* God, *That many things were* Foisted *in, which they do not Like, as they Frequently Answer in their* Pamphlets, *particularly as to the* Writings *of St.* John, *all of whose* Authority *they Strike at, because they make most against them. So that by the same* Salvo *the* Alcoran *is Vindicated and the* Scriptures! *And* Mahomet *is here said to be Rais'd up by* God, *to Scourge the Idolizing* Christians, *and the* Alcoran *to Preserve the true* Faith! *And they say in the same Place, that* MAHOMET wou'd have himself to be but a Preacher of the Gospel of Christ. *Such a* Preacher *indeed as our* Unitarians! *And they say truly to the Ambassador,* We your fellow-Champions for the Truth.

And they have since Carry'd on the same Argument in their late Writings, *of Preferring* Mahometism *to* Christianity, *as you will see in the second* Letter, *Sect. II. Nay, that they Esteem even* Paganism *as* Preferable *to the* Christian *Doctrin. And yet they take it ill, That we will not own them as our* Christian *Brethren*!

But now it is time to let the Reader see those Papers *I have Mention'd. And he will Judge for himself.*

AN

A N

Epiſtle Dedicatory,

To His Illuſtrious Excellency *Ameth Ben Ameth* Embaſſador of the Mighty Emperor of *Fez* and *Morocco*, to *Charles* the 2d. King of *Great Britain*.

AMONGST the many ſplendid Entertainments and Receptions, amidſt the ſeveral congratulatory Encomiums and Preſents, that were offer'd unto your Excellency, as Publick Teſtimonies of the Eſteem and Admiration the Inhabitants of this Weſtern Empire do juſtly conceive of the Mighty and Glorious Emperor of *Morocco*, your Maſter: And of your own peculiar Virtues; there hath been no ſuch Addreſs or Preſent made unto your Excellency, none, as we preſume, that was of a Weightier Importance (tho' ſlenderer appearance) as this, which we now ſubmit to your liking and acceptance, at your Departure. For the contents thereof, being about the Myſteries of that All ſuf-

ficient and Inviſible *One Deity*; its own intrinſick value needs no Words, nor the uſual adornments that might be expected from us, to ſet it out with an outward ſplendor, to ſo diſcerning a Perſon in Spiritual and ſublime Matters, as your Excellency is known to be, ev'n in the Judgment of learn'd Univerſities. Beſides, Truth in theſe Countries is fain to go, ſometimes like Princes, in a Diſguſe; who being out of their own Kingdoms, are driven to put by their Royal Habiliments, for to converſe with more Safety and Freedom, with a few wiſe and Faithful Worthys they can beſt truſt. Religion then, Excellent Sir, the Religion of an *one only Godhead* (as alſo of many other great Verities, wherein ye agree with our Sect and diſagree from other Chriſtians) is the *Vail'd Princeſs*, whereof we are now become the Venterſom Uſhers into your Excellencies Preſence, I ſaid Venturſome not by reaſon of any affront we need Fear at your hands; but rather from the raſh Severity of ſome of our own fellow *Chriſtians* here, for venting thoſe Verities, we ſhall delare to hold in common with you; (which are contrary to them) yet *Chriſt's* and our Spirit is otherwiſe, to eſſay by gentle Perſuaſions and Union with all Mankind, as far as may be.

KNOW therefore, Noble Sir, that we are of that Sect of *Chriſtians*, that are call'd *Unitarians*; who firſt of all, do both in our own Names, and in that of a Multitude of our Perſuaſion, (a wiſe and Religious ſort of People) heartily ſalute, and congratulate

tulate Your Excellency, and all that are with you, as Votaries and fellow Worshippers of that *Sole Supreme Deity* of the Almighty *Father* and *Creator* : and we greatly rejoyce, and thank his Divine Bounty, that hath preserv'd Your *Emperor*, and his *People*, in the excellent knowledge of that Truth, touching the belief of an *Only Soveraign God*; (who hath no *Distinction*, or *Plurality* in *Persons*) and in many other wholsom Doctrins, wherein ye presevere: About which, this our *Western* part of the World, are declin'd into several *Errors*, from the integrity of their *Predecessors*. But besides this much in the general, our Attendance on your Excellency at this time, hath a more special prospect, as you shall perceive by the Sequel. For, about Thirty or more Years, there came an *Embassador*, as your Excellency is, from the *Emperor* of *Morocco* into *Europe*; with whom *Count Maurice* of *Nassau*, *Prince* of *Orange*, (a *Protestant Christian*) and the *Prince* of *Portugal*, (a *Papal Christian*) held a Conference about the *Christian* and *Mahumetan* Religion. The Ambassador deferr'd then to Speak fully his mind on the matter, till after his return home when he had there consulted with the Learned in the *Alcoran*, he sends his Answer in a *Letter*; which not only sets forth the Tenets of his own *Religion*, but also refutes some *Errors* held amongst the *Protestant* and *Romanist Christians*. In some of which, as in other points, we presume that Embassador was mistaken and misinstructed. Now, we herewith present unto your Excellency, a faithful Tran-

ſcript of that *Letter*, that's with difficulty to be ſeen, only in the Cabinets of thoſe *Princes*, to whom it was directed in *Latin*. Not that we account the contents thereof, to be a Novelty to you that are of that *Religion*; but becauſe it is a piece of *Rarity* and *Learning:* And chiefly, for that it is the foundation, on which we build another ſmall piece or two, in the ſame *Language:* The which we here *Dedicate*, likewiſe unto your *Emperor*, to your *Excellency*, and to his *Mauritanian* Subjects; the which comprehends the main deſign of our waiting on you at preſent. Now foraſmuch, as that Noble Embaſſador, doth in this *Letter* write ſome things, which to us ſeem very ungrounded, and therein charges without Sufficient diſtinction, the whole body of *Chriſtians*, with ſuch *Errors*, which we *Unitarians* do abhor as well as the *Mahumetans*; with whom we muſt agree in ſuch, even againſt our other fellow *Chriſtians:* Therefore, we that are fain'd to be more exercis'd Soldiers in ſuch controverted points in *Religion*, and ſhou'd beſt know the differences in *Europe* about the ſame, ſhall undertake in this our *Second* and *Third Treatis*,(which are but as *Obſervations* on that *Letter*) Firſt, to ſet forth (for your better information) briefly and diſtinctly in what points all *Chriſtians* do generally agree with the *Mahumetans*, in matters of *Religion*. 2dly. In what things *Chriſtians* Univerſally diſagree from you, with the reaſons for the ſame. 3dly. In what Caſes you do juſtly diſſent from the *Roman Catholicks*. 4thly. That *Proteſtant Chriſtians* do joyn with

with you, in your condemning of thoſe *Romiſh* Errors, and theirs and our reaſons for the ſame. 5thly. We intend there to lay down, in what *Articles*, we the *Unitarian Chriſtians*, (of all others) do ſolely concur with you *Mahumetans*; (to which we draw nigher in thoſe important points, than all other *Proteſtant* or *Papal Chriſtians*:) With our Additional arguments to yours; to prove, that both we and you have unavoidable grounds from *Scripture* and *Reaſon*, to diſſent from other *Chriſtians* in ſuch Verities (tho' we do count them otherwiſe) our *Brethren* in our Lord *Jeſus Chriſt*.

THEREFORE in the 6th place, we as your neareſt *Fellow Champions* for thoſe Truths; We, who with our *Unitarian* Brethren were in all Ages exercis'd to defend with our Pens, the Faith of *One Supreme God*; (without *Perſonalities* or *Pluralities*) as he hath rais'd your *Mahomet* to do the ſame with the *Sword*, as a *Scourge* on thoſe *Idolizing Chriſtians*: We I ſay, in this our peculiar lot in *Religious* Controverſies, ſhall in our duty of Love, undertake to diſcover unto you, in theſe our Books, thoſe weak places that are found in the platform of your *Religion*; and ſhall herein (with your favour) offer to your Conſideration ſome Materials to repair them. For, we do (for the Vindication of your Law-Makers Glory) ſtrive to prove, that ſuch faults and Irregularities, not cohering with the Faſhion of the reſt of the *Alcoran* building; nor with the undoubted ſayings of your *Prophet*, nor with the *Goſpel* of

Chriſt

Christ (whereof *Mahamet* wou'd have himself to be but a *Preacher*) that therefore (I say) those Contradictions were Foisted into the scatter'd Papers found after *Mahomet's* Death, of which in truth the *Alcoran* was made up, it being otherwise impossible that a Man of that Judgment, that hath prov'd it self in other things so Conspicuously, shou'd be guilty of so many and frequent repugnancies, as are to be seen in those Writings, and Laws that are now adays giv'n out under his name. We do then in these our Papers, endeavour to clear by whom, and in what time such Alterations were made in the first setting out of the *Alcoran*; and tho' we have ten times more to urge on the same Subject that we present; yet by a few Summary touches, that we have here in few days made up for your view; we Suppose there may be enough to satisfy any unprejudic'd and thinking Persons: Such as it is, we beseech you to accept thereof as Friendly advices left to your Reason and Conscience to judge of with your selves; seeing we offer not the same as to defame or upbraid you, but out of humanity and a loving Spirit, to the end that if you think fit to axamine and redress those Errors, we may by your proceedings, stop the mouths of your Adversaries, against whom we are often fain to stand for you in such Points wherein we may well and reasonably do it: Least after all, your Excellency shou'd judge of this our undertaking and Present, in a narrow and contracted Idea, sutable to the slen-

dernes

dernesſ of our Perſons, Parts, or Retinue, who are but two ſingle Philoſophers. and yet come as Orators of thoſe *Unitarians*, whom we proclaim'd to be ſo great and conſiderable a People, it is neceſſary we ſhou'd give a ſhort view of the Antiquity and extent of this Noble *Sect*, and hint to you the reaſons that makes them in theſe *European* parts, uſe ſuch Cautiouſneſs; and as to their Sentiments to carry themſelves, as thoſe Princes I mention'd, to go Incognito.

As to their *Antiquity*, I need but call it to your mind, that not only all the *Patriarchs* down from *Adam* till *Moſes*, not only all the *Jews* under the written Law, and the Old Teſtament, to this very day, were ſtill Worſhippers of an *one only God* (without a *Trinity* of *Perſons* :) but that alſo all the Primitive *Chriſtians*, in and after *Chriſt*, and his *Apoſtles* time, never own'd any other, beſides that *Single* and *Supreme Deity*? and all the true and pureſt *Chriſtians* their Lawful *Diſciples*, do to this very day, worſhip no other, but the *Sole Soveraign God*, the *Father* and *Maker* of all things. And therefore are we call'd *Unitarians*, as Worſhippers of that one only *Godhead* in *Eſſence* and *Perſon*, that we may be diſtinguiſh'd from thoſe backſliding *Chriſtians* named *Trinitarians*, who own three Co-equal and Self-ſubſiſting *Perſons*, whereof every one is an abſolute and Infinite *God* (as they pretend) and yet they'll have all theſe *three*, to be but *one God*; which is ſuch a Contradicting abſurdity, that certainly

our wiſe Maker and Lawgiver, wou'd never impoſe it to be believ'd upon that harmonious and relative Rectitude he hath plac'd in the *Reaſon* of *Man*. But of the firſt oppos'd this riſing Error in old times, was *Paul* of *Samoſate*, a Zealous and Learn'd *Biſhop* of *Antioch*, with his People and Adherents he liv'd Sixty years before the Council of *Nice*, that was held on this Subject about three hundred years after the *Aſcenſion* of *Chriſt* our Lord. There was alſo *Marcellus* Biſhop of *Ancyra* in *Galatia*, with his Friends and Followers. *Euſtatius* Biſhop of *Antioch*, and *Arrius* a *Presbyter* of *Alexandria*, with many more that liv'd in the time of that *Council* did openly withſtand and refute the *Trinitarian* Schiſm ;as we ſee in theChronicles of that Age. I omit *Photinus* Biſhop of *Syrmium*, and the famous *Neſtorious* with many more Perſecuted perſons for the ſame Truth: Who, tho' they had ſome Nominal differency about the too Curious Expoſitions of thoſe Myſteries; yet, they agreed in that main point of the Undiſtinguiſh'd Soveraign *Unity*. And from the Reign of the Emperor *Conſtantine*, both the *Oriental* and *Occidental Empire* generally perſiſted for ſome hundred years in that ſame Faith, reſiſting thoſe contradictory opinions of the *Trinitarians*, ev'n in the declining times of *Chriſtianity*, occaſion'd by the Growth, or the Tyrannical Uſurpation of the *Popes* and *Clergy*, who wou'd force their private notions and human Inventions on Men's Conſciences; that is, in the Reign of the Empe-

Emperor *Charles* the *Great* about the year Eight Hundred; *Bonosius* and *Elipandus* with other *Bishops* and *Christians* in *Spain*, unanimously oppos'd the Doctrin of a *Trinity*. And of late years, in *Europe*, stood up the pious and noble Personage *Faustus Socinus* and his *Polonian* Association of Learned Personages, that Writ many Volums against that and other Sprung up Errors among *Christians*. But now to lay before your Excellency, the extent of this Orthodox Faith of the *Unitarian* Christians, in what *Nations* it is held, be pleas'd to observe that all the *Christians* throughout *Persia*, *Armenia*, *Mesopotamia*, those call'd of St. *Thomas*, and some *Hollanders* and *Portugueze* in *Asia*, those that live among the *Greeks* in *Europe*, even your Neighbouring *Christians* in *Nubia*. All those together (which far exceed the *Trinity asserting Christians*) do maintain with us, that Faith of *One Soveraign God*, one only in *Person* and *Essence*. And why shou'd I forget to add you *Mahumetans*, who also consent with us in the Belief and Worship of an One only Supreme *Deity*, to whom be Glory for ever. *Amen*.

But in the *West* and *North* of *Europe*, we are not so numerous, by reason of the inhumanity of the *Clergy*, who contrary to the gentle ways of *Christ*, wou'd convince us and others, but by *Fire* and *Thunder*, and *Jayls*, and *Swords* of *Princes*; tho' our Patient Carriage and Brotherly Love towards them for their precious Truths we still hold

in Common, might Evidence to them of what ſort of *S*pirit both they and we are. Yet our People are numerous in *Poland*, in *Hungary*, in *Holland* as well as *England*, but being under the threats of ſuch Un-chriſtian Perſecutions, (which hath been in the Wiſdom of God, the lot of all true *Chriſtians* from the beginning, for to try, exerciſe and fortify their Knowledge and Virtue by the oppoſition of their Adverſaries) we cannot open our ſelves, nor argue touching our Faith, but that ev'n our neareſt Friends that are *Trinitarians*, out of a miſtaken Zeal, wou'd be the firſt to deliver us up to *Biſhops Courts*, *Priſons* and *Inquiſitions* to the endangering both our Lives and Fortunes. That is the ſad reaſon, that we have not hitherto waited in greater Numbers, to congratulate and Welcome your Excellency, nor can at this preſent in ſuch a manner, as we well judge to be ſuitable to your Grandure, and the reſpect we bear to your *Prince* and *People*, for any ſhare of *Divine Truth*, you or any other do hold entire with us from our God and our Saviour Chriſt.

Countenance therefore this Philoſophical plainneſs and freedom (that's part of our Profeſſion) which emboldens us Two to be more forward than others of our Perſuaſion, to offer to you rather than fail, ev'n a Meſs of our own Trade. Such ſlight preſents in appearance as theſe little Books are, whoſe contents nevertheleſs we think ſo important for the good of your Souls that we wou'd

be

be ready (if acceptable) to go and aſſert the Contents thereof, to the learned of your Country, had we any proſpect of Succeſs, while we are uncertain what Entertainment attends ſuch as would object any thing againſt your *Alcoran* be it never ſo modeſtly and lovingly propos'd.

Therefore, ſince we cannot now in Perſon, be pleas'd Noble Sir, to Communicate the import of theſe Manuſcripts, to the Conſideration of the fitteſt Perſons of your Country-men, only as a Scantling of what the more learn'd of our *Unitarian* Brethren cou'd ſay, far beyond any thing that's here on theſe Subjects of our Differences. And leaſt you might think it too mean an Office to be inſtrumental in ſpreading any ſuch divine Verity; conſider, if it be ſo great a matter to perform the part of an *Embaſſador* among earthly *Princes* (which your *Excellency* hath ſo laudably done of late) how far more Glorious is it, to undertake the leaſt *Embaſſy* in the Cauſe and *Religion* of the Supreme *Monarch* of the World. To whom be glory and Dominion for ever, Amen.

THE

THE Socinian Trinity EXPLAIN'D, AND COMPAR'D with that of the CHRISTIANS. IN A LETTER TO A FRIEND.

June, 1694.

SIR,

THE *Socinians* hold a *Trinity* as well as we: Nay they hold several *Trinities*. They have lately Published *Bidle's Confession of Faith touching the Holy Trinity*. But in the Explanation of this is all the difference. (I.)

(I.) He, and one part of the *Socinions*, make the *Second* and *Third* Persons to be *Creatures*, wherein they are guilty of a very gross sort of *Idolatry*, beyond what was acknowledged by any of the *Heathens*, to join *Creatures* into one *Holy Trinity* with *God*, and to *Baptize* Men into the Faith and Worship of *Creatures*. The *Arians* could never answer the Charge of *Idolatry* in giving Divine Honour to *Christ*, while they acknowledged him to be but a *Creature*: Nor can the *Worship* of *Christ*, supposing him but a *Creature*, be excused from *Idolatry*, by any manner of way, which will not at the same time justifie the Excuses not only of the *Church of Rome*, but of the *Heathens* themselves for their *Idolatry*.

(II.) Another sort of *Socinians* deny the *Second* and *Third* of the *Trinity* to be *Persons*: And make them no more than the *Power* and *Wisdom* of *God*, one call'd his *Word*, the other his *Spirit*, but yet that they are *nothing different from God*; as by a Man's *Spirit*, you mean the Man himself. Thus the *Brief History of the Unitarians*.

But, by this Rule, they cannot stop at a *Trinity* in *God*, but must go thro' all his Attributes, *Justice*, *Mercy*, *Providence*, *Omnipotence*, *Eternity* and Twenty more; and instead of the *Three in Heaven* (which they acknowledge) they must go to a *Fourth*, *Fifth*, *Sixth*, and without End.

In the next Place, where it is said, *John* 1. 14. *The Word was made Flesh*, they say that no *Person* was

was made *Flesh:* This *Second* of the *Trinity* they say is not a *Person*, but only God's *Power*, or the *Manifestation* of his *Power*, which they say *Inhabited* an Human Person; *i. e.* the Person of *Jesus Christ.*

So God *Inhabited* or *Inspired* the *Prophets*, *Apostles*, &c. but this did not make *Him* to become *Flesh.* But he inspired Christ in a *Higher Degree.*

The *Degree* signifies nothing as to the being made *Flesh.* No *Inspiration* or *Inhabitation* of God, or any thing less than an *Impersonation*, *i. e.* taking our Flesh into his own *Person*, so as to be one *Person* with him, nothing less than this can make him to be *Flesh.*

And it is certain that nothing can be made *Flesh* but a *Person.* A *Manifestation* of God, or of any thing else, is nothing in it self; it is but our manner of Apprehending what is *manifested* or *shewn* to us: And to talk of this being made *Flesh*, is the grosest Nonsence and Contradiction: Therefore if there be but *One Person* in the *Trinity* (as this Sett of *Socinians* do hold) then the *whole Trinity* was made *Flesh*; and then they must come to *Muggleton*, who says, as they do, that there is but One *Person* in the *Godhead*, which is God the *Father*; and that *He* was *Incarnate*, and really *Died*, so that there was then no God; But *Muggleton* says, that *Elijah* govern'd in his absence, Rais'd him from the Dead, and Restor'd him to his Throne, and then He was GOD again.

But, on the other hand, if ther be Three *Persons* in the *Holy Trinity* (as the reſt of our *Socinians* do hold) But the *Second* and *Third* only *Creatures*, and that the *Word* (the *Second* Perſon) was *Incarnate*; then they muſt anſwer for their *Idolatry*, in Worſhiping a meer *Creature*; and anſwer the Cloud of Texts which require and atteſt Divine Honor to be due to *Chriſt*, and Command the very *Angels of God* to *Worſhip* Him.

But, to turn again to thoſe *Socinians* who will have but one *Perſon* in the *Trinity*, they put this Meaning upon *Matth.* 28. 19. that we are Baptized in the Name of the *Father*, and of the *Son* (who is the ſelf-ſame *Perſon* with the Father) and of the *Holy Ghoſt* (who is the ſame *Perſon* with them Both.)

Again, *Matth.* 12. 32. if you ſin againſt *one* of theſe you ſhall be forgiven ; but if you ſin againſt *another* (who is the very ſame with that *one*) you ſhall not be forgiven.

(III.) Now, I pray you, compare their *Trinity* and ours. They make *Three in Heaven* who are not *only Three*, but may be *Threeſcore*, and yet all but one and the ſelf-ſame *Perſon.*

We acknowledge the *Three in Heaven*, whom the Scriptures tell us of, to be *only Three*, and that they are *Three Perſons.*

One of theſe was made *Fleſh*, the *other* not, yet they will not allow them to be different *Perſons*, but that *He* who took Fleſh, and *He* who

who did not take Flesh were the same, or that they were not *Two.*

These are the Men who cry out upon *Mysteries*; and pretend to Explain their Faith wholly by *Reason* and *Demonstration*, and to make it easie and intelligible to the meanest Understanding!

Besides, they differ more (if more can be) betwixt one another, than they do from us. What greater difference can ther be concerning the *Object* of our *Worship* than *one* to make it *GOD*, the *other* but a *Creature*? As it is among the *Socinians*, in their Opinion of the *Second* and *Third* in the *Holy Trinity.* What greater difference, than for one to say they are *Persons*, another *no Persons*? One to say they are *Adorable*, the other *not*? Must not one of these think the other *Idolators*? And the other think them *Profane*, and Erroneous in *Faith*, who deny Divine Honour to whom it is Due?

(IV.) We acknowledge a Great and Sublime *Mystery* in the *Holy Trinity* of *GOD.* That is a *Mystery* to us, which exceeds our Understanding. And many such *Mysteries* ther are, to us, in the *Nature* of *God* which we all acknowledge; A *First Cause* without a *Beginning*! A Being which neither *made it self*, nor was made *by any other! Infinite* without *Extension!* In *every place*, yet circumscrib'd in *no place*, ! *Eternal* and *Perpetually Existing* without any *Succession* of *Time*! a *Present*, without *Past*, or *Future*! And many other such *un-Explainable*, *un-Intelligible*,

Incomprehensible Mysteries; which yet hinder not our Belief of a *God*. And therefere not being able *fully* and *clearly* to explain the *Trinity*, which is the very Nature of *God*, can be no Reason for us to reject such Revelation which *God* has given us of Himself. Yet do we not want several *Shadows* and *Resemblances* of one *Nature* communicating it self to many *Individuals*, without either a *Multiplication* or *Division* of the *Nature*. We say that the *Soul* is *all* in *all*, and *all* in *every part* of the *Body*; yet that the *Soul* is neither *Multiplied* nor *Divided* among the several *Members* of the *Body*. It is impossible for us either to *Explain* this, or to *Deny* it; for we *feel* it to be so, though it is wholly *unconceivable* to us *how it can be*. Now if the *Soul*, which is but an *Image* of *God*, at an Infinite distance, can Communicate it self to several *Members*, without breach of its *Unity*; why should it be Impossible for the *Eternal* and *Infinite Mind* to Communicate it self to several *Persons*, without breach of its *Unity*? I will be bold to say, you will not find so near a *Parallel* in *Nature* whereby to conceive of God's *Eternity*, or his *Infinity*, as this, and a great many more, whereby we may conceive of His *Trinity* and *Unity*, by what we feel in our selves, and see in a thousand things that are before us. We see *Extension* not *Divided* but *Distinguish'd* into its three *Dimensions*; and Communicating its *whole Nature* to *each* of the

the *Three*, for *Each* is *Extenſion*; and yet there is but *one Extenſion* in all the *Three*.

The *Soul* is not *Divided* betwixt its ſeveral *Faculties*; they remain perfectly *diſtinguiſh'd*, though not *divided* from one another: To *underſtand* what is *preſent*, is a quite different thing from *Remembring* what is *Paſt*; and to *Love* or *Hate*, is different from both of theſe; yet theſe Three Faculties, the *Underſtanding*, the *Memory*, and the *Will*, partake all equally of the ſame *Soul*.

Light and *Heat* are ſo *different*, that ſome are capable of the *One*, who are not of the *Other*; and yet they are not *Divided* in the *Sun*; but flow *equally* and *naturally* from it without any *Diviſion* of its *Nature*.

I ſay not that any of theſe *Parallels* do come up to the full explanation of the Communication of the *Divine Nature* to ſeveral *Perſons*, without any *Diviſion* or *Multiplication* of the *Nature*. But I am ſure they take away the *Contradiction* alledged to be in it, while we ſee the ſame *Dificulty* in our own and other Natures, which we can as little Explain.

(V.) But inſtead of ſolving this difficulty, the *Socinians* have made it a downright and Irreconcileable *Contradiction*. They would have *Three* to be *One* and the ſelf ſame *Perſon*. This cannot be ſav'd from a *Contradiction*. They acknowledge the *Three in Heaven* the *Father*, the *Word*, and the *Spirit*. If they are *One* and the ſelf-ſame *Perſon*, they cannot be *Three*. If they are one *Nature* and ſeveral *Per-*

ſons;

ſons; this is a *Difficulty*, it is a *Miſtery*; but it is no *Contradiction*, becauſe they are not *One* and *Three* in the *ſame reſpect*; for that is neceſſary to make it a *Contradiction*. In *one Reſpect*, that is of their *Nature*, they are *One*; in an *other Reſpect*, that is, of their *Perſons*, they are *Three*. But if they are *One* in *Perſon*, as well as in *Nature*; and yet are *Three* (as theſe *Socinians* do confeſs) then they are *Three* and *One*, in the *ſelf-ſame Reſpect*, which is a full *Contradiction*.

THE Second LETTER,

Puts our

English UNITARIANS,

TO

DEFEND Themselves.

And shews they are not

CHRISTIANS.

July 17. 1697.

SIR,

I Have received yours Dated the 5th Instant, wherein you Desire a *Second* Letter from me concerning the *Socinians*, or *Unitarians* (as they call themselves) And you tell me how much you have been Disappointed as to the Issue of the *First*, which you Desir'd from me: That you were made believe by those *Socinians* of your Acquaintance, that they were as Ready to Defend their own *Principles*, by *Reason*, as to object against others: And that they wou'd Immediatly give you an Answer to any thing upon that Head, provided it were *Short* and *Clear*. You tell me, that they object nothing against my *first* Letter, upon either of these

Ac-

Accounts : And yet that now in three Years time, you can get no Answer from them, tho' you have been made Daily to Expect it. Sir, this is no surprize to me, this is what I told you, at the beginning, wou'd be the Event of it. I told you, that men of least *Reason*, were the greatest *Pretenders* ; that many can Apprehend an *Objection*, who have not Depth of Reason enough to search into the *Solution*. Therefore *Objecting* is the Easier Task ; according to the *Proverb*, that *A F—— may Ask more Questions than a wise man can Answer*. Therefore I told you, that these sort of Men wou'd never Endure to have the Tables turn'd upon them, and be put to *Defend* themselves That when they saw more *Contradiction* amongst themselves than they can Pretend amongst us: And the *Difficulties* which they Object against our *Hypothesis*, return ten times more *Monstrous* and *Manyfold* against their own, they wou'd be *Silent*, and at last, *Modest*.

Therefore since they have worn out your Patience, and that you are now out of Hopes of having any Answer from them, you are Provok'd to pursue them ; and desire to know from me how far they ought to be allow'd as *Christians*. You speak of our *English Unitarians*.

But I must first Enter my *Protest* against their assuming the Name of *Unitarians* : For tho' they Profess the *Unity* of *God* (whence they take that Name) yet they Profess it not more than all *Christians* do: Neither can they avoid that Name which they wou'd

wou'd render ſo odious, of *Trinitarians*; for they all hold a *Trinity* as well as we. And which is worſe, Different ſorts of *Trinities*, and *Contradictory* to one another, and to themſelves, as is ſhewn in the *firſt* Letter. But however, they will have themſelves known by the name of *Unitarians*, and us of *Trinitarians*, and ſo let it go. For we contend not about *Names*, but *Things*. Yet this Precaution was Neceſſary, leſt they ſhou'd take advantage of *Words*, or others be offended.

And now I come to Anſwer Directly to your Queſtion. And I think, That our *Engliſh Unitarians* can in no Propriety, be call'd *Chriſtians*; that they are more *Mahometans* than *Chriſtians*; and greater Enemies to *Chriſtianity* than the *Mahometans*. Laſtly I will ſhew, that they are not own'd as *Chriſtians*, even by thoſe they call their *Brethren*, the main Body of the *Unitarians* or *Socinians* in *Chriſtendom*.

(I.) *Firſt*, That they are not *Chriſtians*. *Chriſtians* are ſo call'd from the *God* whom they Worſhip. And therefore theſe who think *Chriſt* not to be *God*, nor Worſhip him as ſuch, with *Divine* Honour, they cannot, in any Propriety of Speech, be call'd *Chriſtians*.

For it will be allow'd me, on all hands, that to Denominate a Man truly a *Chriſtian*, it is not enough that he believes ther was ſuch a Man as *Chriſt*, for that is acknowleged by all the World: Nor is it ſufficient to believe no more than what

the *Mahometans* Profeſs, *viz*. That *Chriſt* was the *Meſſiah*, The *Word* of *God*, and *Interceſſor* with *God* for *Men*; That he was *Conceiv'd* and *Born* Miraculouſly of a *Virgin*; That He was a *True Prophet* ſent from *God*; That He *Rais'd* the *Dead*, cur'd the *Blind*, *Lame*, &c. and wrought many *Miracles*; that all He Taught was *Truth*; and finally, that the *Scriptures* both of the *Old* and *New Teſtament* are the word of *God*. I ſay all this is not ſufficient to Denominate a Man a *Chriſtian*, becauſe the *Mahometans* do Believe all this; and their *Alcoran* does not Reckon any to be a true *Muſulman*, that is a *Believer*, who does not acknowlege all this. As you may ſee in the *Alcoran*. Chap. 3, 4 and 5. in the *Engliſh* Tranſlation of it, Printed at *London*, 1649 It was Reprinted, 1688. and added to the Second Part of the new Edition of the Turkiſh Hiſtory. They who wou'd be further ſatisfy'd may Conſult the *Latin* Tranſlation of the *Alcoran* by *D. Pet. Abbas Cluniacenſis* put out by *Theodor. Bibliander*.

But in the *Chapters* above Quoted, and many other Places of the *Alcoran*, you will ſee as *High* and *Honorable* things ſpoken of *Chriſt*, as you will hear from any of *our Unitarians* here in *England*. And therefore if the Belief of all this be not Sufficient to to Intitle the *Turks* and other *Mahometans* to the Name of *Chriſtians*, neither can it Intitle our *Engliſh Unitarians* to it; who are no more *Chriſtians* than theſe.

(II.) And

(II.) And from the Affinity betwixt our *Unitarians* and the *Mahometans* our *Unitarians* do apparently ſide with the *Mahometans* againſt the *Chriſtians*; and Repreſent *Mahometans* as the true *Chriſtians*; and our *Chriſtianity* as mere *Paganiſm* and *Heatheniſm*, as I will ſhew you preſently.

But they put their words into the Mouths, of others for *Popularity* ſake; for ſuch New *Schems* when underſtood (and they are Eaſily underſtood) wou'd, as yet, ſound very Surprizingly here in *England*.

Yet all this notwithſtanding, when ſo fair an opportunity offer'd as the Preſence of the *Morocco* Ambaſſador and the acceptance he found at Court in the Year 1682. Our *Engliſh Unitarians* here in *London* cou'd not Reſiſt the Occaſion, but Sent an *Addreſs* to him, by two of their Number, a *Copy* of which I have from Unqueſtionable hands, and wherein you will ſee how Gently they Deal with *Mahomet*, and the *Alcoran*, both of which they Vindicate, and prefer to our *Chriſtianity*.

And they have not been idle, ſince that time, of Promoting their Common Cauſe. Secretly and Under-hand, while they were kept Under by the Authority of *Laws*, and Diſ-Countenance of the *Government*. But of late Years, taking advantage of the Plenitude of the *Indulgence* Granted to *Diſſenters* of ſeveral ſorts and ſizes, they have appear'd *Publickly* in *Print*; and Indefatigably fill'd the Nation with their Numerous *Pam-*

phlets. And, finding Encouragement, have, at last, Proceeded, as to Vilifie *Christianity*, so, in its Place, to Recommend *Mahometism*, Under the fairest and most taking Characters. One of their late Treatises Entituled *A Letter of Resolution concerning the Doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation.* p. 18. Represents *Mahomet*, as having had *no other Design, but to Restore the Belief of the Unity of God, which at that time* (says he) *was Extirpated among the Eastern Christians, by the Doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation. That MAHOMET meant not his Religion shou'd be esteemed a New Religion, but only the Restitution of the true Intent of the Christian Religion. That the MAHOMETAN Learned Men call themselves the true Disciples of the MESSIAS, or CHRIST; intimated thereby that CHRISTIANS are Apostates from the most Essential parts of the Doctrin of the MESSIAS; such as the Unity of God*, &c. That *Mahumetism* has Prevail'd so Greatly, *not by Force and the Sword*—— *but by that one truth in the ALCORAN, the Unity of God.*

Then he Represents the *Tartars* as acting more Ratitionally, in Embracing *The more Plausible Sect of Mahomet* (as he translates it from an Author he Quotes) than the *Christian* Faith of the *Trinity*, *Incarnation*, &c.

He wou'd have us believe, That the Doctrin of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation* was that which Pav'd the way for *Mahometism*, by Prejudicing Men

Men against the *Christian* Faith: Whereas the Truth is, that *Mahometism* came in upon the Ruins of the Doctrins of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation*, advanced by the *Arians*, which shook the *Christian Faith*, so as to Dispose those who had forsaken it for the Vile *Heresie* of *Arius*, to Receive any New Impressions which were Contrary to it: Insomuch that, Generally speaking, where-ever *Arianism* Prevail'd, and no where else among *Christians*, was *Mahometism* Embrac'd; which was but an Improvement upon the stock that the *Arians* had laid down. And the *Alcoran* is a system of *Arianism*.

He says, that the Doctrins of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation* do hinder the *Mahometans*, *Jews*, and *Pagans* from Embracing of *Christianity*.

Yes. And the *Socinians*, and our *English Unitarians* too. For till they Believe these Doctrins, they are not *Christians*: These being the Essential Doctrins of *Christianity*.

Indeed if we shou'd Dwindle down the *Christian Doctrin* to what they Believe, we shoud'd soon Gaine them: For then we were Agreed, that is, we shou'd Cease to be *Christians* as well as they.

If it be true that is said of a *Jesuit*, who, finding no other way to Convert an *Heathen Prince*, Represented *Christ* to him as a *Warrior*, and Mighty *Conqueror*, and so Gain'd him to be *Baptiz'd* in His Name; this was such a sort of

Christian

Christian as we shou'd make, by bringing down the *Christian Faith* to their size, whom we cou'd not Persuade to come up to it.

But I am not now Arguing with these our *Unitarians*, only shewing their *Principles*; and how much nearer they come to *Mahometism*, or *Paganism*, than to *Christianity*.

And therefore I do not Examine all that most Notorious False Representation before Quoted, which our *Unitarians* have given of *Mahomet* and his *Doctrin*, from *Divers Historians*, as they say, (but Name none of them, least we shou'd Examine them) as that he did not Propagate his Religion *By Force and the Sword*, tho' it be the Profest *Principle* of the *Alcoran*, and *Practice* of *Mahomet* and his Followers, and is own'd in the Address of our *Unitarians* to the *Morocco Ambassador*, as well as witnessed by the *Histories* and *Experience* of all the Ages since *Mahomet*.

This Modest *Author* (or *Clubb*) affirms, with the same assurance, *ibid.* that the *Mahometans* call themselves the *True Disciples of Christ*. And in the same p. 18. he Represents our *Modern Christianity* (so he calls the *Faith* of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation*) as *no better nor other than a sort of Paganism and Heathenism*.

I stay not now to Confute these. My Present Business being only to let the World see what sort of *Christians* our *Modern Unitarians* are: And to give Notice of them, as *Scouts* amongst

Us

Us for *Mahomet*, whom they have, in ſo Great a Meaſure, already owned; and now openly Propagat his Cauſe, Write *Apologys* for him, and Recommend him in the beſt Manner that they can, in *Odium* to the Common *Chriſtianity*: Which they Repreſent as much more *Vile*; nay more Vile than *Mahomet* ever Repreſented it; as no Better nor other *than a ſort of PAGANISM and HEATHENISM.* Therefore theſe are Greater Enemies to *Chriſtianity* than the *Mahumetans.*

If theſe be *Chriſtians*, I am ſure we are not. But they are Abominable and Deteſted, ſo as not to be own'd for ſo much as *Chriſtians* even by thoſe whom they ſometimes Vouch to be of their own Party, and Boaſt in their *Numbers* and *Authority.* I mean the *Socinians* or *Unitarians* in *Poland*, *Tranſilvania*, and other Parts of *Chriſtendom.* Which is the *Second* Branch of what I Promis'd and come now to Conſider.

(III.) The Great Body of the *Socinian Unitarians* are in *Poland*; and their *Metropolis* is *Cracovia*; There is their *Root* and *Stock* whence *Branches* are ſpread into other Countries.

And the *Cracovian* commonly call'd the *Racovian Catechiſm* is their *Text*; Publiſhed by the *Body* of them, in the Year. 1609. as the True Standard of their Doctrin: And is own'd, as ſuch, by the Body of the *Socinians* elſe where. Therefore I will take my *Proofes* from thence, as being more

Authentick

Authentick then any Quotations out of their Particular Writers. And thus I frame my Argument.

Thoſe who Deny *Divine Worſhip* to *Chriſt* are not reckon'd *Chriſtians* by the *Racovian Catechiſm.*

But the *Engliſh-Socinian-Unitarians* do Deny *Divine Worſhip* to *Chriſt.*

Therefore the *Engliſh-Socinian-Unitarians*, are not reckon'd *Chriſtians* by the *Racovian Catechiſm.*

The *Minor* is prov'd (to ſave Multiplicity of Quotations) from a Book of theirs Printed at *London.* 1694. Intituled *Conſiderations on the Explications of the Doctrin of the Trinity.* &c. where. p. 59. they Expreſs themſelves *Plainly* in theſe words. *We have wrote no Book theſe Seven Years, in which we have not been careful to Profeſs to All the World, that alike Honour or Worſhip (much leſs the ſame) is not to be Given to Chriſt as to God.*

The *Major* is Prov'd from the *Racov. Catech. Sect. 6. cap.* 1. in that Printed *Irenopoli.* 1659. in *Octavo*, p. 164. I will Tranſlate the words for the ſake of the *Engliſh* Reader.

Queſt. Quo vero pacto Chriſto debemus confidere ?	*Queſt.* In what manner ought we to Truſt in Chriſt ?
Reſp. Eo pacto, quo Ipſi Deo. *ibid.* p. 172.	*Anſ.* In the ſame manner as in God Himſelf.

Q. Quid

Q. Quid vero sentis de iis hominibus qui Christum nec Invocandum nec Adorandum censent?

R. Quandoquidem illi Demum Christiani sunt, qui Jesum —— Divina Ratione colunt, Ejusque Nomen Invocare non Dubitant —— facile intelligitur, Eos qui id facere nolunt, Christianos hactenus non esse, quamvis alioqui Christi nomen Profiteantur, & Doctrinæ Illius se adhærere dicant.

Q. What then do you think of those men, who believe that Christ is neither to be Pray'd to, nor Worshipped?

A. Forasmuch as those are Christians, who Worship Christ with Divine Honour, and do not Doubt to call upon His Name, it is easily Understood, that those who will not do this, are not hitherto Christians, altho' otherwise they Profess the Name of Christ, and Pretend to adhere to his Doctrin.

And to cut off the Distinction of several *Degrees* of *Divine* Honour; and that a *Lesser Degree* of it may be given to *Christ* than to *God*; and that that which is given to *Christ*, shou'd be *Relative* only to *God*; and so paid Ultimately to God alone; By which Distnction (of *Latria* and *Dulia*) the *Church* of *Rome* Pretends to Defend her giving an *INFERIOR Divine* Honour to the *Blessed Virgin*, and to *Saints*, and *Angels*, but all Referr'd *Ultimatly* to *God*. I say, the *Racov. Catech.* does plainly Name this *Distinction*, and overthrows

 it;

it; and Eſtabliſhes this as a Fundamental Truth. That

All Religious Worſhip is due only to God: And that it is not Lawfull to give not only the Higheſt, but the Leaſt Degree of Religious Honour to any but God

Ibid. p. 172, 173. Etenim Cultus Religioſus ſoli Deo omnis debetur—Ex quo apparet, non modo ſummo Honoris Gradu, ſed nec Inferiori, qui modo Religioſus ſit, quenquam licere afficere, præter Deum.

And ſays that *Chriſt* is not only *Like* God, but *Equal* to God in the *Supreme Power and Government of All things*: That he is not only the *Only Begotten Son of God*, but *God*.

Ibid. *Sect.* 4. p. 47. Denique quia etiam Imperio, ac Suprema in omnia Poteſtate Deo Similis, imo Æqualis eſt Effectus—— Non Solum autem eſt Filius Dei Unigenitus, ſed etiam —— jam tum Deus fuit.

To whom all things obey as unto God, and to whom Divine Worſhip ought to be Paid, as being *God over all Bleſſed for Ever.*

Ibid. p. 100. Cui, ſicut Deo, omnia Parebant, & Cui Divina Adoratio exhibeatur.

Ibid. p. 108. Cum Deus ſit ſuper omnia, Benedictus in ſecula.

It is true that the *Racov. Catech.* does, notwithſtanding of all this, Deny *Chriſt* to be Partaker of the *Divine Nature*, and allows Him to be but a *Creature.* (Sect. 4. c. 1. p. 114.) tho it Grants, that God *did make Chriſt moſt Like unto Himſelf, by the Participation of His Divine Nature and Glory, and*

Ibid. p. 118 Quod Deus Chiſtum ſibi, Divinæ Naturæ & Gloriæ participatione Simillimum

that, in Christ, He wou'd have all to Worship and Adore Himself.

That *He Communicated to Christ His own Divine and Heavenly Majesty, and made him one and the self-same with Himself.*

millimum effecerit, in Eoque se Coli & Adorari ab omnibus velit.

Ibid. p. 170. Siquidem ipse Deus Divinam suam Cœlestemque Majestatem cum illo Communicavit, & hactenus Unum Eundemque secum Effecit.

I Grant this to be a manifest Contradiction It says that *Christ did* and *did not* Partake of the Divine Nature: And besides, it Quite overthrows the Distinction of *Relative* and *Inferior* Worship, which it set up. p. 172. 173. against the *Chruch* of *Rome*; and yet, p. 118. as above Quoted, is forc'd to make use of it, to solve the *Idolatry* of Paying *Divine* or *Religious* Honour to *Christ*, supposing Him not to be *True God* by *Nature*, but only a *Made God*, as these *Socinians* most *Foolishly*, *Blasphemously*, and *Contradictorily* do Dream.

But the use I have to make of it, is to shew, That our *English Socinian Unitarians* (because they Deny *Divine* Honour to *Christ*) are Exploded, as no *Christians*, by the main Body of the *Socinians*.

If they say, That, because of this Difference, they are not to be Reckon'd among the *Polonian-Unitarians*, I have shewn in the *First Letter*, that they Differ as widely, and in Points as *Fundamental*, among themselves Here in *England*;

 and

And that they own as *Brethren* (to encreaſe their Number, and make themſelves more conſiderable) thoſe whom they have as little Pretence to as to the *Socinians* of *Poland*, and other Countries; And from whom they differ as much, as from theſe in *Poland.*

In the next Place, when they come to boaſt their *Antiquity*, and to rid themſelves from the *Scandalous Imputation* of being an *Up-ſtart HERESY*, and contrary to all *Ages* of *Chriſtianity*; and from being ſuch a *Contemptible Number*, in this ſmall Corner of the World, our miſerably diſtracted and divided *Iſland*, which in the time of our *Late Schiſm* of 41 produc'd, like *Egypt*, upon the Over-flowing of the *Nile*, monſtrous Herds of *Heterogeneous Hereſies*; among whom were theſe now reviv'd *Semi-Arian*, *Semi-Socinian*, *Engliſh Unitarians*, the *Foundation* and *Riſe* of *Quakers*, *Muggletonians*, and *vile Puddle* of our *Sectaries*; among whom *John Bidle* not the leaſt then aroſe, a *School-Maſter* in *Gloceſter*, now own'd by our *Engliſh Unitarians*, his *Life* written with great Pomp, and his *Blaſphemous Works* re-printed, and put amongſt the Volumes of the *Unitarian Tracts*, now freely *Publiſh'd* and openly *Diſpers'd*, to poiſon the Nation, I ſay, when this *Novelty* and *Paucity* of our *Engliſh Unitarians* is objected, then the *Socinians* of *Poland*, *Tranſilvania*, and all other Parts are muſtered up, *Socinus* is Magnified, and *Arius* too is brought in Aid, and the numerous Council at *Ariminum* is much inſiſted

ſiſted on, and more ancient *Hereticks* are inliſted to ſhew the *Antiquity* and *Univerſality* of the *Engliſh Unitarian* Creed :

But when preſs'd with the different *Tenets* of theſe or any of them, then they are *All* thrown off, and Diſown'd, and as hard Words given them, by our *Engliſh Unitarians*, as by any other their Adverſaries whatſoever.

Then they take Pains to ſhew, and brag of it, That they (the *Unitarians* of *England*) are not only diſown'd; but that they wou'd be *Excommunicated* by the *Unitarians* of *Poland*, if they were there.

See the full Confeſſion to this, in that moſt celebrated Book with them which bears this Title. *A Brief Hiſtory of the Unitarians, called alſo Socinians.* This was Printed, and induſtriouſly Diſpers'd *Gratis*, in the Year 1689. And *Re-Printed*, with Additions, *Anno* 1691. There, in Anſwer to *Act.* 9. 14. and 21. p. 33. of the 2d Edition, They confeſs in theſe Words. *The Polonian Unitarians were ſo zealous in this Matter, that they Excommunicated and Depoſed from their Miniſtry ſuch of their own Party, as denyed that Chriſt was to be Pray'd to, and worſhipped with Divine Worſhip. This had bad Effects. Therefore the Unitarians of* Tranſilvania *were more moderate, they admitted to the Miniſters and Profeſſors Places, thoſe that rejected the Invocation and Adoration of Chriſt; But obliged them, under their Hands, not to ſpeak againſt Worſhipping or Praying to the Lord Chriſt, in their Sermons or Lectures. Thoſe Unitarians that reject the Invocation of Chriſt,*

ſay,

ſay; &c. And ſo he goes on, in Favour of theſe latter *Unitarians*, who reject the *Invocation* of *Chriſt*.

And by what here themſelves confeſs our *Engliſh Unitarians* wou'd not be permitted among the *Unitarians* of *Poland*, or *Tranſilvania*; or indeed, in any other Part of the *Chriſtian* World, except in *England* at *this time*.

And, if *Chriſtianity* holds *Here*, their next Remove will be under *Mahomet*; to whom they are nearer akin, and with whoſe *Ambaſſador* they have already concerted; for his Diſciples too are *Unitarians*, and of as good a Form, as thoſe who, very unjuſtly, diſtinguiſh themſelves by that Name, here in *England*. From whom,

Good Lord, Deliver this Church and Nation.

N. B. I have Printed the Addreſs of our *Engliſh Unitarians* to the *Morocco* Ambaſſador, without any *Remarks* upon it in that Place, becauſe all the Allegations there made on their behalf are fully Anſwer'd in what follows.

Our *Engliſh Unitarians* ſay that the *Chriſtians* borrow'd the Notion of the *Trinity* from the *Heathen* (See before p. xxx. And the *Remarks* on my *firſt Dialogue* p. 6.) And yet their Chief Objection againſt the Doctrin of the *Trinity*, is, That it is ſo Abſurd and Contradictory as that neither *Jews* or *Heathens* knew any thing of it.

THE

PREFACE

CONTAINS,

ERRATA Dial. 1.

PAge 15. l. 4. f. find r. make. p. 16. Ult. r. the Present Case. p. 32. l. 31. f. Happly r. Apply. p. 33. l. 15. r. This is. p. 34. l. 10. f. come r. came. p. 43. l. 23. f. *Seneca* r. *Tully*.

Dial. 2.

Page 8. l. 22. f. one. r. our. p. 14. l. 31. r. separat p. 16. l. 20. f. dot. r. not. l. 34. r. there, in. p. 53. l. 32. r. Text.

Dial. 3.

Pag. 3. l. 9. r. *Gaius*. p. 5. l. 24. r. *Gaius*. p. 42. l. 12. del. *and*. l. 13. r. φιλοικτίρμων. antepenult. r. μετὰ. p. 48. l. 31. r. πάντων. p. 55. penult. r. Conciousness. p. 57. l. 11. r. (34.) CHR. p. 59. margin. l. 5. r. Θεοπέσιον. p. 60. margin. l. 6. r. πρὸν Σωτήρ. p. 61. l. 32. put (39.) before SOC. p. 66. margin. l. 11. r. inimicus. p. 67. ult. f. Soc. r. As. p. 68 l. 23. r. First.

Dial. 4.

Page 9. l. 24. r. (think we) p. 16. l. 20. f. found. r. form'd. p. 17. l. 25. f. on. r. one. p. 25. l. 33. f. sumus r. summi. penult. r. sæculoque. p. 38. antepenult. r. Præexistence. p. 40. l. 19. f. better. r. letter.

Dial. 5.

Page 5. l. 16. r. as we.

Dial. 6.

Page. 1. l. 11. r. Object. p. 9. l. 14. f. buried. r. burnt. p. 18. l. 4. r. things. p. 31. l. 3. f. Judgment r. Government. p. 34. ult. r. Isai. 53. 11. p. 39. l. 18. r. quos. p. 40. l. 19. f. Face r. Fact. p. 42. l. 24. f. Inticements. r. Incitements. p. 44. l. 27. r. Courtiers. p. 45. l. 10. f. Sting. r. Skin. l. 18. f. of r. off. p. 47. antepenult. r. as the. p. 48. l. 6. r. Repentance. l. 8. r. lean. l. 20 r. if to. l. 38. r. to God.

CONTENTS.

THE

First DIALOGUE.

9.

THE

Second DIALOGUE.

Concerning the *Texts* of Holy *Scripture* which are brought for

---

THE

Third DIALOGUE,

THE

Fourth DIALOGUE.

XIX.

THE

Fifth DIALOGUE.

THE

Sixth DIALOGUE.

CONTENTS.

The Years of *Christ* in which those *Ante-nicene* Fathers flourished, whom I have Quoted in the following *Dialogues*, and the *Editions*, that you mistake not where I have Quoted the *Page*. And if any other *Edition* happens to be Quoted, the *Edition* is told.

	Year of Christ.	
ST. *Barnabas* the Apostle — —		*Oxon.* 1685.
St. *Ignatius.* — — —	101	*Usher*'s Edit. *Oxon.* 1644. Gr. Lat. / *Is. Voss.* Edit. *Lond.* 1680. Gr. Lat.
St. *Justinus* Martyr. — — —	140	*Parisijs.* 1636. Gr. Lat.
St. *Irenæus.* — — — —	167	*Parisijs* 1639.
Clemens Alexandrinus. — — —	192	*Paris.* 1641. Gr. Lat.
Tertullianus. — — — —	192	*Paris.* 1664.
Origen. — — — — —	230	*Rothomagi.* 1668. Gr. Lat. Tom. 2.
St. *Cyprianus.* — — — —	246	*Oxoniæ.* 1682.

THE

THE FIRST DIALOGUE.

Introduction.

SOCINIAN. HAVE you Read the Book I gave you, Intituled *A brief History of the Unitarians, call'd also Socinians?*

CHRISTIAN. I have. And I know it to be the Celebrated Book of your Party. Which therefore you have *Printed* and *Re-printed* often, in several *Volumes*, since the Year 1687. when you first did Publish it. And you have since fully Employ'd the Liberty given you of Propagating your *Principles* openly, and above-board. Whereby you have Gain'd too Plentiful a Harvest among those who, since they must have some *Religion*, delight in that which is fartheſt from the *True*. But your Success has been most among those who had not *Leisure* or *Learning* to Examin your *Pretences*; for whom this Book is Calculated, in a short, easy and plausible *Turn* to several *Texts* of *Scripture*; which they who love not the Trouble of *Examining*, are Pleas'd shou'd be *True*, think it Sufficient for them; and so Rest satisfy'd.

It is a *Translation* and a *Compend*, yet with *Improvements*, of Larger *Socinian* Treatises wrote in *Latin*, in the same Method, of Answering the several *Texts* of *Scripture*, in the Order of the Books as they Lie, from *Genesis* to the *Revelation*, which are brought to Prove the *Christian Doctrines* of the *Holy Trinity*, and the *Incarnation* of the *Second Person*, which is *Christ*:

And this is the True and only *Method* to Determin this *Controversy*; because these *Doctrins* are Discover'd to Us, only by the *Revelation* which is given of them in the *Holy Scriptures*. So that the whole Question is, Whether they are *Reveal'd* there, or Not?

And the way to know this is Twofold. *First*, from the very *Words* of the *Scripture* it self. *Secondly*, from the Current Sense of the *Church* in those Ages wherein the *Scriptures* were wrote, and Downwards; which is, at least, the best *Comment* upon the *Scriptures*: They who learn'd the *Faith* from the *Mouths* of the *Inspir'd Writers* themselves, and Convey'd their *Writings* down to Us, being the most Capable of any to give us the true *Sense* and *Meaning* of them.

And in both these Respects, you Pretend to have the Advantage. Not only in your own *Interpretation* of the *Scriptures*: But you say likewise, That your *Doctrin* was the *Primitive Doctrin* of the *Church*; And *Ours* Introduc'd as a *Novelty* and *Corruption* afterwards.

We will Discourse upon Both these Points, in their Order. But first let me ask you a Question, in the same Freedom of Conversation which we have always Us'd; and that is, Whether your *Conviction* or *Scruples* Began upon either the *Uncertainty* of the *Scripture-Expressions* themselves, or the Sense of the *first Ages* of the *Church*? But, on the other hand, is not this truely the Case, That you thought these *Doctrins* Irreconcilable to your own Natural *Reason*; And therefore by no means to be Admitted, let the *words* of the *Revelation* be never so *Po-*

sitive

ſitive, or the *Teſtimony* of *Antiquity* never ſo *Clear* in the Matter? And therefore that you were Oblig'd to *Turn* and *Wind* theſe the beſt you Cou'd, and to *Force* them to Comply with your *Hypotheſis*?

SOC. I will not Deny, but that, if ther were no *Difficulty* in Apprehending how *Three* can be *One*, or *God* cou'd be *Man*, I ſhou'd, without more ado, Acquieſce in ſuch *Texts* as theſe, *That theſe three are one*; That *the Word was God*; And that *The Word was made Fleſh*. But, I ſuppoſe you will Allow me, That where ther is Manifeſt *Contradiction*, we muſt Turn the *Senſe* of the *Text* another way. Will you ſay, That we are Oblig'd to Believe *Contradictions*?

CHR. No. But we are to be ware, that we think not things to be *Contradictions* thro' the *Weakneſs* of our *Underſtandings*, which are not ſo in themſelves.

SOC. I grant you all that. Therefore if you can Reconcile theſe things from being plain *Contradictions*, I confeſs you will Clear the way very Conſiderably towards my Receiving the *Texts* you bring, in the Eaſy *Literal Senſe*. And likewiſe for my Joining in the *Teſtimonies* of the Ancient *Fathers* of the *Church*; with both of which (I have no Scruple to tell you) we have Trouble enough, to ſatisfy our ſelves, and Ward off the Force of the Arguments you bring againſt Us.

CHR. Therefore if I can ſay any thing towards your Satisfaction in this, it will be a good *Preparative* for what is to follow, that is, the Conſideration of the *Scripture Texts*, and the *Senſe* of *Antiquity* in the matter.

SOC. If you can do that, your Buſineſs is more than half done. And therefore I ſhall be glad to know if you have any thing to offer upon that Head. But I muſt Caution you not to Trouble me with Subjecting my *Reaſon* to *Faith*, and ſuch *Topics*, with which I have been *Teaz'd*, till I have no *Patience* left. For I muſt tell you, That I cannot *Believe* any thing, but what I think I have

All *Belief* founded upon *Reaſon*.

Reason to *Believe*. Else, I cou'd not *Believe* it: And whoever tells me, That I *must Believe*, because I *must Believe*, I will not Answer him one word more. But look upon him as *Abandon'd* from *Common Sense*, and only fit for *Bedlam*.

CHR. I readily agree with you, That we not only *ought* not, but that it is not in our *Power* to *Believe* any thing, but what we *think* we have *Reason* to *Believe*. The *Reason* we go upon may not be *Good*, that is, the *Weakness* of our *Understandings*; but still we must *Think* it *Good*, else we *cou'd* not *Believe* it: For that wou'd be to *Believe*, what we do indeed *not Believe*. Every Man has a *Reason* (such as it is) for what he *Believes*; tho' every Man cannot always *Express* it. My *Barber* told me so, may be a *Reason* with some: But they cou'd not *Believe* it, if they did not *Think* it a Good *Reason*.

Yet we know not the *Reason* of many things that we Believe.

But after all this, you will Allow me, That we may have good *Reason* to *Believe* the *Matter* of *Fact* of many things, that such things are truly so and so; of the *Causes* of which, or the *Nature* of the things themselves, we may be *Ignorant* to a Great Degree; And not able to Solve many *Difficulties* and *Objections* may Arise from the *Nature* of the things. We know not the *Nature* of any one thing under the Sun, but *à posteriore*; by Guessing at it, from the *Effects* we see it Produce. Our *Knowledge* here, is nothing but *Observation*. We see *Trees* Grow, and Produce their *Like*; so of *Beasts*, and *Men*. We find such and such *Vertues* in *Herbs* and *Minerals*, &c. But we know not the *Reason* of any one thing, no, not of a *Pile* of *Grass*, why of that *Colour*, *Shape*, or *Vertue*!

But this we Assuredly know, not only from *Observation*, but from *Reason*; That nothing can Produce its self. For that wou'd be to say, the *Cause* is not before the *Effect*: It wou'd be to suppose the same thing to be before it self: That is, to Be, and not to Be, at the same time, which is the Height of *Contradiction*. Therefore we

we are Forc'd, even from plain *Reason*, to Acknowledge a *first Cause*, which gave a *Being* to all other things, and from whom all other things have Proceeded.

But then, from the same *Reason*, we must Believe that this *First Cause* did not Produce *It Self*. For that wou'd be the same *Contradiction* as before. Neither that it was Produc'd by any other: For then *It* wou'd not be the *First* Cause. We must likewise Believe that this *First Cause* had no *Beginning*; for then It must have a *Cause*; And there must be a *Time* suppos'd wherein *It* was not. And if that were suppos'd, then *It* cou'd never *Be*, because it cou'd not Receive Its *Being* from *Its Self*, nor from any *other*. From hence we must Believe that it's *Duration* cannot be by *Succession* or *Time*; for then It must have a *Beginning*.

Now, how can we Apprehend a *Duration* without *Time*; an *Eternity* all *Present* together! A *Being* that is *Self-Existent*, neither Produc'd by *Its Self*, nor by any *other*! Yet all this hinders not our Belief of a *first Cause*, being forc'd to Confess it, by Undeniable *Reason*; tho' we cannot Solve these and a thousand more *Difficulties*, and seeming *Contradictions*, which necessarily arise from such a Supposition.

And because you cannot Solve the *Difficulties* which occurr to you in this same *Incomprehensible Nature* of *God*, as to the *Trinity* and *Incarnation*, you Reject the *Revelation* that is given of it, in the *Holy-Scriptures*, and the Current Sense of the *Catholick-Church* in the *First* and all following *Ages* of *Christianity*: And strain your Wit, to Turn and Screw these to your Purpose. Which you Confess you wou'd not otherways have done.

SOC. I make a Difference betwixt things *Incomprehensible*, and which Exceed our *Understandings*, many of which are in the *Nature* of *God*, besides those that you have Nam'd; And betwixt those Positions which are downright *Contradictions*, for these cannot be True. And

we must force all the *Texts*, and all the *Authority* in the World, rather than Admit of them. As that *God* shou'd be *Man*: Or, that *Three* shou'd make but *One*.

No *Contradiction* in the *Terms* by which we Express the Holy *Trinity*.

CHR. A *Contradiction* is only where two *Contraries* are Predicated of the *same thing*, and in the *same Respect*. For *three Men*, or *three Thousand* may make but one *Company*, or one *Army*: There is no Difficulty in this.

Now I will Grant you, That it is a *Contradiction* to say, That *Three Persons* are but *One Person*. But that *Three Persons* may be in One *Nature* is no *Contradiction*.

SOC. Come let us be Plain. Is it not a *Contradiction* that *Three Men*, shou'd be but *One Man?*

CHR. By *Man* here you mean *Person*, in which Sense it is a *Contradiction*. But it is no *Contradiction* to say, That there may be several Human *Persons*, in the same Human *Nature*. We say there is but *One* Human *Nature*. Yet we know there are many Human *Persons*.

SOC. But every *Person* that Partakes of this *one* Common *Nature*, is a Distinct *Man* from all other *Men*. And one *Man* cannot be another *Man*.

CHR. That is, one *Person* cannot be another *Person*, which is Granted. And tho' we call each *Person* a Distinct *Man*, yet, as I said, that is only with Respect to his *Personality*. For one *Man* do's not Differ from another as to his *Nature*, but only as to his *Person*. And tho' we allow this common way of speaking as to *Men*, to say, *one*, *two*, or *three Men*, &c. when it is strictly true only of their *Persons*: Yet that is not allow'd as to the *Persons* in the *Divine Nature*, to say, *one*, *two*, or *three Gods*; because it might lead Men into the Notion of *Polytheism*, to think that there were more than *one Divine Nature*. Therefore there is Reason to Guard our *Expressions* of *God*, with much more *Care* and *Strictness*, than when we speak of *Men*. But if you wou'd Allow that several *Persons* might Partake of the *one Divine*

vine Nature, as you allow they do of *one Human Nature*, our Dispute wou'd be at an end, as to the Substance of it; Tho' still we have Reason to Insist upon the *Nicety* of the *Expressions*, for the Cause told before.

SOC. This is *Nicety* and *Philosophy* indeed somewhat *In-comprehensible.*

CHR. You make that no Objection in our Contemplation of the *In-comprehensible Nature* of *God*, as in the several Instances before given. All that you Require is, That there shou'd be No *Contradiction.*

SOC. That is True. But still I think it a *Contradiction* that several *Persons* shou'd not be several *Men.* And tho' the *Divine Nature* is *Infinitly* Exalted above the *Human*; yet what is a *Contradiction* in one *Nature*, must be so in *Another.*

CHR. I have before told you in what sense several *Persons* may be Call'd several *Men*, not with Respect to their *Nature*, but only of their *Personalities*, which may Differ, but their *Nature* cannot; for it is the *Same* in *All.* So that here is no *Contradiction*, tho' it may be a *Difficulty.*

But now, as to your other *Position*, That what is a *Contradiction* in one *Nature* must be so in another, I think it will not hold.

I. No *Contradiction* can be Charg'd in any *Nature* we do not Understand.

SOC. Why? A *Contradiction* is a *Contradiction*, wherever it is.

CHR. That is True. But that may not be a *Contradiction* in one *Nature*, which is so in Another.

SOC. I do not Understand you. Explain your self.

CHR. Let me Ask you a Question. Is it not a *Contradiction* that a Man shou'd go *Two Yards* as soon as *One*?

SOC. Yes surely. For *Two Yards* are but *One Yard*, and *Another Yard.* And I cannot go *Two Yards*, till I have first gone *One.*

CHR.

CHR. Now open your Eyes, and Try if you ſee not what is at *Two Yards* diſtance from you, as ſoon as you ſee what is but *One Yard* from you? You ſee a *Star*, as ſoon as the Top of the *Chimney*.

Then go to *Thought*. Can you not *Think* of *Rome* or *Conſtantinople*, as ſoon as of the Next *Street*?

Thus you ſee that what is a *Contradiction* to *Legs*, is None to *Eyes*, nor to *Thought*. And the Reaſon of this is, the Different *Natures* of theſe things.

Again. Is it not a *Contradiction* that I ſhou'd be here Sitting with you in this *Room*, and at the ſame time ſhould be with other Company in another *Room*? This is a flat *Contradiction* to *Body*. But it is no *Contradiction* to *Soul*, which at the ſame time is Preſent in all the Diſtant *Parts* of the *Body*, according to the old ſaying, That the *Soul* is *All* in *All*, and *All* in Every *Part* of the *Body*.

Once more. Is it not a *Contradiction* that *Yeſterday* ſhou'd be to *Day*, or that to *Day* ſhou'd be to *Morrow*? For it wou'd Imply, That the ſame thing ſhoud be *Paſt* and not *Paſt*, *Preſent* and not *Preſent*, *Preſent* and yet to *Come*. But with *God* all things are *Preſent*, ther is no *Paſt* or to *Come* in *Eternity*.

Thus what is a *Contradiction* to *Body*, is not to *Soul*; and what is a *Contradiction* to *Time*, is none to *Eternity*; and what is a *Contradiction* with *Men*, is not ſo with *God*. And the Reaſon is, as I have ſaid, the Different *Natures* of theſe things; and that from a *Contradiction* in the *One*, we cannot Infer a *Contradiction* in the *Other*.

From hence I may Conclude, That tho' it were a *Contradiction* in *Human Nature*, for ſeveral *Perſons* to Partake of the ſame *Nature*, and not to be ſeveral *Men*, that is, ſeveral *Natures*, as well as *Perſons*. Yet it will not follow, That it is ſo in the *Divine Nature*. Which is *Infinitly* more *Diſtant* and *Diverſe* from *Our Nature*, than the *Motion* of *Sight* or *Thought* is from that of

our

our *Leggs*; than *Body* is from *Spirit*, or *Time* from *Eternity*. And if it be Impossible for all the *Philosophy* and *Description* in the World, to Give to a Man that is Born *Blind*, any *Idea* whatsoever of the *Nature* of *Sight*, or of its *Motion*; or to Reconcile its Going *two* yards as soon as *one* from downright *Contradiction*; For he cannot but Compare it with that *Motion* which he only knows, of *Leggs* or *Arms*: Or, if we cou'd Suppose a Man without *Thought*, it were Utterly Impossible to Reconcile to him the *Progress* of *Thought*, from the most Palpable *Contradictions*: How then shou'd We Object *Contradictions* in the *In-comprehensible Nature* of *God*, from Comparing *it* with our *Frail* State of *Flesh* and *Blood!* Therefore I think we may safely Depend upon this as a Standing Conclusion; That we cannot charge that as a *Contradiction* in one *Nature*, because we find it so in another, unless we *Understand* Both *Natures* perfectly Well. And the *Divine Nature* being Allow'd on all hands, to be *In-comprehensible*, Consequently we cannot Charge any thing as a *Contradiction* in it, because we find it so in our Frail *Nature*.

And we find it thus in many other things. It is common to say, This is *Impossible*, it is a *Contradiction*. But being Explain'd to us, we say, now it is *Easy*, I did not *Understand* it before, I took it quite *Wrong*. Therefor we must *Understand* things first before we charge *Contradictions* in them. It is our *Ignorance* often which makes the *Contradiction*. As of the *Blind* Man Judging of *Colours*, or of the *Nature Sight*, and Comparing it with his *Walking*:

II. Of the word *Person* as Apply'd to *God*.

SOC. It is Easy to Apprehend the Difference between *Walking*, *Seeing*, and *Thinking*. The very *Words* do Express it. And it wou'd be Improper to Confound the *Words*, to Call *Walking*, *Seeing*; or *Seeing*, *Walking*, &c. Therefore, tho' Doubtless ther are many things in the *Divine Nature*, which Infinitely Exceed our Understanding; yet, for that Reason, we ought not to Apply to *God* those *Terms* which are Proper only to our selves;

as the Word *Person*, to say there are three *Persons* in the *Godhead*. This raises the *Contradiction* we speak of: Because we cannot Comprehend how *Three Persons* can be *One*, in our *Nature*.

CHR. I told you before, That we do not make three *Persons* to be one *Person*, but one *Nature*. And tho' the *Motion* of the *Feet* is called *Walking*, of the *Eye* is call'd *Seeing*, and of the *Mind* is Call'd *Thinking*: Yet to a Man Born *Blind*, the Word *Seeing* is altogether *Un-intelligible*. He knows Nothing at all of it. And you cannot give him any *Idea* of *Light*, or *Colour*, but he must Apprehend it as something that may be *Felt*, *Heard*, *Smell'd*, or *Tasted*. For he Cannot *Conceive* but according to the *Senses* that he has. Now if ther were *Words* which Cou'd Express the *Nature* of *God* Properly, or as He is known to the *Angels* of *Heaven*, they wou'd be as *Un-intelligible* to Us, as the Word *Seeing* is to one Born *Blind*. The *Apostle* said, That when he was *Caught up into PARADISE, he heard UNSPEAKABLE Words, which it is not Possible for a Man to Utter:* And if they were *Utter'd*, it wou'd be *Impossible* for Us to *Understand* them.

2 Cor. xii. 4.

SOC. I can Readily allow, that we must speak of *God*, in *Words* not *Strictly* and *Properly* adapted to Him, but Borrow'd from *Terms* we Use among our selves. As when we call God *Father*, we mean that we have our *Being* from Him; but not in that Manner as a *Son* is *Begotten* by his *Father* among *Men*.

CHR. And thus we understand the word *Person*. As when *Christ* is call'd *The Express Image of His* (God's) *Person*. We mean something of a quite Different Kind from the *Person* of a *Man* upon *Earth*. But it is a *Word* we must Use, like the word *Father*, because we have no other *Word* to Express it by.

Heb. 1. 3.

And we find what we call *Personal* Actions, attributed to the *Father*, to the *Son*, and to the *Holy Spirit*; as the *One* to *Send*, the *Other* to be *Sent*. The

One

One to *Proceed* from the *Other*. The *One* to *Beget*, the *other* to be *Begotten* of Him. The *One* to take *Flesh* and not the *other*, &c. Therefore we call these *Persons*, because we find *Personal* Actions attributed to them. And I cannot see but you have full as much Reason to Quarrel with the word *Father*, as the word *Person*; they are both *Scripture-Words*. Therefore keep the word *Person*, till you can find another word more *Proper*, Still Remembring that these are words only *ad Captum*, in Condescention to our *Capacities*, and therfore not to be taken *Strictly* and *Properly* as to *God*. And from a seeming *Contradiction* that may Appear in these things, as they Relate to *Men*, we must not Infer a *Contradiction* in *God*, to whom these *words* are but *Improperly* Apply'd. And whose *Nature* we do not understand. And therefore, as I said before, we cannot Charge a *Contradiction* in Him, from what we find so in other *Natures* which we do understand. For we connot Infer from the *One* to the *Other*, unless we understand Both: as in the Instances before given of the Motion of *Leggs*, *Sight*, and *Thought*, of *Body* and *Soul*, of *Time* and *Eternity*

SOC. But is it not a *Contradiction* that the *Son* shou'd be as *Old* as the *Father*. As you say of the *Persons* in the *Trinity*. For must not the *Cause* be before the *Effect*?

III Of the Son being as Old as the Father.

CHR. This is still Measuring from one *Nature* to another, when the One we *Understand* not, and can speak of it only by *Allusion* to the Other. Therefore I may fairly Deny your *Consequence*, and shew that you Argue from a wrong *Topic*. That because it is a *Contradiction* betwixt *Father* and *Son* among *Men*, it will not follow that it is so in *God*.

But in this, I can give you a Plain *Answer*, even from *Created* Natures, which are before Us. For tho' the *Cause* must be before the *Effect* in *Nature*, yet not always in *Time*. Nay Never in *Time*, in all *Necessary Effects*. For where the *Effect* is *Necessary* to the *Cause*, the *Cause* cannot be without it; and therefore the *Effect* must be as

Of *Light* and *Heat* in the *Sun*.

Early in Time as the *Cause*. Thus *Light* and *Heat* are *Necessary Effects* of the *Sun*; therefore they must be as *Early* in *Time* as the *Sun*. And if the *Sun* were *Eternal*, *Light* and *Heat* wou'd be as *Eternal*. And yet they both *Proceed* from the *Sun*. And the *Sun* is Before them in *Nature*, because they *Proceed* from it; But not Before them in *Time*, because they are *Necessary* Effects, and the *Sun* cannot be without them.

Now it is not *Necessary* for a *Man* to be a *Father*. Else Every *Man* must be a *Father*. But if a *Man* cou'd not be a *Man* without being a *Father*, then he must be a *Father* as soon as he was a *Man*. And consequently, the *Son* must be as *Old* in *Time* as the *Father*, tho' in the Order of *Nature*, he wou'd come Behind him, as Proceeding from him, and as the *Effect* follows the *Cause*. Therefore tho' it Cannot be in *Human* Nature; that the *Son* shou'd be as *Old* as his *Father*, yet it may be in the *Divine* Nature.

SOC. That is, if the *Production* in the *Divine* Nature be *Necessary*.

CHR. As no doubt it is. For the *first Cause* must be a *Necessary* Being. And ther can be no *Accidents* in Him. He is incapable either of *Addition* or *Diminution*; for either wou'd Argue *Imperfection*.

IV. Of the *Production* in *Spirits*.

SOC. But *God* is a *Spirit*. Is there *Production* or *Generation* in *Spirits*? Do they *Beget* their *Like*, as *Men* do? Or must *two SPIRITS* Join for the *Production* of a *third*? Or can *SPIRITS Beget* of *Themselves*?

CHR. This is still *Bewildring* your Self with the Comparison of a *Nature* you do not *Understand*, and Measuring it with a *Nature* you do *Understand*, and Inferring from the *one* to the *other*, which will by no means Hold.

I. Of the *Faculties* in the *Soul*.

But in the Case you put, there is some *Light* given to us in the Contemplation of our own *Soul*, which is that *Image* of *God*, wherein He made *Man*. In our *Soul* we find ther is a *Faculty* of *Understanding* a thing, that is, *Apprehending*, or as it were, *Seeing* of it. And this Resembles *Creation*, or bringing things into *Being*, as to Us.

Us. For what we *Understand* not, is to Us, as if it were not.

Then when we *Understand* a thing, and are thus in *Possession* of it, we find that our *Soul* has Another *Faculty* of *Remembring* it, that is, *Preserving* its *Being*, as to Us. For without this, our *Understanding* of any thing wou'd last no longer than the *Impression* of a *Seal* upon *Water*. And when the *Thought* was Past, it wou'd be *gone* for *Ever*, and we cou'd never *Recover* it. By which means we cou'd have but one *Thought* at a time. But we cou'd not Compare *Thaughts* and *Things*, and *Inferr* or draw *Consequences* from *One* to *Another*. Which we Call *Reasoning*. Which therefore is Attributed Chiefly to this *Faculty* of the *Soul*. So that a Man of sound *Memory*, which is the Form in *Wills*, means the same in the *Construction* of *Law*, as a Man of sound *Judgment*.

This Resembles the Λόγος or *Word* of *God*. Which *Just Martyr* in his *Apol.* Calls the *Reason* of *God*. For the word Λόγος signifies *Reason*, and so is used, *Luk.* xvi. 2. *Rom.* iii. 28. xii. 1. ii. *Pet.* ii. 12 *Matth.* xvi. 7, 8. *Luk.* v. 21. and several other Places of *Holy Scripture*. And indeed *Reason*, which is the *Reflection* of the *Mind*, is properly call'd the *Word* of the *Mind*, as near as an *Allusion* can be made from *Body* to *Soul*. For *Words* do outwardly Express the *Reasoning* that is inwardly in the *Thoughts*; And the *Reflection* of the *Mind*, is speaking *Words* to its self. Every *Reflex-Act* is a *Colloquie*.

When things are thus as it were *Created* to Us by the *Understanding*, and *Preserv'd* by the *Memory*, that we may *Reason* and *Reflect* upon them, then they Appear either *Agreeable* or *Dis-agreeable* to Us. We Contract either a *Liking* or *Distast* to them; That is, We *Love* or *Hate* them. And this is the *Operation* of a Distinct *Faculty* of the *Mind*, which is call'd the *Will*; and is the *Seat* of *Happiness* or *Misery*. To *Enjoy* what we *Love*, is *Pleasure* and *Happiness*; And to be *Join'd* to what

what we *Hate*, is *Misery* and *Affliction*. Ther are several things which we *Know*, and which we *Remember*; But they are *Indifferent* to us, we neither *Love* nor *Hate* them; and therefore they afford us neither *Pleasure* nor *Trouble*. These *Passions*, are *Seated* in the *Will*; and come not, till the *Will* has Exerted an Act either of *Love*, or *Aversion*. Thence arise *Love*, *Fear*, *Joy*, *Grief*, *Hope*, *Despair*, and all the *Passions*. The *Will* is the *Seat* of all the *Passions*.

This is a Resemblance of the *third Person* in the *Holy Trinity*, who is therefore call'd the *Spirit* of *Love*, and the *Comforter*.

Now of these three *Faculties* of the *Soul*, the *Understanding* may well be call'd the *FATHER Faculty*. And the *Memory* may be said to be *Begotten* by it. For we cou'd not *Remember* what we did not first *Know*. And the *Will* Results or Proceeds from both of these. For we cannot *Love* or *Hate* what we do not both *Know* and *Remember*.

But in how many things shou'd we *Err* and be *Mistaken*, if we shou'd think to Draw an Exact *Parallel* betwixt this *Generation* in the *Faculties* of the *Soul*, and the *Generation* of *Bodies*? In that of *Bodies*, it is a *Contradiction* the *Father* shou'd not be *Prior* in *Time* to the *Son*. In that of the *Soul*, it is a *Contradiction* the *Son* shou'd not be as *Old* as the *Father*, because the *Soul* cannot be without the three *Faculties*. They are of the *Constitution* of the *Soul*: And it cou'd not be a *Soul* without them. Therefore each of them must be as *Old* as the other, and all as *Old* as the *Soul*.

SOC. That is, because the words *Father* and *Son* are not *Strictly* and *Properly* belonging to the *Faculties* of the *Soul*, only by way of *Allusion* to the *Generation* of *Bodies*. Therefore what is a *Contradiction* in the *one*, is none in the *other*.

CHR.

CHR. How *Readily* you can give this *Answer* in the *Parallel* 'twixt *Body* and *Soul*? And yet how do you *stick* to give the same *Allowance* in the *Parallel* betwixt Mortal *Man* and the *Infinit Being*? But you will find that to be a *Contradiction* in the *one*, because you find it to be so in the other!

SOC. I grant ther must be a vast *Difference* betwixt the *Production* ther is in *Bodies*, and that in *Spirits*. They are not of the same *Kind*. But methinks ther shou'd be an Exact *Parallel* in the *Production* of *Spirits*; For tho' ther is *Higher* and *Lower* among them, yet they are all *Spirits*, and so of the same *Kind*. Now see if you can find an Exact *Parallel* betwixt the *Faculties* of the *Soul*, and the *Persons* of the *Godhead*. And I will be Content.

CHR. Think you not, That ther is *Infinitely* greater *Difference* and *Disproportion*, even in *Kind*, betwixt the *Soul* of *Man* and the *Eternal Incomprehensible Almighty*, than ther is betwixt the *Body* and *Soul* of *Man*! So that you Ask of me what I will no ways Undertake.

Only I still Insist, that from a *Contradiction* in the *one*, if you cou'd find it, you cou'd not Inferr a *Contradiction* in the *other*, because you understand not *Both* the *Natures* you speak of. And what is spoken of the *One*, is by way of *Allusion* only to the *Other*.

In the next Place, the *Contradictions* you Allege are all by way of *Parallel* 'twixt *God*, and the *Bodily Persons* of *Men* upon *Earth*. And since you have Granted me, that a *Contradiction* will not lie in the *Parallel* betwixt the *Body* and *Soul* of *Man*; I can much more strongly Argue, that it will not lie in the *Parallel* betwixt the *Body* of *Man* and *God*, so as that a *Contradiction* in the *one* shou'd Inferr a *Contradiction* in the other.

But still I will go as far along with you as I can. And having Enter'd my *Protest*, that I put nothing of the *Merits* of the *Cause* upon it, I will go on to shew

you

you what is no *Contradiction* in the *Faulties* of the *Soul*.

It is no *Contradiction*, That these three *Faculties* shou'd be One *Soul*. And the *Soul* nothing else, that we can tell, but these three *Faculties*. That these three *Faculties* shou'd be all *Coeval* as to *Time*, and yet one *Before* the other in Order of *Nature*, as *Proceeding* the *one* from the *other*. That they are perfectly *Distinct* the one from the other, having Different *Objects*, and Different *Manners* of *Operation*. The *Understanding* being Conversant about what is *Present*, the *Memory* about what is *Past*, and the *Will* about *Love* and *Hate*. Yet that they all Act in *Concert*, and no one of them can *Act* without the other. For as the *Memory* cannot Act but upon a Previous Act of the *Understanding*, and the *Will* upon the Act both of the *Understanding* and the *Memory*, so even the *Understanding* do's not Act, nor the *Memory*, without a Concurrent Act of the *Will* which Consents to it. So that tho' they Act *Distinctly* yet not *Separately*. And the *Soul* is not *Divided* or *Multiply'd* among them, but the whole *Soul* Acts in *Each* and *All* of them

2. Of the Difference 'twixt *Faculties* and *Persons*.

SOC. And now you think you have Solv'd all our Objections as to the *Trinity*, of three being *one*, and *one*, *three*. And of their being *Co-eternal*, tho' *one* Proceeding from the *other*. But your *Parallel* will not hold betwixt *Faculties* and *Persons*.

CHR. I pretend not to *Prove* any thing by *Parallels*; They are but *Illustrations*. Nor do I think there can be any Exact *Parallel* betwixt *God* and any *Creature*. But if the *Objections* you bring may be Solv'd by what we can observe in *Created Natures*, it shews your *Unreasonableness* to Insist upon such *Difficulties* against what is *Reveal'd* of the *In-comprehensible* Being. Therefore let me hear what use you make of the Difference betwixt *Faculties* and Persons in the *Persons* Case?

SOC.

SOC. You know the Difference betwixt *Substance*, and *Subsistence*. It is the Latter only makes a *Person*. And we give not different *Subsistences* to the *Faculties* of the Soul. Therefore they are not different *Persons*. And we say, that three *Persons* or *Subsistences* cannot be one *Person*.

CHR. And so say we too. We say that three *Persons* are always three *Persons*, tho' they may be one *Nature*. But let me ask you, can three *Substances* be one *Substance*, or three *Faculties* one *Faculty*, more than three *Subsistences* or *Persons* can be one *Person?* If not, then your *Distinction* is of no use in the present *Case*. For the Difficulty of three being *one*, and *one* three, lies as much in the one Case as in the other, and all you can say from this *Puzling* piece of *Philosophy* signifies nothing. For whatever other uses may be made of it, it cannot help you in this Case, since one *Substance* can no more be Another *Substance*, nor one *Faculty* be another *Faculty*, than one *Person* can be another *Person*.

SOC. But why do you not say three *Faculties* instead of three *Persons* in *God*? And then we shou'd not so much Quarrel with you.

Why we say *Persons*, and not *Faculties* in *God*.

CHR. Because we must not Alter the Phrase of *Scripture*, which calls *Christ* the *Express Image of His* (Father's) *Person*. Heb. 1. 3. χαρακτὴρ τῆς Ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ the *Image* of His *Subsistence* or *Personality*.

For a *Son*, being a Distinct *Person*, is the *Image* of his Father's *Person*, but not of his *Nature*: Because the *Son* partakes of the same *Nature*, in as full and ample Manner as his *Father*, and is as much and truly a *Man*, having the same *Human Nature* with his *Father*: In which he is *Equal* to his *Father*; But *Inferior* as to his *Person*, The *Relation* and *Subordination* between them, is only upon a *Personal* account. As it is among the *Persons* of the *Holy Trinity*. Tho' all *Equal* in *Nature*, which is but *One*. For if we say ther is not more than *One* Human *Nature*, we cannot say ther is more than *one* Divine *Nature*, tho' several *Persons* partake of it.

Again, a *Person* being the most *Compleat* and *Perfect Substance*, as *Subsisting* by its self, and not in Another (like *Faculties* or *Qualities*) must be given to *God*. Ther are no *Accidents*, *Faculties*, or *Qualities* in *Him*. But every thing in *Him* is *Himself*. And the *Faculties* of the *Soul* are but a *Resemblance* of the *Persons* of *God*.

4. Of the Difference betwixt *Faculties* and *Passions*.

SOC. How come you to make but three *Faculties* in the *Soul?* You may make three hundred if you will. Why do not you make every *Passion* a Distinct *Faculty?* And so of the *Attributes* of *God*, you may make them all *Persons*. One of *Wisdom*, Another of *Justice*, Another of *Mercy*, Another of *Power*, and so forth.

CHR. The *Faculties* are the *Powers* of the *Soul* it self, and of perpetual *Necessity* to its *Constitution*. So that without these the *Soul* wou'd not be a *Soul*. Therefore they are always in the *Soul*. Not so of the *Passions*. They go and come. A Man is not always in *Joy*, *Grief*, *Fear*, *Anger*, &c. But he always has an *Understanding*, a *Memory*, and a *Will*, And it is as these are Conversant about any *Object*, that the *Passions* arise. The *Faculties* are the *Constitution*, the *Passions* the *Complexion* of the *Soul*. The *Complexion* often *Changes*. But when the *Constitution* is Broke, it is *Death*. And the *Complexion* arises from the *Constitution*. Not the *Constitution* from the *Complexion*.

Now tho' the *Passions* are *Many* and *Various*, yet the *Faculties* are but three, and they can be neither *more* nor *Less*.

5. Of *Extension* and the *Dimensions*.

The Difference 'twixt these is like that of *Colour* and *Dimension* in a *Body*. The *Colours* are *many* and *various*; The *Dimensions* are but three, and can be neither *more* nor *less*. That is, *Length*, *Breadth*, and *Thickness*. These must be in every *Extension*. They are of the *Nature* of *Extension*, and therefore *Inseparable* from it. And tho' these three make one *Extension*; yet they are perfectly *Distinguish'd*, tho' never *Separated* from one another.

Length

Length is not *Breadth*, and neither of them is *Thickness*. Yet no *One* of these can be without the other *Two*. They are *Distinctly* Three, yet *Intirely* but *One*. They all make up but *one* and the self same *Extension*.

The *Colours* Change according to every *Variation* of the *Light*. But the *Dimensions* are still the *same*, and still *Necessary* to the *Body*. Which Alters not in its *Nature*, from the *Change* of *Colours* in it. But wou'd Cease to be a *Body*, if it were Possible it cou'd want any of the three *Dimensions*; For then it wou'd be no longer an *Extension*, that is, no more a *Body*.

Thus we say of the *Soul*: It cou'd not be a *Soul*, if it wanted any of the three *Faculties*, for they are of its *Nature*. But the *Passions* may *Go* and *Come*, without any Alteration in the *Nature* of the *Soul*. The *Passions* suppose the *Faculties*, for the *Passions* are an *Operation* of the *Faculties*. But the *Faculties* suppose no more than that we are *Capable* of the *Passions*, not that they are always *Necessary* to Us; for sometimes we are without *Any*.

And our Blessed Saviour in the Parable of the *Sower*, describing the several ways by which the *Seed* becomes Unfruitful, Ranges them into *Three*, according to the three *Faculties* of the *Soul*, but not after the *Passions* which are many. The *first* was of those who *Understand* not; the *second* was of those who *Retain* or *Remember* not; and the *third* was of those whose *Wills* or *Affections* were Corrupted, through the *Cares* and *Pleasures* of this Life.

Now this *Allusion* 'twixt the *Body* and the *Mind*, 'twixt *Colours* and *Dimensions* in the *Body*, and the *Faculties* and *Passions* in the *Soul*, will not Come up nor Answer exactly in every thing, because of the vast *Difference* ther is in the *Natures* of *Body* and *Spirit*, and the Different Manner of their *Operations*. But tho' they *fail* in *some* things, yet they *Answer* in *others*, and serve

6. Apply'd to the *Persons* and *Attributes* of *God*.

for *Illustration*. And so much the more, because, while we are in the *Body*, we conceive of *Spiritual* things, even of our own *Soul*, in some sort, after the manner of *Body*. And if our own *Soul*, by which we *Move* and *Act* and *Think*, is so Hidden from us, that we cannot Conceive Rightly of it: How much more must the *Infinit* and *In-comprehensible Nature* be Remov'd far above our poor *Under-standing*! Seeing we cannot Conceive any thing of it, but by *Allusion* to what we *Understand* here of *our selves*, and other *Creatures* that are before us. Therefore such *Allusions* are given to us, and *God* speaks to us of *Himself* after the manner of *Men*, because we cou'd not otherwise *Understand* any thing at all of *Him*. Thus *God* ascribes *Passions* to Himself, as *Joy*, *Anger*, *Grief*, *Repentance*, &c. And we Describe Him by what we Call His *Attributes*, as *Power*, *Wisdom*, *Goodness*, *Justice*, &c. And these we Conceive to Flow from His *Nature*. Tho' at the same time our *Reason* tells us, that ther can be no *Accidents* in *God*, nor any *Change* in *Him*. And therefore that whatever is in *God*, is *God*: But by the three *Persons* in the *Godhead*, we mean the *Divine NATURE*, which Consists of the three *Persons*, as the *Soul* do's of the three *Faculties*, and *Extension* of the three *Dimensions*, without any *Confusion* of the *Faculties*, or *Dimensions*; or *Division* of the *Soul*, or of the *Extension*. As we say the three *Persons* are *God*, neither *Confounding* the *Persons*, nor *Dividing* the *Substance*. But what we call the *Attributes* of *God*, are the Different Manners of our Apprehension of the *Actions* of *God*, and so are *many* and *various*. As *Passions* are in *Man*, and *Colours* in *Bodies*. But *Colours* do not make the *Body* in which they are, tho' they suppose it. And *Passions* do not make the *Soul*, tho' they are in it. But the *Faculties* are the *Soul*, and the *Dimensions* are the *Extension*. Thus we say, the *Persons* in the *Godhead*, are *God*, but we Conceive of the *Attributes* of *God*, after the manner of *Passions* in the *Soul*.

Tho'

Tho' we know, at the same time, that the *Allusion* do's not, cannot *Answer*. But we cannot Conceive otherwise of *God*. And thus it is when we use the words, *Father*, *Son*, *Spirit*, *Person*, in Relation to *God*, we must not suppose them to *Quadrat* and *Answer* exactly to these *Words* as us'd among *Men*. They are only *Allusions*, but they are *Necessary*, because we cannot otherwise speak of *God* at all.

Hence appears the unreasonableness of Inferring a *Contradiction* in the *Nature* of *God*, from what we find to be so in the *Nature* of *Man*, and in these *words* as Apply'd to *Man*. Which is the *Topick* I have Insisted upon from the Beginning. And I have Illustrated it by the Comparison of those Ir-reconcilable *Contradictions* which must Appear to a Man Born *Blind*, in any *Description* possible to be given him of the *Nature*, *Motion*, and *Progress* of *Sight*. And you connot Help him with any *Allusion* or *Image* of it, in any thing that he *Understands*. He can Apprehend nothing *Like* it, in any manner whatsoever, tho' at never so great a *Distance*. It cannot be said he has a *wrong* or *imperfect Notion* of it, for he has not, nor can have any *Notion* of it at all, not the least *Glimps*. Whereas on the other hand, as to the present *Subject* we are upon, and to which I apply this; tho' it be impossible for any *Creature* to have a *Full* and *Compleat APPREHENSION* of the *Infinit Nature*; yet ther are such *Allusions* and *Similitudes* given us of it, Chiefly in the *Soul* of *Man*, which is said to be made after His *Image*, as Enables us to have some sort of *Idea* and *Apprehension* of it, tho' we must still suppose at *Infinit Distance*, and that we *Presume* not to draw *Inferences* from the *one* to the *other*, from *Man* to *God*. And even as to that *Ineffable Mystery* of the *Holy Trinity*, ther is no obscure *Resemblance* of it given us in the *Frame* of our own *Soul*, Consisting of three distinct *Faculties*, as I have before explain'd it. And even in the three *Dimensions* which

These Conclusive to the Argument.

which make up every *Extension*, so far as *Body* is *Capable* of such a *Resemblance*. At least it solves the *Contradictions* you Alledge as to the H. *Trinity*, when we see how *Three* may be *One*, even in *Bodies*. Nay that *One* must be *Three*. For *Extension* cou'd not be *Extension*, if it were not three *Dimensions*. As the *Soul* cou'd not be a *Soul*, if it were not *Understanding*, *Memory* and *Will*: so that the *Multiplicity* makes the *Unity*. Tho' as I have said, if these were *Contradictions* in *Body*, or in our *Soul*, it wou'd not follow it was so in *God*, because of the *Infinite Desparity* of the *Natures*.

3. *Allusions* from *Body* to *Soul* Necessary. Yet many *Contradictions* in them

I have said likewise, That we cannot Apprehend the *Nature* of a *Spirit*, even of our own *Soul*, but by *Allusion* to *Body*, to something *Material*. Hence some have Contended that our *Soul* is *Matter*, that is, a *Body*. Nay, that *God* Himself is so. That ther is nothing but *Matter*. And yet we find many *Contradictions* in this *Allusion*. As what I mention'd before of the *Presence* of a *Body* which is so *Circumscrib'd*, that it Cannot be in *two Places* at *once*. And yet how *One* and the same *Soul* can *Actuat* all the Distant *Members* of the *Body*, without being either *Multiply'd* or *Divided* among them, is what we can find no *Resemblance* of in *Bodies*. And yet we cannot frame a *Conception* of a *Soul*, without *Allusion* to something *Material*. And yet all this Notwithstanding, we Charge not this as a *Contradiction* in *Soul*, because we find it so in *Body*. Tho all our *Notices* of the *Soul* comes from the *Body*.

Apply'd to our Present *Subject*.

Now to Apply. The Imperfect *Notices* we have of the *Nature* of *God* come from His Works of *Creation* which we have seen. Yet in none of these do we find any *Resemblance* to His *Eternity*, *Self-existence*, and *Omni-Presence*, &c. Nay, they wou'd be flat *Contradictions*, if Apply'd to any *Creature*. Yet we Call them not *Contradictions* in *God*. How then can we call *Three* and *One* a *Contradiction* in *God*, tho' we found it so in all

Crea-

Creatures? But when we find it not to be a *Contradiction*, both in the *Nature* of *Body*, and of *Soul*, will we still make it a *Contradiction* in *God*, whose *Nature* we *Understand* not? And for this only Cause, Reject the Plain *Revelations* that are Given to us of it?

10. We must think of *Three* in every *Spirit*.

But pray, let me Ask you what *Notion* have you of any *Spirit*, of an *Angel*? Can you Apprehend an *Angel*, without an *Understanding*, a *Memory* and a *Will*? Can you think otherwise of *God* the *Father* of *Spirits*, and who made them after His own *Image*? Ther cannot be a *Thought* without these *Three*. For every *Thought* is the *Act* of these *Three*. We have no nearer an *Idea* of *God* than an *Omnipotent Mind*. And whose *Thoughts* are *Omnipotent*. Therefore *God* must be these *Three*. And these *Three* are *God*. Our *Notion* of His *Attributes* are the *Acts* of these *Three*, in *Mercy*, *Wisdom*, *Power*, *Truth*, *Justice*, &c. And since ther is no *Accident* in *God*, but every thing that is in Him must be of His *Essence*, consequently these *Three* are of the *Essence* of *God*. And *Each* of them is *God*, and all *Three* the same *God*. So that instead of this being a *Contradiction*, it wou'd rather be a *Contradiction* if it were not so. That is, That ther cou'd be a *Thought* without what is of the *Essence* of a *Thought*, that it shou'd proceed from *Three* Jointly, from an *Understanding*, a *Memory*, and a *Will*, each *Distinct* from the other, yet all *Three*, one and the same *Mind*. So that if we think of *God*, after the *Image* He has made of *Himself* (and we can think of Him no otherwise) we must think of a *Trinity* in *Unity*.

At least, I hope, what I have said is sufficient to take away all Pretence of *Contradiction* in the Case, so as to hinder us to believe the *Revelation GOD* has given Us of it.

SOC.

V. If the *Divinity* were a *Contradiction*, that wou'd prove it not to be of *Human* Invention.

SOC. Whether *God* has given us any *Revelation* of it, is the Grand *Question*, which must be Determin'd when we come to Examin those *Texts* of *Scripture* which are Alleg'd for it. But we insist it is a *Contradiction*, and therefore that these *Texts* must not be understood in that Sense.

CHR. If it be not a *Revelation*, it must be an *Invention* of some or other. But if it be a *Contradiction*, it cou'd not be an *Invention*. For who cou'd *Invent* a *Contradiction*? Or if he *Cou'd*, who *Wou'd* do it, with a Design to have it pass upon the World, and to be *Receiv'd* among *Mankind*? When Men have a Mind to *Impose* upon others, they Contrive their *Story* as *Plausible* as possibly they can; so be free, not only from *Contradiction*, but *Objection*.

In the next place, what do's any Man *Get* by it? What *End* cou'd it serve to set up such a *Notion* in the World? Men generally have some Prospect of *Advantage* when they wou'd *Impose* upon others.

I. The *Objection* as to *Transsubstantiation* Solv'd.

SOC. Who Invented *Transsubstantiation*? Which you as well as we think a *Contradiction*, that one and the same *Body* shou'd be in many *Places*, at the same *Time*.

CHR. It was not purely an *Invention*. For I believe that cou'd never have come into the Head of a Man of it self. It was but *Grafting* upon some very high Expressions in the *Fathers*, concerning the great *Mystery* in the Holy *Sacrament*, which they *mistook*, and thence were led to take the words, *This is my Body*, strictly according to the *Letter*. Whereas they were plainly *Figurative*, and ther are several other *Figures* in the *Words* of *Institution* of the Holy *Sacrament*, which they cannot Deny, as where the *Cup* is put for the *Wine*. Which is the *Figure* we call *Continens pro Contento*, where the thing that *Contains* is put for what is *Contain'd* in it. And again the *Present* is us'd for the *Future*. Luk. xxii 20 *This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood, which is shed for you.*

Whereas

Whereas this was ſpoke before His *Blood* was *Shed.* There *IS* is put for *SHALL BE*, which is another *Figure* of *Speech.* Then this *Cup* is the *New Teſtament*, another plain *Figure.* Men may Run themſelves into *Contradictions*, in Purſuit of an *Argument*, but none can *Invent* a *Contradiction.*

SOC. This is the ſame we ſay of you. That the *Contradictions* you Run into ariſe from your miſtake of thoſe *Texts* which you Allege for the *Trinity*, which we ſay you take too *Literally.*

CHR. But you cannot ſhew the *Figure.* They are no *Figurative* Expreſſions. This we ſhall ſee plainly when we come to them; So that if ther be a *Contradiction*, it muſt be in the *Words*, not what we *Infer* from them.

Secondly, We put no *New* Conſtruction upon them, but the ſame that was Taught in the whole *Chriſtian Church* from the Beginning, which likewiſe I ſhall ſhew you. Whereas, in the Caſe of *Tran-ſubſtantiation*, we ſhew the *Novel* Conſtruction they have put upon the *Words*, contrary to the Senſe of all *Antiquity.* This is *Un-anſwerably* done in Biſhop *Coſins* his *Hiſtory of Tran-ſubſtantiation.*

Thirdly, Ther is no *Temptation* in the World to ſet up the *Doctrin* of the *Trinity.* But ther was very *Great* in that of *Tran-ſubſtantiation*, of *Reverence*, and even *Adoration* to the *Prieſthood*, to think that *four words* Pronounc'd by a *Prieſt* ſhou'd make *God*!

But *Fourthly*, ther are *Contradictions* in *Tran-ſubſtantiation*, which cannot be Alledg'd in the *Doctrin* of the *Trinity*: For Example, That I ſhou'd *Diſ-believe* my *Senſes*, upon the Credit of a *Revelation* made to my *Senſes.* Which is to *Believe*, and not to *Believe* my *Senſes*, at the ſame time: If I *Believe* the *Revelation*, I muſt *Diſ-believe* my *Senſes.* And yet unleſs I *Believe* my *Senſes*, I cannot *Believe* the *Revelation.* They who were

 preſent

present at the *Institution* must *Believe* their *Senses*, that it was *Christ* who spoke to them, and that they *Heard* such *Words*: Yet they must not *Believe* their *Senses*, that it was *Bread* and *Wine* which they *Saw*, and *Tasted*; But that they *Eat* and *Swallow'd* the very *Person* whom they *Saw* sit *Whole* and *Entire* before them, and who was then *Discoursing* with them!

SOC. And do's not the Doctrin of the *Trinity* Contradict our *Senses* as much as all this?

CHR. No. Not at all: It *Contradicts* none of our outward *Senses*. Pray, which of them do's it Contradict? Is it our *Seeing*, *Taste*, or *Smell*?

SOC. None of these can Reach to it.

CHR. No. Nor to our *Soul*. They can neither *Touch*, *See*, nor *Smell* it. A *Spirit* is not the *Object* of outward *Sense*. Therefore no *Contradiction* to it. It is *Above* it, and of another *Kind*. But an outward *Revelation* is an *Appeal* to our outward *Senses*. And without the *Truth* of our *Senses* suppos'd, we cou'd Believe neither *Revelation* nor *Miracle* Exhibited to our *Senses*. And no *Miracle* that ever *God* wrought, or *Revelation* that He gave, did *Contradict* any one of our *Senses*, much less *All* together. For, as I said, it wou'd be a Perfect *Contradiction* to our *Believing* them.

And as you *Socinians* make use of this of *Tran-substantiation*, to shew that *Christians* Believe *Contradictions*; And Compare those you suppose in the *Trinity* with this: So the *Church* of *Rome* Insists mainly upon this against Us, why we shou'd make such Difficulty in Believing *Tran-substantiation*, since we Believe the *Trinity*, which *They* and *You* say, Implys as many *Contradictions* as the *Other*.

2. No Allusion or Parallel in Nature to Tran substantiation.

And I will Add this to what I have said, That ther is not any thing in *Nature*, which bears the least *Resemblance* or *Likeness* to *Tran-substatiation*, that we might be able to frame any sort of *Notion* of it. Whereas *God* has

has given us several *Allusions* and *Images* of His Holy *Trinity*, in as near Proportion as *Finit* can Bear to *Infinit*, chiefly in the Frame of our own *Soul*; Whereby, tho' we cannot come to a Clear and Full *Perception* of His *Nature*, for that is *Impossible*: Yet we see so much of Him in the *Glass* of His *Creatures*, as to give us some *Idea* of Him; and to solve what is *Reveal'd* to us of Him, from being *Contradictions*, by Comparing it with the *Likeness*, tho' *Faint*, that is found of it in *Creatures*. But *Tran-substantiation* is the very *Reverse* to *Nature*; and all *Natural things*. Not only *Above* them, but stands in Direct *Opposition* to them, and leaves nothing *Certain*, no not our *Senses*. And what then can be *Like* to it?

The *Lutherans* Endeavour to get Clear of this, who take the *Words* of *Institution*, *This is my Body*, as *Literally* as the *Church* of *Rome* do's. But they Deny not the *Certainty* of our *Senses*, and own that it is True and Real *Bread* and *Wine* which we *See*, *Smell*, and *Tast*. But then ther is no *Resemblance* in *Nature*, nor Ground in *Reason*, and as little in *Revelation*, that *two Bodies* shou'd be *Con-substantiated* under the *Accidents* of *One* of them, and which, are not *Accidents* proper for the other. In which, tho' ther is not a *Deception* of the *Senses* as to the *Bread* and *Wine*, yet ther is as to the *Body* and *Blood* of a *Man*, which if hid under the *Accidents* of *Bread*, my *Senses* are *Deceiv'd*, for they have no Other way to Distinguish *Substances*, but by the *Accidents* Proper to them. And when I *Eat* a Piece of *Bread*, my *Sight*, *Touch*, *Smell*, and *Taste* imform me that it is not *Flesh*. Which if it be, they have all *Deceiv'd* me: And I can be *Certain* of nothing in the World.

(3.) Compar'd with *Con-substantiation*.

Besides the *Lutheran* Notion gives *Ubiquity* to *Body*, as well as that of *Tran-substantiation*. Which is a *Contradiction* to the *Nature* of *Body*, which must be *Circumscrib'd*, else ther cou'd not be a *Greater* or a *Lesser* Body.

So that, upon the whole, *Con-substantiation* is very little Remov'd from *Tran-substantiation.*

SOC. But was not *Con-substantiation* the *Invention* of *Luther.* So you see Men may Invent *Contradictions.*

CHR. That will not follow. For *Luther* was Bred up under *Tran-substantiation.* In which finding *Absurdities*, he thought to Mend them by this New-coin'd *Distinction.* I grant that Men may Invent *Distinctions*, and upon Examination they may be found *Contradictory*; which themselves might not see at first. But that is not Parallel to the *Inventing* a Downright Flat *Contradiction* in *Terms*, without Ground or Foundation, or any Previous *Principles* leading to it. As it wou'd be in your *Notion* of the *Trinity*, if it was *Invented.* And, as I said, without any *Temptation*, or serving any *End* or *Purpose* in the World. If ther was no *Foundation* for such a thing in *Reason*, as you say, nor any *Revelation* of it, how cou'd it have come into the Head of any *Man* living?

VI. *Allusions* and *Parallels* Necessary, in our Contemplation of the *Nature* of *God.*

SOC. Do you think ther is any thing in *Reason* for it? Or that all your *Allusions* and *Parallels* will *Prove* it?

CHR. I bring them not for *Proof*, but to Clear our way towards the *Proof*, which is the *Revelation* of it in Holy *Scripture.* And to take off your *Objection* and Great *Prejudice* towards the Receiving that *Proof*, which is, your Conceit of *Contradiction* in the *Thing*, and which *Blinds* your *Eyes* against the *Proof*, let it be never so *Plain.*

Yet this I will say on Behalf of *Allusions* and *Parallels* in the Present Case, that they are not only *Useful*, but *Necessary.* For we cannot otherwise come at any *Notion* or *Apprehension* of *God* at all. His *Being*, in it self, is far Exalted above all Created *Understanding.* Therefor we cannot come at it *Directly*; it is *LIGHT Inaccessible* and wou'd strike us *Blind.* We must know it then by the *Reflection* of it in *Creatures*, like beholding the *Sun* in *Water*, which is too *Bright* for our *Eyes* to look upon, without some Means to *Darken* it's *Rays.*

And

And *God* discovers Himself to us by such *Allusions*: For how cou'd He do it otherwise? He calls Himself our *King*, and our *Father*: Is it not Lawful then to Contemplate *Him* under such *Allusions*, when it is Impossible for us to do it otherwise? We come at the Knowledge of Him, by those *Images* of Himself which he has Created in us. He has Planted *Wisdom* in our *Hearts*, and a *Fore sight* or *Providence* in Managing our own Affairs, as likewise *Justice* and *Mercy*, and other Noble Endowments. Thence we Frame our *Notions* of his Infinite *Wisdom*, *Power*, *Providence*, &c. And we can have no *Notion* of him at all, but by *Allusion* to what he has *Created* in us. All the Rest is *Clouds* and *Thick-darkness* to us.

Therefor I have Insisted upon these *Parallels* and *Allusions*, to shew, That ther is an *Image* and *Resemblance* of his *Holy Trinity*, Imprinted in our very *Souls*, as well as in *Bodies*, so far as they are Capable of it. But still with that *Distance* and *Dis-proportion* that must Necessarily be suppos'd betwixt *Finit* and *In-finit*.

Having said thus much, to Remove your Prejudice; I will go on, and shew you yet further *Parallels*, whereby we may Rise up Higher, as on a *Ladder*, and view more of the *Perfection* of *God*, by that *Image* of it which he has Impress'd upon *Creatures*.

VII. *Self-Reflection* an *Image* of the *H. Trinity*.

To be *Beneficial* to others, is an *Image* of *God*, from whom all *Good things* do come. This is Express'd in the *Heavens*, the *Sun*, *Moon*, and *Stars*, and their *Influence* upon the *Earth*. But they are not *Sensible* of it, nor have any *Pleasure* and *Happiness* in it. The *Sun* shines to *Others*, not to *Himself*.

It is then a Nearer *Image* of *God*, to *Know* when we do *Good*, and to take *Pleasure* and *Satisfaction* in it. To do it *Voluntarily*, and when it was in our Power not to do it. Whereby it becomes *Our* Act, and we Gain the Name of *Benefactors*. And *Rejoice* in it, as God did in his *Works*, and saw they were *very Good*.

We

We by this *Partake* of the *Happinesſ* we give to others.

But ther is an Higher Degree of *Happinesſ* ſtill, and a yet nearer *Image* of *God*, and that is, when we our ſelves are made the *Object* of our own *Benefactions*, as I may ſo call it. When we can do *Good* to *Our Selves*, and can *Taſte* our own *Happinesſ*, can *Rejoice* and take *Pleaſure* in *Our Selves*. This is the *Neareſt* to us of any thing. And this *Joy* no Man can take from us, no ſtranger can Intermeddle with it. This is Perform'd in us by what we call *Self-Reflection*, whereby we become the *Object* of our own *Knowledge*, and *Love*. And this is *Reciprocal* in us, we are the Perſon *Knowing*, and the *Perſon* that is *Known*, the *Perſon* that *Loves*, and the *Perſon* that is *Loved*. And this cou'd not be Done, but by the Operation of ſeral *Faculties* in the *Soul*, which are an *Image* of the ſeveral *Perſons* in the *Deity*. And the *Original* of this *Self-Reflection* is a *Reflex-Act* of the *Underſtanding*, the *Father Faculty*, as has been before Diſcours'd. And this Reſembles the *Father*, the *Fountain* (as I may ſo ſay) of the *Diety*.

In this Conſiſts the *Eſſential Happinesſ* of *God*, in the *Knowledge* and *Love* of *Himſelf*. And this *Reflected* Perfectly from one *Perſon* of the *Godhead* to Another. Which is Infinitly more *Compleat* than the *Shadow* of it in the *Reciprocal Reflection* of the *Faculties* in our *Soul*. But a *Shadow* and *Image* of it, it is. And without which we ſhou'd not be able to have the leaſt *Glimps* or *Apprehenſion* of the other.

VII. Of the Fecundity in the Deity.

This leads me to Another *Step* up this *Ladder*, which Neceſſarily follows from what has been ſaid, or is rather but a further Proſecution of it.

We all Agree that whatever *Perfection* is in *Man* muſt be much more *Eminently* in *God* from whom it came.

Now to the *Happinesſ* ther is in *Thought*, ther is a further added, which is, to *Communicate* that *Thought* to *Another*. Without this, the *Soul* wou'd be a very *Solita-*

ry

ry thing. And wou'd grow *Weary* of *it self*, in a little time. As we find it, when we are left too long *Alone*: Without *Conversation*, Life would be a *Burthen*. Who wou'd be Content to *Live*, if ther were never a *Man* left in the *World* but himself? This *Communication*, of *Thought* is done, among *Men*, by *Words*. Whence in Compliance to our Manner of Apprehension, the *Son* is likewise Call'd the *Word* of *God*. *Self-Reflection* is very Properly call'd, the *Word* of the *Mind*. And this *Word* was the first *Communication* which *God* gave of himself. He is also call'd the *Word*, as He was the *Instrument* by which *God* made all things and *Comunicated* of *Himself* to *Creatures*. Whence the *Creation* is Describ'd as being all *Spoken*. He *Spake* the *Word*, and it was done, He Commanded, and they were *Created*. God *Said*, Let ther be *Light*, &c. And by his *Word* were the Heavens made, and all the Host of them by the *Breath* of his *Mouth*. So the *Son* is call'd the *Word*, in Respect of *God*'s Communicating *Himself* to *Himself*. And likewise of his *Communicating* Himself to *Creatures*.

But ther is another *Communication* beyond the *Communication* of *Thoughts* by *Words*, and that is, to *Communicate* ones self, our whole *Nature*, full and Entire. To Produce ones *Like*, in full Perfection as ones self. Thus, we see *Trees* spring from *Trees*, *Beasts*, *Fish*, and *Fowl* and *Man*. Propagat their *Kind*. And shall *God* who gave *Fertility* to *Creatures*, be *Barren* Himself? He that made the *Eye*, do's he not *See*? And is not the *Fertility* of *Creatures* an *Image* of a much more Eminent *Fecundity* in *God*? As he says, *Isah. 66 9.* according to the *Vulgar* Translation. *Numquid Ego, qui alias Parere facio, Ipse non Pariam? dicit Dominus. Si Ego, qui Generationem Cæteris tribuo, Sterilis ero? ait Dominus Deus tuus.* That is, *Shall not I who cause others to bring forth, bring forth my self? saith the Lord. If I give to Others the Power of Generation, shall I be barren my self? saith the Lord thy God.*

Since

Since therefor the *Communication* of ones *Nature* is a *Perfection*, it is of Necessity that *God* must have it. For it is a *Maxim*, in *Philosophy*, that *Nemo dat quod non habet. None can Give what he has not.*

Besides, the former Argument includes this. For *God* cou'd not *Communicate* his *Thoughts*, without *Communicating* also his *Nature*, that is, he cou'd not *Communicate ALL* of his *Thoughts*, except to what was *Capable* to *Receive* them. And nothing but *Infinite* can contain *Infinite*. And it being Natural to *Goodness* to *Delight* in *Communicating* it self, Consequently *God* must be Depriv'd of the *Plenitude* of this *Perfection*, if ther were not a *Person* Capable of Receiving all his *Goodness*. Else *God* must be *Stinted* in this Greatest of *Happiness*. As a *River* cou'd not Empty it self, unless ther were a Place to Receive it; and so wou'd Cease to be a *River*.

And thus, unless ther were Different *Persons* in *God*, ther wou'd be a *Contradiction* in all his *Attributes*. Ther wou'd be *Infinite Power*, without *Power*, to *Exert* it self *Infinitly*. Which is a flat *Contradiction:* And so of *Infinite Love*, *Wisdom*, &c.

(1.) Of a *Third Person* in the *Trinity*.

SOC. Whatever ther may be in these Reasons for *two Persons* in the *Godhead*, the *One* to *Contain* and *Receive* All of the *Other*, yet what can you say for a *Third*? what need is ther of that?

CHR. First, that it is *Reveal'd* which we are to see. In the next place, by the *Image* God has given us of Himself in our own *Soul*, we have seen already, That the *Soul* is not *Compleat*, nor can *Act*, without three *Faculties*. And no *Two* of them can *Act* without the *Third*. And to Happly this, the *Communication* of Infinite *Power* and *Wisdom* (which are Represented in the *Two* first *Faculties* of our *Mind)* cannot be suppos'd without an *Infinite* Reciprocal *Love*, betwixt these *Persons*. And ther being no *Accident* in *God*, but that whatever is in *God*, is *God*; Consequently the Reciprocal

cal *Love* (to which Anſwers the Third *Faculty* of the *Soul*) which *Unites* theſe two *Perſons*, muſt be a *Perſon* too, and *God*, for it muſt be *Infinit*. And ther is an *Image* of this in *Human Production*, wherein ther muſt be juſt three *Perſons*, neither *More* nor *Leſs*, that is, *Father*, *Mother*, and *Child*. Which Names *God* uſes in Relation to *Himſelf*. Therefor we may uſe them? Thus the Son of *Sirach* uſes them *Eccluſ*. 24. where he ſpeaks of the ſecond *Perſon* by the name of *Wiſdom*, and as that *Word* of *God* he Introduceth Him ſaying, ver. 5. *I came out of the Mouth of the moſt High, firſt Born before all Creatures. I cauſed the Light*, &c. And ſo ſpeaks of the other works of *Creation*, all of which he aſcribes to Himſelf. Then ſays, ver. 20. *I am the Mother of Beautiful LOVE*. This the third *Perſons* of the *Holy Trinity*. But more of this, when we come to the *Texts* of *Scripture*.

SOC. If the *Divine Nature* ſhou'd Repeat this *Production* of *Perſons*, then you might have as many *Perſons* in the *Divine Nature*, as in the *Human*, and Conſequently as many *Gods* as *Men*.

2. Why but *one Production* in the *Deity*.

CHR. Your *Conception* is *Groſs*. For *Firſt*, three *Perſons* in the *Divine Nature* do's not make three *Gods*, more than three *Faculties* make three *Souls*. As we have Diſcours'd before. But *Secondly*, ther Cannot be another *Production* in the *Divine Nature*, more than ther can be another *Divine Nature*. For the three *Perſons* are of the *Eſſence* of the *Divine Nature*. As the three *Faculties* are of the *Soul*. Therefore *Unchangeable* and *Unalterable*. And as to the Argument I have Proceeded upon of *Infinit Communication* from one to Another, if it be *Infinit*, it can be no *More*. And to *Infinit Production* nothing can be *Added*. But *Human Productions* may be oft *Repeated*, Becauſe they are all *Finit*, and therefore *Additions* and *Additions* may be Made to them. From all which follows.

First. That an *Infinit Power* without an *Infinit Production*, is a *Contradiction*. For it supposes *Infinity* to be *Limited*.

Secondly, That ther can be no *Infinit Production* but in the *Persons* of the *Blessed Trinity*.

Thirdly, that an *Infinit Production* cannot be *Repeated*. Because it wou'd *Add* to *Infinit*, and make more *Infinits*.

SOC. The *Heathen Philosophers* might have talk'd at this Rate. How come they not to find out a *Trinity* as well as you?

CHR. They did talk at this Rate. And did hold a *Trinity* in the *Godhead*, as I shall shew you by and by, when we come to that Head.

3. (The second Person *Begotten*, the third *Proceeding*.

SOC. But your St. *Athanasius* the *Creed-Maker* will not only have us Believe all this, but takes upon him to Determin the very *Manner* forsooth, as if he knew it, how all this is done, That the *Father* is neither *Created* nor *Begotten*; the *Son* not *Created*, but *Begotten*; the *Holy Ghost* neither *Created* nor *Begotten*, but *Proceeding*.

CHR. You *Socinians* pretend of all Men to Argue without *Passion*, and *Personal Reflections*, but *Fairly* and upon the *Square*, keeping Close to the *Argument*. And have been Propos'd as a *Pattern* for this, by some that *Lov'd* you better than they *Knew* you. For none have Exceeded you in *Bitterness* and *Foul-Language*. Even in this *Brief History* we are now upon, the Common *Epithets* you bestow upon *Christians* are *Ignorant*, *Brutal*, *Stupid*, without *Common-sense*, &c. Hence came your *Witticism*, in your *Brief Notes upon St Athanasius's Creed*, whom you call *Sathanasius*, and *Creed Maker* there, and in other of your *Books*. And Please your selves with this Prophane *Jest* and *Contempt* cast upon that *Great* and *Learned CHAMPION* of *Christianity*.

But to leave your *Dirt*. You Charge very Unjustly upon him the *Inventing* of these *Terms* and *Distinctions*.

He

He follow'd the same *Terms* us'd in *Holy Scripture*, and by the *Catholick Church* before him. The *Terms* of *Father* and *Son*, and the *Son* being call'd the *Only Begotten* of the *Father*, you cannot be Ignorant are *Scripture-Phrases*. But the word *Begotten* is never Apply'd to the *Holy Ghost*, but the word *Proceeding* is, as *Joh.* xv. 26. *The Spirit of Truth which PROCEEDETH from the Father.*

SOC. But you say He *Proceedeth*, from both *Father* and *Son*.

4. The *Holy Ghost* Proceedeth from the *Father* and the *Son*.

CHR. Then He *Proceedeth* from the *Father*. If He *Proceeds* from *Both*, He *Proceeds* from *Each*. And in the same *Text*, the *Son* takes upon Him to *Send* the *Holy Ghost* Jointly with the *Father*. *The Comforter—— whom I will send unto you from the Father.* And *Chap.* xvi. 13. 14. *He shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear that shall he speak*, And from whom shall he hear? Even from the *Son*, who saith, *He shall Receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you.* Do's He not Receive it likewise of the *Father*? Yes, for *Christ* saith in the next verse, *All things that the Father hath are Mine; therefore said I, that he shall take of Mine, and shall shew it unto you.* Here the *Father* is made the *Fountain*, from whom the *Son* receives *All* the *Whole* of the *Father*, All that the *Father* hath, And the *Holy Ghost* receives the same *All* from *Father* and *Son*. And he is call'd the *Spirit* of *God*, and the *Spirit* of *Christ*, as *Rom.* viii. 9. *If so be the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any Man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is None of His.* And *Gal.* iv. 6. *God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts.* And He cou'd not be call'd the *Spirit* of the *Son*, any otherwise than as *Proceeding* from the *Son*. So that it is Evident He *Proceeds* from both *Father* and *Son*. And He is call'd the *Spirit* of *Each*, that is, of *Both*.

And to this Answers the *Parallel* I have before Mention'd of the three *Faculties* in the *Soul*, for the *Under-*

ſtanding is the *Fountain* or *Father Faculty*, whence the *Memory* receives All that it has, and may be call'd its *Son*; and the *Will* receives from *Both*, and *Proceeds* from *Both*.

5. Of the Terms *Begetting* and *Proceeding*.

SOC. But why do you ſay the One is *Begotten*, the other *Proceeding*? Where is the Difference.

CHR. This is Entring too far into the *Myſtery* of *God*. Or to Expect that *Parallels* ſhou'd Hold in every thing. We are to follow the Expreſſions of Holy *Scripture*. But yet we are not left wholly Deſtitute even in this Point. We have Diſcours'd before, *Sect*. vii. of *Self-Reflection* in the *Soul*. And that this is the *Generation* of *Spirits*. And that this is an *Act* of the *Underſtanding* the *Father Faculty*, by which it *Begets* its own *Similitude* and *Likeneſs* in the *Memory*, by its own Internal *Power* and *Fecundity*. So that the *Memory* may be call'd a *ſecond Underſtanding*. But the *Momory* is no *Reflective* Faculty, it only *Preſerves* what the *Underſtanding* has Committed to it. And the *Will* Determins its ſelf only as to *Like* or *Diſlike*. And therefor may be ſaid to *Proceed*, rather than to be *Begotten*. And the more becauſe the *Will* Acts perfectly *Voluntarily*, tho' as we ſay, it muſt follow the *Ultimat Dictat* of the *Underſtanding*, but that is not by way of *Force*, but *Choice*. For the *Will* do's every thing by *Choice*.

IX. Of the *Unity* of *God*.

SOC. But who can think of this Diverſity of *Perſons* in *God*, without a Breach of his *Unity*? It makes Him as it were *Compounded* of the three *Perſons*, whereas we know *God* to be a Being that is moſt *Simple* and *One* in His *Nature*, and cannot be *Compounded* or *Made up* of any thing.

CHR. *God* is not *Compounded* or *Made up* of any thing. His *Unity* is the moſt *Perfect* of all *Unities*. But in Every *Unity* ther is an *Union* of ſomthing, and that muſt be *Divers* things. For ther is no *Union* of *One*.

1. The *Unity* of *Bodies*.

This *Unity* in *Bodies* is by way of *Compoſition*. For every *Body* is *Compounded* of other *Bodies*, which are

Parts

Parts of that *Body*. As a *Brick* is *Part* of an *House*. And my *Finger* is *Part* of my *Body*. And ther are seveveral *Parts* in my *Finger*, and *Parts* of those *Parts* again, and so without End. And these *Parts* may be *Divided* the One from the other. And other *Parts* may be *Added* to them, and the *Body* made *Bigger*. So that Every *Body* is many *Bodies*, that are *Compounded* and *put together*.

But it is far otherwise in the *Unity* of a *Spirit*. For a *Spirit* is not *Compounded*, or made up of *Parts*. And therefore cannot be *Divided*. It is not capable of *Addition* or *Multiplication*. We say not that our *Soul* is *Multiply'd* or *Divided* among its three *Faculties*. Or that it is *Compounded* of them. They cannot be taken from it, as a *Part* may be taken from a *Body*. Therefor its *Unity* is more *Perfect* than that of a *Body*. It Consists not of several *Parts*, tho' it do's of several *Faculties*. We call not the Faculties *Parts* of the *Soul*. They are Rather *Powers* of the *Soul*. Essential *Powers*, by which it *Acts*, and without which it cou'd not *Act* at all, nor be a *Soul*. 2. The *Unity* of *Spirits*.

These *Powers* of the *Soul* bear a nearer *Resemblance* to the *Persons* of *God*, which are *Essential* to the *Godhead*, without which it cou'd not *Act*. It cou'd not have a *Reciprocal Knowledge* and *Love* of its self, nor *Enjoy* its own *Blessedness*, nor *Communicat* it *Fully*, as has been said, and Consequently must be *Stinted* and *Limited* in the *Greatest* of *Happiness*. 3. *Apply'd* to *God*.

Yet these *Persons* are not *Parts* of *God*, nor is He *Compounded* of them, or either *Multiply'd* or *Divided* among them. But the whole *Deity* Flowing *Perpetually*, in its Full *Infinity*, from one *Person* to Another, is in the Eternal *Enjoyment* of its own *Beatitude*, *Blessed* for ever in its *Self*; in so Perfect an *Unity* as can be but Faintly *Represented* in the *Unity* of any *Creature*, even of a *Soul*.

SOC.

1. Of the mutual *Communication* of *Spirits*

SOC. But is ther not a Mutual *Communication* of *Spirits*? Do's not one *Spirit* Join with Another and *Partake* of it, as *Bodies* do?

CHR. Yes surely, and in much more *Intimate* manner than *Bodies*. All the *Enjoyment* and *Satisfaction* in the *Union* of *Bodies*, is from the *Union* of their *Souls*. This is what we call *Love*. Without this *Bodies* are *Insensible* of their *Union*, and can take no *Pleasure*, or *Satisfaction* in it, as in the Production of *Trees*, *Plants*, *Flowers*, &c.

1. Stronger than that of *Bodies*.

And the *Union* of *Souls* is stronger, the less of *Corporal* is mixt with it. Therefore *Friendship* is the strongest *Tye* among *Men*. This is the Chief *Cement* of *Conjugal* Affection. Where that is wanting, 'tis a *Yoke* indeed. And upon the Comparison the Preference is given to *Friendship*. Deut. 13. 6. *If the Wife of thy Bosom, or thy Friend, which is as thine own Soul, entice thee*, &c. And 2. Sam. 1. 26. *Thy Love to me was Wonderful* (said *David* of *Jonathan*) *passing the Love of Women.*

But the Comparison of the *Union* ther is in Flesh and that which is between *Spirits*, is carry'd much Higher by the *Apostle* 1. Cor. 6. 16, 17. *For two, saith He, shall be One Flesh, but he that is Joined unto the Lord, is one Spirit.* To be one *Spirit* with *God*! And that more nearly than *Man* and *Wife* are one *Flesh*. This seems to be one of those *Unspeakable things* which St. *Paul* says, *are not Lawful* (or Possible) *for a Man to utter*. 2. Cor. 12. 4.

2. *Allusions* to this in *Holy Scripture*.

But this must be the *Foundation* of those frequent *Allusions* in Holy *Scripture*, where *Christ* is call'd the *Bridegroom*, and the *Church* his *Spouse*. And *Heaven* is Describ'd as the Eternal *Marriage-Feast*. And He having taken our *Nature* into the *Deity* in his own *Person*, what *Communications* thence may be Given even to our *Bodies* when *Glorify'd*, by our *Participation* of the same *Human Nature* with *Christ*, is *what Eye hath not seen, nor Ear heard, nor can Enter into the Heart of Man to Conceive, That they all* (says *Christ*, Joh. 17. 21, 22, 23.) *may be one, as thou Fa-*

Father art in Me, and I in Thee; that they also may be one in Us— And the Glory which Thou gavest Me, I have given Them; that they may be one, even as We are one. I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one, and that the World may know that Thou hast sent me, and hast Loved Them, as Thou hast Loved Me. These are *Wonderful* Expressions! And lead our Thoughts to what we cannot *Comprehend*! But they plainly Import, that by our *Union* with *Christ*, who has *United* Himself to our *Nature*, we shall Partake of an *Union* with *God*, even *Like* to the *Union* of *Christ* with *Him*, who Partakes likewise of His *Divine Nature*. As the *Apostle* speaks, 2. *Pet.* 1. 4. *Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious Promises, that you might be Partakers of the Divine Nature.* An *Earnest* of which was Given in the *Miraculous Descent* of the *Holy Ghost* at *Pentecost*, like that at our *Saviour*'s Baptism; whereby we were (as it may be said) put into *Possession* of the *Holy Spirit* of *God*. As the same *Apostle* speaks, 1. *Pet.* 1. 12. —— *with the Holy Ghost sent down from Heaven, which things the Angels desire to look into*; Or to *Prie* narrowly into them, παρακύψαι, to *stoop down* and look *Earnestly*, as St. *John* into the *Sepulchre*, Joh. 20. 5. παρακύψας Or else to *Bow* themselves, in *Adoration* of so great a *Mystery*.

St. *Paul* speaking how intimatly we are *United* to *Christ*, says, *Eph.* 5. 30. *We are Members of his Body, of his Flesh, and of his Bones.* And he takes this from *Allusion* to the Production of *Eve* out of *Adam*, whereupon *Adam* said, *Gen.* 2. 23. *This is now Bone of my Bones, and Flesh of my Flesh.* And the Inference is made in the next words, *Therefor shall a Man leave his Father and his Mother, and shall Cleave unto his Wife, and they shall be one Flesh.* Which the *Apostle* repeats, *Eph.* 5. 31. Immediatly after his words before Quoted, *We are Members of His* (Christ's) *Body, of his Flesh and of his Bones. For this*

Cause

Cause shall a Man leave his Father and Mother, and shall be Joyned unto his Wife, and they two shall be one Flesh, This is a great Mystery: But I speak concerning Christ and the Church. Here is the *Parallel* closely carry'd on betwixt the *Union* ther is in our *Marriages*, and that much more Intimat *Union* in our *Marriage* with *Christ*, and in *Him*, with the whole Blessed *Trinity*; which the *Apostle* calls the *great Mystery.*

3. Use of Parallels.

Therefor let none Despise the use of *Parallels*, which are so frequent in *Holy Scripture*. By these we are led to the Knowlege of *God*, and the great *Mystery* of our *Redemption*, and future *Enjoyment* of *God*. We see indeed by these but as in a *Glass*, darkly. But without these we shou'd know much less, and not be able to frame to our selves any *Ideas* of it at all, or any but what wou'd be much more *Erroneous*. And since *God* in *Holy Scripture* has us'd this *Method* with us, no doubt it is most *proper*, and the *Best* we can use. We must ascend to *God* by the *Scale* of His *Creatures*. We have no other way; For we cannot see Him as He is.

4. Adam a Type of Christ.

Hence our *Partaking* of the *Nature* of *Christ*, is made lively to us by what we Know, that is, our *Partaking* of the *Nature* of our *Parents*, and so up to *Adam*. Hence *Rom.* 5. 14 *Adam* is call'd *The Figure of Him who was to Come.* And the *Parallel* betwixt *Him* and *Christ*. is Carry'd on to the End of that *Chapter*. And 1. *Cor.* 15. 21. *As in Adam all Die, even so in Christ shall all be made Alive.* And *ver.* 45. *The first Man Adam was made a living Soul, the last Adam was a Quickning Spirit.* And *ver.* 47. *The first Man is of the Earth, Earthly: The second Man is the Lord from Heaven.*

Tertullian insists largely upon this *Parallel*, (*de Resur. Carn.* c. 6.) and go's through every *Particular* and *Circumstance* of the Formation of *Adam*, and shews how it all Referr'd to *Christ*. He says, *Quodcunque enim Limus exprimebatur, Christus cogitabatur Homo futurus* —— *ita*

Limus

Limus ille jam tunc Imaginem induens Christi futuri, non tantum Dei opus erat, sed et Pignus. i. e. *Whatever the Earth of Adam was made, Christ was Meant by it, who shou'd become Man—— So the Earth then putting on the Image of Christ to come in the Flesh, was not only God's Workmanship, but his Pledge.* That is, that *Christ* shou'd come in the *Flesh.*

And as *Adam* was a *Type* of *Christ*, so was *Eve* of the *Church*, which shou'd bring forth *Children* unto *God.* And as the *Church* is *Builded* upon *Christ* her *Rock* and *Foundation*; so was *Eve* made or *Builded* (as our *Margin*, after the *Hebrew*, reads *Gen.* 2. 22.) out of *Adam.* And as the *Church* has no *Life* but what she Derives from *Christ*, so neither had *Eve* but what she Deriv'd from *Adam*, And as the *Side* of *Christ*, was *Open'd*, after His *Death*, whence Issu'd *Water* and *Blood.* Of which He has given us the *Two* Salutary *Sacraments* of *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper.* By the *First* we are *Born again* of *Water* and the *Holy Spirit*; and made *Members* of His *Church*, which is His *Body:* And by the *Second* we are Perpetually *Nourish'd* with His *Blood* into *Eternal Life.* Now these *Flowed* not out of *Christ's side*, till after He was *Dead.* For till then He had not fully Paid the *Price* of our *Redemption.* The *Consummatum est* was not Pronounc'd but with His *last Breath* upon the *Cross.* For till His *Death*, all was not *Finish'd.* Then came out the *Water* and the *Blood*, which are the *Life* of His *Church.* And the *Church*, being then Perfectly *Redeemed*, may be said to be *Born*, and taken out of His *Dead Body.* So it is said *Gen.* 2. 21. *The Lord God caused a deep Sleep to fall upon* Adam, *and he Slept.* And while he was in this nearest *Image* of *Death* (And we must suppose it was more than an *Ordinary Sleep* which the *Lord* caus'd to fall upon him) his *Side* was *Open'd*, and *Eve* was taken out of him.

§. And *Eve* of the *Church.* Particularly in her *Formation.*

And as it was said of the first *Adam*, That ther was no *Help* meet *for him* found among all the Inferior *Creatures*, therefor that *God* made an *Help* meet *for him*, out of his own *Flesh* and *Blood*: So was ther no *Help* meet for the second *Adam* among *Birds*, *Fish* or *Fowl*, but His Delight was with the *Children* of *Men*. And out of them He purchased a *Church* with His own *Blood*, to be an Holy *Spouse* unto Him, and an *Help* meet for Him, to bring forth *Children* unto *Glory*.

It cannot Escape any Bodies Observation, That the *Male* and *Female* of *Man* were not *Created* together, like those of the *Birds*, *Fish* and *Fowl*: But that the *Man* was Created *alone*, and afterwards his *Female* was Deduc'd out of him. And ther is more *Circumstance* and *Particularities* told of this *Deduction* of *Eve* out of *Adam*, than even of the *Formation* of *Adam* out of the *Earth*, or any other Part of the *Creation*. And in that very short *History* in *Genesis* of the Times before the *Flood*, it cannot be imagin'd so much of it shou'd be taken up with this, if it were not a matter of the Highest *Moment*, and greatly to be Regarded by Us. And it appears the more to be so, by the frequent *Allusions* made to it in the *New Testament*, not only with Relation to *Man* and *Wife*, but to *Christ* and His *Church*.

XI. By the word *God* in *Holy Scripture* the whole Blessed *Trinity* is meant.

SOC. Come, to have done with your *Allusions*. If *Each* of the three *Persons* in your suppos'd *Trinity* was *God*, than the word *God* wou'd not in *Scripture* be Apply'd to *One* of them more than to *Another*. But it is evident that generally through the *Scripture* by the word *God* is meant *God* the *Father*, and Him only. As to those Particular *Texts* wherein you Alledge it is Apply'd to the other two *Persons*, we shall Examin them by and by But it wou'd be *Always* apply'd to them, if Each of them were *God*, as you say. Why not *Always* to them, as well as to the *Father*?

CHR.

CHR. It is not *Always* given to the *Father*, as I shall shew you. But first take my Direct Answer. That by the word *God* in *Holy Scripture* the whole *Trinity* of *God* is meant. And it must be so. For if the three *Persons* are of the *Nature* of the *Godhead*, which we have already Discours'd, then the word *God* must Imply them all. As when we say the *Soul* of *Man*, the three *Faculties*, and *Each* of them, is certainly meant.

SOC. But why then do you Attribute *Creation* to the *Father*, *Redemption* to the *Son*, and *Sanctification* to the *Holy Ghost?*

Particular *Acts* Attributed to *Each*.

CHR. As we Attribute one *Operation* of the *Soul* to the *Understanding*, another to the *Memory*, and another to the *Will*. And yet they all three Act in *Concert*, and no *One* of them can *Act* without the *Other*. As has been plainly shew'd before. And that thus it is in the *Persons* of the *Holy Trinity*.

And, to apply the *Parallel* to your present *Objection*, the *Understanding*, which is the *Father Faculty*, has the name of *Soul* given to it more commonly than either of the other two *Faculties*. For Example, when we Describe a *Fool*, a Man of no *Understanding*, it is common to say, such an one has no *Soul*, or, as *Chrysippus* in *Seneca* said of the *Soul* of a *Swine*, that it serv'd only as *Salt*, to keep his *Body* from *Stinking*. But we say not so of an *Obstinate* Man, or one of a Perverse *Will*. Or of a Man that has a Treacherous *Memory*. On the Contrary, it is a saying, That the greatest *Wits* have the shortest *Memories*.

The word *God* sometimes Distinguish'd from the *Father*. And the *Deity Express'd* by the *Persons* only. And the word *Father* given to the *Son*.

Thus the word *God* may sometimes be us'd to Express *God* the *Father*. But generally speaking it means the *Deity*. And sometimes it is us'd in Distinction even from the *Father*. as *Col.* 2. 2. —— *the Mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ.*

And the *Godhead* is sometimes Express'd without the word *God* at all, only by the *Persons* of the *Godhead*, as

as in the Form of *Baptism* which *Christ* Commanded, *In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*

And sometimes the Term of *Father* is given to the *Son*, as *Isai.* 9. 6. where *Christ* is call'd the *Everlasting Father.* That was in Relation to *Creatures.* For *by Him were all things made*, Joh. 1. 3.

XII. That the *Heathen* had a Notion of the *Trinity*, as well as the *Jews.*

SOC. We will talk more of this, when we come to Examin these *Texts.* But now, in the mean time, I must call upon you for what you Promis'd *Sect.* viii. *of the Fecundity of God.* Where you said, That even *Heathen Philosophers* have Argu'd as you did. And had a Notion of a *Trinity* of *Persons* in *God*, from the *Fecundity* of His *Nature.*

CHR. This Notion of the *Fecundity* of *God* made them Describe *God* as *Male* and *Female.* Thus *Damascius* repeats what old *Orpheus* taught of the *Deity*, ἀρσενόθηλυν αὐτὴν ὑπεστήσατο, πρὸς ἔνδειξιν τῆς πάντων γονιμικῆς οὐσίας. He made it *Male* and *Female* to shew the *Generative* Power of all things, which they Deriv'd from it; or by which He made all things. And *Proclus* upon the *Timæus*, p. 95. Quotes this among other *Orphick* Verses,

Ζεὺς ἄρσην γένετο, Ζεὺς ἀμβροσίη. ἔπλετο νύμφη.
Jupiter *is a Man*, Jupiter *is also an Im-mortal Woman.*

It was very common among their *Mystick* Writers to stile *God* Ἀρρενόθηλυν, that is, *Man* and *Woman.* And *Synesius* a Learned and Pious Christian *Bishop* follows this Form of Expression in some of his *Hymns* to *God*, as

Σὺ πατὴρ, Σὺ ὄ, ἐσσι Μαῖηρ,
Σὺ ἄρρεν, Σὺ ὄ Θῆλυς.

Thou art Father, *thou art* Mother,
Thou art Man, *thou art* Woman.

SOC.

SOC. This go's but to two *Persons.* It seems they thought not of a third.

CHR. That do's not follow. *Synesius* a *Bishop* did not think so, who uses the same *Expression.* And he Liv'd in the fourth *Century*, when the Doctrin of the *Trinity* was fully and every where Establish'd, by your own Confession. And he cou'd not then have been a *Bishop* without Acknowleging of it. Owning two *Persons*, do's not deny the third. And the *Heathen Philosophers* held three Supream and Almighty *Principles*, which they call'd likewise *Persons* or *Hypostases* (which is the *Greek* for *Persons*) And that these Act in *Conjunction*, and made the *World* and all things.

SOC. I have heard indeed that ther is a great deal of this in *Plato.* For the *Defence* of the *Brief History of the Unitarians* which we are now upon, p. 5. and p. 17. Speaks of *three Principles* of *Plato.* And Accuses the *Ante-Nicene Fathers* for Arguing so like *Platonick* Philosophers, and says, That they follow'd the *Ideas* of *Plato* concerning the *three Principles.* And p. 17. he tells us likewise, That the *Jews* had this Notion of the *Trinity*, and Quotes *Philo* for it one of the most Learned *Jews.*

CHR. These are large Concessions. He has given us up the *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, the *Jews*, and the *Heathens.* But having started the *Objection*, what *Answer* do's he give to it?

SOC. For the *Heathens*, he says, That the *Fathers* finding fault with *Plato*'s Notion, brought into the World a new Interpretation of the three *Principles.* And for the *Jews*, he says, *Must we believe* Philo Judæus *rather than St.* Paul? *Who plainly tells us, in Direct Opposition to* Philo, *that there is one God.*

CHR. And so said *Philo.* For the *Jews* acknowledg'd but one *God*: And St. *Paul* (who was *Co-temporary* with *Philo*) do's not Charge them with holding more than one *God.* So that in this, ther is no *Direct Opposition*, or any *Opposition* at all betwixt St. *Paul* and *Philo.* You must

must shew then that St. *Paul* oppos'd him as to the three *Hypostases* or *Persons*.

And as to the *Heathen*, we suppose not that they *Invented* it, but *Learn'd* it from the *Jews*. It is plain that *Plato* attain'd to the Knowlege of the *Jewish* Religion in *Ægypt*. And several of the *Fathers* have observ'd the Agreement of his Doctrin, in many things, with the *Old Testament*. Whence *Numenius* the *Pythagorean* said of him, *Quid enim aliud est Plato, quam Moses Atticissans*. That is, that *Plato* was nothing else but *Moses* speaking at *Athens*. And many of the *Fathers*, as *Justin Martyr*, *Clem. Alexandrinus*, *Eusebius*, &c. have said, that *Plato* had Penetrated into the Mystery of the *Trinity*.

But these *Philosophers* having got Possession of the *Notion*, did Refine upon it by their *Philosophy*, and fell into Sundry *Errors*. As they did about the *Notion* of a *God*, and several other things which they had Receiv'd by *Tradition* from the Beginning but knew it not, as of *Marriage*, *Sacrifice*, *Priesthood*, &c. Instituted by *God* from the Beginning of the World, and Descended thro' the *Heathen* as well as *Jewish* Posterity of *Adam*. But the *Original* of them was Last among those who had not the Holy *Scriptures*, to Preserve the *Tradition*. Thus *False Religions* came in, and were nothing else but a *Corruption* of the *True*, at first *Instituted* by *God*.

But still they Retain'd so much of the *Stricture* of it, as to shew from whence they Came, and to be Reducible into it again. And they stand in many Points as *Witnesses* to it, and *Confirmations* of it. Particularly where *Reason* comes in, in Aid of *Religion*, as in our Present Case. The *Church* having the *Revelation* of the Blessed *Trinity*, builds upon that. And is not Oblidg'd to go any further. But the *Heathen Philosophers* had no other way of Proving it but by *Reason*. And some of them went very far in that, as we have seen; and may be Helpful even to *Christians*, in their *Contemplation* of the *Divine My-*

Mysteries. St. *Augustin* owns this in the seventh *Book* of his *Confessions*, and Professeth that the *Books* of the *Philosophers* were of Great use to him to Help him to Understand more Easily, some Orthodox Truths. And that he found in some of them almost all the Beginning of the Gospel of St. *John.* Which made *Amelius* an Heathen Philosopher say when he Read it, That that *Barbarian*(as he call'd St. *John*) had stol'n from their *Philosophers* his Notion of the λόγος or *Word* of *God*, being *God*, and *One* of the three first *Principles. Euseb. Præpar. Evan.* p. 540. But we shall see more of this when come to Consider that Place in St. *John*; And likewise how the *Philosophers*, but espicially the Ancient *Hereticks* (the *Predecessors* of the *Socinians* and *Arians*) had *Corrupted* the *Doctrin* of three first *Principles* with the Multitude and Confusion of their *Æones*, &c.

Therefor the *Apostles* and *Fathers* had Reason to give a *New* (which was nearer to the *Old*) *Interpretation* of the three first *Principles.*

SOC. Let me know a little what the *Old Notion* of these three *Principles* was and when it *Began* among the *Heathen.*

CHR. I told you before, that it came down to them by *Im-memorial Tradition* from the *Beginning*; and therefore we cannot Trace the *Beginning*. But we can Trace it so far, as to shew that it was no *Invention* of the *Christians.* For *Plato*, who has so much of it, was Born about 428. years before the Birth of *Christ.* But the *Heathen* did not Ascribe the Beginning of it to *Plato*, as if it were an *Invention* of his. They said that *Orpheus* had it long before *Plato.* And the *Chaldeans* had it long before *Orpheus.* They look'd upon it as coming down to them by Old and Long *Tradition*, whose Beginning they knew not. *Plotinus* speaking of these τρεῖς Αρχικὰς Ὑποστάσεις *three Chief Persons*, which sometimes they call *Principles*, says, Μὴ καινὰς μὴ ὃ νῦν ἀλλὰ πάλαι μὲν εἰρῆδαι.

That

That this was not *Now*, or then Invented, but a *Tradition* of *Old time*. And *Proclus* upon *Tim. Plat.* calls this Doctrin, ἡ περὶ τριῶν Θεῶν παράδοσις. The *Tradition* of *three Gods*. And Θεοπαράδοτος Θεολογία. The *Doctrin* or *Theology* that was *Deliver'd* or *Reveal'd* by *God*. They call'd these *Three*, sometimes three *Principles*, sometimes three *Gods*, sometimes three *Natures*, sometimes three *Persons*, τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις, and τρεῖς φύσεις. And it is not strange they shou'd fall into these *Varieties* of *Expressions* wanting the true *Revelation* of this Great *Mystery*, and consequently not ty'd up to that *Strictness* of *Expression* as we are But they Explain'd themselves so as to shew, that by these *Three* they meant *One* only *God*. Therefor they Call'd this *Trinity* of *Gods* the τὸ Θεῖον the *Godhead*, or *Nature* of *God*. As says their Ancient *Oracle*,

Παντὶ δὲ ἐν κόσμῳ λάμπει τριάς, ἧς Μόνας ἄρχει.

In all the World ther shines a *Trinity*, of which an *Unity* is the *Head*.

This is Inserted among the *Oracula Zoroastri en Platoncis Collecta*. p. 8. This Treatise of *Zoroaster's* is Publish'd by *Franc. Patricius*, at the End of his *Nova de Universis Philosophia*. fol. Edit. *Venit*. An. 1593.

The *Heathen Philosophy* is full of this Doctrin. And they plac'd a Gradual *Sub-Ordination* of these three Divine *Hypostases* or *Persons*. And from thence they Argu'd, that ther was a Necessity for these three *Hypostases* to be in the *Nature* of *God*. And that they cou'd be neither more nor less. And that they must Proceed from one another. *Porphyry* is Quoted to this Purpose by St. *Cyril*. Cont. *Jul*. l. 1. p. 34. Edit *Paris*. 1638. in *Fol*. Πορφύριος δὲ φησὶ, πλάτωνος ἐπιθέμενος δόξαν ἄχρι τριῶν ὑποστάσεων τῷ Θεῷ προελθεῖν ἐστίαν. That the *Divine Nature* do's Extend or Communicat it self to the three *Hypostases* or *Persons*. And *Philo* the *Jew* calls these three *Persons* τὸ ὄν, Δεσποτικὸν τῷ ὅλεω Δύναμιν. *de Agric. Noæ*. l. 2. the first, *Being*; the second, *Governing*

ning or *Preserving*; the third, *Love* or *Beneficence*. Which is the very *Order* in which we have Discours'd of the three *Persons*. And *Euseb.* in his *Prepar. Evangel.* p. 327, says, οἱ πάντες Ἑβραίων θεολόγοι μετὰ τὸν πάντων Θεὸν, καὶ μετὰ πρωτότοκον ἀπὸ Σοφίαν, τὸν τρίτον καὶ ἁγίαν Δύναμιν ἅγιον πνεῦμα προσείποντες, ἀποθεάζεσιν, ὑφ' οὗ καὶ ἐφωντίζοντο, θεοφορούμενοι. that is, all the *Jewish* Divines, after the *God* of all, and His first born *Wisdom*, do *Deify* a *Third* and *Holy Power*, which they call the *Holy Ghost*, of whom the *Inspired* were *Enlightned*.

Grotius Quotes some of their *Cabalists* who call *God* three *Lights*, and by the Names of *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*.

And *Ainsworth* on *Gen.* 1. Recites out of one of their *Rabbies*, that in the word, *Elohim* ther are three *Degrees*, each *Distinct* by it self, yet all *One*, Join'd in *One*, yet not *Divided* from one another.

But more of this as to both *Jews* and *Heathens*, when I come to shew you their Notion of the λόγος in Explanation of *Joh.* 1. 1.

XIII. A short *Re-capitulation.*

SOC. You have Begun with Clearing *Contradiction* out of the way, as to the *Trinity*, That ther is none in the *Terms* wherein you Express it, that is, of three *Persons* in one *Nature*. *Secondly*, That we cannot Infer *Contradiction* from one *Nature* to another, unless we *Understand* Both. Which you have Exemplify'd in the Instance of a *Man* born *Blind*, of the Different *Manner* of the *Presence* of *Soul* and *Body*, &c. *Thirdly*, you have Drawn *Parallels* as to those Particulars wherein we Charge *Contradiction* in your Notion of the *Trinity*, chiefly from the three *Faculties* in the *Soul* of *Man*. *Fourthly*, You have Endeavour'd to Prove even by *Reason*, the *Diversity* of *Persons* in *God*, from the Necessity of *Infinit Power* having an *Infinit Scope* wherein to Exert it self. Whence you have Inferr'd what you Call the *Fecundity* of *God*. And supported it with several *Parallels* which are made

use of in *Scripture*. And *Lastly*, to Remove the Prejudice of the *Trinity* being an *Invention* of the *Christians*, and likewise to Reconcile it more to our *Reason*, you have produc'd *Testimonies* from the *Heathens*, as well as the *Jews*, to shew that the same *Notion* had been with them all along, and Descended to them from the first *Revelation* given to *Adam*.

And all this I suppose you intended, to Facilitat my Understanding the *Texts* we are to Discourse of, in your *Sense*, and the commonly receiv'd *Notion*, and not to strain them as *you* say *we* do, from the *Plain* and *Genuin* meaning of the *Words*; And which you say we wou'd not do, but from the *Necessity* we think lies upon us to avoid *Contradiction*. And now I suppose you think the way is open to enter upon the Consideration of the *Texts* in *Scripture*, which must Determin the Point.

Parallel of two *Natures* in *Christ*.

But ther is another *Point* Involv'd with that of the *Trinity*, wherein *You* and *We* as much Differ, that is, what you call the *In-carnation*, that the *Divine* and *Human* Natures shou'd be both join'd in one *Person*. And among the *Texts* we are to Discuss, several Refer to this. Therefor before we Begin with the *Texts*, let me know if you have any *Parallel* or *Illustration* of this, to Remove my *Prejudice* (as you call it) from this *Sense* of these *Texts* too. And then we have Done with *Parallels*.

CHR. I will give you that in the words of the *Creed* of St. *Athanasius*, That *as the Reasonable Soul and Flesh is one Man, so God and Man is one Christ*. Now ther are no *two* things in the World so *Different* as the *Natures* of *Body* and *Soul*. Hardly any thing, except that of *Being*, agrees to *Both*. Yet how are they *United*, so as *Both* to make but one *Person*? And the *Parting* of them, is the *Distruction* of the *Person*. And even while they Remain *United*, their *Natures* and *Properties* are no ways *Confounded* or *Blended* together, the

Soul

Soul Partakes nothing at all of the *Nature* of the *Body*, nor the *Body* of the *Nature* or *Properties* of the *Soul*. But both Remain, tho' United, *Distinct* and *Intire*, each in its own *Nature* and *Properties*. Yet the *Properties* of *Either* are Attributed to the *Person* that is Compos'd of *Both*. Thus *Man* is said to *Eat*, *Drink*, *Sleep*, &c. whereas these belong only to the *Body*. He is said likewise to *Understand*, *Remember*, *Love* or *Hate*. And these belong only to the *Soul*, Thus when *Christ* suffer'd, *God* is said to *Suffer*, to shed his *Blood*, to *Die* for us, *Act*, 20. 28. 1. *Joh*. 3. 16. Tho' this Cou'd not belong to the *Divine* Nature of *Christ*. He is likewise call'd the *Mighty God*, the *Everlasting Father*, Isai. 9. 6. And that *All things were Created by Him*. Col. 1. 16. Which cou'd not belong to His *Human* Nature. But *Both* and *Either* are spoke of His *Person*, in which Both *Natures* are *United*. And this shews Him to be both *God* and *Man*, since the *Properties* of Both *Natures* are Attributed to Him.

SOC. By what *Links* and *Chains* can *God* and *Man* be Join'd together, so as to make one *Person*?

CHR. I cannot tell you. Nor how *God* do's *Communicat* of Himself to *Creatures*. In Him we *Live* and *Move* and have our *Being*. The *Being* of every *Creature* is a *Communication* of *God*.

SOC. But how can the same *Person* be *Finit* and *Infinit*? Do's not this Imply a *Contradiction*?

CHR. How can the same *Person* be *Mortal* and *Immortal*? Do's not this Imply a *Contradiction*? But it is none, while it is not spoken of the same thing. It is spoken of the same *Person*, but not of the same *Nature*. Thus we say of the same *Man*, that he is *Mortal*, and likewise that he is *Immortal*. But the one is spoken in Relation to his *Soul*, the other to his *Body*. And can any Man tell the *Links* and *Chains* by which *Mortal* and *Immortal*, by which *Spirit* and *Flesh* are Join'd together,

gether, so as to make but one and the same *Person*? These things we cannot Explain in *our selves*. And wou'd we Explain them in *God*! Whose *Power* is *Infinit*, and what is *Impossible* with *Men*, is *Easy* to *God*, for with Him all things are *Possible*.

SOC. But can the *Godhead* be *Converted* into any thing else than what it is? That wou'd Argue *Mutability* in *God*. How then can the *Godhead* be *Converted* into the *Manhood*.

CHR. The *Godhead* is not *Converted* into the *Manhood*. As the *Soul* is not *Converted* into the *Body*, in the *Union* of our *Persons*. Therefore the *Creed* of St. *Athanasius* says, That *God* and *Man* are *One* in the *Person* of *Christ*, *Not by the Conversion of the Godhead into Flesh, but by taking the Manhood into God*.

SOC. I see that *Athanasius* went upon *Parallels* as well as you. But you Urge *Parallells* no further than as *Illustrations*, to Remove our *Prejudice* from taking the *Scriptures* in your *Sense*. Therefore the *Scriptures* must Determin the Cause. And now let us come to to them.

XIV. The Current *Sense* of the *Church* the best *Interpreter* of the Holy *Scriptures*.

CHR. Ther is another *Preliminary* Necessary to be settl'd, in order to our Right *Understanding* of the Holy *Scriptures*. And that is, in what *Sense* we shall take them. All *words* are are *Equivocal*. And Capable of Different *Meanings*, either *Literal* or *Figurative*. And for us to set our *Fancies* on work what this or that *word* may be *Screw'd* to, and to put our own *Inventions* upon them, is *Endless*, and of no *Certainty* when we have done. Who wou'd Build his *Faith* upon the *Criticism* of a *Lexicon*? Tho' I deny not but ther is use for this sort of Learning too, in its Place. And many times it serves to *Illustrate* and *Clear* up things very much.

But the Ground and Foundation we have to go upon, in Disputed *Places* of Holy *Scripture*, is the *Sense* in which they to whom they were Deliver'd did *Understand* them. They who Learn'd the *Doctrins* from the *Mouths* of

of the *Apostles*, as well as from their *Writings*. These, surely, must best know the *Meaning* of these *Writings*. And then again, they to whom *These* taught them. And so on thro the several *Ages* of the *Church*. And Considering that the *Gospel* was *Preached*, before the *Apostles* left the World, in most *Countries* of the then known *Earth*, even as far as the *East Indies*, what was the Common and Receiv'd *Doctrin* in all these far Distant *Churches*, must be what was at first *Deliver'd* to them; and cou'd not be any *Concert* or *Contrivance* among them, who had no *Correspondence* with, or so much as *Knowledge* of one another.

This is Reducing our Dispute to Matter of *Fact*, to what was the *Doctrin* of the *Church*, and the *Universal* and Receiv'd *Doctrin*, especially in the *First* and *Purest Ages*. This was the Method taken with *Arius*, in the *Council* of *Alexandria*, they did not go with him upon his *Logick*, nor *Criticism* and *Etymology* of words, but *Quis unquam talia Audivit*? Who ever Heard of this *Doctrin* before? And there being *Bishops* Assembl'd from several *Countries*, each declar'd the *Doctrin* that had been Receiv'd in his *Country*. All which Concurring against the *New* Notions started by *Arius*, they were Rejected as *Novelties*, and *Breaches* upon the *Christian Faith*. As you may see in *Socrat. Hist.* l. 1. c. 5.

SOC. We know the force of this *Argument*. And therefor we Contend that the Current *Doctrin* of the *Church* was our way before the first *Council* of *Nice*. Which we say Corrupted the true *Christian* Faith.

CHR. You have none to Quote on your side, but those who were Condemn'd by the *Church*, as *Hereticks*, for these and such like *Doctrins*, contrary to the *Faith* Establish'd every where.

This is *Learnedly* and *Elabouratly* set forth by Dr. *Bull*, in a *Treatise* wrote on Purpose upon that Subject, concerning the *Ante-Nicene Faith*. Wherein he fully Vindicats

dicats the *Fathers* of those *Ages*, from the Aspersions you wou'd cast upon them, as any way Favouring your *Heresy*.

And thus far will come in my way, that in Examining the several *Texts* of *Scripture*, I will endeavour to bring some of the *Ante-Nicene Fathers* for the *Orthodox* Construction, against that *Interpretation* which you set up. And wherein their *Faith* concerning the *Doctrin* of the Holy *Trinity*, and likewise as to the *Divinity* of our Lord *Christ*, will fully appear.

If I bring them not upon every *Text*; or not *many* of them; it is not strange, since the *Writers* of those *Ages* were not *many*. And their *Works*, that are come to our hands, are generally *Epistles* or *Apologies*, or upon particular *Subjects*, not *Comments* upon the *Scripture* in Order, as became more the use in the after *Ages*. And therefor their *Sense* upon particular *Texts* is to be found, as it were by Chance, where they have occasion to Quote them upon other *Subjects*. And tho' it will take more *Pains*, yet I hope I shall have sufficient for what I have Undertaken.

THE

THE SECOND DIALOGUE.

Concerning the *Texts* of Holy *Scripture*, which are brought for the Proof of the Bleſſed *Trinity*, and *Divinity* of *Chriſt*.

SOCINIAN. YOU have *Promis'd* fair, if you can *Perform* Equally. But before we begin with the *Texts* in the order they are Quoted in our *Brief Hiſtory*, I deſire you wou'd give me one of your Maſterly *Texts*, as you think, for the Proof of your *Doctrin*; that we may Conſider it more fully by it ſelf, than the Time will allow us in Running over the many other *Texts* Quoted.

CHRISTIAN. With all my Heart: And this will determin the Cauſe, in a manner, before it be Determin'd: And beſides, will make my Anſwer to your *Interpretation* of the other *Texts* both *Shorter*, and *Plainer*, and ſave many *Repititions*.

XV. *Joh.* 1. 1. particularly Conſider'd.

The *Text* that I offer for this, is, *Joh.* 1. 1. *In the Beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God.* In order to Underſtand this more

Perfectly, it will be necessary to know upon what *Occasion*, and with Respect to *whom*, the *Apostle* wrote this.

Ther was at that time one *Cerinthus*, an *Arch-Heretick* and *Disciple* of *Simon Magus*, who affirm'd that *Jesus* was the Son of *Joseph* and *Mary*. That *Christ* or the *Word* came upon Him, in the Form of a *Dove*, at his *Baptism*, and Inspir'd him with the Knowlege of *God* the *Father*, and with the Power of working *Miracles*. That when *Jesus* suffer'd, *Christ* left Him, and flew up into *Heaven* without Partaking any thing of his *Sufferings*. It was against this *Cerinthus* and his *Followers*, that St. *John* wrote his *Gospel*, when he was Return'd to *Ephesus*, after the Death of *Domitian*. See *Iren*. l. 1. c. 25. l. 3. c. 11. *Epiphan. Her*. 22. &c.

These *Hereticks* being *Bewildred* in their *Imaginations*, and given up to the *Delusions of Satan*, Fancy'd to themselves several *Æones* or *Ages*, which they said *God* Produc'd after one another. Of these St. *Irenæus* gives us a large Account. One of these they Call'd Σιγὴ *Silence*, from whence they said the λόγος or *Word* did Proceed. Whence St. *Ignatius*, in opposition to them, calls *Christ* the λόγος ἀΐδιος ἐκ ἀπὸ Σιγῆς προελθὼν that is, *The Eternal Word, not proceedeng from Silence*. Epist. ad *Magnes*.

This was in Pursuance to what his *Master* St. *John* (whose *Disciple* he was) had wrote against these same *Hereticks*, beginning his *Gospel* in the words of this *Text*, Asserting the *Word* of *God* not to have been any of these fancy'd *Æones*, Produc'd in *Time*, but to have been in the *Beginning* with *God*, and to be *God*. And *Grotius* upon this *Text* says, that *In the Beginning* was a common *Hebrew Phrase* whereby to Express *Eternity*. *Sicut mos est Hebræis Æternitatem populariter describere*. And his Authority is the more considerable to you, because your

your *Brief History* says, p. 31. That *H. GROTIUS is a SOCINIAN all over.*

Ther were others concern'd besides these *Hereticks* in what St. *John* wrote concerning the Λόγος, that was, the *Jews* and the *Heathens.* And it will be necessary also to know what their Notion was of the *Logos*, that we may see how the *Apostle* adapted what he said to all of them. And this I will shew you presently, when I come to answer what your *Brief History of the Unitarians*, says to this *Text*, from which I will no longer detain you.

SOC. He says, p. 83. That by the *word* is only meant God's *Power* and *Wisdom*, which is not something different from *God*, but being His *Wisdom* and *Power*, is *God.*

He says likewise, p. 84. That the Appellation of *God* is given to *Angels* and *Men.* As *Moses* was call'd a *God* to *Pharaoh.* Exod. 7. 1.

CHR. These *two* answers which the *Hist.* of *Unita.* gives to this Text, do Contradict one another. The *First* supposes the *Word* to be *Real God.* The *Second* to be but *Man*, and call'd God *in a Borrow'd Sense* as ther are Gods by *Office* or *Deputation* from God. The *first* answer makes the *Word* not to be any thing *Different* from *God.* The *Second* says that it is *Man* and *not God.*

SOC. These *two* answers I confess cannot well stand together ; they cannot both be true. But let us see if either of them will hold. Therefore pray satisfy me as to the first answer ; that is, that by the *Word* of God any more is meant than the *Power* or *Wisdom* of God, as we say the *Power* or *Wisdom* of a *Man*, by which nothing is meant different from the *Man.*

CHR. You remember what we have discours'd, That *Properties* in *Body*, and *Faculties* in *Soul*, are *Persons* in *God.* And the reasons why it must be so. And there-

for the *Wisdom* of a Man is not a distinct *Person* in Man, but it is otherwise in God, whose Wisdom is a distinct *Hypostases*, that is, a *Subsistence*, or *Person* in his *Nature*.

SOC. I Remember this very well, and what has been said upon it; but we are now upon the point of *Scripture*, and therefore I desire, that you wou'd shew me from *Scripture*, that the *Word* is a distinct *Person* from *God*.

CHR. You have not remembred exactly, for we do not say, That any of the *Persons* of God are distinct from *God*? But they are distinct *In* God. *God* is as it were a *Species* to all the *Persons*; tho' it be sometimes more particularly apply'd to the *First* Person, as has been shewn. The *Nature* of *God* is *One*, and the *three Persons* are all *In* it. And ther is an Example of this among Men. We do not say that *John* is a distinct Person *from* Human Nature; but he is a distinct Person *In* Human Nature. That is, he is a distinct *Person* from other *Persons* who partake equally of the same Nature. *John* is a distinct Person *from Peter*, and *Peter* from *John*; but neither of them is distinct *from* that *Nature* of which he partakes, and which consequently is *his own Nature*. That wou'd be, to be distinct *from* Himself. The Destinction is not in the *Nature*, for a Distinction cannot be 'twixt *One*. But the Distinction is 'twixt *several Persons* who are united in the *same Nature*. Thus the *Son* is a Distinct Person *from* the *Father*, but not *from* God, unless where *God* is taken for the *Father*.

SOC. I see my mistake in this. Therefore, pray, go on and shew, that the *word* is a distinct Person *In* God, or *from* the *Father*.

CHR. I prove it, because Personal Actions are attributed to Him: And because he is set up as the Object of our *Adoration*. Which you do not deny; for you worship *Him*. i. e. *Christ*, whom St. *John* calls *The word*. And I think you will not dispute that any thing but a *Per-*

1. The *Son* a Distinct *Person* from the *Father*.

Person can be an object of *Worship:* Therefor, if *Christ* be a *Person*, which you confess, the *Word* must be a *Person*, because you cannot deny that in the First of St. *John*, He is call'd the *Word*.

I shall have occasion to shew you hereafter, that the *Chaldee Paraphrase* and the *Jewish Targums* do all along, in the *Old Testament*, make the *word of Jehovah* Synonimous with *Jehovah Himself*, and yet a Distinct *Person*, from Him; and do attribute to the *Word* the same *Personal Actions*, as to *Jehovah*; and to be Equally *Adorable* as *Jehovah*. As, the *word of Jehovah* Raining down fire from *Jehovah* upon *Sodom*. *Gen.* 19. 24. The *word of Jehovah* shall be my *God*. *Gen.* 28. 21. *Abraham* worshiped and called upon the name of the *word of Jehovah*, and said Thou art *Jehovah*, &c. more of this I will shew you, when I come to Explain what Notion the *Jews* had of the *Logos* or *word of God*, how they esteem'd *Him* to be both *God*, and a Distinct *Person*. But now, as to the *Scripture*, in the plain words of the Text. *Psal.* 110. 1. *The Lord said unto my Lord, sit Thou on my Right hand, till I make Thine Enemies Thy Footstool.* That the *Second* Lord, here spoken of was *Christ* is plain from *Matt.* 22. 44. and that the *Jews* so Understood it; whence the *Targum* of *Jonathan* renders it thus, *The Lord said to His word.* In the Language of St. *John*, who calls *Christ* the *word of God*. And ther cannot be a greater Distinction of *Persons*, than one to *Speak* to the other, one to *sit* on the others Right Hand, one to *Subdue* the others *Enemies*, &c.

And therefor where it is said, *The word is God*, by the *word* a *Person* must be meant, and not only a *Property* or *Attribute* of God. *Which*, as your Author says, *is not something different from God, but is God*, and yet in the very same answer he says, *that it is so God, that it is not all that God is.* This is as unintelligible to me as the *Trinity* can be to him. *To be God* and to be *nothing* Hist. p. 83. 84

different

different from God; and yet to be *so God* as not to be *all that God is!* This is past all Human Understanding, for if you be not *all that God is*, you cannot be *God*, but a Piece of God, and if you be not something *different from God*, then you must be *all that God is.*

SOC. The Def. of the History, pag. 44. means no more by, *The word was God*, then that the *word* was *in some manner like God.*

CHR. He does not deserve an Answer. Let his *Historian* answer him, or let him answer the *Historian*, for in this, he disputes against him instead of defending him. Nay, let this *Defender* answer himself, he says, p. 53. that the Knowlege which *Christ* had was by the *Divine Word* abiding on him, which agrees with the *Historian*, p. 120. who likewise tells of the *Divine Word* being communicated to *Angels* and *Men*, p. 83. and 84. and that the *word was made Flesh* means no more than the *words* abiding on or inhabiting an Human Person, the Person of *Jesus*, p. 87. so that *here* the *word* is kept as a distinct thing from *Jesus*, and according to this the *word* was not a *Man*, was not *Jesus*, but only did Inspire *Jesus*; and yet the *Defender* p. 46. says expresly, and gives it as his Paraphrase upon that Text, *The word was made Flesh*, that the *word* did not only *Inhabit* and *Inspire Jesus* but was *that Man Jesus*; these are the words of his Paraphrase. *The word (Jesus) was a Man like unto us in all things, Sin only excepted,* and to fortify this, he quotes Mr. *Limborck*, speaking these words. *The true Sense of this Place, is, that the WORD WAS FLESH, that is, a TRUE FLESHLY SUBSTANCE, subject to all the Infirmities that attend our Flesh, that is to say, He was Mortal, Vile, and Contemptible, which appear'd more especially in the Days of His Passion and of His Death, which are call'd* Heb. 5. 7. *THE DAYS OF HIS FLESH that is, the Flesh, Death, Passion,* &c. *of the WORD OF GOD.* And yet in the same place he says, *now is it not*

more

more agreeable to Reason and Scripture to interpret these words thus —— than to say, THE WORD WAS INCARNAT, which is a Language unknown to Scripture, &c.

Is not this Astonishing! Pray, what is the difference 'twixt, *The word was made Flesh*, and *the word was Incarnat*, but that *made Flesh* is the *English* for *Incarnat*? Do these Men speak against Mysteries!

Ther are multitudes of more Quotations out of *Scripture*, may be given to prove the *Word* to be a *Person*. *John* 1. 14. *The Word was made Flesh*. You will not say it was the *Bible* that was made *Flesh*? Or any *outward Speech* or *Declaration* of Gods? Was it not a *Person* that was made *Flesh*.

SOC. By *God's word* there, is meant *God* Himself, and not any thing distinct from God, as I told you just now.

CHR. Was it *God* Himself than that was made *Flesh*?

SOC. The word was made Flesh, that is, *Did abide on, and Inhabit an Human Person; and so was in appearance made Flesh or Man*, or the word became *Incarnat*, *that is, abode on the Person of Jesus Christ*. Hist. Uni- P. 87. 86.

CHR. I must still ask, what was it that was made *Flesh* or *Man*? If by the *Word of God* you mean *God Himself*, then *God* was made *Man*, which you will not allow.

If you mean only some *outward Speech* or *Declaration* of His, as the *Book* of the *Scriptures*, or the like. Then that *Book* was made *Man* or *Incarnat*.

SOC. You do not observe that he says, the word was *in appearance*, made Man.

CHR. I did observe it, and see the utmost pains taken to escape the force of this *Text*. But this, like all other Fallacious Subterfuges will involve you in greater difficulties: For was ther *nothing* really made *Flesh* in this *Text*? Those *Hereticks* wou'd be beholding to you, who say that *Christ* assum'd only a *Body* of *Air*, and suffer'd only

only in *Appearance* and *Show*, but had no real *Flesh* or *Blood*.

But these your *Hist.* calls *false Prophets and Teachers*, p. 151.

But pray how did the Word *appear* to be Flesh? Or how was it *Incarnat*?

SOC. Because it did *Inspire* or *abode on* the *Person* of *Jesus*.

CHR. Do's that make it *Flesh*? Or *appear* to be *Flesh*?

SOC, I dare not say that, for it did *Inspire* the *Prophets*, and *Patriarchs*; and the Spirit of God Inspires every Holy person. But it was in Christ *in a more Eminent manner*.

CHR. Does that make it *Flesh*? Does the *Spirit of God* contract the *Nature* of *Flesh*, when it Inspires a *Person* who has *Flesh*? It inspir'd *Moses* more than other *Prophets*, and the *Prophets* more than other Men: Is it therefor more *Flesh* in a *Prophet* than in another Saint? Or can you say that *it* is *Flesh* at all, by any Inspiration *it* gives to Men? Does *it* Contract *Corruption* and become *Flesh*, by its *Inspiration* of *Man*? Can *It* be *tainted* by touching one Nature? Is the Spirit *Incarnat* when it abides upon any *Man*?

Joh. 3. 34. *SOC.* All these you speak of did partake of Gods Spirit, or Inspiration in their several *Degrees*, But it is said of *Christ*, That God giveth not the Spirit *by measure* unto *Him*; what Alteration this will make, is to be Consider'd.

CHR. It is indeed, and by the Argument you have already heard, it will prove *Christ* to be *God*; for as we said before, nothing can hold *Infinit*, but *Infinit*. And therefor nothing can hold the Spirit of God, *without measure*, that is the *whole Spirit of God*, but what is it self as *Infinit* and *without measure*, as that *Spirit*.

Irenæus

Irenæus (advef. Her. l. 3. c. 17.) Difputes againft thofe who faid that *Jefus* was the Receptacle of *Chrift*, upon whom *Chrift* Defcended like a Dove; So you fee this is no new fhift of our *Authors* to avoid this *Text*.

Origin (in *John*, p. 416. 2. Tom) fays, That the *Son* is the Brightnefs of *all* Gods Glory, as it is deliver'd by *Paul. Heb.* 1. 3. *who being the Brightnefs of his Glory.* But ther are particular Brightneffes, which come from this Brightnefs of *all* the Glory. But none can partake of the *Whole* Brightnefs of *all* Gods Glory ἢ τ ὑὸν αὐτȣ *Except His Son.* And, fays he, if you add *His Spirit* too, you will think and fpeak moft truly and perfectly of God. Thefe are the words of *Origin.*

SOC. I muft not now be Diverted, I have had my faying to that Argument already. Therefore I defire to know if you have any more to prove the Diverfity of *Perfons* in God, or, which is the fame, that either of the two, the *Word*, or the *Spirit*, are *Perfons.*

CHR. John. 16. 13, 14. Chrift fays of the Spirit— *He fhall not fpeak of Himfelf, He fhall receive of mine, and fhew it to you*; and in anfwer to this, the *Hift.* of *Unita.* pag. 99. fays, That *of thofe who are Unitarians, all the Arians and very many Socinians do acknowledge that the Holy Spirit is a PERSON.* 2. The *Holy Ghoft* a *Perfon.*

SOC. But in the fame Place, they deny Him to be *God.* And make Him only *Chief of the Heavenly Spirits, and prime Minifter of God, and of Chrift.*

CHR. Then you make Him not only to be a *Creature*, but to be a Subject or Minifter to another *Creature*, which is *Chrift.*

SOC. I cannot help that.

CHR. But what fay you of the *Word of God?* Is that a *Creature* too?

SOC. The *Divine Wifdom* and *Power* is call'd, *The Word.* As faid before.

CHR. Does the *Wisdom* or *Power* of God differ from the *Spirit* of God?

SOC. No sure, for what is the *Wisdom* or *Power* of a Man, but the *Spirit* of a Man? They are but different Expressions of the same thing.

CHR. Then the *Word* of God, and the *Spirit* of God are the same thing.

SOC. Yes. At most but a different Expression of the same thing. And we use these words Promiscuously: The *Word* or *Power* of God abiding on Christ, and the *Holy Ghost* or *Spirit* is *Meerly the Power of God*? says the *Hist. of the Unita.* p. 4. 75. 125.

CHR. And in what you have quoted before, upon the Text. *John.* 1. 1. *The word was God.* The *Hist. of the Unita.* says that *the Word (or Divine Wisdon and Power) is not some thing different from God; but being His Wisdom and Power is God.*

But, pag. 99. you say, That the *Holy Spirit* is not *God*, or a *God*.

SOC. That was but the Opinion of some of the *Unitarians.*

CHR. Your *History* says it was the Opinion of *all the* Arians *and very many* Socinians.

SOC. Well! That is but *some* of the *Unitarians* still.

CHR. It is the *major* Part by much of your Congregation, and the most *ancient* Part.

SOC. I believe we must give off the *Arians.*

CHR. Nay, we will have *very many of the Socinians* too, by the Confession of your own *History.*

SOC. I confess we *Unitarians* are *Divided.*

CHR. And worse than that, you lose all your pretence to *Antiquity.* For you must not derive your selves from the *Arians*, no nor from *Socinians* neither, for *very many* of his Disciples are against you.

John 16. 13, 14. *SOC.* I care not for *Antiquity*, nor *Universality*, Truth is not carry'd by Votes. Let us come to the Argument; Christ says,

says, That *the Spirit shall not speak of Himself.*—— *He shall receive of mine, and shew it to you.* To this Objection you have repeated one Answer of *all the Arians*, and *very many Socians*; and I must own, upon our Principles, that you have Confuted it.

But ther is a second Answer there given, p. 99. which is that I stick too, and that is, *That Actions proper to Persons are, by a Figure, apply'd to things, and even to Qualities of things.* As God's Commands are call'd *Councellours*; Wisdom is said to *lift up her Voice, build her House, hew out her seven Pillars*, &c. And this is the Answer my Author gives to *John.* 1. 3. *all things were made by him*, (the Word;) for here, says he, the word begins to be spoken of as a *Person*, by the same figure of Speech that *Solomon* saith, *Wisdom hath builded her House*, &c. Hist. p. 52.

But farther, the *Def. of the Hist.* p. 40. says, that the Creation of the world cannot be prov'd from this Text, That *all things were made* by the *Word*; because he says, that the words *Heaven, Earth* or *Sea*, are never omitted in the Descriptions we have in Scripture of the first and true *Creation.* For you must know that this *Defender of our Historian* understands all this Passage in the *first* of St. *John*, not of the *Creation*, but only of the first *Propagation* of the *Gospel.*

CHR. Then he thinks that *Heaven, Earth* and *Sea*, are not included in *all things that were made*? But he is very positive that the *Creation* is never mention'd in *Scripture* without mentioning *Heaven, Earth*, or *Sea.* And consequently that where it mentions the Creation of *Heaven, Earth* or *Sea*, it is never attributed to *Christ.*

This is a very bold Assertion, but it is necessary to his Cause, to avoid the plain *Texts* which speak of the *World* being made by *Christ.* Let us see therefore if we can please him in his own Method, tho' it be no ways necessary; for none of Common Sense can deny, but the *Creation* may be Spoke of in General words, which in-

clude all Particulars, without mentioning the particulars, or any of them.

But to take way all his excuse, these Words are expresly apply'd to *Christ*. *Heb*, 1. 10. *Thou Lord in the Beginning hast laid the Foundation of the EARTH and the HEAVENS are the work of thine Hands.* We shall have occasion to clear this further by and by. *vers.* 2. it is said *by whom* (Christ) *He* (*God*) *made the World.* But your *Author* will not let this mean the *Creation*, because the words *Heaven* or *Earth* or *Sea* are not there, for the same reason he will except against *ver.* 3. of Chap. ii. *The Worlds were fram'd by the Word of God, so that things which are seen, were not made of things that do appear.* These things which are seen must be *Heaven*, *Earth* or *Sea*. But it is no matter, if they be not nam'd it shall not do: Besides the *Apostle* is here making a Regular Deduction down all along from the *Creation*, which he begins vers. 3. in the words I have Repeated, then vers. 4. he comes to *Abel*, vers. 5. to *Enoch*. vers. 7. to *Noah* vers. 8. to *Abraham*, and so on. But all this is nothing, that must not be the *Creation* whence this Narration begins, but it shall be what came to pass, some thousand years after, and which has no Relation to the Narrative the Apostle has in hand. But that the *Creation* may be meant without the Mention of *Heaven*, *Earth* or *Sea*, appears from Act 17. 24. there it is said. *God that made the World and all things therein.* That this was spoken of the *Creation* no *Socinian* dare deny. It is St. *Paul's* Argument to the *Heathen* Idolaters, who knew nothing of the *Gospel* being call'd the *Creation* of the *World.* Indeed *Heaven* and *Earth* are mention'd afterward, where it is said that God is *Lord of Heaven and Earth*, but ther is no mention of *Heaven* or *Earth*, where it speaks of the *Creation*, and so spoilt our *Authors* Observation. Tho' if it were Granted him, it cou'd do him no Service, because the *Creation* is attributed to *Christ*, with express mention of *Heaven* and *Earth*, as before is shewn. *Heb.* 1. 10.

again

again. *Col.* 1. 16. *By Him.* (Christ) *were all things Created that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth.* And ther are several other Texts to the same purpose.

But ther is nothing better to confute a *Socinian* then plainly to set down his *Paraphrase*, and shew how it fills the words of the *Text*. Thus then the *Def. of the History* Paraphrases this vers. *Joh.* 1. 3. *all things were made by him, and without him, was not any thing made, that was made.* Paraphrase. *All things necessary to the Propagation of the Gospel, were Perform'd by him: And without his Direction there was not any thing perform'd, that was perform'd.*

A little of this art wou'd turn the whole *Chap.* of *Gen.* from meaning the *Creation*, or any thing else. I am weary of pursuing such Extravagance.

But let *Creation* mean only the *Preaching* of the Gospel, or what you please, yet is not that it self a *Personal* Action? How come you then to deny the *Word* to be a *Person*? You dare not trust your Cause, and all your Defence is because *Wisdom* is said to *Live*, &c.

I have told you already, That the *Second* Person of the Trinity is describ'd by the name of *Wisdom*, in the *Proverbs* Particularly, and in many other Scriptures. But I need not this now, for I will freely acknowlege, That Actions proper to *Persons* are sometimes, by a Figure, apply'd to *things*, and even *Qualities*.

But at the same time you will allow me, that ther is a way to distinguish 'twixt *Figures* and *Plain* speaking; and that a *Figure* will not do in every place; and that notwithstanding of *Figures*, we may destinguish *Persons* from *Qualities*. And no where more plainly than in the present Case. How cou'd you distinguish one *Person* not to be another *Person*; or that the thing you speak of is not a naked *Quality*, more than to say, *He shall not speak of Himself— He shall receive of mine, and shew it to you?*

Do men use to say, that a *Quality* shall not speak of it self, which certainly cannot speak at all? Wou'd you make

Christ

Christ guilty of such a *Figure* of Speech as this? Do men say that a *Quality*, shall Receive of one, and give it to Another? If these be not Marks by which to distinguish *Persons*, I wou'd desire to know any others that are more certain.

All Actions are *Personal* Actions: And when they are ascrib'd to *Qualities*, it means, That it was by such *Qualitys* that the *Person* perform'd such an Action, otherwise it is not proper to ascribe *Personal* Actions to *Qualities*.

You will say it was great *Wisdom*, Built such a *Fabrick*, Erected such a *Monarchy*, or the like effects of *Wisdom*: But you do not say, That *Wisdom* walks in the *Garden*, or *Rides* such a *Horse*, or *calls* such a Man by his *Name*, or grants him a *Commission* to go to such a *Place*, to do such things, which otherwise he had not *Authority* to do, let him have never so much *Wisdom* as to Command a *Troop* of *Horse*, to be *Governor* of such a *Town*, to Grant a *Pardon* or the like, These are a little too *Personal* to ascribe to naked *Qualities*, and no man wou'd understand you, if you speak at such a Rate, you might as well give a *Quality* Power to Raise *Money*, declare *War* against *France*, and name every *Ambassador*, and say Lord *B*—— shall not not go, but Lord *D*—— shall go.

SOC. This indeed wou'd be out of all roads of Speaking, but can you find that the *Holy Ghost* ever spoke so particularly as this, and nam'd Persons of Himself to do this or that, without Acting by Ministers, that is Inspiring *Prophets* to name Men, and the like.

CHR. Yes, as positively as ever was said of any *Person*, and in Actions as *Personal* and Particular.

Acts. 13. 2. *The Holy Ghost said seperate me* Barnabas *and* Saul, *for the Work whereunto I have called them.*

The Spirit said unto PHILIP, go near and join thy
Acts. 8. 29. *self to this Chariot.* And again, *The Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip.* ver. 39. Was not this a *Personal* Action? Cou'd a naked *Quality* catch a Man up in the Air, and carry him

carry him from one place to another? *The Spirit said unto* Peter, *behold three Men seek thee.* Act 10. 19. *Peter* cou'd not tell by his own Wisdom, that ther were three Men seeking him; therefor this cannot be made Parallel to the Expression of *Wisdom building a House*, or the like Effects of *Wisdom* in a Man; for this was no Effect of any *Wisdom* in *Peter*, but a Revelation to him from the *Spirit*; which therefor must be a *Person*.

It is not call'd a *Revelation* which I find out by any *Wisdom* God has given me.

Christ says, *I will send the Comforter to you from the Father.* Do Men send *Qualities* of Errands? Is not the *Sender* a different *Person* from him that is sent? Or do's a Man send *himself* from *himself*? Besides *Christ* was *Conceiv'd* by the *Holy Ghost* in the Womb of the *Virgin*, which sure is a *Personal* Action. Naked *Qualities* do not use to *Beget* or *Generate*. *Joh.* 15. 26.

SOC. This must be Consider'd of: But go on.

CHR. I wou'd desire you to tell me what *Spirit* it was which *Christ* speaks of, *Joh.* 16. 13, 14. where he says, That the *Spirit* shall not speak of *Himself*, &c.

SOC. That is told you in the second Answer which we are now upon pag. 100. of *Brief History*. That it was the *Holy Spirit*, or *Power* of God.

CHR. Is this *Spirit* or *Power* any thing *different* from *God*?

SOC. No. That has been told you already from pag. 83. where it is said in plain and express Terms, That the Divine *Wisdom* and *Power* is not something *different* from *God*, but *is God*, and that *'Tis the common Maxim of Divines*; that the *Attributes* and *Properties of God, are God.*

CHR. Then it was *God*, who was not to *speak of himself*; but to receive of *Christ*; *Christ* was to *Dictat*, and *God* to *Repeat*!

SOC.

SOC. Pag. 101. it is said, That He was *not to speak of Himself, but to speak what he cou'd hear from God.*

CHR. Then it was *God* who was to hear from *God*? And *God* was not to speak of *Himself*; but only what *God* shou'd tell him!

SOC. All this Non-sense cannot be Charg'd upon my *Author*, because he supposes this *Spirit* to be a *Creature*, and not to be *God*.

CHR. That is the *first* Answer, which you have rejected. And you have prov'd pag. 83. and elsewhere, That the *Spirit* is not any thing *different* from *God*, but is *God*. And even in this very *second* Answer which you mention, p. 100. (that you may not be charg'd with forgetfulness) you call this *Spirit*, by the name of the *Holy-Spirit*, or *Power* of *God*.

SOC. We do so, and we keep constant to this now, tho' we part with *all the Arians*, and *very many of the Socinians* in so doing.

CHR. Then the Nonsense which you said just now, cou'd dot be charg'd upon your *Author*, must be laid to his Account again, *viz.* To make the *Spirit* or *Power* of God, which is God, not to speak of *Himself*, but to receive from *God*, and speak what *God* did dictat to *God*, &c.

SOC. I must take time to Consider of this.

CHR. But besides, I'm afraid the Constancy which you bragg you have to this Opinion now, viz. *That the Spirit is not any thing different from God, but that it is God.* Does not hold very well with you, but that you are forc'd to part with it sometimes, when it is for your Conveniency.

SOC. If you can shew me any such thing, I will trust no more to any thing *our Unitarians* say.

CHR. Look into the History p. 125. and therein answer to that Crabbed Text, 2 *Cor.* 13, 14. he replys in these words, *This Text Demonstrats, that neither the*

Lord

Lord Christ, nor the Holy Spirit are God, for it plainly Distinguishes them from God.

Here the *Holy Spirit* is plainly *Distinguish'd from God*, and *is not God.* And before, as you have said, *It is not any thing different from God, but it is God.*

SOC. It is time to go to the *second* Answer which the *Hist. Unita.* gives to that Text *John* 1. 1. *The Word was God.* For ther is enough said as to the *first* Answer, *viz.* That by the *Word* here is only meant God's *Power* and *Wisdom*, which is not any thing different from *God*, but is *God.* The *second* Answer, is, That the word *God* is given sometimes to *Creatures*, to *Angels*, and even to *Men.* And therefor that *Text* may not mean that the *Word* was the *Supreme God*, but only *a God* as *Kings* are call'd *Gods*, &c.

CHR. To reduce the State of the Case as short and clear as possible, it is thus. The Distinction is 'twixt a God by *Nature*, and a God by *Office*, or *Deputation.* By *Nature*, we all agree, ther can be but *one God*: But by *Office* ther be *Gods* many, and *Lords* many, whether in Heaven or in Earth. 1. *Cor.* 8. 5.

Now in which of these Senses the *Word* is call'd *God* is the Question?

SOC. That indeed is the Question, and if you can make it clear, this Cause, for ought I can see, will remain decided for ever.

CHR. If I can make appear what St. *John*'s meaning was, who wrote these words, I suppose that will satisfy you.

SOC. Yes sure, what he meant by it is the whole matter.

CHR. I have told you before the Notions of the *Jews* and *Heathens* as to the *Trinity*, That they did believe three *Hypostases* or *Persons* in the *Divine Nature*; and consequently each of these Persons must be God by *Nature.* 3. The *Heathens* Notion of the *Logos.*

ture. The second of these *Persons* they did call the Λόγος, the *Word*

This is so notoriously known that I might spare any Proof of it, therefor I will give you but a few Authorities that I might not seem to speak wholly Precariously. *Plotinus*, Ennead, 5. l. 5. c. 3. speaking of the *Logos* calls Him God *by Nature* Θεὸς αὕτη ἡ φύσις *His very Nature is God.* And to shew that he meant not the *first Person* of the *Godhead*, in the very next words, he calls Him Δεύτερος Θεὸς *a second God.* By which, as I told you before, they meant only the *second Person* in the *Divine Nature*, and so have fully explain'd themselves. They meant the same thing we do, but (as St. *August.* observes by way of an Excuse for them) not being ty'd up to strict forms of Words, as the *Christians* have been, occasion'd by the many *Heresies* have arisen, they took their own Latitude of Expression, which yet made their meaning plain enough; as the same *Plotinus* does in another place of the same Book, *Ennead.* 5. l. 1. c. 6. where he affirms the *Logos* to be *next to the most High*, of necessity together with Him, and nothing between them, and that He differs from Him, only in that He is *another*, or in His *Personality.* These are his words, ἐ χωρισθεὶς, ἀλλ' ὅτι μετ' αὐτὸν καὶ μεταξὺ οὐδὲν—— ἐξ ἀνάγκης στήσεται αὐτῷ, ὡς τῇ ἑτερότητι μόνον κεχωρίσθαι And *Enn.* 5. l. 8. c. 5. he calls this *Logos* υἱὸν Θεοῦ *the Son of God.* *Orpheus* the Eldest of all the Greek Philosophers (as he is cited *Clem. Strom.* l. 5. p. 254. Edit. *Florent.* Fol. an. 1550) calls the *Logos*, the *Divine Word*, and the *Immortal King*, in these Verses,

Εἰς ὃ λόγον θεῖον ἔλεψας, τούτῳ προσέδρευε
Εὐθύνων κραδίης νοερὸν κύτος. οὐ δ' ἐπίθαρσε
Ἀτραπιτοῦ, μοῦνον δ' ἐσόρα κύτμιον Ἄνακτα
Ἀθάνατον ——

Porphyry

Porphyry (Quoted by St. *Cyril Cont. Jul.* l. 1. p. 32. Edit. *Paris.* fol. An. 1638.) calls the *Logos* Ἀχρόνος ἀεὶ καὶ μόνος αἰώνιος. *without time, always, and alone Eternal*, *Tertullian* (Apolog. adv. Gentes. c. 21.) says, that *Zeno* call'd this *Logos*, the Maker of the World, who formed all things in order, and that He was call'd *Fate*, and *God*, and the *Soul of Jupiter*, and the *Necessity of all things*. *Hunc enim Zenon determinat Factitatorem, qui Cuncta in Dispositione formaverit, eundem & Fatum vocari, & Deum, & Animum Jovis, & necessitatem omnium rerum.*

And as the *Heathen*, so the *Jews* understood the *Logos* in the same sense, *Philo* (*Quæst. & Solut.*) calls the *Logos* in the same words of *Plotin.* above quoted Δεύτερον Θεὸν a *second God*, next to the Πατέρα τῶν πάντων to the *Father of all*, and in his *Legis Allegor.* l. 2. p. 93. Edit. *Paris.* fol. An. 1640. he speaks, thus of the *Logos*, Καὶ ὁ λόγος ὃν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑπερανώτατός ἐστι τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ πρεσβύτατος καὶ ἡγεμονικώτατος τῶν ὅσα γέγονε. That the *Word of God* is superior to the whole World, and Elder and more General than all the things whatsoever which are produc'd. τῶν νοητῶν he adds (*de Profug.*) *Elder* then all *Intelligibles*, than all things in the *Intellectual* World, as well as in the *Sensitive*, than all *Spirits*, as well as *Bodies*, that is, than all *Created* Beings.

4. The Jews Notion of it.

And to shew that he meant this of another *Person* than of *God* the *Father*, he calls this *Logos* the *High-Priest* of *God*, that is, Governing next under Him, or having the Administration of *God's* Kingdom in all the World, which he calls the *Temple of God*, Ἐν ᾧ καὶ Ἀρχιερεύς ὁ Πρωτόγονος αὐτοῦ Θεοῦ λόγος. *in which, His* (God's) *first-born Divine Word, is High-Priest.* de *somn.* agreeable to this, the *Chaldee* Paraphrase makes the *Logos* and *God* or *Jehova* Synonimous, and instead of *Jehova* often uses the *Logos* or *Word of God*, as *Exod.* 20. 1. *Deut.* 33. 7. &c.

But does plainly distinguish them from being the same *Person*, as *Gen.* 17. 7. *I will establish my Covenant between my Word, and Thee.* Where God speaks of His *Word*, as of another *Person*.

The *Jerusalem Targum* is yet more Express, upon *Gen.* 3. 22. thus.

The word of the Lord said, behold Adam, *whom I Created, is the only begotten upon Earth, as I am the only begotten in Heaven.* And *Philo* (*de Agricult.* l. 2.) introduces the *Logos* speaking thus of Himself, Καὶ γὰρ ἔτι ἀγένητος, ὡς Θεὸς ὤν, ἔτι γένητος ὡς ὑμεῖς. *I am neither Un-begotten as God, nor Begotten, after the manner that you are.*

Here the *Begotten Word* is distinguished from the *Un-Begotten Father* of the *Word*, and the Creation of *Adam* is attributed, in express Terms, to the *Word*; and the Text says he was Created by *God*, which makes *God* and the *Word* to be Synonimous, and *Onkelos* Paraphrase of *Gen.* 28. 21. thus renders it, *If the Word of the Lord will help me—— the Word of the Lord shall be my God.*

Let me add to this, at least to shew the *Jewish* Notion in this matter, the *Stile* in which the *Apocrypha* Expresses it. Thus we find it.

SOC. But my Business now, is not what the *Jews* or *Heathens* meant by their *Logos* or *Word* of *God*, but what St. *John* meant by the *Logos* he mentions in that *Text* you have quoted.

CHR. Where do you Imagin that St. *John* got this Term of *Logos*, or the *Word* of *God?*

SOC. I have often Reflected upon that, and really it appear'd very strange to me, the beginning of his *Gospel* seem'd to me to be out of all the Common Road of speaking: And therefore I put it upon the Account of some Extraordinary Impulse of the Spirit of God; and that he spoke Words, which never Man had spoken before. And therefore I thought you to blame to draw Arguments from

from such uncouth *Phrases*, whose meaning seem'd as hidden as the *Revelations*.

CHR. But I hope you are of another Opinion now, and believe that those *Terms* were not of St *John*'s Inventing, but were us'd before he was Born, and were known Common *Terms* in the World.

SOC. I must not deny plain matter of Fact.

CHR. Why then shou'd St. *John* use common *Terms* in a different *Sense* from the whole World?

SOC. I can give no Reason why he shou'd.

CHR. He must not intend to be understood if he did, and so cou'd not be a sincere Writer. He must intend either to Confirm the World in the Opinion they had of the *Logos*, or to disprove it; now you find plainly that he did not Absolutly deny or Reject the *Logos*. But he Reforms some Errors concerning *it*, and teaches the Truth of it. For, as was said before, The *Heathen Philosophers* had Corrupted the *Tradition* of the *Trinity* which had come to them; and consequently of the *Logos*, which was one of the three first *Principles*, whom they acknowleged.

SOC. What Corruption did St. *John* intend to correct in his Treatise of the *Logos*?

CHR. The *Cerinthian* Hereticks denyed the *Logos* to be *in the Beginning*: But made many Ages distance between the Eternal Being of the *Father*, and the Emanation of the *Logos*, wherein they fancy'd the Father, *in silentio et Quiete multa fuisse in Immensis Æonibus*, as *Irenæus* expresses it. *adverſ. Hereſ.* l. 1. c. 1. to have been in *Silence* and deep *Quiet* for immense *Ages*. And they suppos'd that the *Logos* was at last produc'd by the *Father* ἀπὸ σιγῆς out of this *Silence*; which they made one of His *Emanations*. As I have said before: And I desire to Repeat to you again, that you may Remember it, what I before Quoted out of St. *Ignatius* his *Epist.* to the *Magnesians*, where he calls Christ the λόγος ἀπὸ σιγῆς

προελθὼν. The Eternal *Word* who did not proceed from *Silence*.

And you will believe *Ignatius* to be the best Interpreter of St. *John's* meaning, who was his own *Scholar*, and Learn'd the Gospel from his *Mouth*. *Irenæus* adverſ. Hær. l. ii. p. 257. ſays expreſly that St. *John* wrote on purpoſe againſt *Cerinthus*, to vindicat the *Logos*, being Prior and Superior to all fancy'd *Æones* or *Emanations*; and to that very End, wrote the words of this Text, John 1. 1. *In the Beginning was the Word*, &c.

I have here given you *two* of the Ancient *Fathers*, long before the *Council* of *Nice*, for *Our* Expoſition of this *Text*, in Direct Oppoſition to *yours*; And *Aſſerting* the ſame *Doctrin* concerning *God* and His *Word* which We *Believe* and *Teach* at this Day. But I can give you more. And firſt More of St. *Ignatius*, who ſays of himſelf, Ἐγὼ μὴ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτὸν οἶδα. i. e. I *ſaw him* (Chriſt) *in the Fleſh after His Reſurrection*. Epiſt. ad *Smyrnens*. Edit. *Uſſer*. p. 112.

This *Ignatius* (*Epiſt ad Epheſ. p.* 33 *of Edit. Uſſer*) Speaks of Chriſt in theſe words Ἔχομεν ἰατρὸν, καὶ τὸν ὡρέλιον ἡμῶν Θεὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν Χριστὸν τὸν πρὸ αἰώνων υἱὸν Μονογενῆ καὶ λόγον, ὕστερον δὲ καὶ Ἄνθρωπον ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου, ὁ λόγος καὶ σὰρξ ἐγένετο, ὁ ἀσώματος ἐν σώματι, ὁ ἀπαθὴς ἐν παθητῷ σώματι, ὁ ἀθάνατος ἐν θνητῷ σώματι, ἡ ζωὴ ἐν φθορᾷ. i. e. *We have likewiſe a Phyſician, Our Lord God Jeſus, the Chriſt, who was before Ages, the only begotten Son and Word but afterward made*
John 1. 1. *Man of the Virgin Mary, for the Word was made Fleſh-Incorporeal in Body, Impaſſible in a Paſſible Body, Immortal in a Mortal Body, Life in Corruption &c.*

Ep. ad Magnes. p. 56. *of Edit Uſſer. Ignatius* ſpeaks yet more Categorically in this point; he ſays of Chriſt ὃς ἐστιν ἀπὸ λόγου, οὐ ῥήματος, ἀλλ' οὐσιώδης. i. e. [*Chriſt*] who is His [*Gods*] Word, not of His *Speech*, but His Subſtance.

And

And *Ep. ad Polycarp.* p. 138. *of Edit. Usser.* he says of Christ ὁ ἀπαθὴς ὡς Θεὸν, δι' ἡμᾶς ὃ παθητὸν ὡς ἄνθρωπον. i. e. *Who was Impassible as God, but for us was Passible as Man.* He calls Him there Ἄχρονον ἐν χρόνῳ, ἄορατον τῇ φύσει, ὁρατὸν ἐν σαρκὶ &c. i. e. *Without Time in Time, Invisible in his Nature, visible in the Flesh.* And more to the same purpose.

Clemen. Alexandrin. Admonit. ad Gent. p. 5. *says that the Word was Christ,* Ὁ μόνος ἄμφω, Θεός τε καὶ ἄνθρωπος; *who only was both God and Man.* And in his *Pædagogus* l. 1. c. 8. p. 113. He says, that *God* hates Nothing, neither *The Word:* for both, says he, are *One*, that is *God*: for he said, *In the Beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God.*

Just. Martyr. Dial cum Tryph. p. 284. 285. says that God, before all Creatures, begot out of Himself Δύναμιν λογικὴν *a Rational Power*, which is call'd by the Holy Ghost, *The Glory of the Lord*, and also the *Son*, and sometimes *Wisdom*, (as by *Solomon* in the Proverbs &c.) and sometimes *God*, and Sometimes *Lord* and that it was He who appear'd in the form of a Man to *Joshua*, as Captain of the Host of the Lord: and that these Appellations belong to Him as being begotten by the Voluntary Generation of the Father; And that the like Generation may be seen in some sort in our selves, for when we bring forth a Word, we do in a manner Beget that Word; not by Cutting or Parting it, as if it were made less in us who beget it; but as in Fire, another is kindled by it, without any Diminution of that Fire whence the other is Kindled. And that this *Word* or *Progenie* of God was *with God*, before all Creatures, and that *all things were made by Him*, and *nothing made without Him*, and that it was to Him God spake, *Let us make Man*, as you have heard.

Irenæus is full and large upon this Text, *adverſ. Heres.* l. 3. c. 11. l. 5. c. 18. l. 1. c. 19. l. 2. c. 2. l. 3. c. 8, 11, 31.

Tertull.

Tertull. Apologet. c. 2. 1. shows what Opinion the Heathen Philosophers had of the *Logos*, whom they own'd as the Maker of the World, and call'd Him, *Fate*, and *God*, and the Soul of Jupiter. Him (says *Tertullian*) *ex Deo prolatum dicimus, & prolatione generatum, et idcirco Filium Dei, & Deum dictum ex Unitate Substantiæ—— De Spiritu Spiritus, & de Deo Deus, ut Lumen de Lumine accensum. We say that the LOGOS is deduc'd from God, and in that Deduction is Begot, and therefor is call'd the SON of God, and God from the UNITY OF SUBSTANCE—— that He is Spirit of Spirit, and God of God, as Light is Kindled of Light.* And (De Præscrip. l. 13) This *Word*, or *Son* of God, appear'd variously to the Patriarchs in the Name of God, was always heard in the Prophets, and at last by the *Spirit*, was made *Flesh* in the Womb of the Virgin *Mary*, &c. But *Tertullian* is so full and in so many places, that I suppose our Adversaries will not contend for him. Read his *7th Sect. adverf. Prax.* p. 503. and 504. and see how expresly he Disputes against our Authors Notion of the *Word*, being nothing different from God, as we say of the Word which a Man speaks, it is not a Distinct Substance from him: *quid est enim dices*—— for you will say, what is a Word but the Voice or Sound of the Mouth—— a sort of an Incorporeal empty thing? But I say that nothing Void or Empty could proceed from God—— nor could want that Substance which comes forth from so great a Substance, and which made so Great Substances——How can he be Nothing, without whom Nothing was made? ——Can that *Word* of God be a Void and Empty thing, who is called the *Son*, who is nam'd *God* Himself; and *the Word was with God, and the Word was God?*—— This certainly is He, *who being in the Form of God, thought it not Robbery to be Equal with God*—— Therefore whatever the Substance of the Word is, *Personam Dico*. I call it

a

a *Person*, and Vendicat to it the Name of the *Son*, *Thus Tertullian*.

Origen upon this Text p. 17. means by *the Word* something distinct from God. *In the Beginning was the Word*, by *The Word here, he Understands the Son, who is said to be in the Beginning, because He was in the Father.*

ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος λόγον νοῶν τὸν υἱὸν παρὰ τὸ εἶναι ἐν τῷ πατεὶ λεγόμενον εἶναι ἐν ἀρχῇ

You would not make God to be *in* and *with* Himself, to *Beget* Himself, to be His own *Son*, &c. and without saying this, you cannot reconcile the Sense of these *Fathers* upon this *Text*, to that Sense your *Historian* puts upon it. *viz.* That *the Word* in this *Text*, is not something *different from God.*

SOC. Our *Brief History* says p. 80. *The Trinitarian Exposition of this Chapter is Absurd and Contradictory.*

CHR. This is his *Civil* way of Treating Us! These are the *Patterns* for *Gentile* Disputing, without *Passion* or *Heat*! But what Reason do's he give for this Hard *Censure.*

SOC. He says, *'Tis this*, that *In the Beginning* shou'd be Meant *from all Eternity.* For, says he, *From all Eternity, is before the Beginning.*

CHR. What! Before the *Beginning* of *Eternity*?

SOC. *Eternity* has no *Beginning.*

CHR. Then ther is no such thing as *From* Eternity. The word *From* Implies a *Beginning.* Do's any body say *From* no *Beginning*? Or can any body *Think* it?

SOC. We cannot speak *Properly* of *Eternity.* We cannot speak of it but by words of *Time.* For we have None other.

CHR. Then take your own *Answer.* And what word of *Time* is *Before* the *Beginning*? But all *Phrases* of *Speech* must be taken in the *Common Acceptation.* And I have Shew'd you from your Beloved *Grotius*, that *In the Beginning* was a Common *Hebraism* for *Eternity.* And that it was so Us'd in this *Text.* Do we not say, that *God* was *in the Beginning* before all things?

 and

And *Origen* has just now told you the Meaning of the *Word* being said to be *in the Beginning*, that is, That the *Word* was always in *God*, and therefore must be in *the Beginning* with *God*. And I have shew'd you that the *Cerinthians* Deny'd the *Word* to have been *in the Beginning* with *God*, but Produc'd many *Ages*, or *Æones* after. Therefore the *Apostle* Asserts that He was *in the Beginning* winh *God*. And St. *Ignatius* Calls Him λόγος Ἀΐδιος the *Eternal Word*. And *from the Beginning* is a *Scripture Phrase* whereby to Express *Eternity*, as the same *Logos* or *Word* speaks of *Himself* by the Name of *Wisdom* (whereby he is Commonly Express'd in Holy *Scripture*) *Prov.* 8. 23. *I was set up from Everlasting, from the Beginning, or ever the Earth was. God* the *Father* wou'd not say, That he was *set up*. Did any other *Set* Him *up*? Yet he that was *set up* is said to be *from Everlasting*. And *from the Beginning* is made *Synonymus* with *from Everlasting*.

SOC. But my *Historian* says p, 80. That *IN THE BEGINNING must Refer to some Time and Thing, it must be in the Beginning of the World, or of the Gospel, or of the Word.* He says, *it must be so.* But gives no other *Proof*. Therefor I go on to the Next.

CHR. To which of these *Times* do's the *Beginning* of *Wisdom* Refer? And the *Wisdom* of *God* is Call'd His *Word*: As your *Historian* Confesses p. 82. Was not *Wisdom* then *in the Beginning* with *God*? Or was ther any *Time* when *God* had not *Wisdom*? Now go on to your Next.

SOC. He says, p. 81. *The word was with God.* That is, says he, *The Son was with the Father. But was not the Son also with the Holy Ghost? And is not he too (according to the Trinitarians) God, or a God? If he is, why doth St. John say, the Son was with the Father: And how comes the Father to Engross here the Title of God, to the Exclusion of the Holy Ghost?* Then he goes on and says in the

the Next words, *The Word was God.* Upon which he Argues in the same way, and says, *What shall we do here? Was the Word the Father? For so they Interpreted GOD in the foregoing Clause.*

CHR. That the word *God* Includes the *Father* is True. But who told him it was to the *Exclusion* of the *Holy Ghost*? Your *Historian* knows well enough that is not the *Doctrin* of the *Trinitarians.* Why then did he Object it? I have told you before, That the word *God* do's Generally Mean the *Godhead*, which Includes all the Three *Persons.* And sometimes it means the *Father*, as the *Fountain* of the other *Persons.* And that sometimes the *Godhead* is Express'd without the word *God* at all, where the three *Persons* are Enumerated, as in the Form of our *Baptism.*

I Illustrated this to you, by way of *Parallel*, that the *Understanding*, being the *Father* or *Fountain Faculty*, is often us'd to Express the *Soul*: But that this was not to the *Exclusion* of the other two *Faculties.* It is said *Luk.* 24. 45. That *CHRIST Open'd their Understanding, that they might Understand the Scriptures.* Your *Historian* might come in here as well, and say, *what shall we do now?* Was this to the *Exclusion* of the *Memory*, and of the *Will*?

It is not said in the *Text* we are upon, That the *Word* was the *Father*, but that the *Word* was *God.* That is, did Partake of the *Divine Nature*; which is not to the *Exclusion* of *Either* of the other *Persons.* But it do's Demonstrate the *Word* was *One* of these *Persons*, as Partaking of the same *Nature* with them. Let us hear if your *Historian* has any more to say.

SOC. Upon these words, *The same was in the Beginning with God*, he says, p. 82. *How comes this to be again Repeated? for John had said once before, that the Word was with God. They care not, 'tis said, and that's enough.*

CHR. He gives a Pretty account of our *Answers*! Do's he Name any *Trinitarian* that gave that *Blunt* Answer?

SOC. No. But he go's on and says, *The Truth is, according to their Sense of this Context, no Account can be given of this Repetion, and they must Allow it to be a Meer Tautology.*

CHR. What is the *Socinian* Sense he puts upon it?

SOC. He says, That *in the Beginning* (that is, the *Beginning* of the *Creation* of Heaven and Earth) *was the Word.* And that by the *Word* the *Power* and *Wisdom* of *God* is meant.

CHR. Well. But how do's this solve the *Tautology*? For St. *John* had said once before, that the *Word* was *with God.* And whatever is Meant by the *Word*, the *Tautology* is the same. Thus then the *Text* go's, in his Sense, *in the Beginning*, that is, of the *Creation*, was the *Word*, that is, the *Power* and *Wisdom* of *God.* And the *Power* and *Wisdom* was *with God:* And the *Power* and *Wisdom* was *God.* And the same *Power* and *Wisdom* was *in the Beginning* with *God.* Let him now solve the *Tautology* he Objects, even in his own *Sense.* Men are very willing to make *Objections*, when they cannot see how easily they are *Retorted*!

But this will bring us to a better Understanding of this *Text.* For in the *Socinian* Sense, it is not only a *Tautology*, but the whole is to no *Purpose.* For who Deny'd that *God* had *Power* and *Wisdom*, from the *Beginning*, not only of the *Creation*, but from all *Eternity*? Against whom did St. *John* Dispute, in this *Sense*? But I have shew'd you against whom he did *Dispute*, that is, the *Cerinthians*, who Deny'd this *Wisdom* of *God*, call'd the *Word*, to be a *Person*; or if a *Person*, not to have been from the *Beginning*, but *Created* by *God* many *Ages* or *Æones* afterwards, and so not to have been *in the Beginning* with *God.* Against these the *Apostle's* words are *Full* and *Cogent.* But in the *Socinian* Sense, they

are

are nothing but what all the World *Knew* and *Allow'd*, and so were meant against *no Body*, to *Prove* nothing, or to *Dis-prove* nothing.

These *Hereticks* made *Two WORDS*, of *GOD*. One by *Nature*, which is the Essential *Wisdom* Inherent in *God* by His *Nature*, and this must have been *Always* in *God*, and ever *In-seperable* from Him. This must have been *in the Beginning* with *God*, and must be *God*. And by this *God* made *all things*, and *without this was not any thing Made, that was Made*. But they Deny'd *Christ* to be *this WORD*. They said He was *Metaphorically* call'd the *Word* and the *Wisdom* of *God*, from the Great *Wisdom* Bestow'd upon Him. And that He was *Created* by the *True* and *Natural WORD* of *God*. Thus the *Arians* (after the *Cerinthians*) held as you may see in the *Synodical Epistle* of *Alexander* Bishop of *Alexandria*, upon the Condemnation of *Arius*. *Socrat. Hist.* l. 1. c. 5.

5. Of the *Word* by *Nature*, and by *Creation*.

Now see how *Direct* and *Pungent* the words of St. *John* are against these *Heresies*, where he sets about to Prove that *Christ* was the *Word* of *God*. Not a *Made* or *Created WORD*, which was not from the *Beginning*, but the very *Word*, which was in the *Beginning*, and which was *God*; by whom *God* made *all things*, and *without whom Nothing was Made, that was Made*, that is, He was the Essential *Wisdom* of *God*, and therefore *Always* in *God*. Which is the Reason *Origin* gives, as I have before Quoted him, why *Christ* is said to be *in the Beginning*, because He was always *in* the *Father*. And it was this same *Word*, St. *John* tells us, that was *made Flesh*.

SOC. But you have forgot to solve the *Tautology* Objected by our *Historian*. You have indeed *Retorted* it upon him. But you have not *Answer'd* it as to your self.

CHR. Every *Repetition* is not a *Tautology*; But to *Enforce* what you say the More. And your *Historian* is sensible of this, for he says, p. 87. upon the 11th. *vers.* of this

this *Chapter*, His own Received Him not, *'Tis again Repeated* (says your Historian) *to Brand the Ingratitude and Stupidity of the Jews.* And, p. 91. upon *Joh.* 3. 13. he says, *It is Repeated*, Majoris Asseverationis causâ, *for its greater Confirmation.* Thus the same *Apostle* having Asserted the *Word* to have been *in the Beginning.* And to have been *with God*, now Joins both together, and says, *He was in the Beginning with God.* To shew what *Beginning* he meant, viz. The same *Beginning* with *God*, since we must so speak. And it was likewise for the stronger *Confirmation* of this most Important *Truth.*

But says your *Author* to the next words that follow *ver.* 3. *All things were made by Him: And without Him was not any thing Made; that was Made.*

SOC. He says, p. 84. *That the WORD begins here to be spoken of as a PERSON, by the same Figure of speech that* Solomon *saith, WISDOM hath Builded her House*, &c. This is the same as I told you before, That by the *Word* he means the Eternal *Power* and *Wisdom* of *God.*

CHR. What do's he say to the next words Immediatly following, *In Him was Life*, &c.

SOC. He says p. 85. *In him.* i. e. *In him when he was in the World, and was made Flesh.*

CHR. But had the Eternal *Power* and *Wisdom* of *God* no *Life*, till *Jesus* was *Born?* Indeed a *Quality* or *Attribute* has no *Life* in it. Therefor if the *Word* have *Life*, it must be a *Person.* For which Reason, you will not let it be a *Person*, till it *Inspir'd* or *Dwelt* in *Jesus.* But all that will not make it a *Person*, more than it was a *Person* in all the *Holy Men* it has *Inspir'd.* Nothing less than *In-carnation* can do that, whereby the *Natures* united become one *Person*, and cannot be *Separated* again, without the *Death* of the *Person.*

But see how you are Caught in your own *Snare.* In *Answer* to *ver.* 3. you make the *Word* the Eternal *Power* and *Wisdom* of *God*, and to be *God.* But in *Answer* to *ver.*

ver. 4. you make the same *Word* to be a *Creature*, and to have had no *Life*, till the *Birth* of *Jesus*. Nay you make it no more than the *Doctrin* of *Christ*, which *here* (says your Author) *is call'd Light, as before it was call'd Life.* So that here was no *Life*, but in a *Metaphorical* Sense, as contributing to give *Life* to others, which a *Dead* thing may do, as the *Book* of the *Scriptures* when Read.

But how do's the *Word* or *Wisdom* of *God INSPIRE*, if it have no *Life* in it? Or do's it borrow *Life* from the *Person* whom it *Inspires*? As your *Author* seems to say, That the *Word* had no *Life*, till it was *made Flesh*. For *then* he supposes, and consequently not till *then*, that *Text* verify'd, *In Him was Life.* But if *Life* was in *Him* before, then he was a *Person* before, and consequently from all *Eternity*, He being the Eternal *Wisdom* of *God*, as your *Author* has Asserted. And *He* having *Life* in *Himself*, might give *Life*, to Another, or *Inspire* Another. For a *Quality* do's not *Inspire*, but is that which is *Inspired.* But your *Author* says, that *He* the *Word* was *made Flesh.* This is something more than *Inspiring*.

6. *Inspiration* must come from a *Person*.

SOC. We can use the *Term* of being *made Flesh*, and of *In-carnation* too, and yet mean no more by it than bare *Inspiration.* Thus our *Historian*, p. 86. says, *The WORD became In-carnat, that is, Abode on the Person of Jesus Christ. For God communicated to him an Effusion of his Power and Wisdom.* And p. 87. in Answer to *ver.* 14. *The Word was made Flesh*, that is, says my Author, *did abide on and inhabit an Human Person, the Person of Jesus Christ, and so was, in Appearance, made Flesh or Man.*

7. What the *Socinians* mean by *In-carnation*.

CHR. The *Text* says, *was made Flesh.* That was only in *Appearance*, say you. This is a pretty *Latitude* in *Interpreting* of *Texts*! And looks like a downright *Denyal* of the *Text.* For if it was only in *Appearance*, then it was not *made* Flesh. This is *Adding* to the *Text*, not *Interpreting.* And let me have the like *Privilege* of *Adding* only these *two* Words, *in Appearance*, to what

Text

Text I think fit, I wou'd fain know if you cou'd Prove any one thing upon me out of the whole *Bible!*

But where was the *Appearance*? If *God* Endows a *Man* with Extraordinary *Gifts* and *Graces*, and *Power* of Working *Miracles*, is this any *Appearance* of *God's* being Made *Flesh*? Then ther was an *Appearance* of it in *Moses*, and many of the *Prophets*, and *Apostles*. *Christ* said to them *Joh.* 14. 12. *Verily, Verily I say unto you, He that believeth in Me, the works that I do, shall he do also, and Greater works than these shall he do, because I go unto the Father.* Was *God* therefor *In-Carnat*, or will He be *In-Carnat* in any who have, or may hereafter do these *Greater Works*? Or will ther be any *Appearance* of His being Made *Flesh*, in any of these His *Saints*? Where then was the *Appearance* of *God's* being made *Flesh* in *Christ*, because of the Mighty *Works* which He did? For that was all which cou'd *Appear* to our *View*.

XIV. The other *Texts* in H. *Scripture* inquir'd into.

SOC. We have dwelt a long time upon this *first* of St. *John*. As if it were the Onely *Text* in all the *Bible* you had to Depend upon.

CHR. You shall see the whole Current of the Holy *Scriptures* Run all in the same Strain. But ther being several things Needful to be Known, in Order to the Explaining of several *Texts*. I have Chose to set them down in this Place, to Avoid *Repitition*. Therefor it will Shorten our Work in what Remains, And now I am Ready to Look over with you the *Answers* which your *Historian* gives to the *Texts* of *Scripture* in the Order he has Rang'd them.

SOC. He begins upon this in his *Second Letter*, p. 42. And the first *Text* he Names is *Gen.* 1. 26. *Let us Make Man in our Image.* Whence you draw Arguments from the Manner of the *Phrase* of *God* being spoken of in the *Plural* Number.

(1) *CHR.* He shou'd have begun at the *first* Vers. *In the beginning God Created the Heaven and the Earth.*

Where

Where the word *Elohim*, which we Translate *God*, is in the *Plural* Number, and *Bara* did *Create* is in the *Singular* Number, which *Litterally* Render'd is thus, *Dii Creavit*, that is, *He*, the *Gods*, did Create. And ther are three *Persons* here visibly spoke of, First he that spoke, *Let ther be Light, Let there be a Firmament.* &c. Second, The *Word* spoken by Him. Of which we have Discours'd largely before. Third, The *Spirit* of *God*, which (*Ver.* 2.) is said to have *Moved upon the face of the Waters.* And these *Gods*, are here said to be the *God* that did *Create.* And we know how Exact the *Hebrew* is as to Every *Letter* of a *Word*, and the Import they draw from thence. As in that little *Alteration* which *God* Made in the Names of *Abram* and *Sarai*, into *Abraham* and *Sarah.* Gen. 17. 5. 15. Upon which *God* there laid Great *Stress*, and gave it as a *Token* of His *Covenant* then Made with them. I will not trouble you with the *Niceties* and *Improvements* which the *Cabalists*, or *Mystical* Writers of the *Jews*, make upon Every *Word* and *Letter*, and *Manner* of *Expression* in the *Sacred Text.* Tho' it shews their *Meaning*, and how they Understood things. But since your *Author* has *Slipt* this *Text*, let us go on with him to that which you have Nam'd.

(2.) To that Text *Gen.* 1. 26. *Let us make Man in our Image*, he says, p. 42. That the *Us* there spoke of was *God* and *Angels.* That *God* spoke this to the *Angels.* That *Man* was Made in the *Image* of *God* and *Angels.* But that *God* Spoke to the *Angels*, not as *Adjutants*, but as *Spectators* of his work. He says, *some Rabbies* do thus Understand it. He says he has spoke to this *Text* in his *first Letter.*

CHR. I can find nothing of it there. So this was a *Put off.* But here he takes Part with the *Jews* against Us. The *Jews* since *Christ*, have *Obscur'd* what they can the *Doctrin* of the *Trinity*, because it

Leads so Directly to the *Divinity* of *Christ*. But they have not been Able to do it so, as not to leave full Proof of it out of their *Writings*, as I have shew'd you. And much more might be Produc'd to the same Purpose.

However in Answer to the *Socinians*, and these *some Rabbies* (your *Author* do's not *Name* nor *Quote*,) I say, That this *Answer* is wholly *Precarious*. And they Produce No *Authority* whatever for it. Besides, it is not Certain that the *Angels* were then *Created*. St. *Barnabas* thinks that this *Text* was spoke before the *Foundation* of the *World*. Which I will shew you Presently. Besides that the Expression *Let Us make*, is not Applicable to bare *Spectators*, but to *Fellow-workers*. Come *see* me *Work*, wou'd be an Invitation to *Spectators*. As *Jehu* said to *Jehonadab*, 2. *Kin.* 10. 16. *Come with me, and SEE my Zeal for the Lord.*

SOC. My *Author* Quotes *Job.* 38. 4, 7. to Prove that the *Angels* were then *Created*. The 4th verse is, *where wast thou when I laid the Foundation of the Earth? Declare if thou hast Understanding.* But I see no *Proof* in this. Therefore it must be *ver.* 7. which is, *The Morning Stars sang together, and all the Sons of God shouted for Joy.* By these *Sons of God*, I suppose he means the *Angels*. And because they *Shouted*.

CHR. That is a strange *Proof*, out of the same *Verse* where *Stars* are said to *Sing!* This is such an Expression as *Psal.* 98. 8. *Let the Floods clap their hands, let the Hills be Joyful*, &c. And *Psal.* 65. 13. *The Vallies are cover'd with Corn, they Shout for Joy, they also Sing.* And by the like *Figure*, all the *Host* of *Heaven* might be call'd the *Sons of God*.

But to leave these *Forc'd* and *Foraign* Proofs. I will now, according to my Promise, give you some of the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers *Interpretation* of this *Text*.

πρὸς ὃν καὶ εἶπεν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς καταβολῆς αἰῶνος, ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν, καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν.

St. *Barnabas* in his *Catholick Epistle*, c. 5. p. 21. speaking of the Lord *Christ*, says, *To whom God spoke in the Day before the Foundation of the World, Let us make Man in our Image, after our Likeness.* And

And again, c. 6. p. 31. *For the Scripture saith of us, as He (* the Father *) said to the Son, Let us make Man after our Image.*

λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφὴ περὶ ἡμῶν, ὡς λέγει τὸ ὁ ποιήσωμεν κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν ἡμῶν τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

Justin Martyr in his *Dial.* with *Trypho.* p. 265. calls it a *Heresy* to say that this was spoken to the *Angels*, or that the Body of Man was the workmanship of *Angels*. But he says the *Father* here speaks to His *Son*, who came from the *Father* before all *Creatures*. He confutes those *Rabbis* who, depraving the *Scripture*, says he, pretend that *God* spoke to *Himself* when He said *Let us make Man*, or to the *Elements*, or the *Earth*, or any the like. He says that expression shews ther was a *number* at least, *two* that were together, and those he makes to be the *Father*, and the *Son*: And that without all doubt, says he, the *Father* there speaks to *one* numerically *Different* from Himself, and to an *Intelligent* Person.

Irenæus says, God spoke these words to the *Son* and the *Holy Ghost*, and he calls them Metaphorically, the *Hands* of *God* by which he made *Man*. And he says that the *Son*, who from the beginning made *Adam*, and with whom the *Father* spoke saying, *Let us make Man*, did *Manifest Himself to Men in the latter days*.

Homo secundum similitudinem Dei formatus est, et per manus ejus plasmatus est, hoc est, per *Filium*, et *Spiritum*, Quibus et dixit, Faciamus hominem. Iren. adverf. Hæres. Præfat. in lib. 4.

Idem ipse qui ab initio plasmavit Adam, cum quo et loquebatur Pater, Faciamus hominem secundum Imaginem et similitudinem nostram, in novissimis temporibus se ipsum manifestans hominibus.— ib. l. 5. c. 15.

Your *Historian* says, that *our Image* in the *Text*, is the *Image* of *God* and *Angels*. But *Irenæus* says, the *Angels* did not make us, and that they cou'd not make the Image of *God*, nor any other but the *Word* of *God* (l. 4. c. 37) *Tertullian* (adverf. *Praxeam.* §. 11 12.) says, that *God*, in this *Text*, did not speak to the *Angels* as the *Jews* interpret, who do not acknowledge the *Son*, but that he

His itaque paucis tamen manifeste distinctio *Trinitatis* exponitur, Est enim ipse qui pronunciat, *Spiritus*, et *Pater* ad quem pronunciat, et *Filius* de quo pronunciat. Sic et cætera quæ nunc ad *Patrem* de *Filio*,

vel ad *Filium*, nunc ad *Filium*, de *Patre*, vel ad *Patrem*, nunc ad *Spiritum* pronunciantur, unamquamque *Personam* in sua proprietate constituunt. Si te adhuc *numerus* scandalizat *Trinitatis*, quasi non connexæ in *unitate* simplici, interrogo quomodo *unicus* et *singularis pluraliter* loquitur? *Faciamus hominem ad Imaginem et similitudinem nostram*, cum debuerit dixisse, *Faciam* hominem ad Imaginem et similitudinem *meam*: utpote *unicus* et *singularis*, sed et in sequentibus: *Ecce Adam factus est tanquam unus EX NOBIS.* Fallit, aut Ludit, ut cum *unus* et *solus* esset, *numerasse* Loqueretur: aut numquid *Angelis* loquebatur, ut *Judæi* interpretantur, quia nec ipsi *Filium* agnoscunt; an quia ipse erat *Pater, Filius, Spiritus*, ideo *pluralem* se præstans, *pluraliter sibi* loquebatur? Immo quia Jam adhærebat illi *Filius, Secunda Persona, sermo* ipsius; et *tertia, Spiritus* in *sermone*, ideo *pluraliter* pronunciavit, *Faciamus* et *nostram* et *nobis*; Cum quibus enim faciebat hominem, et quibus faciebat similem? Cum *Filio* quidem, qui erat *induturus* hominem; *Spiritu* vero, qui erat *sanctificaturus* hominem, quasi cum Ministris et Arbitris, ex *unitate Trinitatis* loquebatur. Denique sequens Scriptura distinguit inter *Personas. Et fecit Deus hominem, ad Imaginem Dei fecit illum.* Cur non *suam*, si *unus* qui faciebat, et non erat ad Cujus faciebat? Erat autem ad cujus Imaginem faciebat: ad *Filii* scilicet, qui homo futurus certior et verior; Imaginem suam fecerat dici hominem qui tunc de limo formari habebat, Imago veri et similitudo. Sed et in antecedentibus operibus mundi quomodo scriptum est? Primum quidem, nondum *Filio* apparente, *Et dixit Deus, Fiat Lux et facta est*: ipse statim *sermo* lux vera, qui illuminat hominem venientem in hunc mundum, et per illum mundialis quoque lux. Exinde autem in *sermone Christo* adsistente et administrante Deus voluerit fieri et Deus fecit. Et dixit Deus *fiat Firmamentum, et fecit Deus Firmamentum, et dixit Deus fiant Luminaria, et fecit Deus Luminare majus et minus*, sed et Cætera utique Idem fecit qui et priora id est *sermo* Dei, *per quem omnia facta sunt, et sine Quo factum est nihil.* Qui

spoke to the *Son*, and the *Holy Ghost*, and from hence he proves the *Trinity* in *Unity*, in express words, and as positive as *Athanasius* Himself. He says, *Scripturæ omnes et demonstrationem, et distinctionem Trinitatis ostendunt.* That is, *All the Scriptures shew both a Demonstration and Distinction of the Trinity.*

After he quotes several *Texts*, where the *Father* speaks of and to the *Son*, and the *Son* of and to the *Father*; and the *Holy Ghost*, as a *third Person*, of the *Father*, and of the *Son*. As, *The Lord said to my Lord*, &c. And thence he proves the Distinction of Persons in the Trinity.

Origen (in *Mat.* p. 266.) says, none cou'd Raise the dead, but He who had heard from the Father, *Let us make Man, in our Image*, and none cou'd command the Wind and Seas, but He *by whom* they and all things else were made.

SOC. My *Author* Notes that the *Socinian* Translation agrees with the stile used all along in this Chapter, *ver. Let ther be Light* vers. 6. *Let there be a Firmament*, &c.

CHR. He must *Note* again, for I cannot find in those words, one Syllable of Invitation to the

An-

Angels, or to any else, either to Assist Him, or be *Spectators*. But rather on the contrary, it is a sole Command, from an Absolute Authority.

(3.) *SOC*. The next *Text* he Quotes is, *Gen.* 3. 22. God said, *the Man is become as one of us, to know Good and Evil.* To which he gives two *Answers*. 1. That *God* spoke this to the *Angels*. 2. That others Translate the Hebrew words thus, the Man is become *one of Himself*, knowing Good and Evil. And he says, That it is thus Express'd in the *Chaldee* Translation by *Onkelos*.

si ipse Deus est, secundum Johannem *Deus erat sermo*, habes *duos*, alium *dicentem* ut fiat, alium facientem. Alium autem quomodo accipere debeas, Jam professus sum; *Personæ* non *substantiæ* nomine, ad *distinctionem*, non ad *divisionem*. Cæterum, ubique teneo *unam substantiam* in *Tribus* Cohærentibus tamen alium dicam oportet ex necessitate sensus, eum qui *Jubet*, et eum qui *Facit*, Nam nec *juberet*, si *ipse faceret*, dum juberet fieri Per eum, tamen jubebat, haud *sibi* Jussurus, si *unus* esset: aut sine Jussu facturus, quia non expectasset ut *sibi* Juberet.

CHR. To his first *Answer* about the *Angels*, we have spoke already. As to the Translation of *Onkelos*, it is thus.

Behold Adam *is only or alone in the Age from himself.* (*Ecce* Adam *unicus est in sæculo ex se*) The Sense of which I confess is Difficult; But your *Author* prefers an obscure *Paraphrase*, before the *Literal* Reading of the *Hebrew*, *Greek*, *Syriac*, *Arabic*, and *Latin*, which are all Verbatim, according to our *English* Translation, and indeed which only can make Sense of the Words. For pray tell me, what is that to be *One of Himself*? What *Purchase* was this? What *Crime*? That God banish'd him *Paradise* for this? Doubtless it was the Clearness and fullness of this *Interpretation* which perswaded your *Author* from the Common and Familiar reading of this *Text*!

(4.) I will not trouble you with his Exposition upon *Gen.* 11. 6. 7. *The Lord said, let us go down. and ther Confound their Language.* It is the like as to these before. But I wou'd see his *Answer* to *Gen.* 19. 24.

SOC. He repeats it thus, p. 44. *the Lord* (*Heb. Jehovah*) *rained Fire from the Lord* (*Heb. Jehovah*) *out of Heaven.*

And

And says that the meaning is, *Jehovah* rained Fire *from Himself*. And refers to what he is to say on *Zech.* 3. 2.

CHR. And I will Expect him at that Place. In the mean time I will give you the Sense of some of the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers upon this *Text*.

Just. Mart. (Dial cum *Tryphon Jud.* p. 277. 279. 357.) interprets this of the *Son*, as a different *Person* from the Father. *Irenæus* (adverf. Heref. l. 3. c. 6.) says the same and proves *Christ* to be *Definitive et absolute Deum*. And that he is *verus Deus et ex sua Persona. True God absolutely*, and *in His own Person*, and that *the Lord rained Fire from the Lord*, was meant of *Him*. *Tertullian* (dverf. Prax. §. 13.) says the same, and proves the *Trinity* and *Unity*. *Deos duos non præferimus*, we do not profess two *Gods*, and then he Explains himself—— *non quasi non et Pater Deus, et Filius Deus, et Spiritus sanctus deus, et deus unusquisque*. Not that the *Father* is not *God*, and the *Son God*, and the *Holy Ghost God*, and each of them *God*, &c.

Cyprian likewise (*Testimon.* l. 3. c. 33.) understands this Text *The Lord rained Fire from the Lord*, to be meant of *Christ*.

But I go on, From p. 45. to 51. and again from p. 53. your Histo. names several Texts, which are spoke of *God* in the Old Testament, and in the same words are apply'd to *Christ* in the new Testament.

(5.) Let us examin some of them. It is said *Psal.* 45. 6. *Thy Throne O God is for ever and ever*. This is apply'd to *Christ*, (Heb. 1. 8.)

SOC. In the *Hebrew* and in the *Greek* it is, *God is thy Throne* (i. e. thy Seat, Resting place, or Establishment) for ever.

Hist. Unit. p. 46.

CHR. This I do deny; and if the words cou'd be both ways in the Original, that is, to bear the Construction of *God is thy Throne, forever*, or, *Thy Throne, O God is for ever*. (because the Nominative and Vocative are the same in the word *Theos*) then the Question will be

be which of the ways we ought to take it. And I say the latter, for these reasons. First, *Heb.* 1. 8 is a Comparison 'twixt *Christ* and the *Angels.* And this Text, in your Sense, gives him no Preference, because God is the *Establishment* of the *Angels,* and so this Text may belong to an *Angel,* as well as unto *Christ.* Secondly, The subsequent Part of the Verse will not bear your Interpretation, *viz. The Scepter of thy Kingdom.* This is certainly *Christ's* Scepter and Kingdom that is spoke of. And it is absolutely Incongruous, that the *Throne* shou'd not go along with the *Scepter* and *Kingdom,* for they always belong to the same *Person.* Therefor the *Throne* in this Text is *Christs,* as well as the *Kingdom.* Lastly, These *Fathers* who wrote before the Council of *Nice,* Read this Text as we do, and apply it to *Christ* as a Proof of His *Godhead. Cyprian* advers. Jud. l. 2. c. 6. *Tertull.* advers. Jud. c. 14. Jud. advers. Prax. c. 13. *Iren.* advers. Hæres. l. 3. c. 6. *Origen* in *John.* p. 29. and upon this Psalm, in *Catena Corderij,* he says that *Christ is manifestly God.*

SOC. The *Def. of the Hist.* c. 7. p. 33. says this *Text* may be apply'd to *Solomon.*

CHR. The *Apostle* has apply'd it to *Christ,* and the Primitive *Fathers,* even before *Nice,* understood it, as we have seen, in a Sense which cannot be applicable to *Solomon.* In what other Sense that *Author* wou'd apply it to *Solomon,* let him see to it.

SOC. He says that he who is call'd *God* in this place is said to have a *God* by whom he is Anointed, which cannot belong to the *Supreme God.*

CHR. This is spoke of *God's* Exalting the *Human Nature* of *Christ,* in respect of which (as well as of His Eternal *Generation*) *Christ* calls *God* his *Father* and his *God.* Against this your Author offers nothing. But to proceed.

(6.)

(6) In that most Elegant and wondrous Rapture in the Exaltation of *God*, Psal. 68. *Christ our Lord* was meant. As is evident from Vers. 18. *Thou hast ascended on High, Thou hast led Captivity Captive, Thou hast received Gifts for men.* Which St. *Paul* do's expresly Interpret, and apply to *Christ*. *Ephe.* 4. 8.

SOC. Our Author says to this, That this was *literally meant of God; and of Christ only by way of Prophesy, or*
P. 47. *rather of Emblem, or Accomodation.*

CHR. But still here is the same *Stile*, and *Appellations* which are given to none but to *God* and *Christ*. And *God* foreseeing that *Christ* wou'd be taken for Real *God* by these Appellations, it is unaccountable that the Scripture shou'd every where assert this stile, speaking of *God* and *Christ* so promiscuously, as that what is said of the one belongs to the other, and to none else. Whereby if we are not *forc'd* to acknowledge them to be *One*, yet it is such a Colour and Tentation as cannot possibly be suppos'd God wou'd lay before us, without a design in Him to lead us into so Gross and Capital an Error. Which it wou'd be the Highest Blasphemy but to Imagin.

But suppose this Text be no otherwise true of *God*, or not so literally, but as *God* is *Christ*? And so was a a Prophesy of God *in Christ*.

SOC. That indeed wou'd end the business, and come the length of a *Demonstration.*

Eph. 4. 9. *CHR.* St. *Paul* says, that He who *Ascended*, in this Text, *descended first into the Lower parts of the Earth.*—— And *is the same also that Ascended up far above all Heavens.* He inferrs this *Text* as a Consequence from the Gift of *Christ* to us, *To us is given Grace according to the measure of the Gift of Christ. Wherefore*, he saith, *when He ascended up on High, He led Captivity Captive, and gave Gifts unto men.*——*And He gave some Apostles, some Prophets, and some Evangelists. &c.* These were the

the *Gifts* given, and this *Gift* of *Christ* was the *wherefor*, why *David* wrote that *Text*. And no otherwise can *God* be said to have *descended into the lower parts of the Earth, and thence to Ascend up again on High.* which St. *Paul* tells us is the true meaning of that *Text* and inferrs it from the *Text*.

SOC. That *Psalm* was Sung upon the Removing of the *Ark*.

CHR. That *Plasm* indeed begins with that Form, which you find *Num.* 10. 35. But it goes on from thence to many other Exaltations and Triumphs of *God*, among which, to that of Christs *Ascension* in the 18th. vers. of which the lifting up of the *Ark* was but a *Type*. And tho' ther is an Allusion between them, and they may be compos'd in many things, yet the full Import of this *Text* cannot be fill'd but in *Christ*, as I have already shewn from St. *Paul*. And I might have given more Instances, but that these were sufficient. For example, it is said in the *Text* that he *Receiv'd* Gifts for Men. *From whom* did *God Receive* Gifts to give to Men?

SOC. St. *Paul* renders it—— *Gave Gifts to Men.*

CHR. Therefore *Both* are true. *Christ Received* from the *Father*, and *Gave* unto *Men*. And this cannot be verified in any other manner.

Again it is said in the same *verse*, That he *Receiv'd* these Gifts for men, yea, for the Rebellious also, *that the Lord God might dwell among them.*

Now see what sense this will be, if it be not intended of *Christ*. That *God* shou'd *Receive* Gifts from some other which would imply some other to be Greater than *God*. And then the End of *God's* Receiving these Gifts, that *God* might dwell among Men.

God *Purchas'd* or *Procur'd* from *another*, That Himself might dwell among men, or be Gracious to men!

But take notice of the *Hebrew* reading of this verse, as it is mark'd in the Margent of our English Bibles; where what we render [*for Men*] is according to the letter of

the *Hebrew* [*In the Man*] And then the verse goes thus. *Thou* (Christ) *hast received Gifts in the Man.* i. e. in thy *Manhood*, or *Human Nature:* for it was in this respect, that He, cou'd be said to *Receive* these *Gifts* which He bestow'd. And this cannot belong to God any otherwise than as *Christ* is *God.*

Hist. Unit. p. 84.

SOC. These Gifts not being given till about a Thousand Years after *David*'s time, *Paul* cou'd not possibly intend a Literal Interpretation of *David*'s words, but only to *Accomodate* them to *Christ*, because *Christ also* did ascend on high, and gave Gifts to Men. To this effect *Grotius*, Dr. *Patrick*, and other famous Interpreters on this Text.

CHR. Dr. *Patrick* says no such thing upon this Psalm, nor *Grotius* either upon this Psalm, or the Parallel place, *Ephe.* 4. He speaks nothing of this bare way of *Accomodating* only, which it may be to a hundred things, that is, I may *apply* or fancy several things like it. On the contrary, he says, this Text was *fullfill'd* in *Christ*, and that more Eminently, then in God's Descent upon *Mount Sinay*, and Ascending thence again. *Quanto autem hæc eminentius per Christum sint impleta nemo non videt.* Thus *Grotius* in his Notes upon Psal. 68. 18. and upon *Ephe.* 4. 8. The difference he makes 'twixt these two Texts, is, that the one was spoken *to* God, the other *of* God. So that he makes *Christ* apparently to be *God*, because the Apostle certainly speaks this Text of *Christ*. Then he takes notice of St. *Paul*'s putting the word *Give*, for *Receive*, viz. that Christ *Gave* Gifts, instead of, *Received* Gifts, as it is in the *Psalm*, and he says, this is excellently apply'd to *Christ* who *Received* Gifts from his *Father*, that He might *Give* to Men. Dr. *Patrick* says, that this is far more Magnificently fulfil'd in *Christ*'s *Ascension*, than in *God*'s *Ascension* from *Sinay*. And you may suppose he deals with his other famous Interpreters, whom he does not name, as he has done with *Grotius* and Dr. *Patrick*.

And

And for *David*'s speaking this a Thousand Years before it came to pass, I suppose you will make no greater Difficulty of it, than of *Psal.* 2. Where it is prophesied of *Christ* in the present Tense. *This day* I *have* begotten Thee, which your *Author* interprets of this *Resurrection.*

All the Ancient, even *Ante-Nicene* Fathers, speaking of this Text, *Psal.* 68. 18. with one consent do apply it to *Christ*: and not only by way of *Accommodation*, as your Historian speaks; But that it was an Express Prophesy of *Christ.* and *Fulfilled* in Him, Which you may see in *Just. Mart.* Dial. con. *Tryph.* p. 315. 258. *Iren.* advers. Hæres. l. 2. c. 36. l. 4. c. 39. l. 5, c. 31. *Tertullian.* advers. *Marcion.* l. 5. c. 8. de anima. c. 55. And *Just. Mart.* in the abovesaid Dialogue. p. 255. to 258. applies to *Christ*, Psal. 24, *The Earth is the Lords,* ——*He hath founded it* &c. And that of *Psal.* 47. *God is gone up with a shout, the Lord with the sound of a Trumpet,*——*God is the King of all the Earth*——*The Princes of the People are gain'd to the God of Abraham*—— &c. And *Psal.* 99. *The Lord Reigneth, let the People tremble*——*Exalt ye the Lord our God, and worship at his Foot-stool*——*Moses and Aaron among his Priests* &c. And *Psal.* 45. *Thy Throne O God is for ever and ever*, &c.

SOC. But the *Def. of the History.* c. 7. p. 34. finds out that several places of the Old Testament are accommodated to other things in the new Testament as these words, *Their sound went out into all the Earth, and their words into the ends of the World.* By which the *Heavens* are meant *Psal.* 19. 4. and other works of *God*, which (as it were) *Preach* His wisdom, and power and goodness to all Nations. And *Rom.* 10. 18. The Apostle applies this to the Preaching of the *Gospel* all over the World.

CHR. What wou'd your *Author* inferr from hence?

SOC. That ther is no harm in accommodating that to *Christ* in the new Testament what was spoken of *God*

in the Old Testament, and he says such is the place in Question.

CHR. That is to say, because one *Creature* may be compar'd, or accommodated to another, therefor it is Lawful to accommodate to a *Creature* the Incommunicable Attributes of *God*. And to apply to *Christ* (supposing Him but a *man*) whatever we find written of *God* in the Old Testament.

But besides, I have shewn, that this place in question is not only *accommodated* but *fulfilled* in *Christ*, and consequently was originally meant of *Him*, nay more eminently than of *God*, or as *God* otherwise than as He is *in Christ*. And this from your beloved *Grotius*, whom you wou'd have to be a *Socinian*, and whom you quote upon this very place. But let us go on.

Hist. pag. 489. (7.) *Psal.* 97. The Majesty of God is gloriously set forth, in which the 7. *ver.* is Remarkable, which obviats the Objection of *Inferiour Gods*, who are there call'd *Idols*, that is, when Men pay Divine Honour to them; for that is it which makes any *Creature* to become an *Idol*. And tho' God communicats his *Name* to Creatures, and calls some of them *Gods*, yet he will not share his *Worship* nor give his Honour to another: Of this he expresses himself to be *Jealous*, we must not come near *it*. And who ever arrogate it to themselves are *Idols* and *False-Gods*, and those that pay it to them are *Idolaters*, and Exod. 20. 5. stil'd the Generation of those who *hate God*. God reckons this a *Hating* a *Forsaking*, of Him, and calls it *the abominable thing that He hates*. And in Detestation of Jer. 44. 4. these *Idols* and to shew how far they were from having Worship paid to them, they are here Commanded themselves to Worship God. *Confounded be all they that Delight in vain Gods*, (as our Common Prayer-Book Translates it) or *that boast them of Idols*. (as the Bible Translation) *Worship him all ye Gods*, or *Angels*, as St. *Paul* renders it. For *Angels* are *Gods* more than *Men*, they are

are the *greatest Gods*, of the *Creation*: But when they claim *Worship* to themselves, they become *Devils*; and if we Worship them, we make them *Idols* to us; for no *Created* Excellency can advance any Being so far, as not still to be at an infinit Distance from *God*: And therefore no *Creature* can partake of his *Worship*: And therefore either the *Son* must not be *Adorable*, or he must not be a *Creature*. Matt. 4. 9. 10.

And now what Invention could contrive a more positive and uncontroversible manner of calling the *Son*, *God*; than to say, *Let all the Angels of God, or let all other Gods Worship Him.* What is this but to call him the *Supreme God*? And manifestly to make the Distinction 'twixt God by *Nature*, and by *Office*? All these *Gods* by *Office* are to *Worship* the *God* by *Nature*. *Worship HIM all ye Gods*, and this the Apostle applys to *Christ*, and says, that it was spoke of *Him*, and how to call Him *God* more directly, and palpably cannot be suppos'd. Heb. 1. 6.

SOC. My *Author* says, that *Heb.* 1. 6. is it not rendred right in our *English Translation*, which says, *Again when he bringeth the First-Begotten into the World he saith, and let all the Angels of God Worship Him.*

But my *Author* says, that in the Greek 'tis, *when he bringeth again the First-begotten into the World*, that is, when he raised Christ from the Dead. Hist. p. 49.

CHR. He mistakes: For the *Greek* is not as he Quotes it, indeed the Greek puts *when*, before *again*, ὅταν δὲ πάλιν, and literally runs thus, *when again he bringeth*, but it is not *when he bringeth again*, as your *Author* slily insinuates, that he might get it apply'd to Christ's *Resurrection*. But what the meaning of *again* is in that verse is put past any doubt, by Repeating the words immediatly preceeding, for the *Apostle* is giving several Instances, and so repeats the words *again* and *again*, which is a most Common and Familiar way of speaking. And I believe never misunderstood but in this place. Read the 5th. verse, *Un-*

to

to which of the Angels said he, Thou art my Son? And again, I will be to him a Father—— and again, when he bringeth the First-begotten into the World—— what ordinary Wit could have found out a new meaning for the last *again*, different from those going before it?

SOC. But why did not the *English* Translation keep the very order of the Words, as it is in the *Greek*, and as you have now last repeated it?

CHR. Because it is not so good English, *when again*, is not the *English* Style so much as, *again when*, tho' they both mean the same thing; And this Rule was never observ'd in any Translation; For the placing of the words is different in most Languages, and in this very *Text* the *Greek* Words are in this order; *when but again he bringeth* ὅταν δὲ πάλιν εἰσαγάγῃ which is not so good English, as, *but again when he bringeth*: And I suppose you will say is not a worse Translation.

But as I said before, all this *Art* is lost, for unless the word *again* come after the word *bringeth*, it will not serve his turn, and in the *Greek* it is put before the word *bringeth*, which quite spoils his Criticism. But he is resolv'd this shall not spoil it; and therefore he ventures boldly, and says, that in the *Greek* 'tis *when he bringeth again.*

SOC. But he has another Answer; He says, 'tis uncertain whether St. *Paul* had any respect to the *Psalm.*

P. 49. *CHR.* But he tells no Ground he had for that uncertainty. All the difference 'twixt these *Texts* is this, the *Psalm* says *Gods*, (*Worship Him all ye Gods*) which St. *Paul* renders *Angels* (*Let all the Angels of God Worship Him*) which he knew to be included in the meaning and import of the word, *Gods*; and the Reason of his doing it is because he is there making a Comparison twixt *Christ* and the *Angels*. So that the putting in the word *Angels* for *Gods* is only applying the *Text* of the *Psalm* to his present Subject. Then the one says

Worship

Worship him, the other, *Let them worship him*. Which is no alteration at all, unless you would insist, that the Texts ought to be quoted Syllabically; which is not observed, nor ought to be in any Translation, because of the different Idioms of Tongues, which must be observ'd to Translate it into Sense. But the Inspired Pen-men of the New Testament take greater Latitude, and in their Quotations of the Old Testament stick only to the *Sense*, and often vary *the Expression*, of which there are many Examples *Exod.* the 22. 28. It is written, *thou shalt not revile the Gods, nor Curse the Ruler of thy People*: St, *Paul* repeating this Text, Quotes it thus; *thou shalt not speak evil of the Ruler of thy People*; By the Act. 23. 5. word *Gods* here was meant the *Judges* and *Governors* of the Land, and therefore St. *Paul*, applying it to them puts in the word *Ruler*, as in the former case, the word *Angels*, instead of the word *Gods*. This I grant we have not Authority to do, we are bound up to the words; But St. *Paul* speaking by the same Inspiration that did Dictat the *Text* he Quotes, his Quotation is at the same time, a most Authentick Exposition of the Text.

Many more Examples may be given of the like liberty taken in the *New Testament* in their Quotation, out of the *Old*; which shall be produced if it be deny'd: for now I would be as brief as possible.

But now it is no ways Material whether St. *Paul* Quoted this from this *Psalm*, or from the Septuagint Translation of *Deut.* xxxii. 42. as *Origin* thinks, περὶ Εὐχῆς. For still it was *God* spoke these words, and they were spoke of *Christ*.

SOC. He does not insist much upon this, it was but to divert you, he has another Answer. He says, *That if St.* Paul *had respect to this Psalm, yet he does not Quote the words of the Psalmist, as if they were spoken of Christ; but only declareth the Decree of God (known to him by the Spirit) for Subjecting the Angels to Christ, in the same words* p. 49.

that

that the Psalmist had used on another occasion, because they are words most proper to express that Decree, for the Writers of the New Testament generally affect to speak in Scripture Language.

CHR. You allow that by the word *First Begotten* in the Text *Heb.* 1. 6. *Christ* is meant.

SOC. Yes certainly. Our *Author* acknowledges it in this same place.

CHR. And St *Paul* says positively, that this was said of the *First Begotten*, for after several other *Texts* which St. *Paul* Quotes as spoken of him, he brings in this as one. *He* (God) *said thou art my Son*—— and again; *I will be to him a Father*—— and again, *when he bringeth the first begotten into the World, he saith and let all the Angels of God worship him.* All this was visibly spoken of the same Person, and altogether, yet your *Author* says, these last words were not spoken of *Christ*: To say that one of these Texts was not spoken of Him, tho' the rest were, and to give no Reason, nor so much as a presumption for this, but to think to put it upon his *Ipse dixit*, this is beyond example: It shews a resolved man strugling even to death under the weight of Truth.

Verse 5.

SOC. He says this was only a *Prophecy* of *Christ.*

CHR.. Ergo *it* was true, and Ergo *it* was spoken of *Christ*, which your *Author* denies, and yet cannot deny it.

SOC. He says, these were the fittest words to Express it.

CHR. They were indeed. But what is the Reason?

SOC. Because the *Writers* of the *New Testament* affect to speak in *Scripture Language.*

But do they affect to ascribe to *Creatures*, the Glorious Attributes of *God*? Is it lawful to apply to a *Man* whatever I find said of *God*, because I affect to speak in Scripture Language? and because I find all the *Angels* of *God*, commanded to Worship *God*, must I therefore bid them

them Worship one who is *not God*? And notwithstanding that in the same place I find all them *Curs'd* and *Confounded* who *Worship* any other but *God*?

If our Side should produce such a Reason as this, what Mercy would you have on us? It would require more implicit Faith to swallow such Reasoning, than even the Notion of the *Trinity*.

But this I must Confess, that ther never was a Cause more obstinatly defended, he fights to the last Man, and leaves nothing unsaid, whether it be true, or false, whatever may *amuse*, or *put off*.——

But this, with considering Men, pluks up his Cause by the very Roots, and tho' they may admire the Variety of his Shifts and Turnings, it is but to see with how much Pains and Skill he quits his hold.

SOC: The *Def. of the History*, Chap. the 7. p. 35. says, that this *Answer* of the *Historian* is a very *sound* and *judicious Answer*.

CHR. This is the best Argument he brings to prove it, and yet he wonders People will not be satisfied with it.

SOC. He has found out a Text *Deut*. 32. 43. where instead of *Rejoyce ye Nations*, *with his People*; which is the English Translation, he says, the Seventy Renders it thus, ἀ πρόσκυνεσάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες Ἄγγελοι Θεοῦ i. e. *Let all Angels of God Worship Him*. And he would rather have the Apostles Quotation to be from this place, because he says, these words in *Deut*. are not spoken of *God*, but of Gods *People* the *Israelites*, and if this can be said of *Gods People*, he hopes it may be said of *Christ* too, without concluding from thence, that he is the *Supreme God*.

CHR. These words in the *English* are indeed spoken of Gods People: *Rejoyce with his People*. But the *Greek* Reading he Quotes, cannot be meant of the *People*, but of *God*. And yet their meaning is the same; they are both a

result from the Consideration of *GOD's Vengeance* upon his *Enemies*, and *Mercy* to his *People*. The one invites the *Nations* to Rejoyce for this with his *People*, the other for this introduces the *Angels* Adoration, not of the *People*, (that is an absurd Thought) but of *God*; for His Mercy to his *People*, which is plain from the very words, thus then according to the Greek: *Let the Angels of God Worship Him, for he will Avenge the Blood of His Servants*, &c. But your *Author* would have it; *Let the Angels of God Worship the People, because God will Avenge*, &c.

Is not the *Him* there (Worship *Him*) the same *Him*, with *He* who will *Avenge* &c? But you would have the first *Him*, mean the People (*Worship Him*) and the second to mean God (He will Avenge) to call the People *Him* in this Place, is a sort of *Welch*, or *Highland* English. But this is done by that Authority and strength of Reason, which interpreted the (*And*) and the (*Thou*) Heb. 1. 10. which you shall see presently, and is a master piece of the *Socinian* Subtlety and Integrity. In the mean time we must lose our pretty Conceipt from the *Greek* version of *Deut.* 32. 43. and the *Idolatrous* Inference we would have brought from it, of Commanding *Angels* to worship *Men*. If *Mens* worshiping *Angels* be *Idolatry*, for *Angels* to worship *Men* must be a *Preposterous* and *Monsterous Idolatry*, and makes *Angels* more Foolish than *Men*. Besides, I suppose that your *Author* believes that it was the *Good* Angels were here spoke of, and he makes *them* Idolaters too. No matter! Any thing to avoid the *Divinity* of *Christ!*

But after all it is most probable that by *Angels* in this Text no more is meant than the *Nations* mention'd in the English Translation; and so ther will not be that Discrepancy 'twixt the *Greek* and *English* Translations which we imagin. We know the *Jews* reckon'd all the *Gentile Nations* to be 70, and that every of these *Nations* had a President

ſident *Angel* to Govern it: But that *God* took the Government of *Iſrael* to *Himſelf*. And theſe Preſident *Angels* are often put for the *Nations* whom they Govern'd Thus it is in the 8th. verſe of this *Chapter*. Where *Moſes* is repeating *God's* great regard to *Iſrael*, even in the days of Old, before they were a *People*; in that, after the *Flood*, when he *Divided* the *World* into *Nations* he did it with reſpect to the 70 Sons of *Iſrael* (Ex. 1. 5.) for he divided it juſt into Seventy Nations, which are all particularly nam'd in the 10 of *Geneſis* The Sons of the three Sons of *Noah* there reckon'd being juſt Seventy. The Seventy *Nations* ſay the *Jews*, God committed to the care of Seventy *Angels*, but he reſerved *Iſrael* for his own Government. Here was the *Theocraſie*, and indeed ther is a leading to this, or great part of it, in the words of the Text. *Remember the Days of Old*, ſays *Moſes*, Deut. 32. 7. *Conſider the years of many Generations*,—— *when the moſt High divided to the Nations their Inheritance: When he ſeperated the Sons of* Adam, *he ſet the Bounds of the People, according to the Number of the Children of Iſrael* (the Seventy read it) *according to the number of the Angels*, which is the ſame number according to the *Jewiſh* Computation, (i. e. 70.) *For*, or But *the Lords Portion is his People:* Jacob *is the Lot.* (or Cord. i. e. the Extent) *of his Inheritance*, of His *Theocratical Government*, leaving to his Angels the *Immediate* Government of the Seventy *Nations* of the *Gentiles*.

Here then *Angels* being put for the *Nations* by the Seventy *Interpreters* in the 8th. *verſe* why may we not reaſonably conclude that it is taken in the ſame Senſe in the 43d. verſe of the ſame *Chapter*, where the Seventy *Nations* are call'd upon to praiſe God with his People *Iſrael*?

But whether it be ſo, or be not ſo, it can never make your *Authors* Senſe, to have the *Angels*, Worſhip the *People*.

SOC. But my *Defender* has another *Salvo* for this Text *Heb.* 1. 6. *When he bringeth the first begotten into the World he saith and let all the Angels of God Worship him.* My *Author* says that was the *Heavenly World.* i. e. when *God* brought *Christ* into *Heaven* after his *Resurection*, it was then the *Angels* were to Worship *Him.*

CHR. Why? were they not to *Worship* him *before*? But do's that *Defence-maker* name any *Authority*, any various reading of the *Text*, or the *Interpretation* of any *Father*, or any sort of *Reason* for his *Addition* to the *Text*, and putting the word *Heavenly* to *World.*

SOC. No. Only says, it is, as if the *Apostle* should have said so and so.

CHR. For the future I desire you would advise him to let the *Apostle* speak his own words, and not to run the hazard *Revel.* 22. 18. of having all the *Plagues* written in the *Book* added to him, for *Adding* to any part of the *Word* of *God*; or to think to impose upon unwary Readers, by *corrupting* instead of *explaining* the *Texts* of *Holy Scripture.* But we have been too long with this, let us go on to the next.

(8.) Ps. 102. 25. " *Of old hast thou laid the foun-* " *dation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the Works of* " *thy Hands. They shall perish but thou shalt endure, yea* " *all of them shall wax old like a Garment, as a Vesture* " *shalt thou change them and they shall be changed, but thou* " *art the same, and thy Years shall have no end.* This is apply'd to *Christ* Heb. 1. 10.

SOC. My Author will not have this spoke of *Christ* in that place of *Heb.* but of *God* only.

Hist. p. 50.

CHR. Does he tell to what end these words are brought there by the *Apostle*?

SOC. No, but he endeavours to make out the Coherence thus. *And thou Lord hast laid the Foundation of the Earth— But to which of the Angels said He, sit thou on my right hand? As he saith to Christ*, Psal. 110. 1.

CHR

CHR. This is such a way of shewing a *Coherence*! Even Imagination cannot find any thing like a *Coherence* in it.

SOC. It was the Founder of the Earth said, *Sit on my right Hand.*

CHR. And did the Apostle repeat over so distinctly three whole Verses out of the 102. *Psalm*, to shew that it was the *Founder of the Earth*, that is, *God*, who said, *Sit on my Right Hand* in *Psalm* 110? Which no Body even Doubted; and is sufficiently declar'd in the words themselves, Psalm 110. 1. *The Lord said unto my Lord*, and is not at all proved by these words *Psalm* 102. where the *Psalmest* is treating of another Subject.

But pray tell me, to what purpose was the word *And Heb.* 1. 40? *And*, Thou Lord in the beginning—— from the 3th. verse there is a Comparison carried on betwixt *Christ* and the *Angels*, and several Particulars are reckoned wherein *He* had the Preheminence above the *Angels*, all join'd together with the Copulative, *And*, viz. *Christ* had the Preheminence in this, *And* this, *And* this—— unto which of the *Angels* said He, Thou art my Son. *And* again, I will be to Him a Father—— *And again* to the Son, He saith, Let all the Angels of God Worship Him—— *And*, Thy Throne O God, is for ever and ever—— *And*, Thou Lord in the Beginning hast laid the Foundation of the Earth—— Now our *Historian* excepts this last *And*, and says it must belong to the same Person to whom all the Rest do belong that go before it, and that follow it thro' the whole Chapter: And gives no other Reason for it than for the Sake of that fine *Coherence* you have seen above; that is indeed, to destroy the whole *Coherence* of that *Chapter*, and make it not only *Non-sense*, but a downright *Fallacy* and *Prevarication* in the *Apostle*. To slip in a *Texts* which belong'd only to *God*, among those *Texts* which were meant of *Christ*, and to reckon it as one of the number by the Copulative *And*, whereas it should have been expressly excepted with a *But*. This was said of

Christ,

Christ, *And* this, *And* this, *But* this was said of *God* only. Thus it must have been expreſt in the *Hiſtorians* ſenſe. In which, there is no reaſon in the World for bringing in theſe *Texts* of *Pſalm* 102. there is no *Connexion* between them and the reſt, they Diſturb and Confound the whole meaning and drift of the Place, and cannot be reconciled to *fair Meaning* nor *Honeſty* in the *Writer*.

SOC. The *Defence of the Hiſtory*. c. 7. p. 34. ſays, that the 10th. verſe of Heb. 1, viz. *Thou Lord in the Beginning haſt laid the Foundation of the Earth* —— is not Cited by the *Apoſtle* as ſpoken of *Chriſt* or with intention to accommodate it to *Him*; but becauſe it was neceſſary for explaining the word, *They*, [they ſhall Periſh] in the following words, which he had occaſion to uſe for expreſſing the Duration of *Chriſt's* Kingdom.

To make you Underſtand this, you muſt know, that my *Author* applies expreſly to *Chriſt*, the 11 and 12 *verſ.* of *Heb.* 1. viz. *They* (the Heavens and the Earth) *ſhall periſh, but Thou remaineſt; and they all ſhall wax old as doth a Garment, and as a Veſture ſhall Thou fold them up, and they ſhall be Changed; but Thou art the ſame, and thy Years fail not.*

Theſe words, He ſaith, are a Deſcription of the Duration of *Chriſt*'s Kingdom, which is Immutable, and will laſt for ever, and are a Confirmation of what went before *Pſ.* 45. *Thy Throne O God is for ever and ever.* Theſe two Scriptures, *Pſ.* 45. 6, 7. and *Pſ.* 102. 25, 26, 27. he ſays the *Apoſtle* quotes for the ſame Purpoſe, *viz.* to ſhew the Duration of *Chriſt*'s Kingdom, which are ſeparated from one another only by the word *And*.

CHR. I thought *And* had been a *Copulative*, that did not *Separate*, but *Join* things together. And ſo I ſuppoſe your *Author* will allow it in all places that ever were read, except the firſt *And* in the 10th verſe of the 1ſt. to the *Hebrews*, which is the *And* he here ſpeaks of. For if *And* be *And* there, then theſe words, *And Thou Lord in the beginning*

beginning has laid the Foundation of the Earth, &c. must belong to *Christ*, as well as all the other *Ands* which are mention'd in the same place.

But here is another piece of Arbitrary Interpretation, which exceeds making *Copulatives*, *Disjunctives*, or any thing else that ever I read, except in your *Author*. It will not need a Confutation, shewing it to you will be Sufficient.

Read these words. *Heb.* 1. 10, 11, 12. *Thou Lord in the beginning hast laid the Foundation of the Earth; and the Heavens are the works of THINE Hands, They shall perish, but THOU remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a Garment, and as a Vesture shalt THOU fold them up, and they shalt be changed, but THOU art the Same, and THY years shall not fail.*

Now who would imagin, but all this was spoken of the same *Person*?

I suppose it will not be deny'd, but the *Prophet* meant them all of the same *Person*, when he first wrote them, *Psal.* 102. And how the *Apostle* came to alter it in the *Quotation* is somewhat difficult to apprehend.

Thou didst this, and *Thou* didst this, and *Thou* didst this, says the *Apostle*, of *Christ*, repeating the words which the *Prophet* had spoken of *God*.

Says our *New Author* the first *Thou* shall not belong to *Christ*, nor so much as be *Accommodated* to *Him*; but all the rest of the *Thou's* shall belong to *Him*, and to no body else. This is to solve the Difficulty of the *And's* which we have spoke of before.

But what was the first *Thou* brought in for, if it was not intended to mean the same *Person* with all the rest of the *Thou's* which did follow? Or why was it not told us that one *Thou* was meant of one *Person*, and another of another, to prevent mistakes, especially in so material a point as that of mistaking a *Creature* for *God*? And when the expression was so necessary to be mista-

ken

ken, that there was no Possibility of avoiding it, without taking *Words* and *Expressions* in such a *Sense* as ther is not one *Precedent* for in any *Language*, or any *Writing* that ever was upon the face of the Earth; Nor would any man in the World be Understood, that *Spoke* or *Wrote*, in that manner.

And then to give it as a Reason for all this, that it was necessary to understand the first *Thou* vers. 20. of a Different *Person* from all the others, for *Explaining* the following words: Whereas it is that which *Confounds* them, and puts them out of all Rules of speaking intelligible among Mankind. And then to Exult in this and cry out. *And now I appeal to any Reader, whether this be an absurd Sense? Is not this Explication clear? But is not the Sense which the* Trinitarians *wou'd put upon this place, both absurd and inconsistent?* This was *Modest!* But have you any more upon this *Text*?

SOC. He proves that suppose *Christ* had indeed *Created* the *World*, yet the *Creation* cannot be ascrib'd to *Him* in this place, *Heb.* 1. 10.

Def. Hist. p. 34. *CHR.* That will make some amends for his *Thou's* and his *And's*. Pray let us hear his Proof.

SOC. Because the *Apostle* in this *Chapter*, does not speak of what is *Natural* or *Essential* to *Christ*, but of what he has *Received* from *God*.

CHR. How does he prove this?

SOC. He says this appears by vers. 4. the words are these, *being made so much better than the Angels*, Therefore the *Apostles* Scope, is to show the Excellency that *Christ* obtain'd, not by *Nature*, or of *Himself*, but that which He had by *Donation*.

CHR. Why might not the *Apostle* shew it both ways? Both from the Excellency *Christ* had by *Nature*, and by *Donation*?

SOC.

SOC. My *Author* does not meddle with that. But he is very Angry at the word *Inheritance*, verſ. 4. *viz.* That *Chriſt* ſhou'd have by *Inheritance* a more excellent name than *Angels*. He ſays the words *by Inheritance* are *Falſe*; for the Name *Chriſt* has obtain'd, came to Him by free *Donation*, and not by *Inheritance*.

CHR. To ask my former Queſtion, why may it not be both? Both by *Donation* and *Inheritance*? It is ſaid ver. 2. That God *appointed Chriſt Heir of all things. I will give Thee the Heathen for thine Inheritance Pſ.* 2. 8. So that your *Author* ſhew'd too much *Rage*, per *Inadvertence*, at the word *Inheritance*, to ſay that it was *Falſe*, and that *Chriſt* had it not by *Inheritance*.

SOC. Having thus ſhewn, ſays my Author, *that Chriſt is not ſaid to have Created the World*——

CHR. Ay! Having *Shewn* it indeed, as he has *Shewn* all the reſt. By ſuch Arbitrary *Suppoſes* and *Conſequences*, which ſometimes are paſt all Human underſtanding, of which we have had a taſte. But we muſt have more.

I paſs here ſeveral *Texs* Nam'd in this *Hiſtory*, becauſe I would come to the moſt Material. And not to ſwell this to too Great a Bulk. And now I come to the *Prophets*.

(9.) *CHR.* Your Hiſtorian Names *Iſa.* 6. 1, 8, 9. *I ſaw the Lord ſitting upon a Throne*—— *I heard the voice of the Lord*—— *go tell this People, hear ye indeed, but underſtand not*—— *Shut their eyes*, &c. This Appearance of God is aſcrib'd to *Chriſt*. Joh. 12. 41. *Theſe things ſaid ISAIAS when he ſaw His Glory.* *Hiſt.* p. 53. 54.

The Words in St. John *are to be underſtood not of Chriſt, but of God; for God only is intended in the foregoing verſe, as all confeſs.*

CHR. I wonder he did not light upon this *Anſwer* before.

SOC. How could that be, till he came to this *Text*.

CHR. Yes, it will serve all the *Texts* which the *New Testament* brings out of the *Old.* We argue, that what is said of *God* in the *Old Testament* is apply'd to *Christ* in the *New*; and that therefore *Christ* must be *God.* He *Answers*, such a *Text* was spoken of *God*, Ergo, says he, not of *Christ.* Which is not only begging the Question: But if it were not spoke of *God* it would be no Argument in this Cause. But he Cunningly Slips in the Word *Only.* That God *Only* is intended in the foregoing verse. That *God* is intended, we say; but that it is to the Exclusion of *Christ*, he must prove.

All the Question will be, who is meant by the [His] in the Text. *These things said* Esaias *when he saw HIS Glory.* The next words are Material, which our *Author* has left out in his Quotation, and which make out the remainder of that short verse. These things said *Esaias*, when he saw his Glory, *and spake of Him.*

SOC. How then shall we Know who is this [Him?]

CHR. Read before and after, and you will plainly see, whom the Apostle is there speaking of. *These things spake*
Joh. 12. 36, 37, 38, 41. 42. *Jesus, and hid himself. But tho' He had done so many Miracles —— yet they believed not on HIM. That the saying of* Isaias *might be fullfilled —— These things said* Isaias, *when he saw HIS Glory, and spake of HIM. Nevertheless among the Chief Rulers many also believed on HIM —— but they did not confess HIM.*

Now to say that Every one of these *HIS* and *HIM*, must refer to the *Jesus* who is there mention'd, except one *His* in the Middle, and that must be meant of another, is a Confounding the Sense, and all Propriety of speaking. It is Like the *And's*, and *Thou's* before mentioned.

But it is wrote, that *Isaias* said these things when he saw *His* Glory, and *Spake*, or Prophesied, of *Him.* As *Abraham* rejoyced to see His day. So, says *Grotius* (in Loc.) *Isaias* saw the *Glory* of *Christ.*

Was

Was it *God* that *Isaias Prophesied* of, or *Christ*?

But these words, *go unto this People*, in the 'bovesaid Text of *Isaiah*, are ascrib'd to the *Holy Ghost* Act. 28. 25, 26. *well spake the Holy Ghost by* Isaias, *saying*, *Go unto this People*. &c.

SOC. Our *Author* Answers, That was *because the Vision and all the words there mention'd were a Scene wrought in the Prophets mind*, (*not exibited to his outword Senses*) *by the Spirit or Power of God.* p. 54.

CHR. Do you apprehend the meaning of this Answer?

SOC. It is somewhat Difficult.

CHR. I Confess, it exceeds my Understanding. I cannot see the Consequence of it. *Because the Vision was a Scene wrought in the Prophets mind.* Therefore what? Therefore that which the *Prophets* ascribes to *God*, the *Apostle* does not ascribe to the *Holy Ghost*? Will this follow? Nay the *Holy Ghost* speaks here as a Person, *that I should heal them.* vers. 27.

SOC. Our *Author* says nothing of that.

But in Mr. *Bidle*'s Exposition of *Is.* 6. 9, 10. Publish'd (with other of our Tracts) *an.* 1691. call'd [*The Faith of one God*, &c.] p. 12. disputing against this Topick of yours, of drawing Arguments from Texts of the *Old Testament* spoken of *God*, which seem to be apply'd to *Christ*, in the *New*, gives one Instance, for all, to Confound you for Ever: for he proves that, by this Method, *Isaias*, as well as *Christ* must be *God*; because that Text *Is.* 65. 1. [*I am sought of them that asked not for me*; *I am found of them that sought me not, I said, Behold me, behold me unto a Nation that was not call'd by my Name*] is, in the 10th of the *Rom.* vers. 20. *ascribed to Isaiah.* [But *Isaias is very bold, and saith, I was found of them that sought me not*, &c.] therefore (says Mr. *Bidle*) *Isaiah is the Lord.* And thus he Ridicules the Arguments drawn from this head.

CHR. I thank you very kindly for this, whereby to Expose that *Pragmatical Heretick* and *Ignorant Pedant* School-Master *John Bidle*, your Great and Admir'd *Apostle.* I cannot think he had a Boy of ten Years of age in his School, who Reading that Text *Rom.* 10. 20. cou'd Understand it as if *Isaiah* had spoke those words *Is.* 65. 1. of himself, or that the Apostle cou'd so possibly misunderstand him; and not rather that he Quoted this out of *Isaiah*, as what *Isaiah* repeated from the Mouth of *God*, and spoke in the name of *God*, and not of *Isaiah*, The whole Context shews it. Whoever will believe *Bidle* to have had Sense or Reason, after this, has a Pitch of Reason fit to be a *Socinian.* But let's go on.

Hist. p. 55. (10.) Isa. 7. 14. *A Virgin shall conceive and bear a Son, and shall call his Name Immanuel.* 'Tis added, *Matt.* 1. 23. *which being interpreted is*, GOD WITH US.

SOC. Matthew wrote in *Hebrew*, and therefore did not Interpret the *Hebrew* Name.

CHR. But if he wrote in *Hebrew*, for sake of the *Jews*, as some think, 'tis generally believ'd that he wrote the same *Gospel* in *Greek* too: or Translated his own *Hebrew* into *Greek*, or some other of the Inspir'd *Pen men* of the *Scripture*, and therefore the *Greek* of St. *Matthews Gospel* is acknowledg'd for *Scripture* by all the *Christian* Church.

SOC. But our Author says, *That we are not bound to Submit to the Interpretation of the Greek Translator, being an unknown and Obscure Person*,

CHR. Does he offer any proof for this?

SOC. No. He says no more of it.

CHR. Then he makes good his *Character*, that he never wants something to say, be it true or false. But we go on.

Hist. p. 55. (11.) Isa. 8. 14. *He shall be a Stone of Stumbling*, &c. This is spoken of *God* in the Prophet, and apply'd to *Christ.* Rom. 9. 33. 1 Pet. 2. 8.

SOC.

SOC. This is only as *Christ* was *also* a Stone of Stumbling, not that He was the *same* Stumbling Stone which the *Prophet* spoke of.

CHR: But the Apostle calls Him that *same* Stumbling Stone. They Stumbled at *that* Stumbling-Stone; *as is written*; *Behold I lay in* Sion *a Stumbling-Stone*, &c. Rom. 9. 32.

The next is a great Text, *Isa.* 9. 6, 7. *Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given, He shall be call'd Wonderful Councellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. Of the increase of His Government and Peace there shall be no End; upon the Throne of* David *to order and establish it with Judgment and Justice from henceforth, and forever. The Zeal of the Lord of Hosts shall perform this.*

SOC. This cannot be a Prophesy of Christ, because it speaks of a Prince actually Born at that time, unto us a Child IS Born. p. 57.

CHR. It is the Language of *Prophesy* to speak of things to come, as *Present:* Nay sometimes as of things *done* and *past. The Lord SAID unto my Lord*, which your Author acknowledges to be a *Prophesy* of *Christ. Thou art my Son, THIS DAY have I begotten Thee*, which our *Author* says is meant of Christ's *Resurrection. Thou ART a Priest forever, after the Order of Melchisedec.* Spoken of *Christ* so long before. But this is too obvious to be insisted on, our *Author* himself acknowledges it, tho' now he has a bad Memory, he insists upon it and proves it p. 104. and gives several Instances. Psal. 110. 1. 2. 7.

SOC. Then there is no way to escape the force of this Text, but what our *Author* has taken, which is to deny the *Translation.* He says in the *Hebrew* it is thus: *Unto us a Child is Born, unto us a Son is given—— the Wonderful Councellor; the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father shall name Him the Peaceable Prince, His Government shall be multiply'd* (i. e. *He shall Reign long, even Twenty nine Years*) *and He shall have very great Peace—— from henceforth to*

the

the End of His Life. The Zeal of the Lord of Hosts shall perform this. i. e. God's Love to His chosen People shall make good this Prophesy. For, he says, all this was spoken of *Hezekiah*, because he Reign'd Twenty nine years, and in that time there was only one Expedition against him, and that also Unsuccessful.

CHR. It belong'd more literally to *Queen Elizabeth*, who Reign'd almost twice as long, and in great *Peace*, except the one *Expedition* of the *Spanish Armado*, and that also *Unsuccessful.*

It is a great Degree of Obstinacy to interpret such *Wonderful*, *Lofty*, and *Mysterious* Words, each of which commands *Admiration*, only to mean that a *King* Reign'd Twenty nine years. Can that go down with any Man of Common Sense?

But this it self must not do, for his Reading of the *Text* is wholly out of his own head.

SOC. He says it is so in the *Hebrew.*

CHR. He *says* so, but he does not offer to *Prove* it. And because this is so mighty and unanswerable an Authority proving the *Divinity* of *Christ*, and that our *Author* is driven to his last Shifts upon it. I will take Pains to set down out of the *Polyglot Bible* the Several *Translations* of this *Text.* And I will not alter the words tho' it will make them bad *English*, That you may see what Ground our *Author* had for his bold *Alteration* of this *Text.*

The *Hebrew* then is thus. *A Child is born to us, a Son is given to us, and the Principality shall be upon His Shoulder, and His Name shall be called Admirable Councellor, God, Strong, Father of Eternity, Prince of Peace, to Multiply Principality, and to Peace no End.*

The *Chaldee* Paraphrase. *A Man Child is born to us, a Son is given to us, and He shall take the Law upon Him, that he may keep it, and His Name shall be call'd from the Face of the Admirable Council, God, A Man enduring to Eternity,*

ternity, Christ, whose Peace shall be multiply'd upon us in His Days.

Syriac. *A Man Child is born to us, a Son is given to us, and His Empire is made upon His Shoulder, and His Name is called Admiration, and Councellor, The most Mighty God of Ages, The Prince of Peace, of whose Principality to Plenty and Peace, there shall be no Bound.*

Arabic. *A Man Child is Born to us, A Son is given to us, whose Dominion is upon His Shoulders, and His Name shall be called, the Angel of Great Council, The Admirable Councellor, The Strong God, The Emperor, The Lord of Peace, The Father of the Age to come: For I am to bring Peace to Princes, Peace and Safety to themselves. His Dominion shall be most Great, and of His Peace there shall be no End.*

Greek. *A Young Child is Born to us, and a Son is given to us, whose Government is upon His Shoulder, and His Name shall be called The Angel of great Council, Wonderful Councellor, Mighty Lord, Prince of Peace, Father of the Age to come. For I will bring Peace to Princes and Health to Him.* Ms. A. *I will bring Peace and Health. His Principality is Great, and of His Peace there is no Bound.*

Add to this, that these *Epithets* which your *Author* would not in this *Text* have Apply'd to *Christ*, but turns the words, that they may belong only to *God*, as *Wonderful Councellor*, or *Angel of Council*, The *Mighty God*, &c. are even by the *Ante-Nicene Fathers* apply'd to *Christ*. *Just. Mart. Dial. cum Tryph. Iud.* p. 301. 355. *Iren. advers. Hær. l.* 4. *c.* 66. *Tertull. De Carne Christi c.* 14. Origen. *in* Joh. p. 32. 42. Cyprian. *advers. Iud. c.* 21. Clement. Alexandr. Pædagog. *l.* 1. *c.* 5.

Isa. 44. 6. *Thus saith the Lord, I am the first and the last.* This is apply'd to *Christ*. Rev. 1. 8, 17. and 21. 6. &c.

SOC.

SOC. My *Author* says, That *Christ* was the *First* (that is, the most *Honourable*) and *Last*, (that is, the most *Despised* of Men) the first with Good Men, and the last with Evil Men.

p. 59.

CHR. That is, something may be said of every thing. But the *First* and the *Last* are in this same *Chapter* of the *Rev.* Synonimous with *Alpha* and *Omega*, the *Beginning* and the *Ending*. And God is described verſ. 4. thus, *He, who is, and was, and is to come.* Tertull. (*adverſ. Prax* c. 17. and 18. p. 510) proves the *Attributes* of *God* to belong to *Christ*. *Omnia Inquit Patris mei ſunt, Cur non et Nomina? All that the Father hath are mine, ſays Christ, and why not His Names too? Sed et nomina Patris*——The *Attributes* of the *Father*, as, *God Omnipotent, Moſt High, The God of Hoſts, The King of Iſrael*, and *Who is, Hæc dicimus et in Filium competiſſe*——*Theſe belong likewiſe to the Son, who is, ſuo Jure Deus Omnipotens, qua ſermo Dei Omnipotentis*—— i. e. *God Almighty in His own Right, as being The WORD of the ALMIGHTY GOD.* And he proves this *Text* we are upon *Rev.* 1. 8. to belong to *Chriſt*. I am the Lord, who is, and was and is to come, The Almighty. *Cum et Filius. Omnipotentis tam Omnipotens ſit quam Deus Dei Filius.* i. e. *Seeing the Son of the Almighty is Almighty, as the Son of God is God.*

ver. 8. 11. 17.

Origen (*in Joh.* p. 5. *of* 2. *Tom*) obſerves that none of the *Evangeliſts*, did ſo manifeſtly declare the *Divinity* of *Chriſt*, αὐτὸ τὴν Θεότητα, as *John* did. And among other Texts of St. *John* which he there reckons up, as proving the *Divinity* of *Chriſt*, he Quotes *Rev.* 1. 8. and 22. 13. *I am Alpha, and Omega; the Beginning, and the Ending; The Firſt, and the Laſt.*

And St. *Cyprian does the ſame. adverſ. Iud.* c. 1. p. 32. *and* c. 6. p. 35. I will not pretend but you may Interpret this too; for there are ſeveral *Beginnings*, and ſeveral *Endings:* And *I am* to Day, *was* Yeſterday, and *will* be to Morrow. And I may take to my ſelf God's Name,

Name, *I am*, and many other things said of *God*, I may *Accommodate* to my self. But this *Appellation* is *Peculiar* to *God:* You will not find in all the *Scripture* any *Creature* call'd in this *Stile*. Which is the Argument insisted on, *viz*. That the most Peculiar *Appellations* of *God* are given to *Christ*. But we shall have occasion to speak more of this upon another Text by and by.

(14) Isa. 48. 16. *I have not spoken in secret from the Beginning, from the time that it was, there am I. And now the Lord God hath sent me, and His Spirit hath sent me.* Hist. p. 60.

SOC. The I, in this Text, is not *Christ*, But the *Prophet*; for *Christ* was not sent at that time.

CHR. This has been Answer'd already, *viz*. That the Stile of the *Prophets* is to speak of Things to come, as *Present*, or even as *Past*. Nay our *Author* pleads Guilty, and says, notwithstanding his Objection, that this was spoke of a *Great Prince to come*. p. 61.

Origen in Joh. Tom. 2. p. 57, *says* This *Text* was meant of *Christ*; and thence proves that He was sent both by the *Father* and the *Holy Ghost*. And (in *Matt.* p 323.) that *both* were *sent* by the *Father* for the Salvation of Man.

SOC. There am I, that is, I *Declare it* as clearly as if I were present on the place.

CHR. Can you find in any Language one example of this way of speaking? Suppose I were to tell you that such a Child was born, and that I was there; and I should say to you, *from the time that it was, there am I:* Wou'd you understand me? Wou'd you not bid me speak some other sort of Language?

Observe I pray you, This whole *Chapter* the 48 *Isaiah* is spoken in the Person of *God*, and not of the *Prophet*. There God calls upon them, *Hearken unto me*,

O Jacob, I am He, I am the First and the Last, mine Hand hath laid the Foundation of the Earth &c.—*I, even I have Spoken*—*I have called him; I have brought him, Come ye near unto me, I have not spoken in Secret from the Beginning*, &c. as in this Text. It was not *Isaiah* who spoke *from the Beginning*. There is not an *I* in all this Chapter, either before, or after this *Verse*, but what is expresly meant of *God*, and Incommunicable to any *Creature*. But this single *I* must be excepted, as before the *And's* and the *Thou's*, tho' it is set down continu'dly, and undistinguished from any of the rest. Nor could this one *I* in the 16 *Verse* be a transition to another *Person* from all the other *I's* thro' the whole *Chapter*, without a Design to *Deceive* the Reader, there being not the least Hint, or Intimation, or Possibility of it, by any Rule or Usage of Language in the whole World. Nor can *Vers.* 16. be Explain'd of any other *Person* But of *Christ*, whom The *Lord God*, and *his Spirit* sent.

SOC. But this is a proof, says my *Author*, That *Christ* was not *God*, Because He was sent by *God*.

CHR. Do not we say, that *Christ* was sent by *God*?

SOC. Yes.

CHR. Why then do you bring that as an Objection against our Opinion, which is in the very Words wherein we Express our Opinion? Does not the *Apostles Creed* say, That *Christ* was *Conceived* of the *Holy Ghost*? Much more may He be *sent* by Him.

But observe that in this *Text* it is said of *Christ*, That the *Lord* sent Him. Here is a plain Distinction put 'twixt *God* and His *Spirit*: *God* sent, and *His Spirit* sent. Which if they be both the same *Person*, bears this Sense. *I sent*, and *I sent*; that is, it expresses the Difference 'twixt *I* and *my self*. Therefore you must allow

allow *God* and *His Spirit* to be two *Persons*, And that *Christ*, being made *Flesh*; was sent into the World by them both.

(15) There is a most plain *Text* which he quotes next to this *Jer.* 23. 5, 6. *I will raise unto David a Righteous Branch, in His Days Judah shall be Saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: And this is the Name wherby He shall be called, The Lord* (HEB. *JEHOVAH*) *our Righteousness.* p. 61.

SOC. In the *Hebrew* it is, *This is the Name which they shall call the Lord our Justifier.* That is, in the happy Days of the *Branch*, the Nation shall call *God* their *Justifier*, or *Deliverer.* p. 62.

CHR. The very Reading the Context shews the Absurdity of this Translation; for it is *God* who is Speaking, and Speaking only of the *Righteous Branch*, describing *Him*, and telling how *He* shall be called. *The Days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a Righteous Branch, and a King shall Reign—— In His Days Judah shall be Saved——And this is His Name, whereby He shall be called, The Lord,* Jehovah, *our Righteousness.*

Hebrew. *And this is his Name, which they shall call Him, The Lord our Righteousness.*

Paraph. Chald. *This is His Name by which they shall call Him. Righteousness shall be to us from the Face of the Lord in His Days.*

Syriac. *And this is His Name by which they shall call Him, The Lord our Righteousness.*

Arabic. *And this is his Name, by which they shall call Him, The Lord Josedec, which signifies the Just Lord, or THE JUSTICE OF THE LORD.*

Greek. *This is the Name which the Lord shall call Him Josedec.*

Here you see it is *the Lord* who calls the *Branch* by this Name, instead of the Lord's being call'd so by others.

(16.) *CHR. Micha.* 5. 2. *Thou Bethlehem, out of thee shall come unto me that is to be Ruler in* Israel; *whose goings forth have been of old, from Everlasting*, or as it is in the Margin, *From the Days of Eternity.*

Hist. p. 62.

SOC. By *Goings forth* is meant only *Pedigree*; that is, whose *Pedigree* was ancient.

CHR. This is pretty Arbitrary, and your Author gives no Reason for it; but I suppose that this is the first time that *Going forth* has been taken for a Man's *Pedegree*, and I believe he will not do it again. But how do you get over the words *from Everlasting*?

SOC. In the *Hebrew* it is *from Ancient Days*, viz. That *Christ* Descended from the *Ancient* Stock of *David.*

CHR. The *Hebrew* Phrase is, *from the Days of the Age*, which, in their *Idiom*, signifies *Eternity*, as also in the *Greek* εἰς τὸς αἰῶνας, *to Ages*, is English'd for *Ever and Ever* at the End of the *Lord's Prayer*; and you find no fault with it: For it is the Idiom of the Language. And it is in the *Latin*, *in Sæcula Sæculorum.* The *Chaldee Paraphrase* has both Expressions together. *Whose Name was said from Eternity, from the Days of the Age.* The Syriac, *whose Going forth is from the Beginning, from the Eternal Days.* The Arabic, *whose Out goings in* Israel, *are from Everlasting Days.*

And in the *English* it is plainly told what is there meant by *Ancient Days*, or *of Old*, as our *Translation* is; not *Yesterday*, or since *David*, But *from Everlasting. Whose Goings forth have been of Old, from Everlasting.*

Here I might retort upon our *Author*, for his Interpretation of *Isa.* 9. 6. *Unto us a Child is Born.* That, says our *Author*, is spoke of in the *present* Tense; Therefore it could not be *Christ*, who was not then Born.

By

By the same Rule, *Christ* did exist, before the Prophet *Micha* wrote; for he speaks of *Christ* here in the *Preterperfect Tense. Whose Goings forth have been of old*——

(17.) *Zech.* 2. 8, 9. *Thus saith the Lord of Hosts*——*Ye shall know that the Lord of Hosts hath sent me.*

SOC These words, *Thus saith the Lord of Hosts*, are not the words of the Lord of Hosts Himself, but of the second *Angel*, who at vers. 3. and 4. spoke to the first *Angel*, and to *Zechariah.* Hist. p. 63.

CHR. Indeed the *Angel* does declare the word of the *Lord*, and what the *Lord* Spoke, but therefore, *it was the Lord* who Spoke it. And this is plain from vers. 5. *I, saith the Lord, will be unto her a wall of Fire*——*flee from the North, saith the Lord, for I have Spread them abroad as the Four winds*——*Thus saith the Lord*——*I will shake my Hand upon them*——*and ye shall know that the Lord of Hosts hath sent me.*

But vers. 10. and 11. makes this plain past Contradiction. *Lo, I come and I will dwell in the midst of thee, saith the Lord: And many Nations shall be Joyned to the Lord in that Day, and shall be my People: And I will dwell in the midst of thee; and thou shalt know that the Lord of Hosts hath sent me unto thee.*

This cannot be apply'd to the *Angel*; It was the *Angel* indeed who told us this, who told us that *God* said all this, but you cannot apply it to the *Angel*, any more then you can say that all that is spoken *in the Prophets*, was meant *of the Prophets.*

SOC. Our *Author* has said nothing of this last Text.

(18.) *CHR.* It was not for his Purpose. The next *Text* he Quotes out of *Zachariah* is *chap.* 3. 2. *The Lord* (Heb. *Jehovah*) *said unto Satan, the Lord* (Heb. *Jehovah*) *rebuke thee.* p. 64.

SOC.

SOC. Our *Author* says, that *The Lord* in the first clause is the *Angel* of the Lord, as appears by vers. 1. for there *Satan* stands before the *Angel.*

CHR. How do you prove the Consequence? That because *Satan* stood before the *Angels*; Therefore *the Lord* in the first Clause is the *Angel*?

SOC I confess the Consequence is not very plain: But he proves it was the *Angel*, because he *Prays* to another *Person* to Rebuke.

CHR. Do not we say that *Christ* is another *Person* from the *Father*? And that He *Pray'd* to the *Father*? And we bring this *Text* as a proof; which you say is no Proof, because there is one *Person* Praying to Another. Whereas if it were not so, it could be no *Proof* for us But your *Author* Confesses, That by *The Lord* in the *first* Clause, *Jehovah* is meant according to the *Hebrew*, which, he says, does so read it as well as in the *second* Clause.

SOC. The Name *Jehovah*, is given to *Angels.* as *Exod.* 3. 2, 4, 6. *The Angel of the Lord appeared——And when the LORD* (Heb. *JEHOVAH*) *saw that he turned aside——God called to him——and said, I am the God of thy Father——*

CHR. We say that *Christ* oft appeared before His *Incarnation*, as *Angels* do, who put on *Bodies* as Men do *Cloaths* without Assuming them into their Nature. And when *He* so Appear'd, *He* took to Himself the Stile of *God*, which we deny that ever any *Angel* did. We say that *He* was one of the *Three* which appear'd to *Abraham* Gen. 18. who stay'd behind, when the other *Two* went on to *Sodom*, who is called there by the Name of *The Lord.* *Constantine* built a Church at *Mamre*, where The *Lord* did thus appear to *Abraham*, in Commemoration of *Christ* appearing there, who is call'd *The Lord*, and manifested His *Divinity* there, accompany'd with *Two Angels.* And we say it was *He* who appeared like

Euseb. De Vita Const. b. 3. c. 51.

like an *Angel* in the *Bush*, and therefore is rightly there call'd by the Name *Jehovah*, and *He* said *I am the God.* Thus that *Text* is plain and easie, in our Sense; but in yours it is *Intricate* and *Crabbed*, and you know not which way to turn it.

(19.) But I come to the Last Quotation out of *Zech.* 12. 10. *They shall look upon me whom they have pierced.* The same thing is of *Christ* Rev. 1. 7. and *Joh.* 29. 37. *Hist.* p. 65.

SOC. As the *Jews* in the times of the *Prophets* did (as it were) *pierce* God with their Sins of several Kinds; So they *pierced* Him again when they put to Death the Lord *Christ*.

CHR. Both these *Texts* in St. *John* refer plainly to *Christ*; and say, that it was He who was *Pierced*; you say it was not *He*, but *God* that was *Pierced.* This is point blank *Denying* these *Texts*, instead of *Answering* them. Again consider the manner of their *Mourning* for Him, *as one that mourneth for his only Son*, as the *Text* speaks; *They shall look upon me whom they have Pierced, and they shall Mourn for Him, as one Mourneth for his only Son, and shall be in Bitterness for Him, as one is in Bitterness for his First-born.*

This is a Sorrow for one that is *Dead*, and lost from Us. This is litterally Fulfill'd in the Death of *Christ*, and His Side *Pierc'd* with the *Spear.* This Sorrow has Pity and Compassion in it, and Trouble and Grief for *Another*, which cannot be said of our Repenting towards *God*, wherein we are not Griev'd for *God*, but for *our Selves.* Can we be said to *Mourn* for *God*, as for an *Only Son*?

SOC. But the Words in the *Prophet*, are not by St. *John Interpreted* of *Christ*, but *Accommodated* to *Christ* and His Sufferings.

CHR. This is the old Distinction of *Accommodated*, by which I suppose you mean, That the *Text* was not spoke of *Christ*, but only that *Christ's* Case was like that

that Case which the *Text* speaks of; And so one of these Cases is only *Compar'd* or *Accommodated* to the other.

SOC. Yes; That is the meaning of it.

CHR. But what if both these *Texts* mean the same *Case*?

SOC. If you can make that Appear, you have done the Business.

CHR. What is the meaning of any *Saying* being *Fulfill'd*?

SOC. That is, when that is come to pass, which was meant or intended in such a Saying.

CHR. Is the *Saying* it self, and the *Meaning* of that Saying, two different things?

SOC. No sure. For what is a *Saying* but the *Meaning* of it? But what do you mean by all these Questions?

CHR. If this Text of *Zech.* was *Fulfill'd* in *Christ*, then it was *meant* of *Christ*; and they are not *two* Cases whereof one may be *Accommodated* to the other; but all is *one and the self same Case*. *Fulfilling* is a *Compleating* of a thing, carrying it to its utmost Meaning and Perfection. That which is *Foretold*, is not *Fulfill'd*, if it be not the *same thing* which was *Foretold*: One thing is not *Compleated* by the *Fulfilling* of *another Thing*.

SOC. This is self Evident. What do you inferr?

CHR. *St. John* says the Scripture in *Zech.* was *Fulfill'd* in the *Passion* of *Christ*; Therefore it is more than *Accommodated*, *Compar'd* or *made like* to it. The *Prophet* and *Evangelist* both spoke of the *same thing*.

Joh. 19. 36. *These things were done* says St. *John*, That the Scripture *might be Fulfilled*—— *They shall look on Him whom they Pierced.* And you having said in your first *Answer* to this *Text*, that the [*me*] in *Zech.* (*They shall look upon ME*) was meant of *God*, It follows from St. *Johns* Interpreting this as *Fulfill'd* (and not only *Accommodated*) in *Christ*, that *Christ* was that *Me* which is in *Zech.* and consequently is *God*. Pray read *ver.* 36. of the 19 *chap.* of St.

St. *John These things were done.* (viz. *Piercing CHRIST* with the *Spear*, and not *Breaking* of His *Legs*, as was done to the Others who were Crucify'd with Him) *that the Scripture should be Fulfill'd, a Bone of Him shall not be broken*; And again another *Scripture* says, *They shall look on Him whom they Pierced.* Here are two *Prophesies* Quoted by the *Apostle* of this *Piercing* of *Christ.* One of them I believe this *Author* will not say was only *Accommodated* to *Christ*, viz. The not *Breaking* of His *Legs*; unless he thinks they could Break *GOD's Legs*; and then you may Contrive an *Accommodated* Sense even in this too: For *Grieving* of *God* may be call'd *Breaking of His Bones*, as well as *Piercing* Him. And you must either *Accommodate both*, or *none* of these *Texts*; The *Apostle* puts them together, and *Accommodats* them both alike. And therefore *Zech.* 12. 10. must belong as much to *Christ*, as *Exod.* 12. 46. *Numb.* 9. 12. Or *Psal.* 34. 20. And it was understood all along in this Sense, even before the Council of *Nice.*

St. *Barnabas*, in his *Cath. Epist.* c. 7. p. 43. speaking of *Christ's* coming to *Judgement*, says, that when the *Jews* shall see him, they will say, *Is not this he whom we heretofore did Crucify.* ἢ ἐρῶσιν, οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὃν πότε ἡμῶς ἐσταυρώσαμεν;

Now tho' St. *Barnabas* does not here Quote this Text of *Zech.* 12. 10. yet it is plain that he Refers to it; and means, the *Looking upon him whom they pierced*, to be understood of *Christ.*

Irenæus Quotes this same Text of *Zech.* 12. 10. as spoke of *Christ.* (*advers. Heres. l.* 4. *c.* 66.) and *Cyprian* (*advers. Jud. l.* 2. *c.* 20.) *Tertullian* (*advers. Jud.* c. 14. *De Resurrect.* Carnis c. 22. and advers. *Marcion.* l. 3. c. 7.) And generally all the *Fathers.*

SOC. The more Learned and Judicious *Trinitarians* confess that the *Trinity*, and *Divinity* of *Christ*, and of the *Holy Spirit*, are not indeed taught in the Scriptures of the p. 67

p. 67. *Old Testament*; But are a Revelation made to us in the *New*, So saith *Tertullian*, *adverſ. prax. c.* 3.

CHR. Tertullian ſays not a word like it in that place. It is but ſeldom this *Hiſtorian* Quotes *Book* or *Chapter* of any *Author*. And you may ſee here a good Reaſon for it. But it was an unlucky or rather happy *Erratum* of the *Author* or *Printer*, (if you make the right uſe of it) to lead the Reader to this place of *Tertullian*, for he Diſcourſes there of the *Trinity* ſo very Learnedly as might have inſtructed your *Author* and cur'd him of his Miſtakes about the *Trinity*, if he had minded it.

Tertullian is there Diſputing againſt theſe *Hereticks* who think that the

Teſtimony of *Tertullian* that the *Trinity* is *Collected* out of the *Unity*.

NUMBER * *and* DISPOSITION *of the* TRINITY *is a* DIVISION *of its* UNITY; *when the* UNITY *deriving the* TRINITY *out of it ſelf, is not deſtroy'd by it, but is ſupported. Therefore they bragg that we Preach* TWO *or* THREE, *but that they Worſhip* ONE *God. As if the* UNITY, *being unreaſonably Collected, did not make Hereſy; and the* TRINITY *being rationally weigh'd did not eſtabliſh the Truth.*

*NUMERUM & *DISPOSITIONEM* Trinitatis, *DIVISIONEM* præſumunt *UNITATIS*; quando Unitas ex ipſamet derivans Trinitatem, non deſtruatur ab illa, ſed adminiſtretur. Itaque Duos et Tres jam jactitant a nobis prædicari, ſe vero Unius Dei Cultores præſumunt. Quaſi non et *UNITAS* irrationabiliter Collecta, Hereſin faciat; et *TRINITAS*, rationaliter expenſa, veritatem Conſtituat.

Theſe are the Words of *Tertullian*, and I would deſire you to conſider *two* things in them. Firſt that he ſays the *Unity* does deduce the *Trinity* out of it ſelf. This ſhews the *Trinity* to be even natural to the *Unity*; and therefore that there could not be an *Unity*, unleſs there were a *Trinity*. And to explain this, he ſays after, that the *Unity* is to be *Collected*. *Unitas Collecta:* This is a Great Confirmation to what we have already Diſcours'd of the *Natural Unity* of the *Perſons* of *God*. That

That in every *Unity* there must be several things to be *United*: Thus the *Unity* of a *Body*, is an *Union* of *Parts*: The *Union* of a *Soul*, is the *Union* of *Faculties*; and the *Union* of *God*, is the *Union* of *Persons*. The very word *Union*, implies *Diversity*; for a thing cannot be *United* to *its self*. Even in *Self-Reflection*, the same *Soul* must be considered as *Agent* and *Patient*, as when *I* love *my Self*. And what is but a *Shadow*, a *Diversity* of *Faculties* in *man* (without which there could be no *Self-Reflection*) must be *Personal* in God (without which *God* could not know or love *Himself*; and so could not be *God*) Therefore, as *Tertullian* says, The *Unity* not being reasonably *Collected*, makes an *Heresie* in the *Christian Faith*. Indeed your *Unity* is not *Collected* at all, or put together: it is made up of Nothing, or (which is the same) it is the *Union* of a thing with it self, a *Unity* without any *Union*, or an *Union* where nothing is *United*: On the Contrary, our Doctrin of the *Trinity*, being *Rationally weigh'd*, and Consider'd, *does Establish the Truth*, that is, gives the only True and Rational account of the *Unity* of *God*. And it will follow from hence, that we deserve the Name of *Unitarians* much more truly than you do? Your *Unity* is a *Heresie*, according to *Tertullian*, ours is the *Truth*.

SOC. I fancy our *Author* must have misquoted that place of *Tertullian*.

CHR. Yet it has not been wholly improper to our Subject as you have seen.

SOC. I am sure, that is not what he intended. But what say you to Two or Three other *Authors* he Quotes in the same place?

CHR. I have them not at hand. And I think it not worth the while to search for them; because if *Tertullian* and Twenty Others said what he alledges, it would make nothing for his cause. And *Secondly*, you

may reasonably suppose, that he deals with the Others as he has done with *Tertullian* in this Quotation.

SOC. Why do you say it would make nothing for his Cause, if *Tertullian* or Others said what he alledges?

An *Answer* to the *Objection* why the *Trinity* is not more clearly *Reveal'd* in the *Old Testament*.

CHR. Because I will allow, in one sense, That the *Trinity* and *Divinity* of Christ are not taught in the *Old Testament*; that is so clearly, as that, if the *New Testament* had not apply'd to *Christ* the *Texts* which the *Old Testament* makes *Incommunicable* to any but to *God*, we had not of our own Heads, thought them *Communicable* to *Christ*. But it is a *Demonstration* that the *Fathers* did think the *Trinity*, and *Divinity* of *Christ* to be Contain'd in the *Old Testament*; because one of their Arguments for the *Divinity* of *Christ* is by Comparing the *Prophesies* of *Him* in the *Old Testament*, with the *Completion* of them in the *New*: And from the *New Testament* applying to *Him* the *Incommunicable Attributes* of *God*, which the *Old Testament* did appropriate to *Christ*. And you have seen the *Fathers*, even before *Nice* insist all along upon the *Old Testament* proofs, both for the *Trinity* and *Divinity* of Christ: So that this is a false and malicious Aspersion your *Author* casts upon them, where he weakly insinuates, that they give up the *Old Testament* phrases, because these of the *Gospel* are more full: Or even that the *Old Testament* Proofs had not been clearly understood but for the *New*, which as I said, if Granted, makes nothing at all to his Cause. But he has not prov'd even that. That he may make out his Character, to have prov'd no one thing that he has attempted.

p. 68.

SOC. But he asks p. 68. if the Trinity were taught in the *Old Testament*, how came the *Jewish Church* in all Ages to be so wholly Ignorant of it, that (as all Confess) they had not the least Suspicion, that *God* is more than *One Person*? And if in this they had Err'd, 'tis not to be douted our *Saviour* would have reproved their *Heresie*

resie and Carefully set them right, as he did in the matter of the *Resurrection*.

CHR. His Confident *Asserting* is the best part of his *Arguments*. He says, that (*all Confess*) the *Jews* had not the least Suspicion of the *Trinity*. The Contrary to which you have plainly seen.

SOC. But then why did not *Christ* explain the *Trinity* more fully to them, and set them right in *This*, as well as in the *Resurrection*?

CHR. He did so, as is evident from the Clear Revelation of the *Trinity* in the *New Testament*; but they remain'd Ignorant in this, as in other things which were as clearly reveal'd; as in the true *Office* of the *Messiah*, His *Passion*, *Resurrection* &c. *Luk*. 18. 31. ad. 35. Nay the very *Apostles* remain'd all *Christ's* Life-time Ignorant of the true meaning of His coming into the World, of His *Death*, *Resurrection*, &c. Act. 1. 6. notwithstanding all the clear Revelations he made to them of it before His Death.

SOC. The Chief of your *Proofs* for the *Trinity* are in the *New Testament*. Therefor in our next *Discourse* let us Consider these, at least the *Principal* of them.

THE

THE THIRD DIALOGUE.

TEXTS out of the *NEW-TESTAMENT.*

CHRISTIAN. I Am now come to my Proofs out of the *New Testament.* And I desire you to Consider.

(1.) *Matt.* 12. 31. *Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven.*

SOC. The *Holy Ghost* is not, in this Text, a *Person,* or a *God,* but meerly the *Power* of God. *Brief History,* p. 75.

CHR. Not in this *Text* ? But in other *Texts* it must be something *Distinct* from *God.* Which you assert, p. 17. and p. 125. upon 2 *Cor.* 13. 14. and in several other places. So that you alter the Notion of the *Holy Ghost* according to the *Texts.* Which is wisely done, for every *Text* will not fit your way.

SOC. But *now* we must take it only for the *Power* of *God,* which is the same with *God,* as 'tis said of *Moses, they provoked his Spirit,* the Undoubted meaning is, They provoked *Him.* So also *Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God,* is an *Hebraism* for Grieve not *God*; As our *Author* explains it p. 52. upon *Psal.* 139. 7.] *Psal.* 106. 33. *Eph.* 4. 30.

CHR.

CHR. Then this is the meaning you have put upon this *Text*, That Sins against *God* are to be forgiven, but Sins Against His *Spirit* are not to be forgiven. Now apply this to the Parallel you have brought. And say that a Sin against *Moses* is to be forgiven; but against the *Spirit* of *Moses* is not to be forgiven: Or, which is the same, That a Sin against *Moses* is to be forgiven; but a Sin against *Moses* is not to be forgiven. For you know *Moses* and His *Spirit* are the same.

SOC. You have propos'd the Difficulty, pray Answer it.

CHR. The *Spirit* of *Moses* is not a *Person*, viz. it is not Subsisting by it self: Therefore we cannot Predicate, or Affirm any thing of it otherwise than of *Moses*, and it would be the same absurdity to say any thing of the *Spirit of God* otherwise than of *God*, if the *Spirit* were not a *Person*, that is, Subsisting by it self.

SOC. I will Consider of this. Go to Another *Text*.

(2.) *CHR.* Mat. 28. 19. *Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*

SOC. Baptizing *unto* such a one, is sometimes meant
P. 75. of Baptizing in His *Name*, as *Rom. 6. 3. as many of you as have been Baptized into Jesus Christ*—— by which is meant, being Baptized *in His Name*. And we find it said, *That our Fathers were Baptized unto Moses*, 1. Cor. 10. 2. *and unto John's Baptism*, Act. 19. 3. and therefore we may suppose they were Baptized *in their Names*. And so being Baptized *in the Name* of such a one, is not a Proof that He is God.

CHR. This is Mr. *Bidle's* Exposition of this Text Reprinted, 1691. in that Volume of *Socinian* Tracts intituled *The Faith of one God*, &c. p. 8. And not to insist upon the Difference of being Baptized *Unto*, and *Into* such a one, which is Considerable. I Answer, That being Baptiz'd *in the Name* of such a one, do's include, being Baptiz'd *Unto him*: But not on the Contrary; for being

being Baptiz'd *Unto such a one*, do's not include, being Baptiz'd *in his Name*. *Unto such a one*, may mean, no more than being Baptiz'd by his *Ministery*. But being Baptiz'd, *in ones Name*, is owning him the *Author* of my *Religion*; and, as such, a *Dedicating* and *Devoting* my self to him: Which is not Lawful to do to any *Creature*, because it is the *Highest* sort of *Worship* that can be. *I thank God I Baptized none of you*, says St. *Paul*, But *Crispus and Gains, least any should say that I had Baptized* IN MY OWN NAME. And again he Argues with them. *Is Christ Divided? Was Paul Crucify'd for you? Or were ye Baptized* IN THE NAME OF PAUL? These are things which No *Apostle* must Arrogate to himself, and there is not an Instance in all the *Scripture* of any that were Baptized *in the Name* of any *Creature*; for that would be to be Baptiz'd into the *Faith* and *Worship* of *Creatures*, which is *Idolatry*: And asserted, *in terminis* in *Bidle's Confession of Faith*, Printed in the above said Volume of Socinian Tracts. p. 4. where Artic. 2. and p. 8. Artic. 3. he asserts *Christ* to have *No other than an Human Nature*, and yet, *in this very Nature* to be *not only a Person——but also our Lord, yea our God*——and the *Object of our Faith and Worship*. Which is as Gross *Idolatry* as ever was own'd by the *Heathen*; and a Greater *Contradiction* than any that is Charg'd upon the Doctrine of the Holy *Trinity*. St. *Gregory Thaumaturgus* in his *Expositio Fidei*, p. 100. says, that from the words of this Text, *non potest Contradici*——there can be no Dispute, but the *Father*, *Son* and *Holy Ghost* have Communion and Unity, according to which, they are neither *Three Divinities*, nor *Three Dominations*, nor *Three Holy's*, but their *Three Persons* remaining, the *Union* of all the *Three* is most firmly to be Confest. As the *Father* sends the *Son*, and the *Son* sends the *Holy Ghost*: But one *Person* never sends it self, for none will say that the *Father* is *Incarnat*, &c. Our *Author's* Interpretation

1. *Cor.* 1. 25. ver. 13.

of this *Text* is the ſame which *Cyprian* ſo ſeverely reprehends in *Lucian*, who, when Our Lord Commanded all Nations to be Baptized in the Name of the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghoſt*, and *Remiſſion* of *Sins* to be given in *Baptiſm*, he, being ignorant of the Command and the Law, Commands Peace to be given, and Sins to be remitted in the Name of *Paul*——wherein he did not Conſider at all, that it is not the *Martyrs* who made the *Goſpel*, but they are made *Martyrs* by the *Goſpel*. *Cyprian Epiſt.* 18. p. 53. and *Epiſt.* 73. *Iubaiano* p. 200. he ſays this form of *Baptiſm* in the Name of the *Father Son* and *Holy Ghoſt Inſinuat Trinitatem, cujus Sacramento Gentes Baptizantur. It does inſinuat the Trinity into the Sacrament of which the Nations are Baptized.* And Afterward in the ſame *Epiſt.* p. 206. he ſays, that *Chriſt* Commands all Nations to be Baptized *in plena & adunata Trinitate, in the* FULL *and* UNITED TRINITY.

SOC. The *Def. of the Hiſt.* c. 7. p. 38. ſays, that the *Jews were Baptized in the Name of Moſes, and that it is plain, the Apoſtle tells the Corinthians, that as they were Baptized in the Name of Jeſus—— So the Fathers had been Baptized in the Name of Moſes.*

CHR. If we had ſaid any thing like this, I ſhould have expected ſome of his uſual Complements, *Impudent*, *want of Common Senſe*, &c. To bring no Argument but to cry Magiſterially, *It is plain*, when it is *plainly* otherwiſe! However we will give him to the next Edition, to find the place where St. *Paul* tells the *Corinthians*, that the Fathers were Baptized *in the Name of Moſes.*

SOC. But he finds ſome places of *Scripture* where *Creatures* are join'd with God as *Exod.* 14. 31. *The People fear'd the Lord——and believ'd the Lord and his Servant Moſes*, 2 Tim. 5. 21. *I charge Thee before God, and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and the Elect Angels, that thou obſerve theſe things* &c.

CHR.

CHR. What does he make of this?

SOC. If *Moses* and *Angels* be join'd with *God* in acts of *Faith* and *Obtestation*, &c. Why not the *son* and *Spirit* in *Baptism*, tho' neither of them is *God* Himself?

CHR. Sure He did not ask this Question to be inform'd; for who is it does not see the Difference? To be *Baptized* in the *Name* of a Person, is, giving up my *Name* to him, *Dedicating* my self to him, making my self his, giving him the *Title* to me, to *Dispose* of me at his pleasure: It is a Form of *Initiating* me into his *Religion*, owning him as the *Father* and *Author* of the *Religion* I profess. And this it is not lawful to do to any *Creature*: There's none whom we must thus call *our Father* upon *Earth*, whom we must join with *God*, in this Solemn act of *Dedicating* our selves unto *God*: for we are wholly *God's*, and he must have no *sharer* in the Possession of us: In this we must join none with him. But there are many things wherein it is no harm to join *Creatures* with *God*, as in acts of *Obtestation*, as your *Author* calls it, invoking *God* and *Man* to witness. To believe what *God* says, and what *Man* says, *&c.* This is so obvious I will insist no more upon it.

SOC. My *Author* Quotes 1 *Cor.* 1. 14. 15. *I thank God* says St. *Paul*, *I Baptized none of you but* Crispus *and* Gains; *least any should say that I had Baptized in my own Name.* He plainly insinuates, says my *Author*, that a *meer Man* may Baptize *in his own Name.*

This is such an *Insinuation*, as, I believe, none but your *Author* could see. If any Man might do it, I know none had better pretence than St. *Paul.* But how his *Renouncing* it, should be a plain Insinuation that he *might do it*, is left to the *Author* to Explain; till when I must still believe, and most Men in the World with me, that these words of St *Paul* rather imply that he had not power to Baptize *in his own Name*, and if not he, then I think, no body else had that Power.

SOC. My *Author* ſtill inſiſts, that to be Baptized *unto Moſes*, is the ſame with being Baptized *in the Name of Moſes*, becauſe being Baptiz'd *unto Chriſt*, and *in the Name of Chriſt*, are the ſame.

CHR. That has been Anſwer'd already, *viz.* The *Greater* (which is, being Baptiz'd *in the Name of a Perſon*) includes the *Leſſer* (which is, being Baptiz'd *unto one*, which may mean no more than by his *Miniſtry*) But on the Contrary, the *Leſſer* cannot include the *Greater*. Therefore tho' being Baptiz'd *unto Chriſt*, and *in the Name of Chriſt*, mean the ſame thing, becauſe the *Greater* includes the *Leſſer*; yet being Baptiz'd *unto Moſes* and *in the Name of Moſes*, are not the ſame, becauſe the *Leſs* does not include the *Greater*.

SOC. He ſtill inſiſts that if to be Baptiz'd *into Chriſt's Baptiſm*, is all one with being Baptiz'd *in the Name of Chriſt*, then he ſays, that to be Baptiz'd *into* John's *Baptiſm*, muſt alſo ſignify to be Baptiz'd *in the Name of* John. And that whoever profeſs'd in his Baptiſm to follow the Doctrin which *John* taught, might be ſaid to be Baptiz'd *in the Name of* John.

CHR. To be Baptiz'd *into Chriſt's Baptiſm* is all one with being Baptiz'd *in the Name of Chriſt*. Becauſe the Form of His Baptiſm was *in His own Name*, together with that of the *Father*, and the *Holy Ghoſt*. But to be Baptiz'd *into* John's *Baptiſm*, was not to be Baptiz'd *in the Name of* John, unleſs *John* did Baptize *in his own Name*. Which it is Evident he did not. For his Baptiſm had Relation and Refer'd to *Chriſt* who was to come after him. As it is ſaid, *Act.* 19. 4. John *verily Baptized with the Baptiſm of Repentance, ſaying unto the People, That they ſhou'd Believe in Him who ſhou'd come after him; that is, in Chriſt Jeſus.*

But what does he ſay to the Objection of being Baptiz'd into the Name of an *Inſpiration*, which is not a *Perſon*?

SOC.

SOC. He ſays (*ending of* pag. 39. *and beginning of* p. 40.) that he ſees no Abſurdity in being Baptiz'd into the Profeſſion of a Doctrine, which came Originally from God the *Father*, is reveal'd by His *Son*, and is confirm'd by the *Power* or *Spirit* of God.

CHR. That is to ſay, he is reſolv'd not to *Anſwer*, ask him as often as you will. For the *Queſtion* is not of being Baptiz'd *into the Profeſſion of a Doctrin*, for all are oblig'd by their *Baptiſm* to profeſs the *Doctrin* of that *Perſon* in whoſe *Name* they are *Baptiz'd*. Thus *Chriſtians* are oblig'd by their *Baptiſm* to profeſs the *Doctrin* taught by *Chriſt*; But they are not Baptiz'd *in the Name* of that *Doctrin*, or of any Article of it, that wou'd be Nonſenſe: For every *Baptiſm* is in the Name of ſome *Perſon*: As no Man is *Inliſted* in the *Name* of a *Cauſe*, but in the Name of ſome *Perſon* for whoſe *Cauſe* he Fights. And the *Cauſe* is proclaim'd in *Name* of the *Perſon*. Thus we read *Luk.* 24. 47. *That Repentance and Remiſſion of Sins ſhould be Preach'd in CHRIST's Name.* This was never ſaid of any *Prophet*, *Apoſtle*, or other *Miniſter* of the *Goſpel*. That is more than belongs to the Office of a bare *Servant*, *Miniſter*, or *Herauld*: They muſt not proclaim *in their own Names*.

The like reaſon will Explain *Luk.* 17. 5. *The Apoſtles ſaid unto the Lord increaſe our Faith*: Which your *Author* would have to mean no more than to *Pray for them*. But he will not find in *Scripture* an Example of requeſting any Mans *Prayers* in ſuch a *Form*, as to deſire them to *Beſtow* upon us any Spiritual Grace.

(3.) The next *Text* we ſhou'd Conſider is *Joh.* 1. 1. *In the beginning was the Word*, &c. Of which we have before Diſcours'd at large. I only here *Mark* it, in its Order. And ſo go to the next.

(4.) John. 2. 19. 21. *Deſtroy this Temple, and in Three Days I will raiſe it up.——He ſpake of the Temple of his Body.*

SOC.

SOC. Christ raised His *Body* by a Power Communicated to Him by the *Father*.

CHR. But had He that Power when He was *Dead*? How can a *Dead* man act? Which way shall he be set about the Raising of *Himself*.

SOC. Indeed I think we must have him *Alive* before he can raise Himself. Let us go on to Vers. 25.

CHR. We will let that alone till we come to Rom. 2. 16. for the same Answer will serve both. But now to prove that *Christ* had a Being before he was born of the *Virgin*, Read *Joh.* 3. 13. *No man hath ascended up to Heaven, but he that came down from Heaven; even the Son of Man that is in Heaven.*

SOC. He that came down from Heaven. That is, says my *Author*, He that is sent to you as the *Messenger* of *Heaven*, or of *God*. And even the *Son of Man* that *is in Heaven*, that is, whose *Mediation*, or *Conversation* is in *Heaven*: But our *Author* quits this *Answer*, and says that the *Socinians* do (generally) understand this *Text* Literally, and say, that 'tis here intimated, that before our *Lord* enter'd upon His Office of *Messias*, He was taken up to *Heaven*, to be *Instructed* in the Mind and Will of *God* (as *Moses* was into the *Mount*. *Exod.* 24. 1. 2. 12.) and from thence *Descended* to execute this *Office* and Declare the said will of *God*. The same thing, they say, is also hinted *Joh.* 6. 38. 46, 51. 62. *John* 8. 40.

CHR. Does any of these places say that *Christ* was *taken up* to *Heaven*?

SOC. No. But that He *came down* from *Heaven*, and was *in Heaven*.

CHR. Will this prove that He was *taken up* to be *Instructed* after His *Incarnation*? We say He was there before, and *came down*. You, without any Authority in the World, will have this to be a taking of Him up after His *Birth*, of which there is not the least hint in all the *Bible*, no, nor any where else. Your *Author* does not

not so much as pretend to any sort of *Proof*; So that we must take it for a Revelation of His own. That is, for an absolute Sign of a baffl'd Cause, and the utmost Obstinacy to resist all Conviction. If he had found us Build any thing upon such a Bottom as this, I'm sure he would Persecute us sufficiently. They may as well take upon them to invent a *New Bible*, as invent *Stories* on purpose to ground upon them strange *Interpretations* of the *Texts* of the *Bible*.

But let me ask you, upon his own Principles, what need was there for *Christ's* being taken up to *Heaven* to be *Instructed* in the Will of *God?* He confesses that the *Word* of God, which is His *whole Wisdom* and *Power*, abode on *Christ*, and *Inspir'd* Him, even *without Measure*, so as that it was even *Incarnate* and *made Flesh* in Him, and spoken of as one *Person* with him, and He with Him. And was not this sufficient to shew Him the Will of *God*? What cou'd *Heaven* add to this? He could have but the same in *Heaven*. But if *Christ's* Ascension into *Heaven* may be solv'd, by my fancying that He *might* be taken up at this or that time, and let down again, I may Deny what all *Christians* mean by His *Ascension*; and every other Article of the *Creed* by the same Liberty. But let us go on. *Hist. Unit.* p. 89.

(6.) How do you Answer *Joh.* 8. 58. *Before* Abraham *was, I am?* *Hist.* p 94.

SOC. That is, before *Abraham* was it was *Decreed* that *Christ* should come.

CHR. Why was not that exprest in the Text? You will Grant that the Words will not bear it. Never Man exprest himself at this Rate: And the *Scripture* is to be understood, like other *Writings*, by the common use of words: Else it was not meant to be understood.

SOC. He produces other Texts to Countenance his Interpretation of this. 1 *Pet.* 1. 20. —— *Who was foreordain'd from the Foundation of the World.*

CHR.

CHR. That is clearly expreſt, that He was *fore-ordain'd.*

SOC. Rev. 13 8. *The Lamb ſlain from the Foundation of the World.*

CHR. Theſe are words of the *Revelation*, which ſpeaks in the higheſt ſtrain of *Prophesy*, and that as we have obſerv'd, ſpeaks of things to come, as *Preſent*, or *Paſt*.

And this cou'd not be miſunderſtood, for none ever ſaid that *Chriſt* was *Slain*, before the time, that He was *Slain*. And therefore this could not be meant but only of the *Decree*; or in Relation to *God*, to whom all things are *Preſent*; in which reſpect the *Lamb* was *Slain* from all *Eternity*.

And beſides you cannot reconcile this Anſwer of *Chriſt's* to common truth as you explain it.

The Queſtion was, whether *Jeſus* or *Abraham* were Firſt. *The Jews ſaid unto Him, Thou art not Fifty Years Old, and haſt Thou ſeen* Abraham?

Jeſus Anſwered, that He was *before Abraham*; if He meant in *Decree* only, it was no *Anſwer* to their Queſtion: For ſo I am before *Abraham*, that is, before *Abraham* was *Born*, it was *Decreed* that I ſhou'd be: And you wou'd not make our *Saviour* anſwer *Sophiſtically*?

Iren. adverſ. Her. l. 4. c. 27. p. 346. underſtands this Text [*before Abraham was, I am*] of *Chriſt's* really *Exiſting* before *Abraham*.

But the next place, why ſhou'd the *Jews* go to *Stone* Him for this Anſwer? There was no ſort of Difficulty in it, as you explain it.

SOC. The *Jews* miſunderſtood it.

CHR. Then you muſt ſuppoſe *Chriſt* ſpoke with a *Mental Reſervation*, on purpoſe that they might miſtake.

SOC. Yes, as *Luk.* 8. 10. He ſpake in *Parables*, *that ſeeing they might not ſee*, &c.

CHR.

CHR. This is not to be underſtood as if *Chriſt* ſpoke in *Parables*, on purpoſe to *Hinder* them from believing: On the contrary, *Parables* do naturally prompt Men to *Inquire* and *Learn* the meaning of them, and therefore are the moſt effectual method of *Inſtructing*: That is, to Men apt and forward to Learn. But otherwiſe they are indeed inſipid, and very ineffectual. But that is from the fault of the Hearer, who will not be at pains to inquire. Therefore our Saviour ſo often repeats, *He that hath Ears to hear let him hear* —*and take heed how ye hear*: *For he that hath, to him ſhall be given, and he that hath not, from him ſhall be taken, even that which he hath.* That is, a Docible Temper will Learn ſtill more. On the contrary, Men who are Careleſs and Stupid, grow backward, and looſe what Reaſon they had.

And what our Saviour ſays of *ſeeing they might not ſee*, &c. it was only as applying to them the *Prophecy* which was of their *Hardn'd* and *Indocible* Temper, which is evident from the parallel Place. *Mat.* 13. 14. *In them is fulfill'd the Propheſie of* Iſaias, *which ſaith, by hearing ye ſhall hear, and ſhall not underſtand, and ſeeing ye ſhall ſee and ſhall not Perceive; for this Peoples heart is waxed groſs, and their Ears are dull of Hearing, and their Eyes are cloſed, leſt at any time they ſhould ſee with their Eyes, and hear with their Ears, and ſhould underſtand with their heart, and ſhould be Converted, and I ſhould Heal them.*

You will not ſay that it was the *Prophecy* which *hardn'd* theſe Men. But God *fore-ſaw* their hardneſs, and *foretold* it by the Prophet, S. *Matthew* c. 1. 22. ſpeaking of the Birth of Chriſt, ſays, *all this was done that it might be fulfill'd which was ſpoken by the Prophet, ſaying, Behold a Virgin ſhall be with Child*, &c. Do you think that the End of *Chriſt's* coming into the World, was only that He might not make *Iſaiah* a Lyar, who wrote this Prophecy? Or that this Prophecy was the *Cauſe* of Chriſt's Birth, ſo that it had not otherwiſe come to paſs, if this Pro-

phesy had not been made? Ther is the same reason, for the same manner of Expression, in the same *Evangelist.* c 13. 14. and Quoting another Prophesy of the same Prophet *Isaiah.*

But how different a Case is this from our Saviours answering a plain and direct *Question* of the Jews? Are you older than such a Man, or not? To make Him deceive them on purpose, is a hard Interpretation; And when He saw them in an Error, and brought into it, by His improper and unknown way of Speaking; that He shou'd leave them in that Error, into which He had visibly led them, and not vouchsafe one word to undeceive them; not only at that time, but never after in his whole Life: On the Contrary, that all He said shou'd be constantly in this Strain, speaking such strange things of Himself, and in words applicable to no other Person in the World. I say this wou'd give Him more the Character of an *Impostor* and a *Deceiver*, as they call'd Him, then of a *Teacher* come from *God* to tell us the *Truth.*

(7.) *Joh.* 10 30. *Christ* says, *I and the Father are One.*

SOC. Not one *God*, But as *Friends* are said to be *One.*

Hist. p. 95. *CHR. Tertullian*(*De Oratione* c. 2. p. 130) Proves that we pray to the *Son*, when we pray to the *Father*, because *Christ* says, *I and the Father are One. In Patre Filius invocatur*; *Ego enim, inquit, & Pater Unum Sumus*: And (*adverſ. Prax.* c. 8. p. 504.) *Sermo in Patre ſemper* — *The Word*, says he, *was always in the Father*, as Christ says, *I am in the Father*, and always with God, as it is written, *And the Word was with God.* And never separated from the *Father*, or other from the *Father*, Because *I and the Father are One.* (*Ibid* c. 22. p. 513) And by this saying he shews them to be Two, *quos æquat & jungit*, whom He *joins*, and makes *Equal.* But all this is to be understood, *Ut Duo tamen crederentur in una Virtute. That they be believed to be TWO in ONE AND the same Power*;

Power; *Because otherwise the Son cannot be believ'd, unless Two be Believ'd.* These are the words of *Tertullian.*

S. Cyprian (*de Unit. Eccle.* p. 109) Quotes this *Text* as proving the *Natural Union* of the *Father* and the *Son.* For he joins it in the same Proof with 1. *Joh.* 5. 7. which is the most express for proving the *Unity* of the *Trinity. Dicit Dominus, Ego & Pater unum sumus, et iterum, de Patre & Filio & Spirtu Sancto Scriptum est*; *Et Hi Tres unum sunt. The Lord said, I and the Father are One*; *and again, it is written of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*; *And these Three are One.*

(8.) The next *Text* I offer you is *Joh.* 10. 33. *Thou being a Man makest thy Self God.* What says your *Author* to this?

SOC. He says, They *Ly'd.*

CHR. That is not the Question. But what Notion had the *Jews* of that Term, *The Son of God*? They knew that *God* had many *Sons* by *Adoption*, and that *Kings* were call'd *Gods* in their Law, (which you instance p. 76. in Answer to *Mat.* 26. 63. *Tell us whether Thou be the Christ the Son of God*) But a *Natural* Son, partakes of the *True*; *Nature* of his *Father*; In which sense to call any the *Son of God*, is to call Him *True and Real God*: As the *Jews* here you see understood it, and in this sense it is, That *Christ* is called the *First Begotten.* The Production of God's *Nature* is Essential to Him; and therefore the *First* Production of *God*, before any of His outward Acts of *Creation*, and in this sense *Christ* is God's *only Begotten.* These are His *Epithets* in Holy *Scripture.* Now the Question is, whether the *Jews* understood Him in this *Sense*, or only in the common sense of *Christ's* being a *God*, or a *Son of God*, as *Kings* or *Judges* are?

You Remember what we have said of *God's* by *Nature*, and *Gods* by *Office*: And that there was a Necessity that our *Saviour* must use the Terms of the *Logos*,

or the *Word*, and likewise of the *Son of God*, and all other *Terms*, in the same sense in which they understood them to whom He spoke; else He had not spoke in Sincerity and Truth.

SOC. I Remember this very well: And it is necessary that He should use these *Terms* in the same *Sense* the *Jews* did. Therefore I desire you to prove, that the *Jews* had any Notion at all of a *Natural* Son of God, or a *Son* of *God*, which is *God:* For our *Author* thinks that they had not the least suspicion of any such thing, as I Quoted him to you before, p. 68.

CHR. And I have Quoted to you before the *Jews* Notion of the *Trinity*, and likewise of the *Messias*, or *Schechina*, which they distinguished from the *Holy Spirit*. If they had no such Notion, why then did they charge *Christ* with *Blasphemy* for saying He was the *Son of God?* And that this did make Him *God*?

SOC. I cannot see a good Reason for it. The Expression is very strange.

CHR. But they explain their own meaning past Dispute. *Thou being a MAN*, say they, *makest thy self GOD.* They could not say this, if they had meant by *God*, only a *Man*. *And they sought to Kill Him, because He said that God was His Father, making Himself equal to God.* Being God's *Natural* Son, does indeed make Him *Equal* to *God*, as every *Son* is *Equal* to his *Father* in *Nature*; and therefore they must mean it in this Sense: For otherwise to be God's *Adopted* Son, or only upon the Account of *Creation*, is so far from making us *Equal* to God, that, on the contrary, it Demonstrats that we are *not Equal* to Him. And in this sense, it is not only no fault, but it is our Duty to call Him *our Father*; for so He is. And therefore it is impossible that the *Jews* should seek to *Kill* Him, or be *Angry* with Him for this, which themselves did every day; much less to inferr from hence, that He made Himself *Equal to God.*

Joh. 5. 18.

SOC.

SOC. But our *Author* says, that *had our Lord been more than the Son of God, He would have own'd His Dignity when they Charg'd Him with Blasphemy, for saying those things from which it might (by their strain'd Consequences) be inferr'd that He made Himself a God.* *Hist.* p. 96.

CHR. He did own His Dignity plainly; because He knew what they meant by *the Son of God.* But on the other hand, if He had not been *such a Son of God* as they meant, which was to be *Equal to God*, or *to be God*: Without doubt He would have Renounc'd the *Blasphemy* with the utmost Abhorrence and Detestation (as St. *Paul* and *Barnabas* did, when the People took them for God's *Act.* 14. 14.) and never suffer'd the *Jews* to have gone away in so mortal an Error, and just Prejudice to Him and his Doctrin; Especially not to loose His *Life* for it, that when the *High-Priest* rent his *Cloaths*, and the *Sanedrim* Condemn'd Him to *Death* for the *Blasphemy* of calling Himself the *Son of God*, He should stand mute (which was owning of the Fact) and refuse to save His *Life* (which was being accessary to his own *Death*) or to undeceive these so fatally mistaken in such a *Blasphemous* and *mortal Error*, when He might have done it so Easily as naming this Distinction of His not being the *Natural* (which only (in their Sense) was *Blasphemous*) but a *Created* Son of God, with which none could find any fault, much less charge it with *Blasphemy*. But I Go on.

(9.) Joh. 14. 1. *Ye Believe in God, Believe also in me.*

SOC. Our Lord has Himself interpreted this *Joh.* 12. 44. *He that Believeth on me, Believeth not on me, but on Him that Sent me.* *Hist.* p. 97.

CHR. That is, They are both *one*. And you will not find any *Prophet*, or *Apostle*, no nor *Angel*, Compare Himself thus with God: or that durst say *Honour me, as you Honour God*; and *ye Believe in God, Believe also in me.*

SOC.

SOC. That is a Different ſtile I muſt Confeſs, from what is us'd of *Angels*, or of *Men*.

(10.) *CHR.* Joh. 14. 9. — *He that hath ſeen me, hath ſeen the Father.*

p. 97. *SOC.* It is alſo ſaid of the Diſciples, *Luk.* 10. 16. *He that heareth you, heareth me* —— *and he that deſpiſeth you Deſpiſeth me.*

CHR. So he that *Deſpiſeth*, or will not *Hearken* to an *Herauld*, *Deſpiſeth* the *King* that ſent him. But you will not ſay, that he who *Seeth* the Herauld, *Seeth* the King.

SOC. That indeed bears a Different meaning, eſpecially in one who pretends to be the *King* Himſelf, and is Accus'd for ſo doing.

(11.) *CHR.* Joh. 14. 14. *If ye ask any thing in my Name I will do it.*

SOC. That is, by *Interceſſion* with the Father, as it is
p. 98. ſaid *Heb.* 7. 25. *He is able to ſave them* —— *that come to God by Him, ſeeing He ever liveth to make Interceſſion for them.*

CHR. The *Apoſtle* is there deſcribing His *Prieſtly-Office* (which was Interceſſion for the *People*) and comparing it with that of *Aaron*: And this is, as He is *Man*. But *I will do what you ask*; is of another Strain, never ſpoke by a bare *Interceſſor*, it arrogates to my ſelf to Grant your Petition, and therefore no *Man* or *Angel* ever Spoke after this manner.

(12.) Joh. 16. 14. *He* [the Holy Ghoſt] *ſhall receive of mine, and ſhall ſhew it unto you.* Here the *Spirit* is plainly ſpoken of as a *Perſon*. This we have Diſcourſt already.

But what does he ſay to theſe words, that the *H. Ghoſt ſhall receive of Chriſt's?*

SOC. That is, *He ſhall receive of God, the remainder*
p. 101. *of Chriſt's Doctrin, and teach it to the Apoſtles.*

CHR.

CHR. This is beyond a ſtraind *Interpretation*; It is *Adding* to the *Text* and your *Author* might have made it ſignifie what he pleas'd. But our *Saviour* gives another reaſon, why the *H. Ghoſt* did receive of *His*: Becauſe, ſays *He* in the next words, *All things that the Father hath are mine: Therefore ſaid I, that He ſhall receive of mine.* And *verſ.* 7. He attributes to Himſelf, the *Sending* of the *H. Ghoſt. I will ſend Him unto you.*

Will you now give unto a *Creature* the Power of *Sending* the *H. Spirit*, which you ſay, *is not any thing Different from God, but is God*? A *Creature* to ſend *God*! And to give Him ſomething of a *Creatures* to carry! A *Creature* to call *God* his *Meſſenger*, and to ſay, *He ſhall receive of MINE and give to you*! And for a *Creature* to ſay that *all things that are Gods are his*! Theſe things are *Unintelligible, Irreconcilable* upon your *Scheme*. But in the Doctrine of the *Trinity* of *Perſons*, in the *Unity* of *Nature*, they are obvious and eaſie: For there is a Natural *Order* and *Superiority* of the *Perſons*, in an *Equality* of *Nature*: Which we ſee even among Men, as has been explain'd.

SOC. My *Author* objects that the *Holy Ghoſt* appear'd in the *Form* of a *Dove* on *Chriſt*, and of *Cloven-Tongues* on the *Apoſtles*. And he asks what Senſe the *Trinitarians* can make of theſe things? they ſay the *Spirit* is a *Perſon*, and *God*: Did *God* receive and aſſume the *ſhape* of a *Dove*, that is, of a *Brute*? What hinders but that they may believe all the *Transformations* in the *Metamorphoſis* of *Ovid*? p. 102.

Object. of the H. *Ghoſt* appearing in the *Shape* of a *Dove.*

CHR. He reſts mightily *Aſſur'd* in this *Objection*, and Expreſſes it very *Modeſtly*! But let us ſee what is in it.

Firſt for the *Holy-Ghoſt* appearing in the *Form* of *Cloven-Tongues*, he himſelf Confeſſes, that this was to Expreſs the *Gift* then beſtow'd, which may be the *Gift* of

Tongues.

Tongues. And consequently, it was not to Express the *Form* or *Shape* of the *Giver*. So this Part of the *Objection* is over.

He says, That for the like Reason the *Holy Ghost* appear'd in the *Shape* of a *Dove* at our SAVIOUR's *Baptism*, to *Signifie the Mild and Peaceable Spirit of Christ*.

If so, then this *Apparition* too was as an *Emblem* of the *Gift*, and not of the *Giver*. So that he has *Answer'd* himself.

But in the Next place, it do's not appear that ther was any *Shape* of a *Dove* at our SAVIOUR's *Baptism*. Tho' it is (I think) a *Vulgor Error*. For which Reason I will speak a little of it here.

Ther was a *Bodily Shape* Appear'd: Else the People cou'd not have seen it. But what was this *Shape*, Or *Appearance*? It was a Fire of Glory that *Descended* from *Heaven*, and *Lighted* upon the *Head* of our *Saviour*. But how did it *Light*? Was it like a *Flash* of *Lightning*, *Quick* and *Transient*? No. For th... in so Great a *Multitude*, the *People* Cou'd not have Discern'd for what Particular *Person* it was Meant. Did it Come down *Swift*, as a *Bird* of *Pray* stoops to its *Game*, like an *Arrow* out of a *Bow*? No. It Descended *Leasurly* and *Hovering*, as a *Dove* do's, when it *Lights* upon the *Ground*, that the *People* might take the more *Notice*. And to Express the *Over-Shadowing* of the H. *Spirit*. And it not only *Lighted* upon the *Head* of our *Saviour*, but it *Abode* and *Remained* upon Him. As it is said, *Joh.* 1. 32. 33.

Now that the Expression in the Text, *Like a Dove*, do's Refer to this *Manner* of the *Descent* of that *Glory* upon our *Bl. Saviour*, and not to the *Shape* of it, Appears from the *Grammatical* Construction of the *Words* in the *Text*, which is better Distinguished in the *Greek* and

and *Latin*, than in the *English*, where the *Cases* of *Nouns* are Express'd by *Particles*, and not by their *Termination*. Now if these words, *Like a Dove*, had Refer'd to the *Shape*, then the word *Dove* must have been in the *Genitive Case*, the Shape *of* a Dove. But it is not so, either in the *Greek* or *Latin*. It is said in the *Greek*, That the H. *Ghost* Descended σωματικῷ εἴδει, in a *Bodily Appearance*, ὡσεὶ (or ὡς as the *Cambridge* Copy of *Beza* Reads it) περιστερὰν, but if it had Refer'd to the *Shape*, it must have been, ὡσεὶ περιστερᾶς, *Of* a *Dove*. Thus the *Latin*, *Descendit corporali Specie, sicut Columba*. That is, *Sicut Columba descendit*. As a *Dove* Descends. It can bear no other *Construction*. But if it had Refer'd to the *Shape*, it must have been, *Descendit Corporali Specie, sicut Columbæ*, The Shape *of* a Dove. Which is not in our *English*. It is not said in our *English* the Shape *of* a Dove. But that the *Holy Ghost Descended* (in a Bodily Shape) *like a Dove*, that is, as a *Dove* Descends. If it had Refer'd to the *Shape*, it shou'd have said, *In a Bodily Shape*, *as* of a *Dove*. Or *like as* of *a Dove*.

Besides, if that *Glory* which Appear'd had been no *Bigger* than a *Dove*, (which is not to be Imagin'd, when it is said the *Heaven* was *Opened*. And the *People* had not taken so much *Notice*, if the *Appearance* had been no *Bigger* than a *Dove*, it might have Escap'd the *Sight* of *Many*; but suppose it) How shou'd they know it to be a *Dove*, more than any other *Bird*, or *Thing*, of the like *Bigness*? Especially considering that it utter'd no *Voice*, for it is Expressly said, That the *Voice* came from *Heaven*, then not from *that* which *Abode* or *Remain'd* upon our *Saviour*.

I have said thus much of it, because of the too common *Practice* of *Painting* the *Holy Ghost* like a *Dove*. Which gives Countenance to the usage in the *Church* of *Rome* of Painting *God* the *Father* like an *Old Man*, from His being Call'd the *Ancient of Days*, and Represented

to *Daniel* in a *Dream* (so it is Expresly said, *Dan.* 7. 1.) *as sitting upon a Throne*, &c.

But in that *Glorious Appearance* at *Horeb* (which was more than a *Dream*) it is particularly Caution'd, *Deut.* 4. 12. *The Lord spake unto you out of the midst of the Fire, ye heard the voice of the words, but saw no Similitude:* That is, of *God* who spoke, for they saw many other *Similitudes*, as *Fire*, *Smoke*, &c. But they were to make no *Resemblance* of *God* from any thing that they *Saw.* And the *Fowl* of the *Air* are particularly nam'd, *ver.* 17.

But how do you *Socinians* get over this *Text*? You, who by the *Holy Ghost* mean only an *Inspiration*, or an *Attribute* of *God*, as His *Wisdom* or *Power.* Now for an *Inspiration* or a *Quality*, or *Attribute* to take a *Bodily Shape*, has an *Absurdity* in it beyond any you can charge upon our *Interpretation* of this *Text.*

SOC. Our *Author* gives an Answer to the *Text* before Quoted, *Joh.* 16. 15. *all things that the Father hath are mine.* he says that St. *Paul* said as much of every *Christian*, 1 *Cor.* 3. 21, 22. *all things are yours——things present, things to come are yours.*

p. 103.

CHR. All things, is often us'd to express all the things which we are then speaking of: And what these things were, and what he meant by *all things* in this *Text*, St. *Paul*, sufficiently Declares, while he repeats that expression in the same Breath, *whether* Paul, *or* Apollo, *or* Cephas, *or the World, or Life, or Death, or things Present, or things to come, ALL are yours*, that is all these things are intended for your Benefit: Not only the present *Ministration* of the *Gospel* in the hands of *Paul*, or *Apollo*, or other Men; and the *Grace* which *God* bestows upon them in this Life; But even *Heaven* hereafter, will be the Portion of *Saints:* But all these things are not, *all things that the Father hath.* This which St. *Paul* speaks to *Christians*, has no proportion to what *Christ* says of *Himself.*

SOC.

SOC. He gives a second Answer. He says that saying of *Christ* is thus to be rendered. *All things, relating to the Doctrin and Discipline of the Christian Church, which the Father hath in His Mind and Design, are mine.*

CHR. Bless me! That men should pretend to *Reason*, and to appeal to *Scripture*; and yet take upon them not only to Interpret them to all the Perversness that words are capable of, but where that will not do, to *Add*, what they please to the *Text*, and turn it to whatever they have a mind to! I'l undertake give me this Latitude, and you shall not prove from *Scripture*, That there is a *God*, or a *World*, or ever such a man as *Christ*. There is an Ingenious Book written, exposing their method of Argument, by which the Author proves from Scripture, after their manner of Interpretation, that *Women* have no *Souls*, and Answers all *Texts* against it in the *Socinian* way; and as plausibly as they oppose these Texts which prove the *Trinity*, or the *Incarnation*, and *Satisfaction* of *Christ*. And another maintains the *Eternity* of the *World*, and Answers the 1st. of *Genesis* as the *Socinians* do. *Col.* 1. 16. *viz.* That by *Creating* was only meant *Modelling*, or *New Ordering*. Which you will see more of when we come to that *Text*. Others set up *Præ-Adamites*, without any stop from the Story of *Genesis*. And indeed there is no stop, to Invention, at this rate, nor any certainty in words. No Temporal Law can guard it self without this Maxim, that *ubi lex non Distinguit, ibi non est Distinguendum*, you must not *Distinguish*, but where the *Law* do's *Distinguish* for that is to set your self above all *Laws*, and alter them at your pleasure.

But *Adding* is yet more Arbitrary. And your *Author* adds more than two thirds to this *Text*. Therefore I recommend to our *Author's* serious Meditation that Admonition *Prov.* 30. 6. *Add not then unto His words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a Lyar.* For *every word*

of God is Pure. His word is Perfect and Intire; and *he that addeth to it, God will add to him the Plagues written in that Book.*

Rev. 22. 18.

But that you may not lean wholly upon what I say in defence of this *Text* we are upon *Joh.* 16. 15. you may Consult *Tertullian adverſ. Prax.* c. 17. p. 510. where he proves, from this *Text*, that *Chriſt* is *God.*

(13.) *Chriſt* says to the *Father* Joh. 17. 5. *Glorify me with thine own Self, with the Glory I had with Thee, before the World was.* Does not this prove *Chriſt* to be before the *World*?

Hist. p. 104.

SOC. This he Anſwers, that is, The *Glory* I had with Thee, in thy *Decree* and *Deſign*, before the World was.

CHR. Does he give any *Reaſon* why it is otherwiſe expreſt in the *Text*?

SOC. No. But he brings other *Texts* where what was only in *Decree*, was ſaid *actually to be.*

CHR. Without ſomething in the *Text* to ſhew that it ſpeaks of ſuch a *Decree*?

SOC. Yes ſure, elſe they cannot be Parallel Caſes to this *Text.*

CHR. Let us hear them.

SOC. 1 Pet. 1. 11. *Searching what, and what manner of time the Spirit—— did ſignifie, when it teſtified before hand the Sufferings of Chriſt, and what was to follow.*

CHR. Is there nothing in this *Text* which tells you that it teſtify'd *before-hand*, of what was *to follow*?

SOC. He might have ſpar'd this Inſtance. The next is better 2. Cor. 5. 1. *We have a Building of God, an Houſe not made with Hands.* Here *we have*, is, we have it in God's *Decree* or *Intention.*

CHR. And is there nothing of that expreſt in the *Text*? If you had repeated two words more, it would have told you, that this Houſe *was reſerv'd for us, in Heaven.* And that it was not to be till after *our Earthly Houſe of THIS Tabernacle were Diſſolv'd.* And therefore

fore that we *groan earneſtly after it, expecting it*; and therefore that *we have* it but in *Reverſion*, not in *preſent Poſſeſſion*. So that what is meant by *we have* in that *Text* is very plainly told.

SOC. His next *Text* will do it. 2 Tim. 1. 9. *Grace was given us in Chriſt before the World was.* Where again, *was given to us*, is, was given in God's *Decree and Intention.*

CHR. And is there nothing in this *Text* to ſhew us, that this was only in God's *Purpoſe* or *Decree*? If you had Repeated but one word before, it had hindred you from producing of this *Text.* For there it expreſly tells us, That this Grace given us before the World, was in God's *Purpoſe*—— *According to His own PURPOSE, and Grace which was given us, before the World was.* And this is the Apoſtle's Stile in other places where He ſpeaks of the ſame, Tit. 1. 2. *in hope of Eternal Life, which God PROMISED before the World began.* Eph. 1. 4.—— *He hath CHOSEN US in Him, before the Foundation of the World.* (c. 3. n) *According to the Eternal PURPOSE, which He PURPOSED in Chriſt Jeſus our Lord.*

Now if you can ſhew ſuch an Explanation in that Text *Joh.* 17. 5. then theſe may be parallel Caſes.

But I have another thing to ask in this matter. Do not *Decrees* always look *forward*, and reſpect things *to come?*

SOC. Yes certainly. One is not ſaid to *Decree* what is *Paſt.*

CHR. But our *Saviour* in this *Text* ſpeaks of what is *Paſt*—— the Glory which I *had* with Thee *before* the World was. Common Speech allows to ſay, I *have* a *Reverſion.* But to ſay, that I *had*, what I *have not* yet, nor ever *had*; is a new way of Speaking.

But there is more than this yet. You ſay that *Chriſt had no Being before the World.*

SOC.

SOC. Yes. That is our Tenet.

CHR. How had He *Glory* then *before the World*, when He had no *Being*? Was this by way of *Decree* too? *Irenæus* (*adverſ. Her.* l. 4. c. 28. p. 347.) quotes this *Text* to prove *Chriſt*'s Exiſtence before the *World*. And *Origen* (*in Mat.* p. 326.) ſays, it was not meant of this *World*.

SOC. Pray. Let us go to ſome other Text.

(14.) *CHR.* Joh. 20. 28. *Thomas Anſwered, and ſaid unto Him, my Lord and my God.*

SOC. *O My Lord!* Are words of Congratulation to
p. 106. our *Saviour*, and *O My God!* Words of Admiration and Praiſe to *God*.

CHR. This is very Ingenious! But if I ſhould ask, who told you this? There is nothing of this Diſcovery in the *Text*. But I wonder he wou'd let *either* of theſe belong to *Chriſt*, becauſe they ſeem *both* to be ſpoken of the ſame *Perſon* as much as words can bear.

SOC. The reaſon is, becauſe they were ſpoke *to Chriſt*; and as a Conſequence of *Thomas*'s Conviction after his having ſo long remain'd Doubtful of our *Saviour's Reſurrection*; of which being now ſatisfied, he makes this Confeſſion to *Chriſt*, and therefore at leaſt *one of them* muſt belong to *Chriſt*

CHR. Then there will be hazard of the *Others* going along with it, for they are link'd very cloſe together.

The truth of it is, our Author leans that way. And ſays *Neſtorius Patriarch of Conſtantinople* thought ſo; But he will not truſt to that. Becauſe it ſeems a very harſh Interpretation, to make *Thomas* Anſwer a Queſtion of our *Saviour's* to him, only by an Exclamation, which might ſerve any Queſtion in the World, by ſaying, *O God!* Which a Man will do when you pinch his Finger. Whereas *otherwiſe* it was a Direct and full Anſwer to our Saviour. His *Reſurrection* was a Great

a Great Proof of His *Divinity*: Of this *Thomas* remain'd a while Doubtful: But being Convinc'd by our *Saviour*, he then acknowleges *Christ* to be his *Lord* and his *God*; and this by way of Answer to our Saviour: *Be not Faithless but believing* says *Christ*, Then *Thomas* Answers and owns his *Belief*, by acknowledging *Christ* to be *Lord* and *God*. S. *Cyprian* quotes this *Text* as proving the *Divinity* of *Christ* (adverf. Jud. l 2. c.6. p. 35.) But we go on.

(15.) *Act* 5. 3, 4. *Why hath Satan filled thine Heart, to lye to the Holy Ghost? — Thou hast not lied unto Men, but unto God.*

SOC. Thou hast lied to the *Holy Ghost*. i.e. to *us Apostles* who have the *Holy Spirit*, or *Inspiration* of *God* in us. *Hist. p. 107.*

CHR. To lie to an *Inspiration*, is a strange Expression. In the next place. Tho' you allow the *Spirit* of *God*, sometimes, to be put for *God Himself*; yet it is a little over bold, methinks, to put *It* for an *Apostle*. There should be very Good Authority for that, Something stronger than one of our Authors *Supposes*. When was S. *Peter* call'd the *Holy Ghost* before? Or the *Holy Ghost* call'd by the Names of any of the *Apostles*? Because the *Holy Ghost* Inspires me, am I therefore the *Holy Ghost*? so that if you tell me a lie, it is to be call'd telling a *Lie* to *God*? But more especially, when the Text says, *he did not Lie to Men.*

SOC. That is, not to Men *only*, or *Chiefly*.

CHR. No. There is another Reason. Men could not know that he *Lyed*; but only *God*, who knew his *Heart*. And therefore it is call'd a lying *to God*, and *not to Men*; for there was no *Evidence* produc'd against him, they knew not but he spoke *Truth*, in telling them the *Price* of his *Land*, which was the matter then in Debate.

SOC.

SOC. Our Author brings a Text to support him. 1 *Thes.* 4. 8. *He therefore that Despiseth, Despiseth not MAN, but GOD.* Who *hath also given to us His Holy Spirit.* Here 'tis manifest, that those who Despised the *Apostles*, are said to Despise *God, because God was in them, by His Spirit.*

p. 107.

CHR. I utterly deny that to be the *Reason*, for that wou'd transferr the Honour of *God* to Every *Good Man*, which is, to every stranger I meet, for ought I know to the Contrary; That if I Despise *Him*, I Despise *God.* Which is Extravagant even to Blasphemy.

But the meaning is, He that Despiseth that *Message* which *God* sent by the *Apostles*, which was the *Gospel of Christ*, he Despiseth not *Man*, for it is not the Gospel of *Man*, but he Despiseth *God*, the *Author* and *Sender* of it. As if any should Return a *King* an Opprobrious Answer by his *Ambassador*: The Affront could not be understood to the *Ambassador* but to the *King* who sent him. But this has nothing in the World to do with our present Case, wherein our Author would have the Honor of *God* to belong to every *Man*, to whom *God* gave the Assistance of His *Blessed Spirit.*

This is a sufficient answer to the *Historian*'s Interpretation of this Text. But I cannot forbear to shew the Ridiculous madness of your Evangelist *Biddle* in his Exposition of this Text, in the above quoted Volume of *Socinian Tracts*, Intitled *The Faith of one God*, &c. p. 9, 10. where, instead of *Ananias* Lying to the *Holy Ghost*, he wou'd very fain (but without any Ground) have it understood that *Ananias* did tell a Lye of the *Holy Ghost*, viz. That the *Holy Ghost* had put it into his heart *to Sell his Farme, and lay down the Price at the Apostles feet*; and so was Guilty of *Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, in fathering upon the Holy Spirit that which was Ejected*

into

into his heart by the unclean Spirit. i. e. to sell his Lands. Whereby you must first observe, that it was by the Inspiration of the *Unclean Spirit* that *Ananias*, and consequently other *Christians* of that time did sell their Possessions, to Distribut to the Necessities of others, which the *Scripture*, and, I believe all Mankind else before Mr. *Biddle*, have always ascrib'd to the *Great Grace*, with which we are told *Act.* 4. 33. *God* did Bless those Early Converts to the *Christian* Faith.

Secondly, he says, that these words in this Text, *why hath Satan filled thy Heart to deceive God*? Seem to be *Blasphemy* [that is, supposing the *Holy Ghost* to be *God*] *for it importeth* [says he] *either that God may be Deceived, or else that Satan, or at least* Ananias *thought so, otherwise he wou'd not have propos'd in his heart to do it.* Thus *Delicat* Mr. *Biddle*! I wou'd recommend to his Annotations 1. *Joh.* 5. 20. *he that believeth not the Son hath made him* (God) *a Lyar, because he believeth not the Testimony which God gave of his Son.* Will Mr. *Biddle* hence infer that any Man had such a Notion of the *Supream Being*, as that He is a *Lyar*? Or not rather that, as we are said to Crucify *Christ* afresh by our Sins, to Grieve the *Spirit* of *God*, &c. So, by Consequence, we make *God* a *Lyar*, when we do not Believe the Testimony He has given; tho', at the same time, none can be suppos'd so grosly Ignorant of the Nature of *God*, as to think Him capable of *Deceiving*, or *being Deceiv'd*; No. Neither *Satan* nor *Ananias* were such *Speculative Atheists*, tho' *Practically* every Sinner is such, in some Degree. But, if you will have it, according to Mr. *Biddle*'s Exposition, that not to believe the *Testimony* which *God* hath given of His *Son*, is to be a downright *Speculative Atheist*, or to think Him a *Lyar*, which is the same, or worse; then I desire you to look to it, for it will stand you as much upon to clear your selves from *Atheism*, for not believing the many *Testimonies* which

God has given of the *Divinity* of His *Son*; as from *Idolatry*, in Worshiping *Him*, whom you do not think to be *True God*.

(16.) Act. 7. 59. *They Stoned* Stephen, *calling upon God, and Saying, Lord Jesus Receive my Spirit.* Here Praying to *Jesus* is call'd Praying to *God*.

SOC. The *Greek* is, *Lord of Jesus*, Receive my Spirit.

CHR. This is only because the word *Jesus* is Indeclinable; that makes it no more *of* Jesu, then *in*, *by*, *with*, or *from* Jesu. And this Text, is as much *Lord Jesu*—— as it is possible for either *Greek* or *Latin* to express it.

SOC. Well, we will give you another Answer. That
p. 108. is, *Stephen* called upon God, *and he also said*, Lord Jesu Receive my Spirit.

CHR. Does your Author alledge any Authority for this?

SOC. No. Not a word. But only that he supposes S. *Stephen*'s Vision of *Christ* at the Right hand of *God*, which he had before the *Council*, to Continue Still with him.

CHR. What is all this to the Business? I cannot see how it Concerns this Text, or favours his *Addition*, and Interruption of the Sense, which speaks of *Stephen* calling upon God *and Saying*—— instead of which our Author adds, of his own head; *and he also said*, leaving out the word in the Text, for both words cannot be in; it cannot be both *Saying*, and *he also said*. And he does not so much as pretend that the word *Saying* was not right Translated, or any thing amiss in it; So that here, by his own Confession, is both *Substraction* and *Addition* to the word of *God*; nay more, a putting in his own Invention instead of the word of *God*. I am weary of this.

(17.)

(17.) Act. 9. 14. 21. *To bind all that call upon thy Name.* (The words are Spoken of the Lord *Christ*, as is made Undeniable by *verſ.* 17.) *Is not this he that Deſtroy'd them which called on this Name* (Chriſt's Name) *in Jeruſalem?*

SOC. The *Socinians generally not only grant, but earneſtly Contend, that Chriſt is to be Worſhipped, and Pray'd to; That he is to be Worſhiped with Divine Worſhip.* P. 109.

CHR. This is their opinion; and it is the *Sore-place* of the *Socinians*; herein they Divide: and herein they Contradict themſelves. And inſtead of Anſwering this *Text*, your *Author* brings ſeveral Arguments from elſewhere againſt the *Divinity* of *Chriſt*, and to avoid *Anſwering*, he turns an *Objector*. His Arguments are all Anſwer'd in what is ſaid before, therefore I will not trouble you with them. For we are now upon his Reply to the *Texts* are brought againſt him.

SOC. When he is againſt the *Invocation* of *Chriſt* (which is not always) he Anſwers theſe *Texts* thus *To bind all that call upon his Name.* And again, *them that called on this Name in Jeruſalem.* He ſays the Original *Greek* may be Tranſlated ſeveral ways. *Firſt*, To bind all that *are called by thy Name.* Secondly, To bind all that *Name this Name.* Hiſt. p. 112.

CHR. We know his Gift in *Interpretations*; And for Anſwer, we inſiſt; that the *Greek* does not bear his Senſe, but is Rightly Tranſlated in our Bibles: and for him to offer nothing againſt it, but his own Saying ſo, and thus and thus it *may be*, is no indifferent meaſure of *Aſſurance*, which oft paſſes with him inſtead of *Argument*.

But in this ſame Chap. *verſ.* 10. It's ſaid, That *THE LORD appeared to* Ananias, *And the LORD ſaid unto him* &c. what *Lord* was this?

SOC. It was the *True God* certainly: For this is the common Stile of *God* thro' all the *Scriptures.*

CHR. And it is Certain, that this was *Jesus* who spoke to *Ananias*, and to whom *Ananias* spoke, and who sent *Ananias* to *Saul* vers. 17. *The LORD even JESUS* hath sent me, says *Ananius.* Hear another Text.

Act. 15. 28. *It seemed Good to the H. Ghost* and *to us.*

Hist. p. 113.

(18.) *SOC. That is, to God's Inspiration in us; and therefore to us also.*

CHR. To seem good to an *Inspiration*! Or to us and to our *Inspiration*! This has been spoke to before.

(19.) Act. 20. 28. *Feed the Church of God which he hath purchased with his own Blood.*

SOC. My *Author* here again Disputes the true Reading of this *Text*; and says that some Read it Feed *the Church of CHRIST.*

CHR. And we still insist upon the truth of our *Translation*, against his bare *Saying*; which we say is an Evident Sign of his lost Cause, when he has nothing to say but to *Assert*, without *Proof.*

SOC. His second Answer is, That some Masters of the *Greek* Tongue, do render the words thus, *Feed the Church of God, which He hath purchased with His OWN Son's Blood.*

CHR. However skilfull in the *Greek* they may be: The word [Son's] is a plain *Addition*, which is beyond the Power of *Interpretation.*

SOC. His third Answer is, That *the Blood of God* is no more, than *the Blood which God gave.* As the *Lamb of God*, is no more than *the Lamb which God gave.*

CHR. The common Law of Discourse allows me to call any thing mine that belongs to me, as *my Horse*, *my Corn*, &c. But no Language ever call'd another Man's Blood, *my Blood*, unless my *Sons*, or near Relations, whose Blood

Blood is really mine. As we call our Children, *our Flesh and Blood*, in which Sense you will not allow *Christ* to be the *Son of God.*

CHR. I Come now to your Authors Fourth *Letter* which contains the *Texts* out of the *Epistles* and *Revelation.* and there first take notice of his *Motto-Text* Rom. 1. 25. *of these who change the Truth of God into a Lie, and worship the Creature.* And desire your Author to reconcile it to their worship of *Christ* supposing Him a *Creature*, as they do; and their Arbitrary changing the *Texts* of *Scripture* as we have seen. But now to the Texts. The first I name is

(20.) Rom. 9. 5, *of whom, as Cconcerning the Flesh, Christ came; who is over all God, Blessed for ever Amen.*

I'll undertake he will have something to say against this *Text*; for it is too Positive to be endur'd.

SOC. Yet he is more merciful then be us'd to be; for here he says only that it is *Probable*, by some *Passages* in the *Fathers (which he does not tell us)* that the word *God* was not originally in this Text. *Hist.* p. 117

But Because this will not do, he *Answers*, Secondly, that these words ought to be Translated thus, *of whom as Concerning the Flesh Christ came, God who is over all be Blessed for ever. Amen.*

CHR. This is *Adding* again to the *Text*: for the *English* is rendered even *Literally* from the *Greek*, and there is no such word in the *Greek* as *Be*, *God BE Blessed*, but it is, *God Blessed for ever.*

And the very natural running of the words comes into our sense, *Christ who is*—— is what? *God Blessed*—— there is nothing else for Him to be in that *Text*: For these words *over all*, are but an Epithet of the *Person* there Describ'd, like *Blessed for ever.* The Person there spoke of is *over all, and Blessed forever*, and is *God.* For this *Text* is not telling what *God* is, but what *Christ* is, of whom only the *Apostle* is speaking from the Beginning

of

of this *Chapter*, without the word *God* us'd at all before that mention'd in this *Text*. And in this case the only Remedy left to the *Author*, is, to cut *One* Sentence into *Two*, and apply *One* of them to a *Person* who is *not Mention'd* at all in the whole *Discourse*. But this it self will not do, for there will want a word, to turn the Sense to *Another* than the *Person* there spoke of; for read the Text, *Christ* who *is*, this word *is* referrs to all the particulars which follow in the same Sentence. *Is, over all, is, God Blessed for ever.* Now to make a new Sentence in the Middle of this, there will want another *is*, for it must be either that *Something is God*, or, *God is something*. *God Blessed for ever*, without any more, is no Sentence at all there is nothing *Affirm'd* or *Deny'd*. But to end all these Disputes, our Author *Adds* the word *Be*, after the word *God*, *God be Blessed*; and then it self it is but *Possible* to become a Distinct *Sentence*, for it breaks and tears the Sense, and shocks any Reader, to stop in the Middle of the Description of one *Person*, and, without any why or wherefore, to apply *Two* or *Three* of the *Epithets* to another *Person* not Mention'd before, and to Force in a new word on purpose to bring it in.

But a Good Cause will struggle thro' many of these Hardships.

But then to call this *Plain* and *Easy*, and *most Rational*, that indeed is a little imposing, and hard to be born, but for so necessary a work as to take away the *Divinity* of *Christ*, or any Argument for the *Trinity*.

Tertullian (*adverſ. Prax.* §. 13. and 15. p. 507, 508, 509.) quotes this *Text* as proving *Christ* to be *God*. S. *Cyprian*, does the same, *Adverſ. Iud.* l. 2. §. 6. p. 35. and *Irenæus* l. 3. c. 18.

That other Expression in this Text [*as concerning the Flesh*] that *Christ* came of the *Fathers* only as to what con-

concern'd His *Flesh*, or *Human Nature*, shews plainly that He had another *Nature* which did not come from the *Fathers*, or that was Deriv'd to Him from His Birth of the *Blessed Virgin*: The same Caution of Expression is us'd Act. 2. 30. where *Christ* is call'd the Seed of *David*, only *according to the Flesh*.

(21.) I would desire among other his Congruous and easy *Interpretations* to look into the 1st. verse of this 9th. Chap. to the *Rom. I say the truth in Christ, my Conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost*. What is the meaning of speaking the Truth *in Christ*? Supposing Him only to be a *Man*, and *absent* in Heaven. And then my *Conscience* bearing me witness *in the Holy Ghost*, Sure to make any thing a Judge and Discerner of *Conscience*, is to make it *God*; for that is an Incommunicable Attribute, by the Confession of all. But taking the *Holy Ghost* in your Authors Interpretation, only for the *Inspiration* which *God* sends into our *Hearts* Then you must read the *Text* thus, My *Conscience* bearing me witness, *in my Inspiration*, which no hody can say but is very *Familiar* and *Intelligible*!

But the Apostle here appealing to *Christ*, and the *Holy Ghost* as Judges of his *Conscience*, I think is a Demonstration, that they are *Persons*; and that they are *God*.

SOC. Our Author says nothing of this Text. And now let us follow him.

(22) *CHR*. There is something of this in his next Quotation Rom. 2. 16. *God shall Judge the Secrets of Men by Jesus Christ*. 1. Cor. 4, 5. *who both will bring to Light the hidden things of Darkness, and will make manifest the Councils of Hearts*.

SOC. *Christ's* Knowledge of the Secrets of Hearts is by the *Divine Word* communicated to Him, and by *Revelation* from *God*. *Hist*. p. 120.

Christian

CHR. If *God* Reveal to me that another Man does now think so or so, does that make me a *Knower of Hearts*? I know that particular that is *Revealed* to me, but no more. Neither do I know it by *knowing the Man's Heart*, I know it only by *Revelation.*

But to have a Power within my self to know the *Hearts* of *all Men*, to look into a Man's *Heart*, and see his *Thoughts*, is not *Communicable* to a *Creature.* *God only knows the Hearts of Men.* 1 King. 8. 39.

And that *Christ* has that Attribute of God of *knowing Hearts*, not when it is *Reveal'd* to Him by *Another*; but that He knows them *in His Spirit*, as it is said of Him *Mark* 2. 8. and *in Himself*, *Mark.* 5. 30. is plain from many *Scriptures* besides these now Quoted, see *Joh.* 2. 24. 25 *Jesus*—— *Knew all Men*; *and needed not that any should Testify of Man*; *for He Knew what was in Man.*

SOC. The *Defence of the Hist.* p. 53. proves that this was no *Inherent Personal Knowledge* in *Christ*, in Opposition to *Revelation.*

CHR. How does he prove it?

SOC. He says, what is known by *Revelation* is an *Inherent Personal Knowledge.*

CHR. That is, such Knowledge is *Inherent*, because it is *in* a Man. And it is *Personal*, because it is the Man's own *Person* that Knows. This indeed is a noble Discovery, and by this he would quite take away the Distinction 'twixt *Personal Inherent Knowledge*, and *Revelation*; because, says he, *Revelation* it self is a *Personal Inherent Knowledge.*

But after all this *Socinian-Subtilty*, is it possible, or would he have us Believe, that he cannot see the difference twixt what a Man knows of his own *Natural Inherent Knowledge*, and what he Knows by *Revelation*; and that for no better Reason, but because he Knows both; and that it is *he himself*, his own *Person* which knows both? A Mans *Natural Inherent Knowledge* is stinted

ted and cannot go beyond its *Sphere*. And therefore one Mans *Natural Knowledge* is *Greater* than anothers. But there are none so Great as to discover some things, particularly the present Instance we are upon, The *Thoughts of the Heart*; which none but *God* can Know by His *Natural Inherent Knowledge*. But suppose *God* reveals to me a particular *Thought* of a Mans *Heart*, does it therefore follow that I know it by my own *Natural Inherent Knowledge*? If I did, I needed not that any should tell it me. And that is the Reason given in the *Text* to shew that this *Knowledge* of *Christ's* was his *Natural Inherent Knowledge*, because it is said, *He needed not that any should testifie of Man, for He knew what was in Man.* If His knowing what was in Man, was by *Revelation*, He not only *needed*, but it was Absolutly *necessary* that some should testifie to Him of Man, I hope there is some Difference 'twixt this and *Elisha*'s knowing what the King of *Syria* spoke in his Bed-chamber (2. Kings 6. 12.) which this *Author* makes a Parallel Place, to this of *Joh.* 2. 24, 25. for first *Elisha* might have had *Intelligence* from some about the *King*; which was the thing that the *King* apprehended, and thought nothing *Miraculous* in it. But suppose *God* told *Elisha*. Therefore *Elisha* needed that some should *Testify* of what the *King* said. And therefore it can be no *Parallel* to that of our *Saviour*, who did not *need* that any should *Testify* to Him, even of the *Thoughts* of Mens *Hearts*, for He not only Knew this or that *Thought*, and that when it was *Told* him; But He knew *all Mens* thoughts, *what ever was in man.* Without need of any to declare this to Him. That is, without *Revelation*, which cannot be said of any *Prophet*, or any *Creature*. And therefore this *Personal Inherent Knowledge* of *Christ's*, is put in opposition to *Revelation*, Contrary to this vain *Defence* of our *Historian*.

Hist. p. 120 *SOC.* But our *Author* quotes Rev. 1. 1. *The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave to him, to shew unto His Servants.* And what need *God* Reveal any thing to *Christ*, if He knew all *things*?

CHR. This is spoken of *Christ* as *Man.* Secondly it is not said that *God* did *Reveal* it to *Christ*, but *gave* it to *Christ* to *Reveal* to others. That is, gave *Commission* to *Christ* to *Reveal* it to *John*, &c. which does not imply that *Christ* did not know it before.

SOC. But the *Defence* of this *Hist.* says, who can give to *God*?

CHR. Christ as *Man* receives all from *God:* Which this Author could not but know to be the *Christian* Doctrin, and therefore it was Frivolous in him to urge it, without farther Reasons, as an Argument against the *Christian* Doctrin.

(23.) The third Text he quotes out of the *Romans* is, c. 10. 12, *The same Lord over all, is Rich unto all that call upon Him.*

Hist. p. 120. *SOC.* This and what follows is spoken of *God* and not of *Christ.*

CHR. The Contrary, is most Evident; from the 4th. verse. The *Apostle* is treating wholly of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, and making Him the object of our *Faith*, as He was under the Law, for He applies Deut. 30. 12. Expressly to *Christ*; and says, *that is the word of Faith which we Preach, That if thou Confess with thy Mouth, the Lord Jesus, and believe that God raised HIM—— whosoever Believeth on HIM—— the same Lord over all, is Rich unto all that call upon HIM—— for whosoever shall call upon the Name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on HIM—— How shall they believe in HIM of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a Preacher?* Here you see the same *HIM* is carry'd through all these verses. And the *Apostle* expressly applies to this *HIM* Joel. 2. 32. *Whosoever shall call upon the Name of the Lord* &c. which is applicable

Rom. 10. 6. 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14.

to

to none but *God*. And therefore it is certain that *Christ* is the *Lord* here ſpoke of. The *Jews* had heard of *God* before: and therefore the *Apoſtle* cou'd not ſay——*Of whom they have not heard*, but in Relation to *Chriſt*. Who was not rightly underſtood by the *Jews*, who did not apprehend what *Moſes* and the *Prophets* had wrote of *HIM*, and therefore they needed a *Preacher* to explain *Him* to them.

Your *Author* cannot deny all the *Hims* in this *Chapter* before your *Text*, to belong to *Chriſt*. But in his old ſhort way, he excepts the *Him* in the 12th verſe, and ſo forward, and the Buſineſs is done! tho' the Diſcourſe goes as continu'dly on as before, and ſpeaks of the ſame *Him*, without any Diſcrimination, or leaſt Mark that he is bringing in any other *Him*. Which would not only be wrong Senſe, but it would be an expreſs *Deceit* to uſe ſuch an unſeen ſhifting of *Perſons* in an Argument, as has been ſaid before. But we go on.

(24.) 1. *Cor.* 6. 9. *Your Body is the Temple of the Holy Ghoſt.* 2 Cor. 6. 16. *Ye are the Temples of the Living God.*

SOC. The *Holy Ghoſt* or *Spirit* being the *Inſpiration* and *Power* of *God*, the ſame *Bodies* that are *Temples* of *the one*, muſt needs be *Temples* alſo of *the Other*. *Hiſt.* p. 121.

CHR. Firſt it is Abſurd and Illogical to ſay, the *Temple* of an *Inſpiration*. *Temples* belong to *Perſons*. But in the next place, you make a Difference 'twixt the *Spirit* and *God*, They are *the one* and *the Other*. And in other Places you make them the ſelf-ſame thing, and no Difference 'twixt them at all, as I have often obſerv'd before.

(25.) 1 Cor. 10. 9. *Neither let us tempt Chriſt, as ſome of them alſo tempted.*

SOC. It ſhould be *neither let us tempt GOD.* But ſince the former is the receiv'd reading of the *Church*; Our *Author* has not Authority ſufficient to Counterballance that, therefore he gives you another *Anſwer.* He ſays that *admitting the Reading in the Engliſh Bibles, yet the ſenſe will be, let us not tempt CHRIST, as the Iſraelites tempted GOD in the Wilderneſs.*

p. 122

CHR. But he muſt confeſs that this is plain *adding* to the *Word* of *God*; for we muſt not *add* words to the *Text*, upon pretence of keeping to the *Senſe.* But does he not bring ſome very extraordinary Reaſon to Support this Opinion of his?

SOC. Not one word, but that *Murmuring* againſt God, or *Chriſt, is tempting* them.

CHR. Then he gives us leave to proceed.

(26.) 2 Cor. 8. 9. It is ſaid, That Chriſt, *tho' He was Rich, yet for your ſakes He became Poor.* When was it that Chriſt *was Rich*, and *became Poor*? If He had no Being before He was born of the Virgin?

Hiſt. p. 123. *SOC.* The ſenſe is, Tho' He *might have liv'd Rich.*

CHR. But the *Text* ſays, that *He was Rich.* And we muſt take your *Authors* word, as formerly, that the meaning is, *not that He was Rich*, but only He *might have been ſo, if He wou'd.*

SOC. The *Defence of the Hiſt.* c. 9. p. 51. gives another *Anſwer*, viz. that πτωχεύειν does not ſignifie to *become Poor*, but to *be Poor.*

CHR. He only ſays ſo. Which he wou'd have to over-ballance the Learning of all the *Tranſlators* of our *Bible.* But in the next place, the ſtreſs does not lie upon the word *Poor*, but upon the word *Rich.* We all know *Chriſt* was *Poor*, but the Queſtion is when it was that the He was *Rich.*

SOC.

SOC. He ſays, *the Senſe of the place is this; Tho' Chriſt was Rich and Glorious, by reaſon of the Authority and Power Conferr'd on Him: Yet He was willing to lead a Poor Life*, &c.

CHR. In this Senſe, *Chriſt* was never *Poor*, for He was always *Rich* in *Authority*. And a man that has *Authority*, can never be *Poor*, in this Senſe. *Poverty* and *Riches* may be taken in many Senſes. There is *Rich* and *Poor* in *Eloquence*, in *Beauty*, in *Courage*, in *Senſe*, in *Authority*, and in *Money*. And if when you ſpeak of any of theſe, you make not your diſcourſe proceed of the ſame, you argue *Sophiſtically*, and no man can Underſtand you. This is the *Defence of your Hiſtory*, and has help'd him much. This *Play* is not worth the *Candle*. Let us Diſpatch.

(27.) His Anſwer to 2. *Cor.* 12. 8. 9. is this, that the *Power of Chriſt reſting on the Apoſtle* was only, that Chriſt *Interceded* for that *Power* to reſt on him. That is to ſay, if I begg an *Eſtate* from the *King*, for you, it is therefore *my Eſtate* which you Poſſeſs! And this ſhall be the way of ſpeaking in this Text, and in the next too. 2 *Cor.* 13. 14 where *The Grace, of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, is not *His Grace*, but *anothers Grace*, which He only beggs for us. p. 124. (28.) p. 125.

But there is another extraordinary thing in this *Text*. For *it plainly Diſtinguiſhes*, ſays our Author, *Chriſt and the H. Ghoſt from God*. Now they are plainly *Diſtinguiſhed*; but in *Anſwer* to *Joh.* 1. 1. they muſt not be *Diſtinguiſhed* at all. Gal. 1. 1, 12. *Paul an Apoſtle, not of men, neither by men, but by Jeſus Chriſt, and God the Father——I neither receiv'd it of Man, neither was I taught it, but by Revelation of Jeſus Chriſt.* (29.)

SOC. Paul rightly denies he is made an Apoſtle by Man, becauſe he was made one by Jeſus Chriſt, who p. 126.

in

in all things acted by the Spirit and Directions of God.

CHR. Did not the *Apostles* act by the *Spirit* and *Directions* of *God*, when they chose *Matthias* into the Room of *Judas*; and Separated *Barnabas* and *Saul* for the work whereunto *God* had called them?

Act. 1. 24. 13. 2.

SOC. Yes certainly; for it is expresly said, that the *H. Ghost* bad them do it.

CHR. Did they therefore in that, receive Commission from *Men*?

SOC. Yes, for it is said, that *they laid their hands on them, and sent them,*

Ver. 3.

CHR. Then mens acting *by the Spirit and Directions of God* does not hinder that such actions are said to be done *by such Men.* For Example, *Matthias* was Elected *by the Eleven Apostles* and *Barnabas* and *Saul* were Separated *by the Church.*

And therefore it wou'd follow, in this Sense, that St. *Paul* did not argue Rightly, as our *Author* says he did, when he deny'd himself to be made an *Apostle* by *Man*, because he was made one by a *Man* who *Acted* by the *Spirit* and *Directions* of *God*,

But his meaning is plainly this, That he did not receive his Commission from, that is, by the mediation of *Men*, but *Immediatly* from *God*.

And if *Christ* were not more than *Man*, and Consider'd as such in this *Text*, the *Apostles* words cannot be made Consonant, especially as *Interpreted* by our *Author*. *Tertullian* (advers. *Prax.* §. 27, and 28. p. 517) proves *Christ* to be both *God* and *Man*. *Ex Carne homo, ex spiritu Deus*, and then proves the *Distinction* 'twixt *Him* and the *Father*, and Quotes this *Text*, among others, to shew that tho' He was *God*, yet He was *Distinguish'd* from the *Father*.

(30.) But let us see what art he will find to escape *Phil.* 2. 5, 6, 7, 8. where it is said, That *Christ being*

in the Form of God thought it not Robbery to be equal with God, &c.

SOC. In the Form of God, that is, *being made like God*, *and namely by a Communication to Him of Divine and Miraculous Power over Diseases, Devils, the Grave, the Wind, the Seas*, &c. p. 123

CHR. A *Communication* of this *Divine* and *Miraculous Power* was given likewise to *Prophets*, *Apostles* &c. were they therefore in the *Form* of *God*?

Every Body that understands Terms, knows what is meant by *Matter* and *Form*. The *Form* of a thing is its *Essence*, not its *Shadow* or *Likeness*: And therefore whatever is in the *Form* of *God*, is of His *Essence*, and consequently must be *God*.

And this is the Inference the *Apostle* makes. That because *Christ* was in the *Form* of *God*, therefore He was *Equal* to *God*: And that this was not any *Arrogance* or *Presumption* in *Christ*, for being in the *Form* of *God*, He was *Natural God*.

But if *Christ* were Originally a *Creature*, as the *Socinians* wou'd have Him, and advanc'd to the *Divine Honour*, or a *made God*, as they word it, then indeed, it cou'd not be Excused from a Great *Robbery*, *Presumption* and *Blasphemy* for Him to pretend to be *Equal* to *God*.

And the *Apostle* in this *Text*, seems to have foreseen and obviated the *Socinian* Heresy; For he does not only call *Christ*, *God*; but tells how *He* is *God*. Not by *Gift or Donation*, or that He was *made* God. That is a Contradiction in the very *Terms*; But that He was in the *Form* and *Essence* of *God*, and so *Equal* to *God*, which cou'd not be pretended to, without *Robbery*, any other way.

Irenæus (advers. Hær. l. 1. c. 2. p. 51.) Quotes the 10th *ver.* of this *Chap.* which immediatly follows the words you have Quoted, and is an Inference from them, viz.

viz. *that at the Name of Jesus every Knee should bow*, and Describing what sort of *Adoration* it was which was to be paid to *Christ*, he says, that *every Knee should bow to Him as to our Lord, and God, and Saviour and King.*

Ut Christo Jesu Domino nostro et Deo, & Salvatori, & Regi, secundum placitum Patris invisibilis omne Genu curvetur.

Clemens Alexandr. (*Admonit. ad Gent.* p. 7.) having said how *God* had persuaded Men many ways, by *Prophets*, by *Miracles*, &c. at last says He *Empty'd* Himself, and if you will not Believe the *Prophets*, Behold the *Lord Himself* shall speak to thee: *Who being in the Form of God, and thought it not Robbery to be Equal with God*; But the merciful God ὁ φιλοικτέρμων Θεὸς, *Empty'd* Himself, desiring to save Man. And now the *Logos*, the *Word* Himself speaks to thee, being griev'd for thy Infidelity. Thus *Clemens*.

Tertullian (*adverf. Prax.* c. 7. p. 504.) quotes this *Text* Phil. 2. 6. as proving *Christ*, whom he there calls the *Word*, to be *God*. And (*adverf. Marcion.* l. 2. c. 16. p. 389.) he says, *Qui Credimus*—— *we who Believe that God dwelt on the Earth, and took upon Him the Form of a Servant, that He might save man are far from their Opinion who wou'd have God take care of nothing.*

Origen (*in Matt.* p. 357. *of Tom.* 1.) pursuing his Allegory 'twixt *Christ* and the *Church*, says that *Christ being the Husband, for His Spouse the Church left his Father* ἐν ἑώρᾳ when *He beheld, or injoy'd His Presence when He was in the Form of God*, IBID p. 374. he says that *Christ, when He was in the Form of God, and thought it not Robbery to be Equal to God, was made a Child*, &c. and (*in Johan*, p. 413. *of Tom.* 2.) he says τὸ ἀνθρώπινον τοῦ Ἰησοῦ *the Humanity of Christ was made* ἓν μετὰ τοῦ λόγου *one with the WORD*; *He being exalted, who thought it no Robbery to be equal with God*; *But the WORD remaining*

maining ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ ὕψει *in its own Altitude or Christ in His Humanity being exalted to the Dignity of the WORD, which He had before with God, The WORD being now both God and Man* Θεὸς λόγος ὢν ἄνθρωπος *GOD the WORD being MAN*, &c.

But Pray, what says your *Author* to that part of the *Text*, that *Christ thought it not Robbery to be equal with God.*

SOC. He Renders it thus, *Who Committed not Robbery by equalling Himself to God.* i. e, did Not Rob *God* of His Honour by *Arrogating* to be *God*, or *Equal* to *God.*

CHR. That was Answer'd like an *Oracle!* for it bears two meanings, either that *Christ* did not *Arrogate* to Himself to be *God*, or *Equal* to *God*: and therefore did not Rob *God* of His *Honour*: or otherwise, it may be Understood, that tho' He did *Arrogate* to *Himself* to be *God*, or *Equal* to *God*, yet this, was not a Robbing *God* of His Honour.

In the last Sense, he must either mean, that *Christ* is *God*; or that it is no Dishonour to *God* to have a *Creature* made *Equal* to *Him.* In the First Sense, no possible account can be Given, why *Christ* should say, That He *did not think it Robbery* to be *Equal* with *God*: when He intended to say, That He *did think it Robbery*, and that He would not be Guilty of such *Robbery*, by *Equalling* Himself with *God.*

SOC. Therefore instead of *not thinking it* Robbery, our Author puts in *Committed not* Robbery, by *equalling* Himself with *God.*

CHR. But does he alleadge that there is any fault in our *Translation*? Or that these words, *Thought it*, are not in the *Greek*? or that the *Greek* word does mean both *Thought*, and *Committed*? Or that *Thought* and *Committed* are the same thing?

SOC. No. He alleadges none of these things; only in the Repeating the *Text*, he puts in the word *Committed*, and leaves out the word *Thought*.

CHR. Hoping it would not be perceiv'd. And so he would get some sort of *Gloss* put upon this *Text*, which otherwise admitted of no Subterfuge, nor room for Witt; for the *Greek* word is ἡγήσατο which does not signify *Committed*, but *Thought*, ἡγήσατο οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν, He did not *esteem* or *think it* any *Robbery* to be *Equal* with *God*.

Again. If *Christ* was nothing but a *Servant*, and no more than a *man*, how can it be said, that he *took upon Him the form of a Servant, and was found in fashion as a man?* Our *Author* do's not give any good Account of this, he says only, that he was *like a Servant*, and *like other men*. But that does in no wise fill the expression of the *Text*. The *Form of a Servant* which *Christ* is here said to take, was his taking upon Him our *Flesh*, which appears from the following words. *He took upon Him the Form of a Servant, and was made in the Likeness of men, and being found in Fashion as a Man*——And this *Form* of a *Servant*, is compar'd with the *Form* of *God*, in which He was before He took upon Him the *Form* of a *Servant*. The same *Word* is used in both *Branches* of the *Comparison*, and therefore must be taken in the same *Sense*, unless you would make the *Comparison* Fallacious ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων—— μορφὴν δούλου λαβὼν. *Being in the Form of God*—— *He took upon Him the Form of a Servant.* Therefore He was as truely *God* as he was *Man*. As much in the *Form* of *God*, as in the *Form* of a *Servant*. And Secondly, He was *God*, before He was *Man*. For observe, it is not said that He *took upon Him* the *Form* of *God*, because He was always in that *Form*, and so could not take it. For taking a thing supposes me to exist before I take it. Therefore the *Text* is worded, *Being*

p. 129.

in

in the *Form* of *God*, that is, always existing in that, He afterwards took the *Form* of a *Servant*. Now if like other men, He had no *Existence* before his *Corporal Generation*, it cou'd not be said, that He *took* Flesh upon Him, or that he was *made* Flesh. We do not say, so of any man. If you ask a Man when did you *take* Flesh upon you? When were you *made* Flesh? He will Answer, I never *took* Flesh, for I was always Flesh. Therefore that Expression of Christs *taking upon him* the *Form* of a *Servant*, is not fill'd, by saying, He was *like* a *Servant*. No. Being *God*, He was *made* Man. But in your Sense, it must have been worded, *being man*, He took upon Him to *become a Servant*. That had been proper: for by that He must be suppos'd to be a *Man*, before he was a *Servant*. And till He was a *Man*, He could not take upon him to be a *Servant*, So He could not *take upon Him* our *Flesh*, unless he had been something before.

The *Def. of this Hist.* c. 9. p. 51. repeats this *objection*, Viz. How did He *take* this *Form* upon Him (which signifies his own free and Voluntary choice) when He did not *take* it, but was *made* So?

Now what Answer can you Imagine he gives to this? *What*? says he, *when the Apostle says, that Christ took upon Him the Form of a Servant; must we say that He did not? Is it not a plain Contradiction to the Apostle?* This is every word of the Answer he gives. Had any of us given the like, he would have found something to have call'd us beyond his Familiar and Common Stile of *want of Common Sense, Impudent, Brutal*, &c. Which he bestows upon us almost in every page. For pray tell me, did that *objection* deny that *Christ* took upon Him *the Form of a Servant?* So far from it, that it supposes it, and argues from it, that *Christ* must have an *Existence* before. But it seems all the Stickler could find out in that *Objection*, was, that it deny'd the Text, *that*

Christ took upon Him the form of a Servant. Such a quick sight as this was necessary to expound the *Scriptures* Contrary to the whole *Christian Church*, and the *Common usage* of *words* among *Mankind*, to bring down *Mysteries*, and make *Proselytes* for *Socinus*. I congratulate with you in your *Champion*. I should have thought it to have proceeded from his *Passion*, or been the Fault of the *Printer*, but that p. 52. he in other words repeats it again, and gives the like Answer. He putts the *Objection*, that the *Apostle* urging *Christ's* taking upon Him the *Form of a Servant*, as an Argument of His *Love* and *Humility*, this must suppose a *Choice* in *Christ* (for who calls it *Humility* in any Man to be *Born* Poor? Does a man *chuse* to be *Born*?) therefore that the *Apostle* must speak of what *Christ* did before he came into the world, for then it must be that He made His *Choice* of Coming into the world. To this our *Author* replies: *That the Apostle did not speak of what Christ did before* He *came into the world.* And he neither *Answers* one word to the *Argument*, nor offers any Reason for his own Assertion. This is, *Bellarmin thou liest*; And *ipse Dixit*, in an extraordinary mannar. But Like a wary Disputant, who could see the weakness of his Cause, instead of *Answering* he falls to objecting. He says, "That if to be *in the Form of God* "signifies *to be the true God*, then the Sense will be "this, *Christ* being the *true God*, thought it not *Robbery* "to be *Equal* with the *true God*. Which is just as if "one should say, *Leopold* who is *Emperor*, does not "think it *Robbery* to be *Equal* with the *Emperor*. Is "it Possible men should put such a *trifling* Sense on "the words of an *Apostle*? Thus he. And in return to his *Complement*, I would ask whether it be Possible, that he should be so *trifling* as to think his Instance of *Leopold* is *Parallel* to what the *Christians* teach of *Christ*? He makes *Leopold* and the *Emperor* to be the same

ſame *Perſon*, and cannot but know that the *Chriſtians* make *Chriſt* to be a Diſtinct *Perſon* from His *Father*. And then from a Ridiculous *Compariſon* 'twixt *the ſame Perſon and Himſelf*, he thinks he has concluded againſt thoſe who make a *Compariſon* 'twixt *two Perſons*. But now to bring his *Inſtance* nearer to the *Truth*: Suppoſe *Leopold* ſhould take his *Son* into the *Partnerſhip* of the *Empire* (as was done ſeveral times among the *Roman* Emperors, and as *David* crown'd *Solomon* in his own life time) and ſuppoſe this *Son*, out of *Love* to a Company of *Condemn'd wretches* ſhould take their *Guilt*, and *Condition* upon *Him*, and make *Himſelf* one of them; might not this *Love* and *Condeſcention* of his he expreſs'd in words like thoſe in this *Text*? That he who was of the Same *Nature* with *Leopold*, being his *Natural Son*, and therefore *Equal* to him in *Nature*, and likewiſe *joint* with him in the *Government*, in both which reſpects of *Nature*, and *Authority*, he thought it no *Robbery* to be *Equal* to the *Emperor*, that a *Perſon* of his *Dignity* ſhould *take upon him* the *Form* of a *Servant* &c. I Know this *Simile* will not Anſwer in all Points. And I would not have choſen it, but that by following my *Author*, I have ſhewn the *Diſparity* of his *Parallel*. Laſtly, he cannot apprehend how *God* can be of *no Reputation*. Anſ. When ſeveral *Natures* are joyn'd in one *Perſon*, what is proper to *any* of the *Natures* may be aſcrib'd to the *Perſon*; as has been ſaid before; thus *Man* is ſaid to *Dye*, tho' the *Soul* cannot; to be *cut* or *maimed*, which only the *Body* can ſuffer: And thus it is, that *God* may be ſaid to be of *no Reputation*, to *ſhed his blood*, to *Die*, &c. Tho' that can befall Chriſts *Human* Nature *only*; The *Godhead* is *Impaſſible*, but the *Perſon*, who is God, may ſuffer.

(31.) I will here subjoin other expressions like to that of *Christs* being in the *Form of God.* Col. 1. 15. *The Image of the Invisible God.* Heb. 1. 3. *The express Image of his Person.* Or of his *Subsistence.* HYPOSTASEOS.

SOC. Man is call'd the *Image* of *God.*

CHR. True. But do you not perceive a Remarkable Difference 'twixt these Appellations given to *Christ*, and what is said of *Man*?

A *Picture* or a *Shadow*, is a Mans *Image*, but not in the same Respect as his *Son*, who is the *Express* Image of his *Person*, because he partakes of his *Nature.*

SOC. This is notorious. But our Author Answers again, that this proves *Christ* not to be *God*, because the *Image* cannot be that *thing* whose *Image* it is.

CHR. This is *objecting* instead of *Answering* to the *Text.* And to this has been reply'd already, in the words of the above quoted *Text.* Heb. 1. 3. That the *Son* is the *Image* of the Father's *Person*, or *Subsistence*, *Hypostaseos*; not of His *Substance* or *Nature*, of which the *Son* partakes *Equally* with the *Father.* And by the word *God*, in this *Text*, The *Father* is meant, as in many other places of *Scripture*, which has been observ'd before.

Just. Martyr. (*Dial. cum Tryphon. Jud.* p. 285.) explains how *Christ* was the *Image* of *God.* Viz. Not on Account of His *Corporal Generation*, but of His *Eternal Generation* from the *Father*, by which he was with the *Father* before all *Creatures.*

Τοῦτο τὸ τῷ ὄντι ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς προβληθὲν γέννημα, πρὸ πάντων τῶν ποιημάτων συνῆν τῷ πατρί.

(32.) But now to prove that *Christ* had a *Being* before his *Incarnation*, what words cou'd you invent more full and Positive than these. *Col.* 1. 15. 16.? *Christ——the first-born of every Creature, for by Him were all things Created that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth,*

Earth, Visible, and Invisible, Whether they be Thrones, or Dominions, or Principalities, or Powers, all things were Created by Him and for Him: and He is before all things, and by Him all things Consist.

SOC. By *First-born*, is meant the *First-born from the Dead.* That is, *Christ* was the *First* Creature *Rose* from the *Dead.* *Hist.* p. 131.

CHR. That is very well! But pray tell me, what do you think of this Argument, By *Christ* all things were *Created:* therefore *Christ* was the *First* who *Rose* from the *Dead* ?

SOC. It is flat non-sense. But what do you bring it in for.

CHR. That is the Sense your *Interpretation* of this *Text* puts upon the *Apostle.* For that is the Proof he brings why *Christ* is the *First-born of every Creature*, because *by him all things were Created.*

SOC. By Him, there, should not be understood of *Christ*, but of *God.*

CHR. How will that mend the Consequence? By *God* were all things *Created*, therefore *Christ* was the *First*, who *Rose* from the *Dead?*

SOC. That is full as Great Nonsense as the other. But why may not *First-Born* mean *First-Born from the Dead* here as well as *Ver.* 18. Where it is said that He is the *First-Born from the Dead.*

CHR. Because in *ver.* 18. It is plainly said so. And *ver.* 25. it is said quite otherwise. For *First-Born from the Dead*, and *First-Born of every Creature* are two quite Different things. And the *Apostle* in these two places speaks of things very Different. For *Verse.* 18. He is speaking of *Christ* as *Head of the Church*, and (as the fulfilling of that Character) of His *Resurrection*, in which Sense he calls Him the *First-Born from the Dead. He is the Head of the Body, the Church*, who is,—*the First-Born from the Dead.*

But

But *Verse* 15. He is speaking of *Christ* in a quite Different Capacity, Viz. As the *Creator* of all things, or that Great Instrument by which *God* created all things, the *Word*, by whom all things were made: In which Sense He was *Prior* to all *Creatures*, as the *Cause* is *before* its *Effect*. And He was *Born* of God——Was His *true Image*, in His *Natural* and therefore *Eternal Generation*, before any *Creature* was *Born* in the Course of *Creation*, who are *Images* of *God* too, in their several *Degrees*; And in this Sense it is, that He is said to be The *Image* of *God*, *per Eminentiam*. The *First born of every Creature*. And this is the *Proof* the *Apostle* brings why He is the *Image* of the *Invisible God*, the *First Born* of Every *Creature*, *For* by him all things were *Created*——

SOC. But our *Author* says, that by him is meant, of *God* and not of *Christ*.

CHR. He *Says* it, but he offers nothing to *Prove* it, nor to reconcile the Text even to Common Sense in his way of *Interpretation*. He would have the *Apostle* prove, that *Christ* was the *First* rose from the *Dead*, because *God* made *all things!*

The word in the *Original* is ἐν. *In him all things were Created*. Which yet is rightly Rendered in the English, *For*, that is *By Him*. God Created all things *In Christ*, or *By Christ*, these terms are *Synonimous*, and so used in the *Scripture*. But your *Author* would rather have it render'd *For*, Viz. that all things were Created *For* Christ; because he would have more Latitude by that word to avoid *Christ's* Preexistence to all *Creatures*, which is unavoidable by the word, *By* or *In*; for if all things were created *By Him* or *In Him*; of Necessity He must be *before* them. But our *Author* thinks they might be Created *For Him*, that is, *for His Sake*, or *with respect to Him*, and that this might be *before He was born*.

But

But in this Text all these ways are apply'd to *Christ*, viz. That all things were Created *In* Him, and *By* Him, and *For* Him. Will you add to this (tho' I think it is not necessary; the *Text* does so plainly shew its own meaning) that *Just. Mart.* (*Dial. cum Tryph. Jud.* p. 284.) expressly applys all this to *Christ*, as being the *Wisdom*, *Power*, *Word*, *Son* of the Father, by which He made all *Creatures*. *Tertullian* (*adverf. Marcion.* l. 5. c. 19. p. 484, and 485.) says, *Si non Christus Primo-genitus* —— *If Christ be not the First-born of every Creature, as the WORD of the Creator by whom all things were made, and without which, nothing was made, if all things were not Created by Him that are in Heaven, and that are in the Earth, visible and invisible, whether they be Thrones, or Dominions, or Principalities or Powers; if all things were not Created by Him, and in Him, The Apostle wou'd not have said so plainly, THAT HE IS BEFORE ALL THINGS*——*And How is He before all, if he be not the First-Born of Creatures? If not the WORD of the Creator? How can He be prov'd to be before all, who appear'd after all? Who could Know Him to be before, who did not Know Him to be at all?* And *Origen* (*in Jerem. Hom.* 1. p. 58. of 1 Tom.) quoting this Text *Col.* 1. 15. he proves from thence the *Antiquity* of *Christ* and from his being the *First-Born of every Creature*, He Infers that He is for that Reason πρεσβύτερος the *Ancient* which wou'd have been no Argument, if it had been meant of his *Resurrection*. And *S. Cyprian* (*adverf. Jud.* c. 1. p. 32.) quotes this Text *Coll.* 1. 15. among many others, proving *Christ* to be the *First-Begotten*, and the *Wisdom* of *God* by which He *made all things*.

SOC. Will you hear more of my *Author's* Answers to this *Text*? The First-Born, that is, *most beloved*—— By Him were all things Created, that is, *model'd*, *not Created*. p. 132.
He is before all things, that is, *in worth and Excellency*.

By Him all things Consist, that is, *by his wise Government, they fall into no Disorder or Confusion.*

p. 133.

And he says some of the *Fathers* said these things upon this *Text*.

CHR. They might so. And these things are inferr'd from this *Text*. For He that is before all things in *Existence*, is likewise so in *Worth* and *Excellency*; And He by whom all things do *consist*, that is, are preserv'd in their Beings, must needs *Govern* so wisely as to keep them from falling into Disorder and Confusion. And the *First-Born* of *God*, must be *most beloved*. And therefore His *Beloved Son* is the *Epithet* of *Christ* in the *Gospel*, as well as His *First Begotten* or *only Begotten*. I say all these things might be rightly inferr'd from this *Text*, from the *Literal* meaning of the Text. And the Fathers might improve thus upon this *Text*.

Def. Hist. c. 3. p. 12. ad 17.

The *Defender* of our *Hist.* has a great deal upon this *Text*. But so confus'd, and such wild Arguments, as if he play'd booty, and meant to betray his Cause p. 16. He proves that Christ was the *First-Born* only because he had the *Preheminence*, which, says he, is often express'd by the *First Born*, and therefore concludes, that *Christ* being call'd the *First-Born*, only *Preheminence* was thereby meant, and not that He was *First Born*. From p. 13. to 16. He Proves, that by these words, *the First-born, by whom all things were Created*, the *Creation* of the *world* cannot be meant, because, says he, this *First-Born* was *Jesus*, who was a *man*. When it is answered (p. 14.) that He was *God* too. He *Denies* it, and that is all his Proof, and asks where is He call'd *God* in *Scripture?* As if he had never heard of *it* before. His second Proof is, that there is *no warrant from Scripture for it*. I *mean* says he, that the *Scripture* does not say in express words that *Christ Created Heaven and Earth*, He will have the words *Heaven* or *Earth* in, as you have heard upon Joh. 1. 3. Yet that it self does not do against this

Text

Text *Col.* 1. 16. for there they are expresly nam'd. *By, Him* were all things Created, that are in *Heaven*, and that are in *Earth*. Ay, but not *Heaven* and *Earth it self*, Replies our *Defender*. And the *all things* of which he speaketh, *he Limiteth to all Thrones and Dominions, Principalities and Powers, Visible and Invisible*; These are the *Heavenly Powers* spoke of; and I wish our *Author* would tell us which of these are *Visible*. But these are so far from being a *Limitation*, as this Author would have them, that it is plain they are but an *Enumeration* of a *Part*. For *Visible* is not put after these *Heavenly Powers*, as this Gentleman slily sets it, the better to serve his turn, but after the *Earth*. *He Created all things in Heaven and Earth, visible and invisible*. And these *Heavenly Powers* are reckon'd as some of the *Invisible* things, and immediatly after them it is added again, that *all things were Created by Him and for Him*. His third Reason is, that *Christ's* Creating all things is not said in *Eph.* 1. 20. 21, 22. and therefore it cannot be meant in *Col.* 1. 16. nay he says, it would be Nonsense in the *Apostle* to speak of it in the *Col.* having said in the *Eph.* that God set Him (*Christ*) above the *Principalities*, &c. as if Christ in His *Human* Nature might not be Exalted above them, and yet, as *God* be their *Creator*. Or as if this *Author* had never heard that the *Christians* said thus. But having call'd this *Absurd*, *Ridiculous*, and *Nonsense*; he ends with no other Reason: His *Dullness* or *Perverseness* is insuperable, for it being objected to him, p. 13. That if by the *Creation* here, only the *new Creation by the Gospel* be meant, how *Christ* should be the *First-born* of every *new Creature*, that is, of every *Good Man*, seeing there were *Good men* before *Christ*, and so He was not the *First-born* in that Sense. All that our *Author* says to this, is, that He was the *First-born* of every new *Evangelical* Creature, which was not at all apprehending the *Difficulty*, for it *Excludes all* before *Christ*. But to return

from the *Defender* to the *Historian*, none denies but all things were *modell'd* by *Christ:* And that it might be inferr'd even from this *Text*: But that therefore, they were not *Created* by Him, remains yet for our *Author* to prove: Or to shew us where *Athanasius* or any of the *Fathers* he Quotes, says any such thing. He Quotes not the *Places* of these *Fathers*. He loves to fight in the *Dark*. But to shew him that tho' this *Text* may be apply'd to the *Reformation* made by *Christ* in the *Gospel*, which our *Author* means by *Modelling*: Yet that it is not only *truly*, but *chiefly* and *literally* meant of *Christ's Creating* all things. First, the *literal* meaning of the κτίζειν which is here used, is, *Creare*, to *Create*. *Secondly*, The *Creatures* which are here chiefly said to be *Created* by *Christ*, are the *Powers* of *Heaven*, which did not fall, and so came not under the *Redemption* of the *Gospel-Modell*, of which our *Author* would have all this to be meant. By Him were all things Created *that are in Heaven*—— *Thrones*, *Dominations*, *Principalities*, *Powers*, &c. Our *Author* says, that by all this is meant no more than that *Christ* became the *Head* of the *Angels*. And this was a *new Modelling* of the *Angels*, and *Modelling* is *Creating*, or *Creating* is *Modelling*, &c. But this *Author* might have observ'd, that the *Apostle* in this *Place* speaks first of *Creating*, and then of *Modelling*. Of *Creating* vers. 16, and 17. And then of *Modelling* vers. 18. viz. of Christs becoming the *Head* of the *Church*, *He*, (Christ) *is the Head of the Body, the Church*. There the *Angels* are not mentioned, He *became* not *their Head* by His *Incarnation*. He was so before. For *He* took not on Him the *Nature* of *Angels*, but He took the *Seed of Abraham*, and so by His *Incarnation* became the *Head* of *Mankind* in a more special manner. And after this vers. 18. where the *Apostle* begins to speak of Christ's *Modelling* the *Church*, there is not a word more of *Creating*: He had done speaking of the one, of Christ's *Creating*, wherein he mentions

mentions the *Angels*; and then he goes on to ſpeak upon another Point, viz. How *Chriſt* became the *Head* of the *Church*, wherein he does not mention the *Angels*, nor ſpeaks any more of *Creating*: And yet this *Author* would Confound all theſe together, and make *Modelling*, and *Creating* the ſame thing. I told you before upon *Joh.* 16. 15. That by this method thoſe who hold that the *World* was from *Eternity* might *Anſwer* all the firſt of *Gen.* to be only a *new Modelling* and to mean no more than *Ovids Metamorphoſis*. Indeed it Confounds all *Language* in the *World*. And not only the *Divinity* of the *Father*, His *Creating* the *World*, or indeed His *Being*, that there is any *God* at all cannot be ſhewn from *Scripture*, if you will allow this *Latitude* of Turning and *Modelling* words from their common and cuſtomary Meaning. But we go on.

(33.) Coll. 2. 9. *In Him dwelleth the Fulneſs of the Godhead bodily. And ye are compleat in Him*, or ye are *fill'd by Him.*

Thus he repeats that *Text*, wherein he leaves out a very material word, πᾶν, *All* the Fullneſs, or the *whole* Fullneſs of the *Godhead*. *Hiſt.* p. 135.

SOC. He ſays that *the Fullneſs of the Godhead*, is *the Fullneſs of the Knowledge of the Godhead.* And that this was it which dwelt in *Chriſt*.

CHR. Both *Addition* and *Subſtraction* in one *Text* is very hard! to leave out the word *All*, and put in the word *Knowledge*. No *Text* will be able to Stand before this. And after all if it ſhould not do his buſineſs——for the *Full Knowledge* of the *Godhead* can be in none but *God*; becauſe, as ſaid before, nothing can hold *Infinit*, but *Infinit*. And therefore if *all* the *Fullneſs* of the *Knowledge* of *God* dwells in *Chriſt*, it is as full a Proof of His *Godhead*, as any can be deſir'd. It muſt be ſome Conſcientiouſneſs of this made the *Author* leave the word *all* out of this *Text*: He thought it would break the

the force of it a little. For tho' the *Fullness of the Godhead* be an Extraordinary Expression, and does in Consequence imply the *whole Fullness*, yet the word *All* makes it obvious, and prevents all objections.

SOC. But our Author quotes *Eph.* 3. 19. Where it is said, that the (*Ephesians*) might be filled *with all the Fullness of God.*

CHR. The *Apostle* there makes it very plain, that he is not speaking *Literally*, or according to the full extent of the *Words*, the whole *Verse* is this, *That ye might KNOW the love of Christ, which passeth Knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the Fullness of God.* Where it is even self-evident that the *Apostle* means no more, than a very great *Degree* of *Fullness*, and *Knowledge*. And it would be *Perverseness* for any one to *Dispute* how a man can *Know* past his *Knowledge*, which is a *Contradiction*. And in this manner of *Expression* it is plain that the *Apostle* saw the *Contradiction*, and therefore intended it *Hyperbolically*. And the whole *Sentence* must be taken in the same *Sense*. But it is not so where *one Expression* of that *Sentence* is joyn'd with *plain words*, and in an *Argument*, as it is in *Col.* 2. 9.

Besides in *Eph.* 3. 19. the *Greek* word is εἰς, which Signifies in; that ye may be filled *In* all the *Fullness* of *God.* Which is the same Expression with that in our present *Text* Col. 2. 10. And ye are compleat, or Filled *in Him.* That is, In the *Fullness* of *God*, we are *filled.* But it is not said, that the *whole* Fullness of God dwells *in Us*: Or that it dwells in us *Bodily*, or *Substantially* (as our *Author* says others do Translate it) to Distinguish it from *Figuratively* as it is in *Eph.* 3. 19.

SOC. Our *Author* says, that *Bodily* or *Substantially* means no more than what is oppos'd to the *Philosophers* Knowledge

ledge of *God*, which was not so *Perfect* as the *Knowledge* of *Christ*.

CHR, Did you ever hear of a *Bodily Knowledge* before? Or that that was ever us'd to signify a more *Perfect* Knowledge? In our way of speaking it would signify a more *Gross* and *Imperfect* Knowledge; Knowledge is always most *Perfect* when it is most Pure, and *Spiritual*; and consequently it is most *Imperfect*, the more it grows *Bodily*.

SOC. Go on to the next.

(34.) 2. Thess. 2. 16. 17. *Our Lord Jesus Christ comfort your hearts and establish them in every Good word and work.* Hist. p. 136.

SOC. Our *Author*, Answers this, in Answer to 2. *Thess.* 3. 11, 12 and says, That it is to be understood of Christ's *Intercession* for us.

CHR. That is altering all the Rise of words that is known among men. The *Church* of *Rome* allows an *Ora pro nobis* to the *Saints*; which is a plain Distinction 'twixt *Intercession* and *Bestowing*. *Establishing the Heart*——nothing can do but *God*. And therefore I ought not to Pray to any but *God* to *Establish my Heart*. If *Intercession* were Ground enough, then I might pray to a *man* to *Establish my Heart*, *to Give me Grace* &c. because he can *Intercede* for me.

SOC. But not so effectually as *Christ*.

CHR. That is true. But it is *Intercession* still. And therefore if *Intercession* will not excuse such a *Prayer* of mine from *Blasphemy* and *Idolatry*, if I make it to a *man*, it will not alter the Case, if I make it to *Christ*, who is no more than a man, as the *Socinians* do Dispute.

(35.) But see what Stiles St. *Paul* gives *Him* 1. *Tim.* 6. 14. 15. 16.——*Untill the Appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, which in his times he shall shew, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of Kings and Lord*

of

of Lords, which only hath Immortality, Dwelling in the Light which no man can approach unto, whom no man hath seen nor can see.———

Hist. p. 139. *SOC.* The last words shew, that not the *Lord Christ*, but *God* is design'd in this whole *Description.*

CHR. They shew indeed that *Christ* is here describ'd according to His *Divinity*; In which Sense he is and ever was *Invisible.* And even in His *Body* He was in some Sense, *Invisible*, that is, they saw His *Body*, but if they did not understand Him to be *the Christ* this was call'd not *Seeing* of Him. *Seeing* is there taken
Joh. 8. 54.55. for *Knowing* and *Understanding.* In which Sense *Christ* tells the *Jews* that they neither Knew *Him* nor His *Father.* Tho' they said of Him that He was their *God.* And they that *Knew* God are said to *See* Him. *If ye had Known me*, said *Christ* unto His Disciples, *Ye should*
Joh. 14. 7. 9. *have Known my Father also: And from henceforth ye Know Him and have SEEN HIM——— he that hath SEEN ME, hath SEEN THE FATHER.*

So that these last Words in the *Text*——— *whom no Man hath seen, nor can see*, are not in one Sense, applicable to the *Father*, and in another Sense applicable to *Christ*, and therefore they do not shew (as your *Author* says) that not the *Lord*, *Christ*, but *God* is Design'd in this whole *Description.*

God is not nam'd in this whole *Description*; and why He shou'd not be nam'd, if He had been intended to have been *Described.* I believe our *Author* will find it hard to tell. Why shou'd *Christ* be nam'd, and *only Christ* in this *Description* if it was intended for *Another*? Why would the *Apostle lead* us, and even *force* us to apply all these *Divine Attributes* to *Christ*, if he design'd to persuade us that *Christ* was *not God*, and that it would be Gross *Idolatry* in any one who thought Him so, or *Worship'd* Him as such?

And

And why would any of the *Divine Attributes* in this *Description* be in *Express Terms* apply'd to *Christ*, as we find it Rev. 17. 14. where He is call'd *King of Kings, and Lord of Lords*?

SOC. Go to the next.

(36.) *CHR. Tit.* 2. 13. *Looking for the Glorious Appearing of the Great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.*

SOC. Nothing Hinders but that we may believe that not only the Lord Christ, but God Himself will appear at the last Judgement. *Hist. p.* 140.

CHR. Nothing Hinders! Yes, I'll tell you what hinders our *Believing* it, *God* has not *Reveal'd* it: and you must not *add* to His Words. *God* has not told us that He will appear any other way in the *last Judgment* than by *Christ Jesus. God* is a *Spirit*, and must take a *Body* to appear to the *Eyes*. And that *God* will assume a *Body* distinct from the *Lord Jesus*, and appear in another *Body* at the last Judgment, is a bold Presumption, and *Adding* to *God's Word* to suppose, and never was supposed; but by those who will invent Extravagant and Groundless *Supposes* to elude the plain *Texts* of *Scripture*. It is the Opinion and Interpretation of the *Mahomatans*, whose greatest Error is being *Socinians*.

Clem. Alexandr. (*admonit. ad Gent.* p. 5. and 6.) applies this *Text* only to *Christ*, who was the *Word* of God, and so true God, and likewise true *Man*, and that it was *His Apparition* at the *last Judgment* that was here spoke of.

"But now this very word Himself hath "appeared unto Men, who only is both "God and Man, and the Cause of all Good "to us — for as said that Divine Apostle "of our Lord, *The Grace of God that bring-* "*eth Salvation unto Men hath appeared*, &c. "*looking for that Blessed hope, and the appear-* "*ing of the Glory of the great God, and our*

Νῦν δὲ ἐπεφάνη ἀνθρώποις αὐτὸς οὗτος ὁ λόγος, ὁ Μόνος ἄμφω, Θεὸς τε καὶ Ἄνθρωπος, ἀπάντων ἡμῖν αἴτιος ἀγαθῶν. καὶ τὸν θεοσέβειον ἐκεῖνον τοῦ κυρίου Ἀπόστολον ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ σωτήριος ἀνθρώποις ἐπεφάνη, &c. Tit. 2. 11. προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα, καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου

Θεῦ, καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. τοῦτ' ἐστι τὸ ᾆσμα τὸ καινὸν, ἡ Ἐπιφάνεια ἣ νῦν ἐπιφανεῖσα ἐν ἡμῖν τοῦ ἐν ἀρχῇ ὄντος καὶ προϋπάρχοντος Λόγου ἐπεφάνη ὁ εὐαγγελιστὴς ὁ πρῶν.

" *Saviour Jesus Christ.* This is a New Song, " the Epiphany or Appearance of the *Word* " who was in the Beginning, and before Ex- " isting, which hath shined unto Us; He " appear'd of late, who before was our *Sa-* " viour.

(37.) *CHR.* Heb. 12 *By whom also He made the Worlds.*

SOC. This is, *for* whom He made the Worlds.

Hist. p. 141. *CHR.* But the Greek is δι', *by* whom, *Origen* (in *Joh.* p. 56. of 2 Tom.) shews the words to be δι' οὗ *By whom* and thence proves ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς τοὺς Αἰῶνας πεποίηκε διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ. That God made the Worlds *By* His Son. But to End this poor Shift, Col. 1. 16. it is said, that *all things were Created BY Him, and FOR Him, and IN Him*; as we have before observ'd.

SOC. Well then we must see if we can get any help from the other words of this *Text.* He says some do render the words thus. By whom He made the *Ages.*

CHR. The *Greek* word αἰὼν, signifies *Age* and it is as often us'd for *Eternity*, that is, *all Ages*, or *Generations*, or the *Age to come*, as we say the *World to come.* Hence the word Αἰώνιος signifies *Eternal.* 1 Tim. 6. 16. But suppose it in that Sense how will it help your Cause? Will you allow that *God* made *all Ages* by *Christ*?

SOC. No. That we must not do. Therefore our *Author* understands by *Ages*, only the *Gospel Ages* or *Times.*

CHR. But by what Authority does he do that? Does he allege any thing out of the *Text* or *Context*, or any other Authority for it?

SOC. No. Not a word.

CHR. Then if he has Power to limit the *Ages*, he may, if he pleases, say, that it meant only the *Ages* of some other *Reformation* than that by the *Gospel* of *Christ*, some yet to come, perhaps the *Millenary*, or what else he pleases.

Heb.

(38.) Heb. 7. 3. *Melchisedeck* is compar'd to the *Son* of *God* in these particulars, as being *without Father, without Mother, without Descent, having neither Beginning of Days, nor End of Life, but made like unto the Son of God, abideth a Priest Continually.*

These are not *Literally* understood of *Melchisedeck*, only that none of these things are Recorded of him, and so he was left in History *without Father*, &c. But in these particulars, he was like the *Son* of *God*, who really was what *Melchisedeck* was there said to be, without *Beginning of Days or End of Life*, &c.

SOC. But our *Author* says, that of all these things he is only like the *Son* of *God* in that particular, of being a *Priest for ever.* *Hist.* p. 149

CHR. By what Rule does he exclude all the rest, which are in the same Sentence?

SOC. I cannot tell indeed.

CHR. *Licentia Sociniana* is beyond *Licentia Poetica.* But how came *Melchisedeck* to be *like* the *Son* of *God*, if there was no *Son* of *God*, when *Melchisedeck* was made? The *Pattern* after which any thing is made must be before the *Copy* that is made after it.

SOC. *Verse* 15. it is said that *another Priest* (Christ) *ariseth after the Similitude of Melchisedick.*

CHR. And how will you reconcile these two upon the *Socinian* Principle? For *Melchisedeck* cannot be both after the Similitude of *Christ*, and *Christ* after the Similitude of *Melchisedeck.* But in the *Christian* Scheme it is most easy, *viz.* the *Eternal Son* of God was *before* Melchisedeck, but *Incarnate* in time *after* Melchisedeck. And yet it was the same *Jesus, yesterday, to day, and* (39.) *for ever.* As it is exprest Heb. 13. 8.

SOC. Our Author says, that was spoke of the *Gospel* of *Christ* not *Changing.* *Hist.* p. 247

CHR. But the *Text* speaks it expresly of *Jesus Himself*, and we know that the *Phrase* was us'd to express

all time *Past*, *Present*, and *to Come*; and is the same with the *Alpha* and *Omega*, the *Beginning and the Ending*, *which was*, *and which is*, *and which is to come*. Rev. 1. 8. and other places of *Scripture*.

(40.) He has two Texts out of St. *Peter*. 1. *Peter* 1. 11. *Searching what*, *and what manner of time the Spirit of Christ*, *which was in them did signifie*, *when it Testify'd before hand the Sufferings of Christ*.

Hist. p. 146. *SOC.* Our *Author* says, That by the *Spirit of Christ* there, is meant only, the same Spirit of *Prophesy* which was in *Christ*.

CHR. This was spoke of the *Prophets* long before *Christ* was Born. *viz.* that the *Spirit* of *Christ* was in them, and did Testifie beforehand the Sufferings of *Christ*, now if *Christ* had no Being, before He was *Born* of the *Virgin*, as you say, how had He a *Spirit* so long before? And how cou'd His *Spirit* Testify before it had a *Being*?

SOC. Therefore our *Author* says, not that it was the *Spirit of Christ* which was in them, but only the *Prophetick* Spirit that spoke of *Christ*.

CHR. But the *Text* says expresly that it was *the Spirit of Christ* which was in them. This is not *Interpreting*, but Running quite from the *Text*.

SOC. He says that *Poets* are call'd the *Poets* of such *Men* as they wrote of, as *Virgil* is called the *Poet* of *Æneas*, and *Homer* of *Ulysses*, because they wrote of *Æneas* and *Ulysses*.

CHR. But is there not some Difference 'twixt calling a Man such a Man's *Poet*, because he wrote of him (tho' that is an Expression I never heard us'd) and 'twixt saying that such a Man's *Spirit* was in him, and did *Signify* to him what he should say? Especially if the *Man* whose *Spirit* taught the other, had no *Spirit* at that time, nor was a *Man* then: A Man to *teach* another before he is *Born*. St. *Barnabas*, in his *Catholick*

Epist.

Epist. c. 5. p. 21, 22. says that the *Prophets having the Gift* (of Prophesy) *from* Christ, *did Prophesy of Him.* οἱ προφῆται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἔχοντες τὴν δωρεὰν ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἐπροφήτευσαν. And St. *Ignatius* in his *Epist.* to the *Magnesians*, says that *they were Inspir'd by His Grace.* Οἱ θειότατοι προφῆται ἐμπνεόμενοι ὑπὸ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ. Thus these Holy Fathers, who liv'd with the *Apostles*; and learned their Doctrin from their *Mouths*, as well as from their *Writings*. And one of them was Ranked with the *Apostles*, Act xiv. 14.

(41.) Ther is another *Text* in this same *Epist.* of St. *Peter*, which likewise imports the *Existence* of our *Bl. Saviour* before His *Incarnation.* 1. Pet. 3. 19. 20. *Quickned by the Spirit, by which also He went, and Preached to the Spirits in Prison, which sometimes were Disobedient in the Days of Noah.*

SOC. Our *Author* Interprets this of *Christ's Descent* into *Hell.* And quotes *Bellarmine.* *Hist.* p. 143

CHR. This is not the only Instance wherein your *Author* Craves aid of the *Romans*; But he does not quote the *Book* or *Chap.* of *Bellarmine*, that you may not find him out, without more pains than it is worth; but this we are sure of, that the *Papists generally* Interpret this of *Purgatory.* And I would desire our *Author* to tell us what Business our *Saviour* had to *Preach* in *Hell*? Is there *Repentance* and *Remission* there? He has given Reason to think this is his Opinion, which we shall have more occasion to Discourse hereafter. But the *Orthodox* do plainly mean, according to the *Letter* of the *Text*, That it was the *Spirit of Christ* which Preached in *Noah*, and the *Prophets* of those Days, to those *Spirits* which were then *Bound* in the *Chains* of their *Sins*; And which are now in the *Prison* of *Hell.* And that *Spirit* by which *He* quickned *Himself*, was the same by which also He *went* and *Preached* in the Days of *Noah.*

(42.)

(42.) But here follows a very peremptory *Text*. 1 *Joh.* 5. 7. *There are three that bear Record in Heaven. The Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are One.*

pag. 152. *SOC.* This *Verse* was not *Originally* in the *Bible*, but has been added to it. Tis not found in the most Antient Copies of the *Greek*, nor in the *Syriack*, *Arabick*, or *Æthiopick*, or *Armenian* Bibles, nor in the most Ancient *Latin* Bibles, Tis not acknowledged by the *Fathers*; 'tis wholly rejected by abundance of the most Learned *Criticks*, and by all acknowledg'd to be Doubtfull and Uncertain.

* Prefat. ad. Epist. Canon. vide *Smith* Vindica. 1. *Joh.* 5. 7. a Suppositionis nota. miscell. p. 137. 138. and the Appendix to his Sermon on 1. *Joh.* 5. 18.

CHR. This is manifestly false, for St. *Hierome* * does by no means acknowledge it to be *Doubtfull* or *Uncertain*. But on the Contrary tells us plainly that he found out how this *Text* had been adulterated by unfaithful *Translators*, and by others *Omitted* on purpose to Elude the *Truth*. And I will shew you hereafter how those whom you Quote as the Primitive *Socinians*, were notoriously Detected in their Adulterating the H. *Scriptures*. And their *Successors* have continu'd their *Practice* in this; therefore some *Copies* may want it. But this is only a *Negative* Argument, or *Presumption* rather, for it can amount to no more. And in no *Judicature* can stand against the *Affirmative* Proof of St. *Cyprian*, St. *Hierom*, and other *Fathers*, and which is admitted in all the *Churches* of *Christ*. And it is a great Providence of *God*, That notwithstanding of the *Corrupters* of this *Text*, it is still extant in the *greatest Number* of *ancient Manuscripts*. The *Divines* of *Lovain* having Compar'd many *Latin* Copies, found this *Text* wanting but in *Five*. And R. *Stephanus* found it retained in the *major Number* of 15 or 16 *ancient Manuscripts*, which he us'd. Therefore it is no wonder if Dr. *Burnet* saw some *Manuscripts* that wanted it, which he has so carefully told in his *Travels*.

SOC.

SOC. Our *Author* gives a second Answer, viz. *These three are one*, that is, are not one *God*, but are one *in Testimony*; for they are spoken of here as *Witnesses*.

CHR. And their *Witness* vers. 9. is call'd the *Witness* of *God*.

SOC. So every *Witness* of Men, which *God* appoints, is call'd the *Witness* of *God*, *viz.* because *God* appoints it.

CHR. But here the *Immediat* Witness of *God* is put in Opposition to the Witness of *Men*, or *other* Witness of *God*, which is by the *Mediation* of *Second Causes*; The *Witness* of the *three in Heaven*, is compar'd with the *Witness* of the *three in Earth*. And the Conclusion is made, that if we receive the *Witness* of the *three* in *Earth*, which is call'd the *Witness* of *Men*, i. e. wrought by the *Ministry* of *Men*, we ought much rather to receive the *Witness* of the *three* in *Heaven*, which is call'd the *Witness* of *God*, and a *greater Witness* than the *Witness* of *Men*. It is call'd the *Witness* of *God*, which *He* testified, in opposition to what was testify'd by other means. And this is a Demonstration that the *Text* of the *three Witnesses* in *Heaven* must not be left out, because ther is a *Comparison* made 'twixt the *Witness* of *these three* and the *three Witnesses* in *Earth*; So that if you leave out this *Verse* you must leave out the 6, 7, 8, and 9th *Verses* altogether, which no *Socinian* has yet so much as attempted. And the *Witness* of these *three* in *Heaven* being call'd the Witness of *God*, in opposition to the same Witness by *Men* is a full proof what was meant, when it was said that *these three are one*, i. e. are *one God*; for otherwise their Witness could not be the Witness of *God*, that is *Immediatly*, as it is there put in opposition to a *mediat* Witness by *Men*, or otherwise.

SOC. I have heard this *Text* is not Quoted by any of the *Ante-nicene* Fathers, and you nam'd *Cyprian* just now, pray let me hear what he says of it.

CHR.

CHR. In his 73. *Epist.* which is Directed *Jubaiano*, p. 203. speaking against the *Baptism* of *Hereticks*, and showing that they cannot be the *Temple* of *God*.

Quæro cujus Dei? Si *Creatoris*, non potuit qui in eum non Credidit; si *Christi*, nec hujus fieri potest Templum, qui negat *Deum Christum*; si *spiritus Sancti*, cum *Tres unum sint*, quomodo *spiritus Sanctus* placatus esse cipotest, qui aut *Patris*, aut *Filij* inimicas est?

He asks of which *God*? If of the *CREATOR*, he cannot who does not believe in Him; if of *Christ*, neither can he be this *Temple* who Denys *God*—*Christ*; if of the *Holy-Ghost*, when *these three are one*, how can the *Holy Ghost* be pleas'd with him who is an Enemy to the *Father*, or the *Son*?

Here you see he reckons the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*, each of them to be *God*. For when he is supposing the several ways by which any become the *Temple* of *God*, he computes that it can be but one of these three ways, that is, by becomming the *Temple* either of the *Father* (whom he calls *Creator*) or of the *Son*, or of the *Holy Ghost*, which shews each of them to be *God*: and he calls *Christ* expresly *God*? and says that *these three are one*, and (*de Unit. Ecclesiæ*, p. 109.) *Christ* says, *I and the Father are one* and again it is written of the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*, and *these Three are one*. This I quoted before, and I refer you to the *Annotations* upon this place in *Cyprian* to shew you many *Manuscripts*, where this *Text* is had, and vindicated from the malice of *Socinus*. And if you will look into Dr. *Hamond*, and *Pole's Synops. Critic.* upon this *Text* you will be further Satisfy'd. For I wou'd not take up time now, to go thro' all this at large.

(43.) 1. *John.* 5. 20. *We know that the Son of God is come and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is True; and we are in Him that is True, even in His Son Jesus Christ: This is the True God.*

SOC.

SOC. My *Author* says, That, this was a very *negligent Translation*, for whether you Interpret, *Him that is True*, to be *God*, or to be *Christ*, no sense can be made of the words.

CHR. Does he tell where the *Nonsense* is?

SOC. No—— he says no more of it.

CHR. It seems to me to be so far from *Nonsense*, that I cannot see the least Difficulty in it. *To know him that is True*. I cannot imagin what should trouble him at that saying, but that he is resolv'd to Quarrel.

SOC. The Latter part of the *Text* ought to be thus render'd. *We are in him that is True* (i. e. in God) *by His Son Jesus Christ. In God, By* Christ.

CHR. But the *Text* is quite otherwise, it is ἐν, In His Son. He does not pretend that the *Original* is otherwise, yet he finds fault with the *Translation*, and calls the *Scripture* Nonsense.

The *Apostle* immediately subjoins to this Text, *Little Children keep your selves from Idols*. Which seems to bear this Sense; That if *Christ* were not the *True God*, He must be an *Idol*, because *Divine Worship* was paid to *Him*; And this is an Explanation of his calling *Christ* the *True God*: viz. That whoever else pretends to it, is an *Idol*, and therefore we must *Worship* none else.

Ther is another part of this *Text* which our *Auther* takes no notice of, which does plainly Evidence the *Divinity* of *Christ*, and that is, That *the Son of God hath given us an Understanding* that we may know Him that is True.

To give man *Understanding* is an *Incommunicable Attribute* of *God*. And that is, past all subterfuge, attributed here to the *Son*.

As *knowing* the *hearts of Men* is, *Rev.* 2. 23. I am He (saith the the *Son* of *God. Verſ* 18.) *which ſearcheth the Reins and Heart.*

SOC. Chriſt knoweth our *Thoughts*, only when *God* Reveals them to Him, and thus the *Prophets* may know *Thoughts*,

p. 155.

CHR. And thus I know your Thoughts, and you mine, i. e when we tell them to one another. But does that make me a *Searcher* or *Knower of your Heart?* We have ſpoke of this before upon *Rom.* 2. 16. and 1 *Cor.* 4. 5. and ſhown that a *Knower of Hearts*, is he who *knows* them of *Himſelf*, without being told by *another*. And that this is an *Incommunicable Attribute* of *God.*

To what I then ſaid, I will only add this, That in the Scripture *God* uſes this as a *peculiar Attribute*, as you may read. 1 *Sam.* 16 7. 1 *Cor.* 28. 9. *Pſal.* 7. 9. and 139. 1. *Jer.* ii. 20. and 20. 12 and many other *Scriptures.* But that which is moſt remarkable, and belongs particularly to this *Text* we are upon is, *Jer.* 17. 10. For what *God* ſpeaks Graciouſly of *Himſelf* in *that verſe*, Chriſt ſpeaks of Himſelf *in this.*

Firſt, The Prophet in the 9th Verſe ſhews, that none can know the Heart: *Who can know it?* And then in the next words, *God* ſpeaks, ſetting forth His *Almighty Power* in that he knew it. *I the Lord Search the Heart, I Try the Reins even to give every Man according to his Ways.*

And *Rev.* 2. 23. *Chriſt* Attributes the ſame to *Himſelf. Theſe things ſaith the Son of God.* (Verſ. 18.) *I am He which Searcheth the Reins and Hearts: And I will give to every one of you according to your Works. Irenæus* (adverſ. Her. l. 4. c. 36. p. 369.) reckons this among the *Attributes* of *God*: And this ſame *Text* Rev. 2. 23. is repeated in his *Text*, and quoted in the *Margent.*

I'll trouble you but with one *Text* more. *Rev.* 5. 5. *Christ* is call'd, *The Root of David.*

(44.) *SOC.* That is, *a Root springing from* David: *As a Root of the Earth is a Root which springeth from the Earth; not on the contrary a Root from which the Earth springeth.* *Hist.* p. 156.

CHR. This is very fine, the *Sophism* is *Subtile*, and worthy a *Socinian!* Pray, let me know what you do mean by the *Root* of any thing? Is it that out of which *the thing Grows*, or that which *Grows out of the thing*?

SOC. That is as Commonly known as any thing in the World. For the *Branches* grow out of the *Root*, and not the *Root* out of the *Branches.*

CHR. And when you, by a *Figure*, apply this to *Families*, and say such a one is a *Branch* of such a *Family*: Such a one is the *Root* of the *Family*: Are not these Terms as Commonly known as the *Root* and *Branches* of *Trees*? And is not the *Root* springing from a *Branch* the same absurdity as a *Father* springing from his *Son*?

SOC. All this is self evident go on.

CHR. Therefore if *Christ* be the *Root* of *David*; He must be *before* David; and this destroys the *Socinian* principle, which allows *Christ* no Being before He was *Born* of the *Virgin.*

And therefore your *Author* must get over this, tho' he is forc't to make the *Root* the *Branch*, and the *Branch* the *Root.*

This wou'd have put any less *wit* or *Resolution* into *Despair.* For the attempt looks as easy to prove *Day* to be *Night.* It is strange he wou'd scruple the *Trinity*, *Incarnation*, or any other Difficulty who cou'd hope to Master this. And he has done it to a miracle! For he has found a saying, a *Root of the Earth*, by which is not meant that the *Earth* springs out

of that *Root*; And therefore the *Root* may be a *Branch*. A *Father* may ſpring from his *Son*, and what you pleaſe.

Let us Entertain our ſelves a little with this Great *Invention*, and Examine it particularly.

Pray what do you mean when you ſay a *Root of the Earth*?

SOC. I mean a *Root* that Grows in the *Earth*, and ſo is call'd a *Root* of the *Earth*.

CHR. So you may ſay a Root of ſuch a *Man's*, who owns the *Garden*, of ſuch a *Gardner* who *planted* it, of ſuch a one who *Beſtow'd* it upon you, and a hundred other ways. But is there no Difference twixt a *Root* that belongs to a *man*, and the *Root* of that *man himſelf*? Twixt that which *Grows* in the *Earth* and the *Root* of the *Earth* it ſelf? Therefore tho' you may call a *Tulip A Root* of the *Earth*, yet you wou'd not call it, *THE Root* of the *Earth*, now *Chriſt* is call'd *THE Root* of *David*, not *A Root* of *David*. But pray what did our *Author* mean when he call'd Chriſt *The Root of David*?

SOC. He meant that *Chriſt* was a *Branch* of *David's* Family.

CHR. And when did you ever hear a *Branch* of a *Root* call'd the *Root* of its *Root*.

It is inextricable Nonſenſe. There is not a man in the World cou'd ſpeak at this rate, or wou'd be underſtood if he did. That deſigning to call *John* a *Deſcendent* or *Branch* of *Robert*, ſhould call *John* the *Root* of *Robert*.

And it is impoſſible for me to think that our *Author* did believe himſelf, when he made this *Diſtinction*: And it is a full Demonſtration to me, That theſe men ſeek not *Truth*, but are reſolv'd to *oppoſe* all *Arguments* againſt their own *Opinion*, tho' they were as *clear* as the *Light*.

But

But (*Rev.* 22. 16.) *Jesus*, says, *I am the Root and the Offspring of David.* Here is both *Root* and *Branch.* This grows too hard for a *Distinction*, and cannot be reconcil'd any other way than as *Christ* is the *Root* of *David*, according to his *Divine Nature* which Created *David*, and so *David* sprang from *Christ*, as a *Branch* or *Offspring* from its *Root*. And then according to *Christ's Human Nature*, He was the *Son* and *Offspring* of *David.* As He is prophesied of. *Isa.* 2. 6. *There shall come forth a Rod out of the Stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his Roots.* But our *Author* will have it, that the *Branch* was the *Root*, growing out of the *Root*; and the *Rod* was the *Stem*, which came out of the *Stem.*

See now, upon the whole, what Cause your *Author* had to Conclude so *Triumphantly* as he do's at the End of his fourth *Letter*, p. 166. *That our Lord* CHRIST, *nor the* HOLY SPIRIT, *neither are, nor ever are called* GODs *or* GOD *in Holy Scripture*; *as also, that neither* CREATION (*whether New or Old*) *nor any of the* ATTRIBUTES *of* GOD *are Ascribed to our* BLESSED SAVIOUR.

Whereas the Main of his *Arguments* have been (as you have seen) to *Ward* off those *Texts* in *Holy Scripture*, which Ascribe the *Name* and *Attributes* of *God* to *Both* the other *Persons* in the *Blessed Trinity*; and to put other *Senses* and *Constructions* upon them.

But then to *Conclude* from all this, That they are not so much as *Call'd* so, after all the *Pains* he has taken to shew in what *Sense* they are *Call'd* so, is such an *Assurance* as *Contradicts* it self! Has he not own'd that *Christ* is *call'd* the *Word* of *God*? And is it not said in Express words, *Joh.* 1. 1. That the *Word* was *God*? And *ver.* 14. *was made Flesh*? Is it not said, 2. *Cor.* 3. 17. *The Lord is that Spirit*? And is not the *Spirit* then Call'd *God*? In what *Sense* is not now the *Question.*

Christ call'd *God.*

The H. *Spirit* call'd *God.*

That

That we have seen already. But he says, they are not so much as *Call'd* so.

SOC. I have now Heard you to the *Answers* my *Author* gives to those *Texts* alleag'd by the *Trinitarians* in *Proof* of the *Trinity* and *In-Carnation.* It is fit you shou'd likewise *Answer* to those *Texts* he brings in *Dis-Proof* of them. For this Compleats the Work.

CHR. In what I have done Already, I hope I have not only Clear'd those *Texts* against which he Disputes, as to their own Genuine *meaning*; but have likewise shew'd, That our *Interpretation* of those *Texts* is supported by the Current *Sense* of the most Orthodox *Fathers* before the *first Council* of *Nice*; and Consequently *Vindicated* the *Ante-Nicene Faith* against the *Allegations* of your *Author.*

That the *Trinity* was the *Doctrin* of the *Church* before the *first Council* of *Nice*, Prov'd from *Lucian.*

But before I come to those *Texts* which he Alleges on his side, Let me Add to the *Testimonies* of the *Fathers* I have Quoted one *Evidence* of a Bitter *Enemy* to *Christianity*, the *Vile* but *Ingenious LUCIAN*, who Liv'd about 170 years after *Christ.* A Man of his *Sagacity*, and who took upon him to *Ridicule* the *Christian Faith*, cou'd not but know what it was, as *Then* generally *Own'd* and *Profess'd* by *Christians.* Especially if (as St. *Jerom* in *Catal.* tells us) that he was once a *Christian*, and turn'd *Apostat.* Among other his *Reproaches* upon *Christianity* he has these words in his *Philopatris*,

God Reigning on High, Great, Eternal, Heavenly, the Son of the Father, the Spirit proceeding from the Father, one out of Three, and Three out of one—— I know not what thou say'st; One that is Three, and Three that are one.

Ὑψιμέδοντα Θεὸν, μέγαν, ἄμβροτον, οὐρανίωνα, υἱὸν Πατρὸς, πνεῦμα ἐκ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, ἓν ἐκ τριῶν, καὶ ἐξ ἑνὸς τριάδα· οἶδα δὲ τί λέγεις, ἓν τρία, τρία ἕν.

Some

Some Learned Men think that the *Philopatris* was not wrote by *Lucian*, but by ſome other about the Year 261. Which anſwers my End as well, to Prove the Doctrine of the *Trinity* to have been Receiv'd in the *Church* before the firſt Council of *Nice*. And next I will go with you to the *Texts* alledg'd on your ſide.

THE

THE

FOURTH DIALOGUE.

A General *Answer* as to the *Texts* Urg'd by the *Socinians*, against the *Divinity* of *Christ*.

(1.) *SOC.* THese begin in the *History*, p. 4. where several *Texts* are Quoted to Prove that the *Father* is Greater than *Christ*.

XVII The *Texts* urg'd by the *Socinians* against the *Divinity* of *Christ*

CHR. That is answer'd in the *Athanasian* Creed. That *Christ* is *Equal* to the *Father*, as touching His *God-Head*, and *Inferior* to the *Father* as touching His *Man-hood*. To which I will add, from our Discourse, That He is *Equal* to the Father in *Nature*, but *Inferior* in the *Order* of Nature, or in *Relation*. And this answers all the *Reasons* and *Scriptures* he produces to §. 7. p. ii. wherein he speaks of Christs *Human Infirmities* and *Death*; for these things befell *Christ* in His *Human* Nature, wherein He was a *Creature*, *Passible*, *Improvable*, *Rewardable*, &c.

SOC. But §. 7. he proves *Christ* to be a distinct *Person* from *God*. For which I suppose you thank him; but I see not how it serves his Cause. p. 11.

(2.) But

(2.) But at the End of this §. p. 12 he intermixes an
p. 12. Argument from *Reason* and argues thus. *'Tis (say the Socinians) as impossible that the Son or Image of the one true God, shou'd Himself be that one true God, as that the Son shou'd be the Father, and the Image that very thing whose Image it is; which they take to be simply Impossible, and Contradictory to common Sense, which Religion came not to Destroy, but to Improve*

CHR. What I have said to you appears the clearer for this Objection: And shews his mistakes. First, he calls the *Son* the *Image* of *God*. If by the word *God* here, The *Father* be meant (as it is often) then what he says is true, but then ther is no consequence in it, and the *Fallacy* will appear by putting the word *Father* instead of the word *God*. For Example: *'Tis as impossible that the Son or Image of the Father shou'd himself be that Father, as that the Son shou'd be the Father, and the Image that very thing whose Image it is.* All which is very true, but makes nothing to his purpose.

But now, if by the word *God*, you mean the *one God-head*, or the *Divine Nature*, then his Assertion is a mistake, *viz.* That the *Son* is the *Image* of *God*. In this Sense, He is not the *Image* of *God*, for He Himself *is God*. But he is the Image of the *Father*, from whom He took His *Nature*, and therefore tho' He has the same *Nature* with the *Father*, yet he *is not the Father*. And we see the same in the Parallel of *Mankind*. I put
Gen. 5. 3. a Case. *Adam* begat a Son in his own *Likeness*, after his *Image*, and call'd his name *Seth*. And the word *Adam* signifies *Man*, and sometimes is taken to mean *Man*, that is *Mankind* in General or the *Human Nature*, and sometimes it means only the *First-Father*, who had that for his particular *Name*. In which Sense only it is that *Seth* can be call'd the *Son* or *Image* of *Man*, that is, of his *Father* Adam. But otherwise he cannot be said to be the *Son* or *Image* of *Man*, for he himself is *Man*, and he cannot

cannot be his own *SON*, or *IMAGE*. But the terms of *Father* and *Son* respect only the *Persons*, not the *Nature* of *Man*; and thus it is in *God*. And our *Author's* mistake arises from not Considering aright of this *Unity* of *Nature*, and *Diversity* of *Persons*, which appear visibly both in the *Divine Nature*, and in the *Human*, which was made after its *Image* and *Likeness*.

SOC. At the End of §. 7. p. 13. he promises many Considerations and Passages of *Scripture*, which no less than *Demonstrat* it to be false, that *Christ* is *God*. And the Demonstration is this, §. 8. Because so many *Texts* expressly declare, that, *only the Father* is God. p. 13.

(3.) The first he brings is, *John* 17. 1, 2, 3. *Father, this is Life Eternal, that they know Thee, The only True God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent.* Here, the *Father* is call'd, The *only* True God.

CHR. But ther is a vast Difference 'twixt saying, that *He is the only true God*, and that *He only is the true God*. There is but *one only true God*, or one *Divine Nature*; and each of the *Persons* do partake of this *Nature*, that is, is this *one only true God*. But then you must not say of any of the *Persons*, that *He only* is this *God*, because the other *Persons* do partake of the same *Nature*, and so are the same *God*. So that the word *only* makes nothing in this Argument. And saying the *only* true God means no other than if he had said, the *True God*, or *God* single, without either the word *True*, or *only*: For we all agree, that ther is but *one, True*, God. These are the attributes which belong to the Divine *Nature*, and Consequently to every *Person* who partakes of it: And therefore they do not Distinguish one *Person* from another, nor are they meant in any such Sense in this *Text*.

(4.) *SOC*. The next *Text* is 1. Cor. 8, 6. *But to us there is but one God, The Father, of whom are all things.*

CHR. We say there is but *One God*: and that the *Father* is *that God*. And this *Text* says no more. *The Father of whom are all things* means *God* in this *Nature*, which includes the whole *Trinity*; and sometimes it is taken *personally* to mean only the *Father*, as has been already discours'd. And this will answer the other *Texts* he there brings.

(5.) *SOC.* §. 9. and 10. p. 14. and 15. He objects, why *Christ* shou'd have the assistance of the *Holy Ghost*,
p. 14. 15. He Himself being *God* the *Son*.

CHR. Christ did submit himself to all the Infirmities of *our Nature* that cou'd be distinguisht from *Sin*. For He came to be an *Example* to *us*. Which he had not been, if his *Divinity* had Exerted it self to the *Utmost*. Therefore he was *perfected*, as we are, by the *Unction* of the *Holy Ghost*. Receiv'd *Baptism* from *John the Baptist*, and *fulfill'd* all *Righteousness*, or *Constitutions* and *means* of *Righteousness* to which *other men* were *Oblig'd*. He *Increast* in *Wisdom*; and ascrib'd to the *Father* and to the *Holy Ghost* the *works* which He did. Nay more, He submitted to receive *Comfort* and *Assistance* from *Angels*, and to be *supply'd* in his Temporal *Necessities* from the *ministry* of *men* and *women*. In short, to be *despis'd suffer*, *dye*, and be *buried*. Leading us thro' every step of our way to *Heaven*. Thus thereby approving Himself to be the *Captain* of our *Salvation*, as the *Scripture*
Heb. 2. 10. speaks, *For it became Him for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many Sons into Glory to make the Captain of their salvation perfect, thro' suffe-*
17. *ring——Wherefore in all things it behoved Him to be made like unto His Brethren.*

(6.) *SOC.* § ii. p. 15, He says, if *Christ* had been more
p. 15. than a *man*, the *Prophesies* of the *old Testament*, wou'd not have describ'd Him *barely*, as the *seed* of the *woman*, the *seed* of *Abraham*, and a *Prophet* like unto *Moses*.

CHR.

CHR. This must be a willfull Mistake in our *Author*: Because he pretends to Answer many *Texts* in the *Old Testament* which do plainly speak *Christ* to be *more than Man*: For Example, when Christ was Prophesy'd of in these words. *Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given—— He shall be call'd Wonderfull, Councellor, The mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. A Virgin shall Conceive, and Bare a Son, and shall call His Name Immanuel.* That is *God* with us. *Is.* 9. 6. 7. 7. 14.

The Lord said unto my Lord. By which *Christ* prov'd, That He must be more than the Son of a *Man*. *If David call Him Lord how is He his Son?* And this *Argument* was so plain as to silence the very obstinat *Jews*. *Psal.* 110. 1. *Matt.* 22. 45.

SOC. But he answers these *Texts* afterward, and thinking them of no force, he does not quote them now.

CHR. That is begging the Question. However without naming these, he shou'd not have said, That ther was nothing in the *Old Testament*, which spoke of *Christ* otherwise then as a *Man*: Or that it describ'd Him *barely* as a Man. The contrary to which himself must know.

These are all his Arguments against the *Divinity* of *Christ*. Let us see his Proofs as to the *Holy Ghost*. They begin p. 16. And there he immediatly falls into his old contradictions of proving the Holy-Ghost *to be God*, and, *not to be God*; *to be a Person*, and, *not to be a Person*. And which is extraordinary, he proves both by the very same Argument. The Arguments of the *Socinians* against the *Divinity* of the *Holy Ghost*. p. 16.

(1.) He says, that the *Holy-Ghost*, or *Holy Spirit*, is to be taken *in the same Sense that we Commonly* say the *Holy-Wisdom*, or *Holy-Will* of God, or as he said before. p. 16. the *Power* of God; *and that they are spoken of, as one and the same thing.* p. 18. That the *H. Ghost* is only the *Power* or *Wisdom* of *God*. p. 16.

And here (without his intention no doubt) he has falne upon the very division of the *Faculties* of the *Soul*, and of the *Persons* of *God*, *Power*, *Wisdom*, *Will*.

But

But now to his proofs. Where he ſpeaks conſiſtently to himſelf, he goes nearer to prove The *Trinity*, than what he himſelf wou'd be at p. 83. which we have Quoted before, he proves that *God's Word*, or *Wiſdom* and *Power*, *is not ſomething Different from God*; *but*, *being His Wiſdom and Power*, *is God*,

p. 17. And yet here p. 17. he ſays, that a *Manifeſt diſtinction is made*, *as between* GOD *and* CHRIST, *ſo alſo between* GOD *and the* HOLY SPIRIT.

By the *Holy-Spirit*, as he tells us, is meant Gods *Power*, and *Wiſdom*, and *Will*.

Theſe he makes to be *God*. And to be manifeſtly diſtinct from *God*. And then theſe Three, *Power*, *Wiſdom*, *Will*, Are the very three *Perſons* in *God* which we have deſcrib'd.

This in him was being led near the *Trinity*, even while he was diſputing againſt it.

And it appears yet more in this, that when he endeavours to get off from this, he falls into manifeſt contradictions. For example, he ſays, p. 16. *That the Holy-Ghoſt*, *or Spirit*, *is only the Power of God*, *at leaſt not himſelf God*. And p. 17. *that 'tis impoſſible the Spirit ſhou'd be God himſelf*.

And yet as before is ſaid, p. 83. he gives the ſame reaſon, why the *Word* is not any thing Different from *God*, becauſe it is the *Power* of *God*, which is *God*. Here the *Spirit* or *Power* of God, *is God*. p. 17. *it is impoſſible the* SPIRIT *ſhou'd be God*.

The matter was this, p. 83. The *Word* muſt be the ſame with the *Power*, and the *Power*, the ſame with *God*, to get over that unanſwerable Text. *The word was God*.

But p. 17. The *Holy-Ghoſt* muſt be Different from *God*, to Hinder Him from being *God*.

And theſe contradictions are no way reconcilable but in the True notion of *One God*, and *Different Perſons*.

SOC.

SOC. The Spirit is obtain'd for us of God, by our Prayers; therefore it is not God. Luk. 11. 13. *How much more shall your Heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?* If we say, these Texts are so be understood, not of the *Person* of the *Holy Ghost*, but of His *Gifts* and *Graces*; The *Socinians* readily confess it, but they say also, that if the *Holy Spirit* were at all a *Person*, much more a *God*, His Gifts and Graces wou'd be bestow'd by Himself.

(2.) That the *Spirit* is Obtain'd of *God* by our Prayers. *Hist.* p. 19.

CHR. If they be *His* Gifts, they must be Bestow'd by Himself, else they were not *His* Gifts; for my Gifts is what I my self Bestow, not what another man Bestows: So, that your very Argument confutes its self.

2dly. They are Expressly call'd *His* Gifts, and that they are *Bestow'd* by *Him.* 1. Cor. 12. 8. *For to one is Given, by the Spirit, the Word of Wisdom; to another the Word of Knowledge, by the same Spirit; to another Faith, by the same Spirit; to another the Gifts of Healing, by the same Spirit; to another the working of Miracles; to another Prophesie; to another Discerning of Spirits; to another Divers kinds of Tongues; to another the Interpretation of Tongues: But all these worketh that one and the self same Spirit, Dividing to Every Man severally as He Will.*

Now as to the seeming Difficulty How these Graces shou'd be the Gifts both of the Father and the *Spirit*, they being two *Persons*, it is easily answer'd by their being *One God*; whereby, as before told, all the Three Persons are Joint as in their *Natures*, so in all their *Operations*; tho' yet some Operations are more *Peculiarly*, but not *Exclusively*, attributed to one than to another.

And this is Remarkable in this very Chapter. vers. 4, 5, 6. where a *Trinity* of *Persons*, and *sorts of Gifts* are plainly Distinguish'd. *Now there are Diversities of* GIFTS, *but the same* SPIRIT; *And there are Differences of* Administrations, *but the same* Lord; *and there are Diversities*

ties of Operations *but it is the same* God, *who worketh all in all.* Here *Gifts* are attributed more Peculiarly to the *Spirit*, who *Inspires* Us; *Administrations* to the *Lord*, who *Governs* Us; and *Operations* to *God*, who Gives Us Power to *Work*, who *works all in all* in Us.

But now, to turn your Argument upon you, I desire to know, how you will Reconcile the *Father*'s and the *Holy Ghost*'s bestowing Gifts, without making them several Persons? That is, how the *Holy Ghost* cou'd bestow Gifts if He were not a *Person*? For our Discourse now is only of Him. And if He were only the *Gift*, and not the *Giver*, He cou'd not be said to *Bestow*. A *Gift* does not *Bestow* it self.

Lastly, *Reconcile* or *Condemn* your own *Sects*, who own the Holy *Ghost* to be a *Person*; and *Bidle* in his *Confession of Faith*, *Artic.* 6. of the *Holy Ghost*, calls Him Expresly, *The Third Person in the Holy Trinity.*

That no *Prayers* are made to the *Spirit.*

(3.) *SOC.* In the same place he says, That in the Scripture no *Prayers* are made to the *Spirit.*

CHR. Wherever *God* is Invok'd, the *Spirit* is Invok'd. Nay more, He is often included in the term of *Father*, when ever we say *our Father*, by which the *whole Trinity* is meant, who are jointly the *Father* of all *Creatures*, but this has been observ'd before.

SOC. §. 4. p. 19. he says, *The Scripture speaks of God as but one Person.*

CHR. That is, where the Scripture speaks of *one God*, he wou'd have it imply'd, That ther is but one *Person* in *God*; which the Scripture no where says.

That *God* is spoke in the *Singular* Number. p. 20

(4.) *SOC.* p. 20. he lays stress upon *God* being spoke of in the *singular Number*, which he thinks cou'd not be, if He had *three Persons.*

CHR. This is no more than saying *God* is *one*, which the *Trinitarians* assert as much as he. But *God* is likewise spoke of in the *plural Number.* As, let *Us* make Man, *Gen.* 1. 26, &c.

SOC.

SOC. He ſays, that is according to the ſtile of a *Prince*, who ſays, *We* do this or that, when it means only himſelf.

CHR. I deny that it means only himſelf. A *Prince* takes that Stile to ſhew he does nothing *by himſelf*, that is, without *Council* or *Advice*, and therefore his Acts are the Acts of a *great many*; Or as he is a *Body Politick*, which implies a *great many*, all of whom He *Repreſents*. And I ſuppoſe, none will ſay, that any of theſe Reaſons has place in *God*. And therefore it is very Ridiculous, as well as Falſe-Reaſoning, to paſs over the moſt weighty and ſerious ſtile of *Scripture*, upon the *Complements* or *Infirmities* of *Princes*.

SOC. But he gives an Inſtance of St *Paul*, who was no *Prince*, nor Temporal Great Man, who wrote 2 Cor. 10. 2. *Some think of us as if we walk'd according to the Fleſh*, which, he ſays, St. *Paul* means *of himſelf only*. p. 25.

CHR. I muſt ask his Pardon. It ſeems plain to me by thoſe words, that St. *Paul* ſpoke of a ſcandal rais'd againſt more than himſelf, againſt the *Chriſtians*, or the *Apoſtles*. Which is undeniable from the two next *Verſes*. For, ſays he, *tho' we walk after the Fleſh, we do not war after the Fleſh: for the Weapons of our Warfare are not Carnal.* Does the Apoſtle think we mean *his own warfare only*, or not rather the *Chriſtian Warfare*?

SOC. But tho' *Princes* ſometimes ſtile themſelves in the *Plural* Number, Yet he ſays, *No Inſtance can be given in any Language, where more Perſons are meant by the Singular Number, as, I, THOU, ME, HIM*, &c. He ſays, *ſuch ſpeaking is contrary to Cuſtom, Grammar, and Senſe, which are the Laws of Speech: Therefore the Holy Scripture always ſpeaking thus of God, either he is only one Perſon; or the Scripture are one continued Ungrammatical Solicism and Impropriety, and that in the chief Article of Faith; which no reaſonable or good man can or ever will allow.* p. 20. p. 2[illegible]

CHR. Which no *Reasonable*, *Good* or *Modest* man wou'd assert in terms so *Irreverend* of the *Holy Scriptures*, and *God* their *Author*; and in such sulsome assurance of his own Wit.

And after all, this is not true. For in common Discourse the *singular* number is as oft put for the *plural*, as the *plural* for the *singular*.

It is as common to say, Such a *King* March'd, or Fought, or Retreated, by which his *whole Army* is meant; as to stile himself *Us* and *We*.

When we say, *Man* fell, Christ came to redeem *Man*: Do you mean only some one particular *Man*? Or by this *Singular* Number are not *many men* meant?

But now give me leave to Retort this argument upon him. What Grammar will he find for God's calling *Himself*, *Us*, and saying *one* of *Us*, The man is become as *one* of *Us*. Abraham speaking to three Persons, to say, My *Lord*, if I have found favour in *Thy* sight —Pass not from *Thy* Servant, But—wash *your* feet, and rest your *selves*— and comfort your *hearts*— And *They* said, where is thy Wife? And *He* said, *I* will certainly return unto thee— And the *Men* rose up, and the *Lord* said. Shall *I* hide from Abraham what *I* do?

Gen. 3. 22. 18. 3. 4. 9. 10. 16. 17.

Here are *three* men spoke of, and spoke to both in the *singular* and *plural* numbers promiscuously. This is odd sort of *Grammar*.

By what Rule of Grammar will he construe this Sentence?

John. 8. 58. 59. *Before Abraham was, I am.* He wou'd do as the Jews did, if he durst, cast stones at *Christ* for such Nonsense or Blasphemy. And now must the Scripture be *one continu'd ungrammatical Solicism, and Impropriety, and that in the chief Article of Faith*, because these and the like Expressions are out of the Road of common speaking, and will not fit our poor Circumstances?

Or

Or if it must be so, unless these sayings are reconcil'd, and if they cannot be reconcil'd to common Sense, but by the Doctrin of the *Trinity*; Then here is an Invincible Argument for the *Trinity*, made out of this Objection; and that by conforming *not only to Grammar, but to the Custom of all Nations which understand to speak Intelligibly and Sensibly.* With which excellent Rule our Author ends this Paragraph, beginning of p. 22, And all that he has to say out of Scripture, against the *Deity* of the *Holy Ghost*.

SOC. He comes next to the *Creed*. And says, the *Son* and *Holy Ghost* are not call'd *God* in the *Apostles Creed*. Objection from the *Creed*. p. 22.

SOC. God is nam'd at first as a *Nature* or *Species* to *Individuals*. *I believe in God.* Then the several *Persons* follow in their order. *The Father. His Son. The Holy Ghost.* That the word *God* was not apply'd to each of them is no Objection; our way of speaking at this Day being the same. As when we say: God the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*, wherein the *Nature* of *God* is intended to descend to the *Second* and *Third* Person; And if this be sufficient with us, to express our meaning, it was much more so, before the *Arians* had disturb'd the doctrin of the *Trinity*; which occasion'd a farther Explication of it in the *Nicen* and *Athanasian* Creeds.

Let me once more retort upon this Author, and ask him what tolerable Sense, he will make of this *Creed* upon his Scheme? That is, supposing the *Holy Ghost* to be nothing different from God, more than a man's *power* or *wisdom* differs from *himself*. Then he must give us some good Reason, how believing in the *Holy Ghost* Came to be a distinct Article by it self, from that of believing in the *Father*? And put at that distance from Him too, as to have more than two thirds of the whole *Creed* interpose. As to say, I believe in a *Man*; And I believe likewise in his *Spirit*. Which is the same, as to believe likewise in *Himself*.

I doubt this wou'd not pass *according to the Custom of all Nations which understand to speak Intelligibly and Sensibly.*

To divide *a man* betwixt *Himself* and his *Spirit*, and to make two *Articles* of these, that may do something; because a *man* has a *Body* and a *Spirit*, and they may be divided. But to divide *God*, who is all *Spirit*, betwixt *Himself* and His *Spirit*! And to put in the *Son* betwixt them! And to make *three* Articles of these, cannot be put into Sensible or Intelligible Language, by the Custom of any Nations yet extant.

Nor cou'd they think this *an accountable and reasonable Faith*, as our Author inferrs the *Socinians* to be, from this their Excellent and plain exposition of the *Creed*. p. 24, 25.

And now as a Conclusion §. 6. p. 24. he in a *meek* and *modest* way tells the *Trinitarians* that their Faith is *absurd*, and contrary both to *Reason* and *to it Self*, and therefore not only *False*, but *Impossible*; that it is, of all others the most *Brutal*; and that not to Discern it, is not to be a *man*, &c. But of this sort of Treatment we have Plentifull Store in your Author.

XVIII. The pretence of the *Socinians* to *Antiquity*.

SOC. You have Quoted Several of the *Fathers* before *Nice* on your Side: We have as *Ancient* on our Side: And it is fit our *Evidence* shou'd be heard as well as yours. Our *History* says, p. 26. *They whom we now call SOCINIANS*, were by the Fathers and first *Ages of Christianity call'd NAZARENS. They were also in those first times* call'd *Ebionites*, *Mineans*, *Samosatenians*, and several other Names he there reckons up.

CHR. They were so call'd, and Condemn'd as *Heretics*. Behold the *Fathers* of your *Church*! Hist. p. 26.

But He joins the *Arians* with the *Orthodox* against all these, and says, that, *The writings of these Ancients are all lost, being destroy'd by the* ARIANS and CATHOLICKS.

So

So that the *Arians* were Enemies to these *Ancients*, which will break their Succession mightily, or make it run under ground for many Centuries, till it broke out again in *Socinus* Fifteen Hundred Years after Christ.

SOC. But what do you say to the several names by which they were call'd in the Primitive times?

CHR. They were the names of several *Hereticks*, as you will find in *Irenæus*, *Eusebius*, *Theodoret*, *Epiphanius*, and others: And they stand to this day Condemn'd as such by the whole *Christian Church*. I cannot Imagine what advantage your Author proposes by this.

Neither does he tell us the opinion of these *Ancient Hereticks*, as to the Question in hand, how they agree with the *Socinians*, and yet deserv'd to be persecuted, and have their Books burnt by the *Arians*.

But that is no matter. The names are old names, and sound like Antiquity; and every body will not examine whether they were *Fathers* or *Hereticks*: but think this Opinion of the *Socinians* has been very *Ancient*.

But if Antiquity alone wou'd do his Business, I can help him to an Elder precedent than any of these: *Simon Magus* was the first broacher of this Doctrin, and Father of all the Hereticks he has nam'd.

St. *John* says, that many of these false Prophets were gone out into the World in his time: And tells you, what their Opinion was, viz. *That Jesus Christ was not come in the Flesh*. And he calls this *the Spirit of Anti-Christ, which was to come into the World*; and it is the same with the *Socinian* Opinion. That Christ had no Being before he was born of the Virgin: and therefore cou'd not come in the Flesh. This Opinion was against the *Arian* as well as the *Orthodox*, and not Reviv'd till *Socinus*. 1 John 4. 1, 2, 3.

SOC.

p. 157. *SOC.* Our Author tells you, that that is not the meaning of that Text of St. *John*, but that this saying, *Came in the Flesh* (or, *in Flesh*, for so 'tis in the *Greek*) is oppos'd to these false Prophets and Teachers, that affirm'd Christ had not a Real Body of Flesh and Blood, but a *Spiritual*, and consequently was not a true Man, nor the Off-spring of *David*. On the contrary, St. *John* here teaches that Christ is come in Flesh, or in the Flesh, that is, was cloathed with a Real Body of Real Flesh.

CHR. I grant that St. *John*'s Words are full against these Hereticks. But will that excuse you? This Text is so worded, as to Detect you both. For St. *John* does not only say, that Christ was Flesh, but that He *came* in that Body of Flesh.

SOC. I told you, That means no more than that he was *cloathed with a Body of Flesh.*

CHR. But the Text says that He *Came.*

SOC. Yes. He came so cloathed.

CHR. Must He not exist then before He came, and was so clothed? Was it nothing that *came*, or *was cloathed*? Your *Socinians* confess that *Christ* was *Flesh*; but you deny that He *came* to take Flesh upon Him, for you say, that He had no Being before He was made Flesh. But
Gal. 4. 4. the Scripture says, that God *sent* forth His Son, made of
Phil. 2. 7. a Woman, and that Christ *took upon Him* the form of a Servant, and was made in the likeness of Men. Cou'd He take this form and likeness upon Him before he had a Being? St. *John* says not only that *Christ* was *Flesh*, but that He was *in the Beginning with God*, was *sent* by God *to take upon Him* our Flesh, that He *came* from God to do it, and that to deny that He *came*, is to be an *Antichrist*, and how He cou'd *come* and be *sent*, and *take upon Him* the form or likeness of Men, and yet be nothing, as you say, before He was Born, this lies upon you to Explain.

SOC.

SOC. I have told you all my Author ſays. But give me leave to purſue it a little farther: Is it not a Common ſaying, That ſuch a man is *Come* of ſuch a Family? Yet this does not ſuppoſe that he had any Being, or that he really *came* before he was born.

CHR. I think it does. You cou'd not ſay a Child is Born, if it were not a Child before it was Born. But you cou'd not ſay, that Child took upon him the form of a man: A man does not take upon him his own Being.

SOC. But *Levi* is ſaid to be in the Loyns of his Father, before he was born, and that the Jews *came* out of the Loins of *Abraham*. Heb. 7. 10, 5.

CHR. And is not that literally true?

SOC. It is true only as to the matter of their Bodies: For that really *Came* from their Fathers. The Soul is ſuppos'd by a Figure which takes the Part for the Whole.

CHR. But Chriſt, you confeſs, came not by Corporal Generation, therefore He muſt come ſome other way. And muſt as really exiſt before He was Born, as the matter of my Body did exiſt before I was Born.

SOC. The ſubſtance of his *Body* He took from His *Mother*, by which He was the *Seed* of *David*.

CHR. But ſomething He took likewiſe from His *Father*, by which you confeſs He is truely call'd the *Son* of *God*. So that what He took from His *Father* muſt exiſt before He was Born, as much as what He took from His Mother did exiſt before.

SOC. You ſay, That what He took from His Father, was from Eternity.

CHR. Yes. But that ſubſtance which He took from His Father, being Join'd to the ſubſtance which He took from His Mother, is what we call His *Incarnation*. As Generation is not the Begetting of a Soul, but the

the Joyning it to a Body. And without this you cannot verify the Form which you your selves allow, That He was *Begotten* of God. For there is Difference 'twixt *Creation* and *Generation*. We are all *Created* by God, and are His Sons in that Sense. But Christ only is His *Begotten* Son, by which He partakes of His *Substance*, and His whole and perfect *Nature* as all *Begotten* Sons do among us.

SOC. At this rate Christ was twice Generated, once from *Eternity*, and once at His *Incarnation*.

CHR. I grant it. For His Eternal substance which He took from His Father being, by the Operation of the Holy-Ghost, Join'd in one Person with the Human substance which He took from His Mother, is call'd His *Incarnation*. And is likewise call'd *Generation*, as he is call'd my Father who is the Instrument of Joining my Soul and Body together, not that he begets my Soul, or it comes from him otherwise than as Joining it into one Person with my Body. Thus *Christ* is not the *Son* of *His own Spirit*, otherwise than as it found His *Flesh* in the Womb of the Virgin, and join'd it to His *Person*.

SOC. But why was His *Human* Generation perform'd by the *Holy Ghost*, whereas His *Eternal* Generation was from the *Father only*, as you say?

CHR. Do not think I will take upon me to Explain all the Hidden Mysteries of God, and this does no ways concern the subject we are upon; only that it proves demonstrably, That the *Holy Ghost* is *God*, because if he were not, *Christ* cou'd not be call'd the *Son of God* from His being a *Person*. For *Begetting* is the most *Personal* action can be Imagin'd: *Naked Qualities* cannot Beget a man. Whatever *Begets* must have *Substance*; Therefore the Holy Ghost must be a *Substance*, and must be *God*, because what He Begot is *for that reason*, call'd the *Son*
Luk. 1. 25. *of God*, and *Christ* must likewise be *God*, because he partakes

partakes of the *Substance* of *God*. For, as before is said, this is the Difference twixt *Creation* and *Generation*; in *Creation* we partake of such substance as God pleases to give us; But *Generation* is partaking of *his own Substance* who *Generats* us.

SOC. Then Christ partakes of two Substances of God. Of the *Fathers* Substance in His *Eternal* Generation, and of the *Holy Ghost*'s in His *Human* Generation.

CHR. The Substance of God is not *Divided* among the Divine Persons. There is but *One Substance* or *Nature* which exists in three Distinct *Subsistences* or *Persons*, as has been said before. And this Substance being, by the Operation of the third Person, United to a Human Substance, is truely *Generation*.

SOC. Then Christ partakes of this Substance twice; once from the *Father* in His *Eteranl* Generation, and once from the *Holy Ghost* in His *Human* Generation.

CHR. A Man cannot partake anew of what he has already. And the very word *Human* Generation, might set you right in this matter. For it was Christ's *Human* Substance which did partake, or was made one *Person* with His *Divine* Substance, by the Operation of the *Holy Ghost*, as on *Corporal* Substance partakes, or is made one *Person* with one *Soul* or *Spiritual* Substance, by Corporal Generation.

SOC. Can one Substance partake of another Substance.

CHR. Nothing else but Substance can partake of Substance, their being United so as to make up one *Person*, is call'd their partaking of one another. Christ did not take His *Divine* Substance from the *Holy Ghost*. But, by the Operation of the *Holy Ghost*, His *Divine* Substance was United into one *Person* with His *Human*

Substance, and His *Human* Substance did partake of His *Divine* Substance, by the operation of the *Holy Ghost*.

Thus, in respect of His *Divine* Substance, the *Holy Ghost* did Unite it to His *Human* Substance.

In respect of His *Human* Substance, the *Holy Ghost* did *Exalt* it into a *Personal Union* with His *Divine* Substance.

In both respects, He was *Begotten*, by the *Holy Ghost*. But in different manners, according to His different *Natures*. As is to be seen even in Human Generation. Thus far towards framing in our selves some notion of the Mysterious Generation of Christ in the Womb of the Virgin.

But there is an easier answer to the Objection, for you have heard in what has been said before, that in the Union of *Two Natures* in *One Person*, what ever belongs to *either* of the *Natures* is verify'd of the *whole Person*; as we say, that Man is *Mortal* because his *Body* is such, and as truely we say that he is *Immortal* because his *Soul* is such. And by this Rule we may truly say, That Christ was *Begotten* by the *Holy Ghost*, and was *His Son*, for so He was as to His *Human* Nature, and likewise that He was *not Son to the Holy Ghost*: But *only* to the *Father*, from whom *only* he took His *Divine* Substance, for that is true as to His *Divine* Nature, and both these are truly verify'd of His *Person*, which is both.

SOC. Let us now, if you please, return to our *History*: For my Author lays stress upon that. And it is not the least plausible part of his Book.

CHR. And there is nothing in his Book shews the weakness of his Cause more than this, for he there confesses, that, which, if he had deny'd, wou'd have been my greatest task to have prov'd against him. And that is, That the *Socinian* Opinion had been all along condemn'd in the *Church*, as *Heretical*; for all these were

Condemn'd

Condemn'd Hereticks whom he names, for that Opinion, in the first Ages of Christianity.

And to render them the more Condem'd, they Differ'd among themselves, even *in that Heresie*, as the *Socinians* do at this day. Besides other Gross and abominable Errors which the *Socinian-Unitarians* do abhor as much as we do. Of those who call'd themselves *Christians*, *Simon Magus* was the first who appear'd in Disgrace of the *Trinity*.

He was Converted and Baptiz'd by *Philip*. But had so contemptable an Opinion of the *Holy Ghost*, as to think He might be purchased with Mony. After this, falling from one Error into another, he at last set up his Whore *Helena* for the *Holy Ghost*, and Instituted beastly Carnalities for the Worship of God, wherin the Impure *Gnosticks* follow'd him: Who boasted themselves the greatest Men of *Reason*, whence they assum'd to themselves, the name of *Gnosticks*, from their Exceeding other Christians in *Knowlege*.

Acts 3. 13 20. Epiph. Hær. 21. Iren. adverf. Her. c. 1. l. 20.

The Denyal of the *Trinity* is ever attended with other Errors, which appeared in *Simon Magus*, who denying the *Trinity* did likewise hold that the World was made by *Angels*, held *Magic* and *Idolatry* Lawful, slighted the Law of *Moses* as not being from God, and allow'd of promiscuous Mariages and all sensuality.

The first our Author names in his List of the *Socinian* Fathers, are the *Nazarens*. A sort of Christians who affected that name Rather than to be nam'd after *Christ* or *Jesus*. *Epiphanius* tells us they were perfect *Jews*, they retain'd Circumcision, and the Iudaical Rites, and differ'd from the *Jews* only that they believ'd in *Christ*.

Id. Hær. 29. Theod. Hæret. Fab. l. 2. c. 2.

They us'd a Gospel which is call'd *the Gospel of Peter*.

The *Ebionites*, whom our Author reckons next, so called from *Ebion*, held that *Christ* was born of *Joseph* as well as of *Mary* (which our *Modern Socinians* do abhorr)

Ibid. c. 1. they liv'd according to the *Mosaical* Law, and receiv'd only the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, but they call'd the *Apostle* an *Apostat*. *Symmachus*, whom our Author mentions, was one of these that Translated the Old Testament out of *Hebrew* into *Greek*. Ther are others likewise who are call'd *Ebionites*, who in all other things agree with the former; but they say that Christ was born of a Virgin, they use only the Gospel according to *Matthew*, and observe both the *Jewish* and the *Christian Sabbath*. Irenæus (adverf. Hæref. l. 3. c. 4. p. 257.) reckons *Cerinthus*, and before him the *Nicolaitans*, who had been put in with the rest, but that they are nam'd *Rev.* 2. 15.

Ib. c. 8. He tells you that *Paulus* of *Samosata* was Condemn'd
Ib. c. 11. by an *Episcopal Council* Assembled in his own City of *Antioch*: And *Theodoret* says farther, that he publickly Renounc'd this Error.

And that by the Providence of God, these Heresies were so extinguished, that their very Names were not known to many.

But now it is thought a fit Season to Revive them again.

And since it must be. Behold the Original of the *Socinians*, and the *Fathers* of their *no Church!* Such Lewd and Scandalous Hereticks, as I am sure any Modest *Socinian* will start and be amazed when he shall reflect from what sort of Men he has deriv'd his Faith, and adventur'd to differ from the *whole Catholick Church* of *Christ*, not only *in this*, but in all *former Ages*.

Hist. p. 27. *SOC. Eusebius* (Histo. l. 5, c. 28.) and *Theodoret* (Hær. Fab. l. 2. c. de Artem.) say, that these *Nazarens* constantly affirmed, that they derived their Doctrin from the Apostles of our Lord, and that it was the general Doctrin of the Chutch, till the Popes *Victor* and *Zephyrin*, set themselves to root it up.

CHR.

CHR. They say that the *Nazarens* affirm'd this, and do not all Hereticks the same? Did ever any Man Condemn himself? Do not even *Quakers*, *Muggletonians*, and all pretend to the *Scripture*? Did not the *Devil himself* quote *Scripture* against our *Saviour*?

But why does not your Author tell how *Eusebius*, in the same Chapter, proves this their Allegation to be wholly false, and without any Ground? First from the *Scripture* it self, and next from those who wrote before *Victor* or *Zephyrin*, as *Justin*, *Miltiades*, *Tatianus*, and *Clemens*, *Irenæus*, *Melito* and many more in all whose Books the *Divinity* of *Christ* is Establish'd, that He is both true *God* and *Man*. And he stands in Admiration at the Impudence of these *Nazarens*, who cou'd pretend that this was the general Doctrin of the Church before *Victor* and *Zephyrin*.

He tells us likewise of another Practise of theirs, which is of great use to have discover'd, that is, That they did boldly adulterat the Holy Scriptures, and rejected the Rule of the Primitive Faith. And he proves this by a very strong Argument, *viz.* That their Copies did not agree among themselves, some of which he there reckons, as that of a *Asclepiades*, *Theodotus*, *Hermophilus*, and *Apollonius*, which last does not agree with it self, for these Copies which were written before, differ from those which he wrote afterward. And *Eusebius* says, That they cou'd not deny this to be done by them, because the Copies were written with their own hands, neither did they receive them from those who taught them the Christian Faith, nor cou'd they show the Copies out of which they transcrib'd theirs.

Therefor they plainly own'd that they had mended the Scriptures, adding some things, and taking away others, to make them more Intelligible. Nay, some of them did not only thus adulterat the Scriptures, but absolutely *Theod. Hær. Fab. l. 2. c. 5*

absolutely rejected the *Law* and the *Prophets*. Thus *Eusebius*, and *Theodoret*.

Hist. Unita. p. 27. p. 28. *SOC. Victor* (say the *Socinians*) began to persecute the Apostolick Doctrin of one God, or, what is the same, that God is one, in the Year 194. but with little Success, till that which was afterwards the Doctrin of the *Arians* grew into general Credit and Acceptance.

CHR. Victor Excommunicated these Hereticks, which your Author calls a *Persecution*. *Victor* himself was under Persecution of the *Roman* Government: And he had then no Civil Sword to Persecute any other.

SOC. My Historian says, That *Victor*'s, or other Indeavours had little Success against these *Nazarens*, &c.

CHR. Witness what you have heard just now out of *Theodoret*, That they were so bury'd in Oblivion as that their very names were not known to many. For which he rejoyces and blesseth God.

SOC. My Author names *Just. Martyr*, and *Origen*, as raising the Honour of the *Son* higher than the *plain and simple Doctrin of the Nazarens*; but yet not so high as the Council of *Nice*, by Attributing to the Son *Eternity*, &c.

CHR. Your Author Quotes nothing out of these *Fathers*. He requires us to take his Word. But I think I have given you sufficient Testimony of the Faith of both these *Fathers*, in our Examination of the *Texts* of *Scripture*. And if you wou'd have further Satisfaction, I refer you at your leasure to Dr. *Bull*'s *Defensio fidei Nicenæ*. Printed at *Oxford*. 1685. There *Sect.* 2. c. 9. you have *Origens* Doctrin as to the *Divinity* of the *Son* of *God* vindicated to be *Catholick*, and plainly agreeable to the *Nicene* Faith. And *Sect.* 3. c. 2. *Justin Martyrs* Doctrin as to the *Eternity* of the *Son* is explain'd.

SOC. Let us then proceed with our Author. He tells us a Lamentable story how Low they are now brought, that neither the *Nazeren* Faith, nor the *Arian*,

or

or *Nicene* (truly so call'd) are openly profest in the Territories of Christian Princes and States, except in a few obscure Towns.

CHR. Blessed be God, That the *Nazeren* and *Arian* Heresies have long been banish'd Christendom, almost as much as what *Theodoret* said, that their very names have not till of late been known to many, at least amongst Us.

But it is a sad and dismal Prospect of our Sins, that God suffers these Tares to appear now again; and this ought to bring us to speedy bethinking our selves, wherein we have faln short of our Christian Principles, and searching into those provocations, and returning from them, which otherwise may root up our Religion, and Destroy Christianity among us.

But with what Assurance can your Author put in the *Nicene* Faith as banish'd Christendom, with the *Nazaren* or *Socinian*, and the *Arian* Faith? Is not the Creed of that Council of *Nice* read in the Christian Churches.

SOC. You except the *Socinians* I hope.

CHR. They are no *Church.* Providence has not permitted them to come to the very name of a Christian *Church.* They look like a *Blot* or an *Objection* only in Christianity. The *Hist. Unitar.* tells us, That their Faith is no where openly profest in the Territories of *Christian* Princes and States, except in a few Cities of *Transilvania*, and some in the *United-Netherlands*, which allows of all *Religions*, that will advance *Trade.* He says there are many of them *in the Turkish, and other Mahometan and Pagan Dominions.* It seems God has banisht them from *Christendom*, only left some, as of the *Canaanites*, to keep us in exercise, least we shou'd forget our Christian War.

pag. 20.

pag. 30.

SOC. But tho' they are so low now yet they say in Ancient times they were much stronger. The *Arians* were very High once.

CHR.

CHR. Indeed God did suffer them to make great Inroads upon Christianity; and to have favour at Court, and raise Persecutions against the Othodox.

The Difference twix Arians *and* Socinians *and a comparison 'twixt* Socinianism *and* Mahometanism.

But he still most signally and Gloriously preserv'd The Faith, and, after some contests, Crown'd it with Victory over *Arius* and His Heresie to this Day.

And besides the *Modern Unitarians*, cannot be call'd *Arians*, nor have title *even to his* Antiquity.

Hist. *Unit.* P. 33.

The *Arians* say, That Christ was Generated *before the World*; and in process of time became Incarnat in our Nature.

The *Socinians* deny that He had any existence *before He was born* of Blessed Mary.

Again the *Arians* say, That the *Holy Ghost* is the *Creature* of the *Son*, and subservient to Him in the work of Creation.

And the *Socinians* say, The *Holy Spirit* is the *Power* and *Wisdom* of *God* which is God.

But Mr. *Bidle*, and those that follow him, take the *Holy Spirit* to be a *Person*, chief of the Heavenly Spirits, *prime Minister* of *God* and *Christ*.

But notwithstanding of these material Differences the Historian includs all these under the Name of *Unitarians*, because, says he, they agree in the principal Article, that there is *but one God*, or, *but one who is God.*

pag. 34.

And in this sense we claim the Name of *Unitarians* as much as any. None assert more than we the *Unity* of Gods *Nature*, which cannot be more than *One*; we say that is but *One God* or *One Nature* which is *God*. But whether that *Nature* may not admit of several *Persons*, is another Question, and medles not with the *Unity* of the *Nature*. But your Different Sets of *Unitarians* know not what to make of the Divine *Persons*, The *Socinans* Differ from the *Arians* both as to the *Son* and the *Holy Ghost*. And therefore can in no Justice derive

Derive themselves from them. Tho', if they cou'd, as will be further shewn, it wou'd do them little Service. But they neither have Unity with *Arius*, nor among themselves, no, not as to the Object of their Worship, they have not the same God; some of them, at this day, making the *Holy Ghost* to be *God*, others to be only a *Creature*. Some that he is a *Person*, others only as a *Quality*. &c.

SOC. But my Author says, that the *Arians* and *Socinians* esteem of one another as *Christian Brethren* and *True Believers*. p. 34.

CHR. It is impossible they shou'd think one another to be *True Believers*, unless all the bovesaid Opinions can be True, or that it is not Material whether the *Holy Ghost* be *God*, or a *Creature*; whether *Christ* had, or had not a Being with His Father before His Incarnation.

And for their being *Christian Brethren*; If it be only the word *Christ* that does it, then all who acknowlege the name of *Christ* must come in, let their Opinions of Him be what they will, tho' some think Him *God*, others only a *Man*.

The *Alcoran* speaks thus of Him. " The *Messiah*, *Jesus* " *the Son of Mary*, is a Prophet, and an Apostle of God, " His *Word*, and His *Spirit*, which He sent to *Mary*. Transl. English Lond. 1649. c. 4. p. 62. c. 3. p. 33.

" The Angels said to *Zachary*, thou shall have a Son " called *John*, he shall affirm the *Messias*, to be the " *Word* of God.

" The Angels said, O *Mary*, God declareth unto thee a " Word, from which shall proceed the *Messias*, named " *Jesus*—— or (as it is in the Latin Translation of D. *Pertus Abbas Cluniacensis* put out by *Theodor. Bibliander*) *O Maria tibi sumus nuncij gaudium cum verbo Dei, cujus nomen est CHRISTUS JESUS, filius Mariæ, Qui est facies omnium gentium, hoc sæculo futuro.*—— Here the *Alcoran* says, the name of the *Word* of *God* is *Christ Jesus*, p. 34. Azoara. 5. p. 23.

That He is the *Face of all Nations*, which the Annotator obſerves, to be a parallel Phraſe to the *Deſire* or *Expectation* of the *Gentiles*, and other like Appellations of Chriſt, *Gen.* 49. and Chap. 22. *Eſay.* ii. and *Zach.* 3. Hag. 2. And He is the Face of all Nations, ſays the *Alcoran*, *not only in this World*, but *in the World to come*.

So that if ſpeaking Great and Honourable things of *Chriſt* makes a man a *Chriſtian*, the *Mahometans* are as Good *Chriſtians* as the *Socinians*.

SOC. If they did acknowledge the *Scriptures*, it might go a great way.

CHR. They do acknowledge them, only they take the Liberty, as you do, to Interpret them Differently from the *Catholick Church*, Thus we read in the *Alcoran*.

c. 4. p. 51. *O you that have knowledge of the Scriptures! Believe in the Alcoran, that Confirmeth the old and new Teſtament.*

c. 5. p. 75. *He* (The Lord) *ſhall ſay to Jeſus, O Jeſus Son of Mary, remember thou my Grace towards thee and thy mother, I ſtrengthned thee with the Holy Ghoſt—— thee did I inſtruct in SCRIPTURE and Knowledge, the OLD TESTAMENT and the GOSPEL.* Again, *I will teach him the SCRIPTURE, the Myſteries of the Law the OLD TESTAMENT and the GOSPEL.* And the Common Appellation which the *Alcoran* gives to the *Jews* and *Chriſtians*, is, *O ye that know the SCRIPTURE!* And it provokes them to Diſpute out of the *SCRIPTURE. O ye that know the SCRIPTURE come with words alike——true between you and us; do I Worſhip other than God? Be ye Witneſſes that we believe in God, O ye that underſtand SCRIPTURE Diſpute not the Law of Abraham, to wit, if he Obſerv'd the OLD TESTAMENT, or the GOSPEL; they were taught after him, perhaps you will acknowlege your Error; O ye that have Diſputed what ye know not! Abraham was no Jew nor Chriſtian, he profeſſed the Unity of God, he was a true Believer, and not of the number of Infidels.*

c. 3. p. 34. p. 35.

The

The People, and particularly those that follow'd him of his Time, as also the Prophet MAHOMET, and all true Believers have known the Truth of his Law——O ye that know the SCRIPTURE! Do not Maliciously conceal the Commandments of God—— Observe exactly what you have learn'd in SCRIPTURE, and what you read——Remember—— that He (God) taught you SCRIPTURE and knowlege, and that after this came a Prophet, that confirm'd the Doctrine that was taught you, that you might believe His Words. p. 34.

These are the words of the *Alcoran*: And you see they make no more of *Mahomet*, than a Prophet who succeeded *Christ*, as *Christ* succeeded *Moses*. And as *Christ* confirm'd *Moses* Law, so *Mahomet* Confirms the *Gospel* of *Christ*. The latter still confirms the former. *Say to them*, (says the same Chapter of the Alcoran) *we believe* p. 37 *in God, in what He hath inspired into us, in what He inspired into ABRAHAM, ISMAEL, ISAAC, JACOB, and the TRIBES, in what was ordained by MOSES, by JESUS, and generally all the Prophets from God.——Such as shall be Impious towards JESUS having believ'd the BOOKS OF MOSES, and shall augment their impiety against MAHOMET, shall Err Eternally.* And there is a great Deal more to the same purpose.

SOC. At this rate they advance *Christ* beyond *Mahomet*.

CHR. Only, That *Mahomet* was a later Prophet, and so the last Messenger from Heaven. Otherwise they do not speak such things of him as they do of *Christ*. They acknowledge *Christ* to be born of a Virgin, by the Operation of God, in the same terms with the Scripture; They say not so of *Mahomet*, whom they do not call the *Messias*, the *Word of God*, and the *Face*, or Lord of *the World to come*, as you have heard the *Alcoran* speak of the *Lord Christ*.

SOC. Wherein then do they differ from the *Christian* Church?

CHR. In the same points which the *Socinians* do. They allow not the *Trinity* nor *Divinity* of *Christ*. And they Interpret those Texts which speak of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation* of the *Word*, as the *Socinians* do.

Alcoran p. 34. And they acknowledge not the *Satisfaction* of Christ, but they put him into the *number of Intercessors with His Divine Majesty:* Which are exactly the *Socinian* Tenets.

And I wou'd not have you asham'd of it, but accept *Mahomet* for one of the Fathers of *Socinianism* He is not half so Scandalous, nor so Heterodox as *Ebion*, and *Theodotian*, and that string of Hereticks whom your Historian has muster'd up for the Primitive Founders of *Socinianism* in its purity. Some of these us'd a different *Gospel* from ours, others rejected all our Scripture, but some parcel that pleas'd themselves, they corrupted the Scripture, and it being Prov'd upon them under their Hands, they call'd it *Mending* and *Improving* the Scripture. Some of them wou'd not allow *Christ* to be Born of a Virgin, but that He was begot by *Joseph*, as other Men are. And many other things which I will shew you by and by, and which grate the Ears *even of a Socinian* now,

Mahomet is much more *Christian* than these, and an express *Unitarian*, but these are not so well known in the World *now* as *Mahomet* is. Therefore you wou'd not own *Mahomet* to be of your Party, least the People shou'd Stone you, for they have all a great Aversion to *Mahomet*: But I assure you, that these Primitive *Anti-Trinitarian* Hereticks were as odious to the Christians then, as *Mahomet* is now. Witness St. *John* quitting the Bath where *Cerinthus*, one of the *Ring-leaders* of these, came in, saying, he wou'd not stay in a Place where ther was one of such Anti-Christian Principles, least a

Judge-

Judgment ſhou'd overtake him for being in ſuch Company.

Mahomet Succeeded *Arius*, and ſet up his Doctrin, which is Contain'd in the *Alcoran*, with ſome Additions. And it is Obſervable, that where *Arianiſm* moſt prevail'd, there *Mahometiſm* came in and proſper'd. That Men might Read their *Sin* in their *Puniſhment*, by the Progreſs of their Wickedneſs, and having once Departed from the *Chriſtian* Faith, can now find no Stop or Remedy.

And as *Mahomet* Improv'd *Arianiſm*, ſo the *Socinians* have Exceeded even the *Alcoran*, in their Contempt of *Chriſt*, as I have ſhew'd, bringing Him lower, and making Him more a *Meer Man* than the *Alcoran* do's.

XIX. The Credit the *Socinians* expect by Alledging ſome *Modern* Chriſtian *Writers* as *Favourers* of their *Opinion*.

SOC. I muſt tell you, that notwithſtanding all you have ſaid, we have ſome of your *Modern* and *Celebrated* Chriſtian *Writers*, who Favour our Opinion. And our *Hiſtory* Names three or four of them.

CHR. This you Urge not, I ſuppoſe, as an *Argument*; onely that it wou'd Gain ſome *Credit* to your Cauſe. 'Tis well he can Name no more: But that you may not Loſe any Advantage, I am willing to hear whom he Names.

SOC. He names two of the *Church* of *Rome*, and two of the *Reformed*, with a *fifth* one *Sandius*, whom he calls *the Arians Hiſtorian.*

Eraſmus.

The firſt he names is *Eraſmus*, who Liv'd and Dy'd in the Communion of the Church of *Rome*. Yet he was not a Bigot *Papiſt*, as he was far from being a *thorow Proteſtant*. His great Wit led him from many Errors of *Rome*. He begun well, but it was left to others to Finiſh.

Yet might he be Vindicated in a great Meaſure from what your Hiſtorian lays upon him, but that is not our preſent buſineſs. Neither does what is here alledged, prove him to be either *Arian*, or *Socinian*. For tho' *Phil.* 2. 6. be a Principal Argument of the Fathers againſt the *Arians*,

Arians, and tho' *Erasmus* shou'd say (for your Author quotes no place where he says it) that this Text did not prove against the *Arians*, yet it is no Consequence, that Therefore no other Text does prove it. One Man may think that a proof, which another does not.

And as to his second Proof from what *Erasmus* says upon *Eph.* 5. 5. I do not find in him what your Author says in that place. Yet, if he said it, viz. That the word *God us'd Absolutely*, always signifies the *Father*, this wou'd not prove him a *Socinian*. For we grant the word *God Frequently* to mean the *Father*, as I have already told you, But that it does not *always* so, you may see *Col.* 2. 2. where the Apostle speaks of the Mystery of *God*, and of the *Father*, and of *Christ*. Where the word *God*, us'd *Absolutely* is distinguish'd from the *Father*, as from *Christ*, and this is there call'd a *Mystery*; which it were not, if it were spoken all of one *Person*, as you wou'd have it: But on the other hand, where it is not so Distinguish'd, we grant that it *always* means the *Father*, but not in Exclusion of the other Persons: For the word *God* us'd *Absolutely*, means the Divine *Nature*, which Includes all the three Persons. He next quotes *Erasmus*'s *Scholia* on the third Tome of St. *Jerom*'s Epistles, but he names not which Epistle, that you may not find it without reading him all over. He says *Erasmus* there denies the *Arians* to be *Hereticks*, and that *they were Superior to our Men in Learning and Eloquence.* To which we must demur till he quotes the place. But I am sure if he says the *Arians* are not *Hereticks*, he Contradicts himself, for in the second Tome of St. *Jerom*'s Epistles, in his Argument of the Epistle *adversus Luciferiano*'s p. 134. Edit. *Basil* 1537. he says, that no *Heresy* did more grievously afflict the Church, than that of the *Arians*. And in his Paraphrase upon *John* 2. 1. no *Trinitarian* can speak more full and express than he does. He calls Christ, " *ex Deo vero,*

" *verus*

" *verus Deus*: *Very God, of very God.* That He was the " Eternal *Word*, with the Eternal *Father*, and that this " *Word*, did so come forth from the *Father* as never " to part from the *Father*. Neither did he so adhere " to His *Father* as an *Accident* adheres to its *Substance*, " but He was God *of* God, He was God *in* God, He " was God *with* God, because of the common *Nature* " of both their *Divinities*. These two who were alike " in all things, nothing did distinguish but the Proper- " ty of the *Begetter*, and the Person *Begotten*. And tho' " this *Word* was *God Omnipotent*, *of the Omnipotent*, yet " being distinguish'd by the Property of His *Person*, " He was with God the *Father* not in any Dissimilitude " of *Nature*. Neither was He *Made*, or *Created* by the " *Father*; but by this His own *Word*, Co-eternal to " Himself, the *Father* made all things, that He did make, " whether Visible or Invisible; by the same He Governs " all things, by the same He restores all things, not using " Him as an *Instrument* or *Minister*, but as a *Son* of the " same *Nature*, and same *Power* with Himself. So all " things whatever are, came from the *Father* as the Su- " pream Author, but *by the Son*, whom He begot from " Eternity, *Equal to Himself in all things*, and without end " does Beget. These are the Words of *Erasmus*, and a great deal more in the same, and many other places, to the same purpose. And if you will make a *Socinian* of this man, you need not despair to gain *Athanasius* too, and prove him to be an *Arian*, *Nazaren*, or what you please. And to shew you what Opinion *Erasmus* has of the great *Ingenuity*, which your Author braggs he expresses for the *Socinians*, upon the same Chapter *John* 1. he says, *They greatly Err from the Truth, who think that the word of God is posterior to Him who brings it forth, as among men the Mind is before the Speech, and who reckon the Word of God, by which God the Father made all things, among the things which were made*: Sed crassior

est

est illorum Error—*But their Error is more Gross who suppose that Christ then began to be the Son and Word of God, when He was born of the Virgin Mary.*

Whether this be the Opinion of the *Socinians*, you can tell, and whether calling their Error *Gross* and *greatly distant from the Truth*, be so mighty a Complement, as your Author wou'd force from this great man to the *Socinians*.

SOC. My Author quotes *Erasmus* Epist. to *Bilibaldus*, wherein he says, he cou'd be of the *Arian* perswasion, if the *Church* approv'd it.

CHR. Your Author is very unwilling to be brought to the Light, his Quotations are all Dark, he does not care to have them look'd into. In *Erasmus*'s Epistles there are no less then *Thirty seven* to *Bilibaldus*. And you may suppose it was too much trouble for your Author to name the Epistle, then you wou'd have found it out too soon, that one which he means, I suppose, is the *third* Epistle of *Erasmus*'s *Twentieth* book of his Epistles; where speaking his Sense of the great Authority of the *Church*, he says, *it was by her Authority he believed the Canonical Scriptures.* And then indeed it is no wonder that he submits every thing else to her Authority. And Magnifying his Deferance to the *Church*, he says, *he cou'd agree with the Arians and Pelagians, if the Church had approv'd what they have taught.* Now the natural Consequence of this to me, is, That *Erasmus* thought these the most Pestilent and Abominable *Heresies* he cou'd think of, for it had been no great matter to submit to any *Rational* or *Tolerable* Doctrin; but to shew the vast Authority of the *Church*, he sure wou'd name some mighty thing. But why did your Historian leave the *Pelagians* out of this Quotation? He wou'd not have them join'd with the *Arians*, for discovering his Plot, for he does not pretend to favour the *Pelagians*, or that *Erasmus* was a *Pelagian*. And this Quotation

Quotation wou'd make him as much so, as an *Arian*. But what ever comes of the *Integrity* I must Commend the *Ingenuity* of your Historian.

SOC. You are Satyrical, you know not how to miss a Blot, let us see if you can find the Like in his next Instance of *Grotius*, who, he says, is *Socinian all over*. *Grotius*.

CHR. It is *all over*, for he quotes no particular place, but desires that you will take his word; or else be at the pains of Reading over all *Grotius* Works.

SOC. I had rather take his word, at this time, for I have not now so much Leasure. But yet he names his Notes upon *John* 1. 1. and says, that his Annotations are a Compleat System of *Socinianisme*. *Hist*. p. 32.

CHR. He has a better Perspective then I can see thro', for I cannot find any such thing in his *Annotations*, but I think the direct Contrary.

SOC. Indeed my Author says, *they are written so Artificially and interwove with so many different Quotations, that he has covered himself, and his Sense of that Portion of Scripture, from such as do not Read him Carefully.*

CHR. I am sure he has covered himself in that place from being so much as suspected of *Socinianism*, for he interprets *John* 1. 1. *In the Begining*, to be the beginning of all things, and to mean *Eternity sicut mos est Hebræis Æternitatem populariter Describere*; that it was a Common and Familiar Expression among the *Hebrews*, whereby to describe *Eternity*.

This is point blank Destructive of the *Socinian* Principle, which allows *Christ* no *Being* before he was born of the *Virgin*; and therefor they are forc'd to interpret these words. *In the Beginning*, to mean only the Beginning of the *Gospel*.

Then *Grotius* does most Learnedly tell us the Acceptation of the term *Logos*, agreeable to what we have already discours'd, *viz*. That it was first with the *Jews*,

and he ſuppoſes it taken firſt from *Gen.* 1. where *Gods* Creating is expreſs'd by, *God ſaid, Let ther be Light, Let ther be a Firmament, &c.* Thence the notion of the *Word* of God. From the *Jews*, the *Chaldeans*, had it, and from them, the *Greeks*. And that it was by this *Word*, that God Created all things, he tells you how *Philo* the Jew calls this *Word*, the *Image* and *Son* of God, how the *Jewiſh Cabaliſts*, and the *Pythagorean* and *Platonic* Philoſophers had invented many other *Emanations* from God beſides His *Word*, or *Logos*.

Theſe Emanations they call'd *Æones*, and reckon'd the *Logos* as one of them. And this Doctrin the *Gnoſtics* follow'd: And *Grotius* ſays, that it was expreſly againſt this that St. *John* wrote, and proves that all the appellations which they gave to their ſeveral *Æones*, as *maker of the World*, *only Begotten*, and *Saviour*, did belong only to *Chriſt*, who was the *Logos*; And this Learned Annotator obſerves, that our *Saviour* is call'd by theſe names in St. *John*'s Writings, and not in the other Holy Writers, tho' they Deliver'd the ſame thing in effect.

And this account of St. *John*'s uſing the term of *Logos*, and Vindicating *It*, from the other fancifull *Æones* or *Emanations*, which the *Heathens*, *Cabaliſts*, and from them the *Gnoſtics* join'd with it, and prefer'd ſome of them before it, is a Confirmation of what I have already ſaid upon that point.

And *Grotious* ſays, that St. *John* by theſe words, *In the Beginning was the Word*, rejects the figment of the *Gnoſtics*, who ſaid, that from the *Proarchs*, after many ages, the *Nous*, or *Mind*, was born; then from the *Nous* the *Monogene*, or *only-Begotten*, and from that the *Logos*. All which St. *John* confutes, by rejecting all theſe but the *Logos*, making that *from the Beginning*, that is, as *Grotius* explains it, from *Eternity*, and applying to *It* the term of *Monogene*, *Only-Begotten*, and all the other Epithets

Epithets of their ſeveral *Æones*, and ſhewing that they belong only to the *Logos*.

And here I cannot but take notice how *Grotius* (upon *Matt.* 24. 11.) Joins *Cerinthus*, and *Ebion* together, as thoſe who perverted *Chriſtianity*, by mixing *Judaiſm* with it, not only as tolerating the *Jewiſh* Rites (which we know the Apoſtles did at firſt) but by acknowledging *Judaiſm* to be the only way to Salvation, which was Preached, as by other Prophets, ſo alſo by *Chriſt*. And he ſays, that St. *John* wrote much againſt theſe, and that theſe and the like, are thoſe whom Chriſt calls the *Falſe Prophets*, *St* Paul, *men ſpeaking perverſe things* (and theſe ſhall ariſe *of your own Selves*, they ſhall be *Chriſtians.*) *Falſe Apoſtles, Deceitful Workers, Transforming themſelves into the Apoſtles of Chriſt, by whoſe Opinions the Faith of many is overthrown.*

Act. 20. 30. 2 *Cor.* 11. 13. 2 *Tim.* 2. 18.

This is *Grotius*'s Judgment of *Ebion*, and the *Ebionites* whom our Hiſtorian has ſet down, as the true *Socinians* of the firſt Age.

But to ſee farther how good a Socinian *Grotius* was, upon *John* 1. 14. he ſays, That the *Logos* ſhew'd Himſelf in our *Human Nature*, that He might advance us *Men* to the *Divine Majeſty*. And applys to this 1. Tim. 13. 16. *God was manifeſt in the Fleſh.* And what *Irenæus* ſays, *Varbum ait, unitum ſuo plaſmati*—— The *Word*, being united to His own *Workmanſhip*, was made a *Paſſible Man.*

Upon theſe words, *The Word was God. John.* 1. 2. *Grotius* tells us plainly how that the *Word* was made *Synonymous* with *God*, and quotes *Juſtin*, calling *Chriſt the God who was before Ages.* And *Theophilus*, that *the word is God, and Born of God*, and much more to the ſame purpoſe.

But to end this matter, *Grotius* having Given the reaſon beforetold why St. *John* treats more expreſly of the *Logos*, than the other Holy writers, ſays thus, " *Cæteri*

" *Scriptores Evangeliorum* —— The other *Evangelists*, " thought it sufficient to express Christ's *Divine Nature* " from His Admirable *Conception*, His Infinite Power in " working *Miracles*, His knowledge of other Men's " *Hearts*, from those things which befel concerning His " *Death*, *Resurrection*, and *Ascention* into *Heaven*, finally " from the promise of His *Perpetual Presence*, of sending " the *Holy Ghost*, Forgiving *Sins*, Judging *Mankind*. " But *John*, according to the Necessity of his times, " and in the beginning wou'd give Him the name of " *God*, and the *Power* flowing from the Eternal Foun- " tain. Thus *Grotius*. And how this agrees with the *Socinians* who hold that *Christ* had no Being before He was Born of the *Virgin*, I leave you to Judge, and what reason your *Historian* had for his great Boast, that

Hist. Vita. P. 32. *Grotius was Socinian all over, That he has interpreted the whole Bible according to the mind of the Socinians. And that their is nothing in all his Annotations which they do not Approve and Applaud, and that his Annotations are a Compleat System of Socinianism, not excepting his Notes on John.* 1. 2.

SOC. I am sure no *Socinian* can either approve or applaud, what you quoted out of *Grotius*, Especially his Notes upon *John* 1. 1. But our Author perhaps means that he is only a *Socinian* as to the *Trinity*: For as to the *Incarnation*, and Pre-existence of *Christ* before His *Birth* from the *Virgin*, I think we have no Title to *Grotius*.

CHR. The *Incarnation* and *Trinity* are closely link'd together, so that you cannot suppose the *Incarnation*, without first supposing the *Trinity*; for you cannot say that *Christ* is *God*, without more *Persons* than one in *God*.

But *Grotius* de Verit. Rel. *Christ* l. 5. §. 21. Vindicates the Doctrin of the *Trinity* from the objection of *Polytheism*, and shews that it was not unknown to the *Jews*. " He says that *Philo* the Jew, oftentimes makes

Three

" *Three* to be in *God*, and calls the *Reason* or the *Word* " of God by the name of *God*, the maker of the World, " neither *Unbegotten*, as is *God* the *Father* of all, nor *Be-* " *gotten* so as *Men* are. That the *Cabalists* distinguish " God into *Three Lights*, which some of them call by " the same names that *Christians* do, *viz.* of the *Father* of " the *Son*, or the *Word*, and of the *Holy Ghost*. And " he says, that it is Confessed by all the *Hebrews*, That " the *Spirit* by which the *Prophets* were Inspired, is not " any thing *Created*, and yet it is Distinguish'd from " Him that sent it; like as also that which they com- " monly call *Schechina*. Now many of the *Hebrews* have " taught, that that *Divine Power*, which they call *Wis-* " *dom*, shall dwell in the *Messias*; whence, the *Chaldee* " *Paraphase* calls the *Messias*, the *Word of God*: And he " is called by that August name of *God*, and also, of " *Lord*, *by David*, *Isaias*, and others. These are the words of *Grotius*. And nothing can speak the *Trinity* more plainly, in Contradiction both to the *Arians* and *Socinians*. The *Spirit* not being *any Created thing*, is against the *Arians*, and Mr. *Bidle*'s *Socinians* who hold that it is *Created*; and being distinguish'd from the *Sender* thereof, does Confound all the other Parties of the *Socinians*, who hold that the *Spirit* of *God*, is not distinguish'd from the *Sender* thereof. And the *Jews* distinguish *Schechina* from the *Spirit*, and make the *Messiah* to be this *Schechina*, for which you may see more Authorities, in the *Annotations* upon this place in *Grotius*'s Works, Printed in *London*. 1679. Tom. 3. and this both proves the *Trinity*, and that the *Messiah* is one of the *Persons*.

SOC. But what say you to that which my Author Objects of *Grotius*, attacking the *Socinians* in his younger Years, in a principle Article of their Doctrin? But being answer'd by J. *Crellius*, he not only never reply'd, but thank'd *Crellius* for his Answer; and afterwards publish- *Hist. p. 32.*

publishing some *Annotations* on the *Bible*, he interpreted the whole according to the Mind of the *Socinians?*

CHR. You have had a Taste of these *Annotations*, and whether they be wholly according to the Mind of the *Socinians*; and from hence you may guess at the truth of the other part of his Allegation: But if you wou'd have full satisfaction, consult *Grotius*'s Works of that *Edition* I have just now nam'd; and there before his defence of the *Catholick Faith* as to the *Satisfaction* of *Christ* against *Faustus Socinus*, you have his Letter to *Ger. Vossius* clearing himself as to this matter of his Answer to *Crellius*, and his *Faith*, both as to the *Trinity*, and the *Satisfaction of Christ*, and vindicating himself from the Imputation of *Socinianism*.

It is a strange thing that you will make a *Socinian* of a Man, who writes against *Socinus* by Name; and throws it off as an Aspertion to be thought to be a *Socinian*. Nay he not only clears himself, but says of *Holland* and *West-Friesland* that none there did Defend *Socinus*. *Nemo ibi hactenus inventus est qui Socinum Defenderet* (Tom. 3. Lond. Edit. p. 112.)

Petavius. Hist. p. 32. *SOC.* Let us go to the next. My Author says, That D. *Petavius*, the most Learned of the *Jesuits*, has granted that generally the *Fathers* who liv'd before the *Nicene* Council, and whose writings are preserv'd, agree in their Doctrin concerning *God* with the *Nazarens* or *Socinians*, and concerning the *Son* our Lord Christ, and *Holy Spirit* with the *Arians*.

CHR. This is a Condemnation of the *Socinians*: For, as before is told, they differ exceedingly from the *Arians*, both as to *Christ* and the *Holy Ghost*, the *Arians* make the *Holy Ghost* a *Creature*, the *Socinians* say that he is nothing different from *God*, but is *God*. The *Arians* are for Christ's *Pre existance* before He was Born of the *Virgin*; the *Socinians* say, that He had no Being *before* He was Born of the *Virgin*, &c.

And

And if the *Anti-nicene* Fathers were for the *Arians* in these Points, then it is a Demonstration that they were against the *Socinian* Opinion. So that stands Condemn'd on all Hands.

But your Author has Quoted no particular *Father*, only says it in the General; And I have shown you in *Eusebius*, the names of several of these *Fathers*, whom he Quotes against the like Allegation of the *Socinians*; and I have before shew'd you, that the Tenets of the *Ante-nicene* Fathers were fully on our side, in the Examination of the several Texts which prove the *Trinity*. But your Author does not Quote the place, where *Petavius* says what he alleges from him, and considering your Author's Ingenuity in other Quotations which I have examin'd, he may be justly suspected in this. But I do not think it worth the while to search over *Petavius*'s Works for it, because I know it is a common Topick with the *Papists* to discredit tthe Ancient *Fathers*, and run all into the Authority of what they call the present *Church*. And therefore if your Author cou'd find a *Jesuit* saying so, it wou'd be no great Argument. For I allow the *Papists* and *You* to agree in a great many things, even when you seem to be most contrary to one another, as your dear Friend *Grotius* has observ'd, who makes the like difference 'twixt *Popery* and *Socinianism*, as 'twixt *Tyranny*, and *unbridled Licentiousness*. (oper. Grotij Londini. 1679. Tom. 3. p. 112.) this he says in answer to *Sibrandus*, who observ'd that *the Socinians had rather take part with the PAPISTS than with the REFORMED*.

SOC. The next my Author Quotes for a *Socinian*, is of the *Reformation*, it is *Episcopius*: Who is he says, so much esteem'd by the *English* Divines. *Episcopius*. p. 34.

CHR. And deservedly for a Learned Man. But now for your Proof.

SOC.

SOC. My Author Quotes the Book and Chapter in him. *Episco. Fustit. Theol.* l. 4. c. 32, 33, 34. and he says that *Episcopius* seems to be *Arian.*

CHR. He is more modest with *Episcopius* than he was with *Grotius* by much. *Grotius* was *all over*, and *absolutely Socinian. Episopius* only *seems to be.* Then he does not so much as pretend to him as a *Socinian*, but what he *seems to be* is only *Arian.* That is, he wou'd have us to loose him, tho' he cannot gain him to the *Socinian* Party; and if his so positive Boasts of *Grotius* come off as you have seen, we can expect little from his fearful, *seems to be*, of *Episcopius.* But however, let us hear what he says? What does he charge upon *Episcopius* from these *Chapters* he Quotes?

Fust. Theol. p. 35. *SOC.* That he said the *Father* is so *first*, as to be first in Order (i. e. in *time*)

CHR. Let me stop you, does he say that *Episcopius* said these words (i. e. *in time.*)

SOC. I suppose not; for they are in a different *better*, and in a *Parenthesis.* But they are in Exposition of the preceeding words (*in Order*) because my Author supposes that whatever is first in *Order*, must be likewise first in *Time.*

CHR. You have seen the contrary to that, in the relation 'twixt *Father* and *Son*, and it might be shewn in many other Instances. But your Author wou'd slip it in, in a short *Parenthesis*, whereby it might pass for *Episcopius*'s, or otherwise being heedlesly granted might carry his Cause. Therefor in answer to him, we say, with *Episcopius*, that the *Father* is *first* in *Order*, but not in *Time.* And *Episcopius* says nothing in this, distant from the *Catholick Church.*

SOC. But he says, that to make three *equal Persons* in *God*, or in the *God-head*, is to make *three Gods.*

CHR. That is, so *Equal*, as to have no Superiority of *Relation* among them, which we do not say. We say, they

they are *Equal* in their *Natural Perfections*; but not so in their *Natural Relations*. And in this *Episcopius* does not differ from the *Church*.

SOC. He denies that the Lord *Christ* is the Son of *God* by *substantial* Generation, from the Fathers *Substance* or *Essence*.

CHR. He does not deny it. He does indeed find fault with defining the *Modus* or *Manner* of it, according to all the Extravagant Invention of the *Schools*, which he reckons up. c. 33. and they are indeed Extravagant and most Dangerous, as *Episcopius* there sets forth, but determins nothing only that such Questions ought not to be started, are not necessary to be believ'd, because not Reveal'd, and have bred much trouble in the Church, whose Creeds at first were plainer and shorter than of after Ages. But if the starting of *Heresies* impos'd that fatal necessity upon the *Church*, where will the blame lie? It is a great Misfortune to be forc'd to fight at all, but if my Life be Assaulted, I must choose the lesser Evil.

I think it a very great hurt to the *Church*, and a Judgment sent from God, that this question we are now upon shou'd be broach'd among us. But pray who began? If you throw your Books about, and boast of them as Unanswerable, and overthrow the Faith of many, you force us to enter the Lists, tho with Grief of heart at the occasion of the Quarrel, And then you make the very Quarrel an argument against us. Why do ye Dispute of these things? Can you not let them lie in their primitive simplicity? O that you cou'd have done so! Was there ever any *Creed* or *Canon* made but against a *Heresy* that was then in being, and spread before such *Creed* or *Canon* was made; To be under *Physick* is a disconsolate Life, but the Remedy shews that the *Disease* was first. Yet you charge your Physician as the Cause of your Disease. God in his mercy, heal the breaches of our Sion, for they are many.

But to return to *Episcopius*, if it were my Task I cou'd show abundantly his principles as to the *Trinity* and *Incarnation* But I think it sufficient to have answer'd your *Historians* Objections.

I will only tell you, that *Episcopius* did not only believe the *Trinity*, but that it was clearly and plainly and most perspicuously Reveal'd in *Scripture*. And he disputes this against *Bellarmine*, who wou'd have the *Scripture* obscure in this point, that he might bring us to the Authority of the *Church*. *Episcopius* does indeed find fault with the un-necessary *School-Distinctions*, as to the *manner* or *modus* of these Divine Mysteries, which is not reveal'd, and that this has prov'd an offence and stumbling-block to the *Jews*, and other Enemies of *Christianity*; and all good *Christians* do join with him in this, and that we should keep as close to the *Scripture* as possible, especially in those *mysteries* which we had not known but by the *Scriptures*. And he gives for a Reason of this that the *Scriptures themselves* are *sufficiently clear and full* as to the *Trinity*, *Incarnation*, &c. which are express'd, in Scripture, *non solum perfecte* not only *perfectly*, sed etiam *Dilucide*, but most *clearly*, *adeo ut neque Ecclesiæ Decisione*—— so that we need neither the Decision of the *Church*, the Conclusion of *Doctors*, nor the Decrees of *Councils* in this matter. (*concio secunda De Cons. Incredulit. Judæorum.*) That God is one, is *of it self evident* in *Scripture*, and, says he, (*Instit. Theol.* l. 4. c. 18.) that He is *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*, is no less clear from the *Scripture*; and from hence you may Judge what sort of *Arian* this *Episcopius* was. And what advantage it is to your Cause to have nam'd him! Indeed he refuses to tell the *manner*, *how* these *three* are *one*, as not necessary, because not Reveal'd, and we all join with him.

Sandius. *SOC.* The next he names is C. *Sandius*.

CHR. This is he whom you have already quoted as an *Arian*, the *Arian opinion*, says your Author (p. 34.)

May

May be seen on their part in their Historian Chr. Sandius. And now you bring him into the Number of the *Catholick* writers. You wanted one to make up the Number. But tho' he cannot be produc'd as a *Catholick*, yet if he says any thing material, tho' an *Arian*, we may hear him.

SOC. My Author says that C. *Sandius* wrote on purpose to prove that all Antiquity was *Arian.* p. 35.

CHR. But does he shew any of his proofs?

SOC. No. He only says that *Sandius* wrote with that Design.

CHR. Then I will oppose to him *Eusebius* and the *Fathers* he quotes who were before the Council of *Nice*, and were not *Arians*. But if by *all Antiquity being Arian*, he only means, as in truth, he can mean nothing else, that the *seeds* of the *Arian* Heresy, were sown even in the *Apostles* time, and so were from *Antiquity*, we do readily grant it, and have prov'd it.

SOC. He says, this *Sandius* under the borrow'd name of *Cingallus* wrote a Treatise call'd *Scriptura Trinitatis Revelatrix*; where, under pretence of asserting the *Trinity*, he has as much (as he cou'd) defeated all the strengths of the *Catholick* Cause, and shews that there is no Considerable *Text* objected to the *Arians* or *Socinians*, but is given up by some or other of the *Trinitarians* themselves: so that among them, they have given away the Victory to their Adversaries. p. 38.

CHR. This if true, serves only to shew that your *Sandius* was a treacherous Enemy, betraying under the shew of Friendship. And for his saying that some *Trinitarian* or other has given up every *Text*, it makes no more if Granted, (which it is not) than this, That one *Text* may appear strong to one, and another *Text* may appear more convincing to another. But tho' I lay aside such a *Text*, and chuse rather to insist upon *Another*, it does not follow that I give up such a *Text*, because I

wave it; yet after all, I muſt abſolutely deny the Aſſertion, whether it be your *Author*, or *Sandius* makes it, and I put it to the proof, and ſay that ther are many *Texts*, as to the *Trinity* which *no Learned Trinitarian* will give up. But I will retort this upon your *Author*. That ther is no point of the *Unitarian* Doctrin, as diſtinguiſh'd from the *Trinitarian*, but what is given up, as I have already ſhewn, not only by *Arians* againſt *Socinians*, and *Socinians* againſt *Arians*; But by ſub-diviſions of *Arians* againſt *Arians*, and *Socinians* againſt *Socinians*, *Bidleites*, *Anthromorphits*, &c. And all againſt the *Nazarens*, *Ebionites*, and others taken in for the *Primitive Unitarians*, as you call them, and even by theſe *Ancients* among themſelves, hardly two of them agreeing almoſt in any point, wherein they broke off from the *Church*. So that *among them* (to uſe your *Author's* words) *they have given away the Victory to their Adverſaries*, with a witneſs.

As for the Advantage he expects from *Dr. Burnet*'s relation of *Van Parr* the *Dutchman*, with which he ends
P. 37. his firſt *Letter* I ſhall ſay nothing; at this time. I will not Anticipat what a Living Author ſhall think fit to ſay in his own Defence. Leſt I miſtake his meaning.

Thus you have ſeen his ſtrength from *Hiſtory*, and his ſucceſs in gaining ſome men of *name* to favour his party.

THE

THE

FIFTH DIALOGUE.

A General *View* and *Application* of what has been ſaid.

CHRISTIAN. LET Us now from the ſeveral *Heads* upon which we have Diſcours'd, take a General *View*, of the *State* of the *Controverſy* on Both ſides. And ſee where the *Difficulty* lies of *Believing*, and the *Prejudices* that Detain *You* or *Us*.

SOCINIAN. Our *Prejudice* lies in the ſeeming *Contradiction* to *Reaſon* there is in your *Faith*. And we wonder that do's not *Byaſs* you to Come to our ſide.

CHR. I will not repeat what has been ſaid upon that Head. But then you ought to Conſider, That it muſt be ſome very *Strong* and *Powerful EVIDENCE* that *Sways* Us againſt that *Byaſs* of ſeeming *Reaſon*. For Every Man wou'd make his *Faith* as *Eaſy* to him as he Cou'd. No man Loves *Difficulty*; But in ſome Caſes it cannot be Avoided; And the *Greateſt* Matters are not to be attain'd without it. This

This *Evidence* is the *Holy Scriptures*, as Underſtood and Generally Receiv'd in thoſe *Ages* wherein they were *Wrote*: And the ſame *Senſe* Deduc'd and Carry'd down to Us, through all the following *Ages* to this Day.

And your *Prejudice* againſt Receiving theſe *Scriptures* in the ſame *Senſe*, is, the ſeeming *Contradiction* you Fancy ther is in *Reaſon* againſt the *Chriſtian* Doctrin, of which we have Diſcours'd.

1. The word *God* in *Holy Scripture* is taken moſt Commonly in a *Complex* Senſe, as Including all the 3 *Perſons*: And ſometimes it is taken *Perſonally* for the *Father*.

But I wou'd ſay a word more Concerning a *Prejudice* you have taken up, as if the word *God* in *Holy Scripture* was always meant of the *Father* only; And ſo you Apply whatever you find ſaid of *God*, as belonging only to the *Father*, and Urge ſuch *Texts* to Infer the *Excluſion* of the other *Perſons*, the *Son* and the *Holy Ghoſt*.

Now I Grant that the Word *God* is often in *Holy Scripture* us'd to mean the *Father* Particularly, or in a *Perſonal* Senſe, He being the *Fountain* (as I may ſo ſay) of the *Deity*, whence the other *Perſons* do Proceed. But moſt commonly it is taken in a *Complex* ſenſe, to expreſs the *Deity* or *Divine NATURE*, wherein all the *Perſons are included*. So that *God* is the three *Perſons*, and the three *Perſons* are *God*. And thus we find it expreſs'd in *Scripture*. (*viz.*) The three *Perſons* without the name of *God* at all; to take away the Cavil about that word: and to ſhew that as *God* is a proper word to expreſs the whole *Trinity*, or any of the *Perſons*: ſo the *Trinity* may be expreſs'd without the word *God* at all. We find the *three Perſons* nam'd where *God* is certainly meant: And yet the word *God* not there, nor any Diſcrimination or Exception of any of the *Perſons*. And what God has put together, how can we take aſunder? *God* is expreſt by *three Perſons*. And ſhall we take upon us to except any of the *Perſons*? Or ſhall we ſay that *one* of theſe *Perſons* is *God*, and that the other are *Creatures*? Shall we ſay this, tho' the *Scripture* ſays

no

no such thing? Or shall we say that *Creatures*, are part of the Description of *God?* We may as well say that they are *Part* of *God.*

When *Christ* Commission'd His *Disciples* to *Baptize* in the Name of *God.* He Does not use the word *God*; but expresses and Describes *Him* thus, *Go and Baptize in the Name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST*, again. *There are three that bear record in Heaven, The FATHER, The WORD, and The HOLY GHOST.* Mat. 28. 19. 1 Joh. 5. 7.

If you will make the *two Second Persons* to be *Creatures* (as one party of the *Socinians* do) than you Join *Creatures* into the Description of *God*, and *Baptize* Men in the Faith and Worship of *Creatures.* As Mr. *Bidle*, in his *Confession of Faith touching the Holy Trinity*, above Quoted, does expresly own; And sets up a *Trinity*, which consists of *God*, and two *Creatures*, the first Person *God*, the second and third Person were *Creatures.* And it will, in no ways solve the *Horrid Blasphemy*, to say that these two are *very Excellent Creatures*; for the Distance twixt *God*, and the *most Excellent Creature* that is, or can be, is *Infinite*; and the Blasphemy the same to join *one Creature* as *another* into a *Trinity* with *God.* And to *Baptize* men into the *Faith* and *Worship* of *Creatures*, jointly with *God.*

And this *Trinity*, in Mr. *Bidle's Confession of Faith*, which he asserts by the express name of *The Holy Trinity*, must be more Abhorrent than the *Christian Trinity*, to the other set of *Socinians*, who own what we call the second and third *Persons* to be nothing Different, but the self same thing with the *first Person*; because, so, the *Christians* join nothing with *God*, nor *Adore* any thing but *God* in the *Holy Trinity*: And suppose the *Christians* shou'd be mistaken in their *Notion*, or *Explanation* of the *Trinity*, they still avoid the *Blasphemous Idolatry* of joining *Creatures* with *God*, or sharing *His* Honour to them

them: which (by vertue of the distinction of *Latria* and *Dulia*, of a *Supreme* and *Inferior*, *Divine* worship) was the only *Foundation* and *Excuse* of the *Pagan*, *Arian*, and *Roman* Idolatry; and Excuses all alike.

But now in the sense of those *Socinians*, who make the *Word* and the *Spirit* to be only *Qualities* then you give this Excellent Sense of these *Texts*. (viz.) There are Three in Heaven. *First* the *Father*. The *Second*, His *Power* or *Wisdom*, And the *Third* His *Power* or *Wisdom*. Which is not only to make a *Man* and his *Spirit* to be *two*; without being *two Persons*: but to make his *Spirit* to be a *second* and a *third* thing from it self. For, as we have said before, This Scheme makes Gods *Word* and *Spirit* to be the same thing, to mean no more than His *Power* or *Wisdom*, which are not distinct from Him.

Thus you have *God* commanding to *Baptize* in the name of *Himself*, and of *Himself*, and of *Himself*.

And whosoever shall Blaspheme against *Himself*, shall be forgiven; But he that blasphemes against *Himself* shall not be forgiven.

p 25. Our *Author* says p. 25. we are out in *Counting*, when we say *three Persons*, and *one God*, which he, in his *Courtly* way, calls *Brutall* in us.

(2.) The *Socinians* hold a *Trinity* more *Unaccountable* than what is held by *Christians*.

I wou'd desire to know by what Rule of Arithmetic he reckons *one God* into *three*, without Distinction of *Persons*, for this is a *Trinity*: But whether it be more Rational than *our Trinity*, do you judge, We both hold *Three* in Heaven, *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*. This is a *Trinity*: Herein we agree, but in the account we give of it, we differ mightily.

We say there are *three* in Heaven, really *Distinct* from one another: and therefore reckon them *three*, tho' they agree in the same *Nature*; which he makes the Difficulty. But, at the same time, he *says* ther are *three* in Heaven. Which three are *not distinguisht* at all

all from one another; but are *only one* in every respect. We say they are *three* in *one Respect* that, is in respect of their three *Persons*; and *in another Respect* are one, that is, in Respect of their *Nature*, which is but one. On the other hand, The *Socinians* say they are *one*, and yet reckon them *three* in the *self same Respect*, i. e. in Respect of their *Nature*, without any Difference of *Persons*. We say *one* is *three*, by being *Distinguish'd* into *three*. They say *one* is *three*, without being *Distinguish'd* at all. Which of these is the best *Reck'ning*, and best *Reason* is left to the Readers Judgement.

And every Scripture bears the same Argument where these *three* are reckon'd. Of which there are multitudes of Texts that we have not quoted. It is in the Preface and Salutation of almost every Epistle; with St. *Paul* frequently, we have remembred. And thus St. *Peter* begins. To the Elect some of which according to the *fore-knowledge* of *God* the *Father*, thro' *Sanctification* of the *Spirit* unto Obedience, and *sprinkling of the Blood* of *Jesus Christ*. 1. *Pet.* 1. 2.

(3.) The *Socinians* own their *Interpretations* to be contrary to the *Church*.

And our Author gives a very fair Confession against, himself, as to all his Interpretations. For after he has done with the Scripture Texts, he owns Ingeniously, p. 158. *That they differ from the Church in Translating several, and in Interpreting all the before-cited Texts.*

SOC. I do remember this, and it has much offended me, That we should confess out of our own Mouths, That we take a way of our own, contrary to the Church of Christ.

CHR. Sure he must give some very extraordinary Reason for this: Nothing less than *express Revelation*, or *Demonstration it self*, can support a Man in a War against the *whole Christian Church*.

SOC. He repeats the old Difficulty of *three* being *one*, and thence concludes that *their Interpretations and Translations, ought to be admitted, and those of the* CHURCH *and* TRINITARIANS *rejected.*

CHR. And you have seen him run himself into greater Absurdities than these he pretends to avoid.

(4.) Pretended *Obscurity* in *Scripture* not the Cause.

And this brings us just where we began, which was, That the *Socinians* wou'd admit of the Translations and Interpretations of Scripture, which the *Church* recommends, and wou'd own the *Trinity* to be sufficiently Reveal'd in Scripture, if it did not appear to them to be contrary to their own Reason, if ther were not difficulties in it, which they cannot Solve. And therefore it is not any Absurdity in the Scripture which hinders them to believe; for while they go upon this Argument, if the Revelation were never so express, they wou'd never submit to it, but screw and gloss while words wou'd bear it, of which we have seen very fair Examples. And he declares in express Terms, that *whatever Doctrin appears Absurd and Contradictory ought to be rejected, how agreeable soever it may seem to the meer Chime and Jingle of the words of some few Texts*, as he Reverently expresses it.

pag. 165.

SOC. He gives two Parallel Instances. One of the *Anthropomorphits*, and Mr. *Biddle*, That God has Human Parts and Passions, *which we reject* (says he) *because it is against Reason, tho' many Texts speak of God after this manner.*

p. 159.

(5.) The *Rule* of *Interpretation* in Case of the *Anthropomorphites*, will not serve in Case of the *Trinity*.

CHR. Ther was a necessity to speak of God after this manner, because otherwise we shou'd not understand Him. For we can apprehend nothing but after the manner of Men. But the reason was quite contrary why God shou'd speak of Himself as *Three One*. You will not say that this was to Condescend to our Capacities. And therefor if this had not been a necessary Truth, God wou'd not, as I may so say, have troubled our Understandings with it, seeing ther was no other necessity in the whole World for Revealing it to us.

Secondly, These Expressions to be delivered into the *Hands* of God, to be hid under His *Wings*, &c. are common

mon and known Figures of Speech, nor are taken literally, even when apply'd to Men. If I shou'd say, I will hide you under my *Wings:* No body would understand it as if I had real *Wings* and *Feathers,* but only that I wou'd protect you and keep you safe, as Birds do their Brood under their Wings.

But *the word was God,* and *ther are Three in Heaven,* have no Relation to these sort of Expressions.

Thirdly, Other Scriptures tell us, That God is a *Spirit, Invisible, Impassible,* &c. and therefor where He is spoke of after the manner of *Body,* we must understand it *Figurativly.*

But ther are no Scriptures which say, That God is not *Tri — une.* And therefor those which say He is so, must stand in their plain literal Sense, and are not parallel to these Scriptures which speak of God after the manner of *Body.*

Fourthly, The Scriptures alledged by the *Anthropomorphites* are plainly *Figurative,* as has been said, even when apply'd to Men. But the Scriptures which are brought for Proof of the *Trinity,* are not so much as pretended to be taken in any Figurative Sense, as *The Word was God, Baptizing in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. He that sins against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven. Ther are three that bear Record in Heaven,* &c.

The *Socinians* do not pretend to escape these Texts by making them *Figurative,* for ther is no *Figure* in them, they take other ways to answer them which we have seen. Therefor this Instance of the *Anthropomorphits* is not parallel to that of the *Trinity.*

Let me here take notice, that Mr. *Biddle,* whom our Author quotes here as an *Anthropomorphit,* is notwithstanding own'd by him, and other the *Socinians* as a Brother *Socinian* and a great *Rabbi* of theirs, whose works

they have *Re-Printed*, with his Life Prefix'd, making him both a *Saint* and a *Martyr* for their Religion.

Concerning whom, I only now obſerve how tender Men are to the miſtakes of their own Party. Mr. *Biddle* and his Followers are own'd as *Socinians*, as very good *Unitarians*, tho' they will take the *Figurative* Expreſſions, which ſpeak of *God* after the manner of *Body*, in a *Literal* Senſe; that is only a ſmall miſtake in them, it is nothing but the old Hereſie of the *Anthropomorphits*, and deſtroys the firſt Notion of a *God*, to make Him a *Body*, and *Matter*, which makes it impoſſible for Him to be *God*. All this ſhall be pardonable in a *Socinian!*

But on the other hand, when we take theſe Texts of the Trinity *Literally*, which the *Socinians* themſelves confeſs, cannot be taken *Figuratively*, this is *Brutall* in us, as our Author civilly treats us.

To digeſt *Anthropomorphitiſm*, and boggle at the *Trinity* is ſtraining at a *Gnat*, and ſwallowing a *Camel*: it is a perſpicuity of Reaſon worthy a *Socinian!* But go on with your *Author*.

SOC. He gives another Parallel. *What can be more expreſs*, ſays he, *Than this is my Body? Yet we reject the Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation, becauſe it is Contradictory and Impoſſible that the ſame Body ſhou'd at the ſame time be in more places than one.*

p. 160.

(6.) Nor in the Caſe of *Tranſubſtantiation.*

CHR. Here he plays both the *Socinian* and the *Jeſuit*. He implies, that we think *Tranſubſtantiation* is contain'd in theſe words, *This is my Body*, and that moſt expreſly. *What can be more expreſs?* ſays he, And that tho' it be ſo *expreſly* contain'd in theſe words, yet that we reject it *only* becauſe it ſeems contradictory *&c.* Herein he inſinuates two manifeſt falſhoods. Firſt, That we think *Tranſubſtantiation* is expreſly contain'd in theſe words, *This is my Body*. Whereas, we ſay, that it is ſo far from being expreſly contain'd in theſe words, that it is not contain'd in them at all.

The

The *Lutherans* take these words as *Literally* as the *Papists*; and yet our Author cannot but have heard, That they utterly reject *Transubstantion*.

This mistake of his occasions, a second, which is, That the reason of our rejecting *Transubstantiation*, is the seeming Impossibility of one Body being in two places at once.

This indeed is a great Objection. And God never Commanded any thing Contradictory to Human *Sense*. But this is not our Chief Reason; Our Chief Reason against *Transubstantiation*, is, that it is not *reveal'd* in *Scripture*. But that it is against many *express Revelations* of *Scripture*: for Example, 1. Cor. 11. 27. Math. 26 29. 1. Cor. 10. 17. As for these words *This is my Body*, we say, *Transubstantiation* cannot be inferr'd from them; And we put the Issue upon this.

SOC. You say, That God never commanded any thing contradictory to Human *Sense*. We do often insist upon the Parallel 'twixt *Transubstantiation* and the *Trinity*, and say that the *Trinity* is as Contradictory as that or more.

CHR. I know you do, And it is a common place of the *Papists* too. But as much without Ground as any thing ever either of you said. Because *Transubstantiation* is wholly against *sense*, and the *Trinity* is not at all. As I have already shew'd.

SOC. But let me Repeat. Is not the *Trinity* against *Sense* at all?

CHR. No. Tell which of the *Senses* it is against? Is it against your *Seeing*, or *Taste*, or *Smell*?

SOC. I cannot say it is *against* them. But our Senses cou'd not have found it out.

CHR. Who ever said they cou'd? Every *Spirit* is without the reach of our *outward Senses*. But that is the reason why a *Spirit* is not *against* our *Senses*, or *Contradictory* to them.

But

But *Transubstantiation* is flatly against them all.

And I do insist upon it, That God never requir'd any man to believe any thing that did *Contradict* any of his *outward Senses*.

So very poor is your Parallel twixt the *Trinity* and *Transubstantiation*.

Again, we have seen *Parallels* in *Nature*, as to the *Trinity*; But ther is none as to *Transubstantiation*. Can you tell us any other case where *accidents* appear without Inherance in a *Substance* proper for *such accidents*? Nothing like it was ever heard of, to lead us to any possible Idea of it.

(7.) Concerning *Mysteries*.

SOC. We reject both, because we will have no *Mystery* in our Religion: and all the *Sacraments*, their *operation*, and their *effects*, what they *Typify*, and what they *Exhibit*, is, in the modestest Explanation very *Mysterious*. I mean your way of explaining them, for we make them as familiar and plain as the High way.

CHR. You do so indeed. Till they deserve the name of *Sacraments* no more than what you have nam'd. And so you do with all the rest of Religion: But you have ill luck at it, for while you endeavour to make it so very plain, to avoid all *Mystery*, you have intangl'd it to the degree of Contradiction it self, and forcing words out of all the meaning that ever mankind put upon them, of which we have seen Liberal Instances. You have advanc'd *Idolatry* beyond the notion, even of *Heathens*, while you own a person not to be *God*, and yet pay him *Divine Worship*. This takes in the most Ancient, Honourable, and greatest part of the *Unitarians*. Then to make God a *Body*, with your *Biddleit-Unitarians*, to Revive the most Noisom of the Ancient *Heresies*, and most Nonsensical, the *Anthropomorphits*, and Countenancing the Idolatry of making *Pictures* of the *Invisible God*, which, if *God* be a *Body* of the *shape* of a *Man*, with *Hands*, *Feet*, *Eyes*, &c. can be no great fault.

fault. And all this to make the Scripture *Plain*, and to ſhun all *Myſtery* in our Religion!

SOC. But how do you anſwer our Arguments? How can any thing that is *Reveal'd* be a *Myſtery*? It was a *Myſtery* or *Secret* before the *Revelation* of it; but ſince it was *Reveal'd*, it ceaſes to be a *Myſtery*, or *Secret*. Unleſs a *Secret diſcover'd be a Secret ſtill.* *Def. Hiſt. c. 9. p. 49.*

CHR. That is to ſay, ſo far as it is diſcover'd, it is *no ſecret*, which is, that *no Secret*, is *no Secret*. But pray, may not a thing be diſcover'd in ſuch obſcure terms, that tho' I underſtand ſomething of it, yet I cannot clearly apprehend it all? And ſo I may have many Searchings and Reaſonings to know farther of it, and to underſtand the Revelation of it more perfectly. Do you pretend to know all the Book of the *Revelations*? Is it not therefore *Reveal'd*? And is ther therefore no *Myſtery* in it? I ſuppoſe you do not deny but *our Saviour* was Reveal'd, *Gen.* 3. 15. Where it was told that *the ſeed of the woman ſhou'd bruiſe the Serpents head.* And in ſeveral other places of the *Old Teſtament*, wherein He was prophesy'd of in very expreſs terms. But you confeſs this to have been a *Myſtery*, till the further Revelation of it in the *Goſpel*. Upon which I deſire you to anſwer your own Queſtion. How it was a *Myſtery* after it was *Reveal'd* in the *Old Teſtament, unleſs a Secret diſcover'd, be a Secret ſtill*? But laſtly, is not *Heaven* plainly Reveal'd to us in the Goſpel? Is ther no *Myſtery* remaining in it? *We now ſee thro' a glaſs Darkly*, ſays St. *Paul*, *but then face to face.* And to ſee *Darkly* is a true Deſcription of *Myſtery*. I know an Ingenious *Socinian* may call this an abſurdity, and ſay, how can you *ſee Darkly*? For ſo far as you ſee, it is not *Dark*. And I will not take pains to anſwer it. 1 Cor. 13. 12.

THE

THE SIXTH DIALOGUE.

Of the *Satisfaction* made by *Christ* for our *Sins.*

CHRISTIAN. THER is one Great *Point* yet behind, which is Built upon the *Doctrin* of the *Trinity*, the *Divinity* and *Incarnation* of *Christ*, and that is the *Doctrin* of *Satisfaction.* Of which your *Author* likewise speaks. And this *Work* will not be *Compleat*, without Considering that main *Foundation* of the *Christian* Religion.

SOC. Let us then go on with our *Author.* He says, whereas besides the above cited *Texts*, the *Orthodox* objection: That if *Christ* were not *God* as well as *Man*, He cou'd not *Satisfy* the *Justice* of *God* for our *Sins*, or be a full *Atonement* for them. The *Socinians* answer, (1.) That Christ is a Propitiation and Atonement for Sin, is a Demonstration that He is not *God*; for *God* doth not *Give* or *Make*, but *Receive* Satisfaction for our Sins.

(1.) Objection of *God*, by this, having made the *Satisfaction* to Himself.

CHR. God *Gave* His *Son* to be a *Propitiation* for *Sin.* And *Receiv'd* from Him *Satisfaction* for our Sins. And this proves Him to be both *God* and *Man. God* because none else cou'd pay *Infinit Satisfaction*, for *Infinit Goodness* offended. And *Man*, because that which *Offended* must make the *Satisfaction.* But *Human* Nature cou'd not make this *Satisfaction*, *In that it was weak*
Rom. 8. 3. *thro' the Flesh*, *therefore*, says St. *Paul*, *God sending His own Son in the Likeness of Sinful Flesh, and for Sin*, or by a Sacrifice for Sin (as our Margent reads it) *condemned Sin in the Flesh.*

SOC. If God gave or sent His Son, then it was *God* who paid the Ransom to Himself.

CHR. In that sense no doubt, He did, as the Apostle
2 Cor. 5. 19. speaks. *God was in Christ*, *Reconciling the world to Himself*, It was God who found out, and afforded us this admirable means.

He exalted the *Manhood* into *God*, united *Human Nature* into one *Person* with the *Divine Nature*, whereby man might become worthy to expiate for his offence.

And, to compare this with Cases which are familiar amongst our selves, nothing is more common than for a man to endeavour to enable his Debtor to make satisfaction for his Debt; by adding to his Stock, putting him into the Method of Gain, obtaining for him offices, preferments, *&c.* And, in this Case, when a Debtor has recover'd himself, by the kindness and munificence of his Creditor, and when he has with thankfulness, paid his Debt: No body objects it as an Absurdity, That, by this Method, the Creditor has paid himself. It is so far true, that if it had not been for the Creditors Goodness and his Management, his Debter wou'd never have been able to have paid him; and in this Sense, he may be said to have satisfied himself; because the Satisfaction given himself, mov'd from himself, and was carry'd on upon his Stock: But, because it was paid by the Debtor,

Debtor, being thus Inrich'd, it is not strictly call'd satisfying himself.

And thus it was, that *Man* paid his Debt to *God*, tho' he was wholly enabl'd to it by God, and without God cou'd never have done it.

All his sufficiency is of God. And after this manner it is that men are said to *Bestow* upon God, and that God accepts it as such, and rewards them for it. You know the *Free-will-offerings* in the Law, and the Contribution for building the Temple are call'd their *offering willingly* to God. Tho' *David* acknowledges to God, that all this store that we have prepared, *cometh of Thine hand and is all Thine own*, yet this hinders not what *David* there says, that he had offer'd them *of his proper Goods*. And at the same time confesses to *God*, *of thine own have we given Thee.*

1 Chr. 29. 6. 16. 3. 14.

And now be Judge your self, whether my *Giving*, or *Bestowing*, does not argue that I have less dependance upon the person who *Receives* a Boon from me, than I have upon my *Creditor* to whom I am *Bound* to *Pay* my *Debt*?

Yet you can well enough disgest our *Giving* to God, who Gives us all; and at the same time cry out upon our *Paying* any thing to God, as an absurdity, tho' he *requires* it from us, and calls it a *Debt* upon us.

But take another reason. It was God the *Son* who was Incarnate, and paid the Satisfaction to His *Father*. Here it is *one Person* making Satisfaction to *another Person*, and so your Objection is wholly over.

By this you see how necessary the Doctrine of the *Trinity* is to the *Satisfaction* of *Christ*. Christ Himself did Sanctify His human Nature. *For their sakes I Sanctify my self*. And then offer'd it up as an acceptable and sufficiently worthy Sacrifice to His *Father*. He Rais'd from Death His Human Nature, freed it from Prison, as having discharg'd one Debt, and *by His own Power.*

Joh. 17. 19. Joh. 10. 18.

Power. He took His Life again, as, of Himself, He had laid it down. Thus in all things, *out of his own stock*, He paid our whole Debt to His *Father.*

p. 136.

SOC. The *Socinians* answer. (2.) They wonder that Christ tho' a *man only*, shou'd not be judg'd a sufficient Satisfaction and Propitiation for Sin, when the Sacrifice of *Beasts* under the Law, was accepted as a Full Attonement and Satisfaction, *in Order to Forgiveness*, Lev. 6. 6.

(2.) How the *Legal Sacrifices* were Accepted as *Satisfaction.*

CHR. I wonder much more, That they shou'd be so wilfully Blind as not to see, that the *Legal Sacrifices* were not accepted *for their own worthiness*, but only as *Types* of the *Sacrifice* of *Christ*, which *only* is sufficient to make *Atonement* and *Satisfaction* to the *Justice* of *God* for us. And St. *Paul* gives this for the reason why ther was a necessity of *Christ's* Sacrifice *in order to Forgiveness. For*, says he, *It is not possible that the Blood of Bulls and of Goats shou'd take away Sins.* Heb. 10. 14.

(3.) The *Necessity* of a *Satisfaction* from the nature of *Justice.*

SOC. This is all our Author says, as to this point, But I would gladly ask why ther was a necessity to make *Satisfaction* to the *Justice* of *God*? It is not call'd *Injustice* in me, if I forgive a Debt without any *Satisfaction.*

CHR. What is it call'd then? Is it call'd *Justice*?

SOC. No. It cannot be call'd *Justice*; for *Justice* wou'd exact to the Uttermost farthing. It is call'd *Mercy:* to *Forgive* is *Mercy*, and not *Justice.*

CHR. Right, and in Men ther is a mixture of both, and sometimes we exert our *Justice*, and sometimes our *Mercy.* We have our proportions of each: And in some men their *Justice* is Greater than their *Mercy*; and in others their *Mercy* does exceed their *Justice.*

But in *God* it is not so. He is both to the utmost, that is, *Infinitely.* His *Justice* must not take any thing from His *Mercy*, nor His *Mercy* from His *Justice*, every one

one of His Attributes muſt be Full and Compleat, and Intire in it ſelf.

Therefor God is not only *Juſt*, that is, has ſome *Juſtice* in Him, or a certain *Meaſure* of *Juſtice*. But He is *Juſtice it ſelf*. *Juſtice* in the *Abſtract*: and whatever agrees to *Juſtice*, to the *Nature* of *Juſtice*, that muſt be in *God*.

Does *Juſtice* require *full Satisfaction*?

SOC. Yes. That is the *Nature* of *Juſtice*.

CHR. Then *God* muſt require it; for he is *Juſtice*.

SOC. Where then is his *Mercy*? If He be all *Juſtice*, ther is no Room for *Mercy*.

CHR. He ſhew's His *Mercy* in *finding* that *Full Satisfaction* for us; which is *Chriſt*, whom He gave and ſent to us. And this *Satisfaction* being *Infinit*, conſequently His *Mercy* is *Infinit*; and ſo all His attributes ſtand in their full Extent, and the one is not crippled to eaſe another. His *Mercy* is not Exalted, by the *Leſſning* of His *Juſtice*; but in the *Fullfilling* of it. His *Juſtice* is Exalted, by His finding an *Infinit Satisfaction* for Sin. And his *Mercy* is Exalted, in that His *Juſtice* cou'd take no leſs a Satisfaction, which brought His *Mercy* to a Neceſſity of finding ſuch a Satisfaction, if it wou'd Save man. Thus His Attributes *Exalt* and *Magnify* one another, but they do not *Cramp*, nor *Incroach* upon one another. Ther is *Harmony*, not a *Strugle* 'twixt the *Attributes* of God; and what ſeems to be a Difference between them, Unites them the more ſtrongly. *One Deep calleth another*: The *Abyſs* of His *Juſtice*, calls upon the *Abyſs* of His *Mercy*. His *Juſtice*, *requires Satisfaction*; His *Wiſdom*, *finds* it; and His *Mercy*, *beſtows* it. Here are the three *Perſons* of the *Trinity* before deſcrib'd, viz. *Power*, *Wiſdom*, *Love*. And let me obſerve to you, That, as the *Will* acts from the Laſt Dictat of the *Underſtanding*: and the *Holy Spirit* of *Love* Proceeds from the *Wiſdom*, which is the *Second* Perſon of the Bl. *Trinity*, as before has been Explain'd: So, in the Preſent

sent Disquisition we are upon, the *Satisfaction* due to the *Justice* of *God* for our *Sins*, His *Love* or *Mercy* do's act, not *Arbitrarily*, i e. without *Reason*; but according to the strict Rules of His *Wisdom* and *Justice* : with which His *Goodness* and *Mercy* must keep even Pace; otherwise ther must be a *Fraction* and *Division* in *God*, that is, among His *Attributes*, and one get the Better of another. But according to the Doctrin of *Satisfaction*, they Recommend and Glorify each another : They all concurr to the same end, tho' in different manners, tho' they seem to be opposit, to go against one another : which they often do among men; for want of *Wisdom* to find out a Method to satisfy both *Justice* and *Mercy* : and therefor one is forc'd to yield to the other, one to oppose, to be against the other. But in *God*, they are all one.

SOC. St. *James* says, *Mercy rejoyceth against Judgment*, c. 2. 13.

Jam. 2. 13. Explain'd. *CHR.* That may be said in Complyance with our manner of apprehension, which, as has been observ'd, is often us'd in Scripture : And in our Forgivenesses, Mercy rejoyceth *against* Judgment : we cannot reconcile them, therefore this was spoke *ad Captum*.

But 2dly, our Margent reads it *Glorieth*; and the *Vulgar* has it, *Misericordia superexaltat Judicium*. Mercy *exalts* Justice, or as the *Greek* will bear it, *Mercy Glorieth of Justice*.

And this appears plain from the part of this verse which goes before; for these words are deduc'd as a Consequence from an Instance of *Justice*, and even of Justice *without mercy*; *for he shall have Judgment without mercy, that hath shew'd no Mercy, and mercy Glorieth of Judgment*.

But if you mean that Mercy Glorieth *against* Justice, by way of Getting the better of Justice, of taking off from the Satisfaction which Justice wou'd require. How

is

is that done in Executing Judgement *without Mercy*? which this Text speaks of?

But if you mean that this severe and exact *Justice* does recommend *Mercy* to us so much the more. Then the force of the Argument appears plain, because this Justice was threatn'd to those *who had shew'd no Mercy*. So that this Justice *recommends* or *exalts* Mercy to us. And Mercy here *Glorieth* of *Judgment*, of this *Justice* done to those who have no *Mercy*.

To *Glory* or *Boast* of a thing, shews that we have a *Kindness* for it, that we are *Pleas'd* with it, or as the common saying is, *Proud of it*: And this supposes a *Concern for it*, and not an *Enmity against it*. And thus it is that the *Mercy* of God *Glorieth of His Justice*: But by no means *against* it, in this Sense, as if His Mercy does *thwart* His Justice in the Redemption of Man by Christ Jesus. But as the Apostle speaks, *His Righteousness* (or *Justice*, δικαιοσύνη) *was Declared, in His being Just, and the Justifier of him who believeth in Jesus.* 3 *Rom.* 26. Mercy satisfying Justice, *Exalts* Justice, and, *in that Sense*, may be said to Glory even *against* it, *viz.* That the *Debtor* is not *Ruin'd* by Justice, which Justice does not Require, so full satisfaction be made otherwise; But it is not so if Mercy will save the Debtor *without satisfying* of Justice, for then Justice must be *Restrain'd* and *Curtail'd* and *Driven* from its *Right*, forc'd to be *Satisfy'd*, without *Satisfaction* given to it. And Mercy Glorying, or Rejoycing against Justice, *in this Sense*, is being an *Enemy* to Justice, Contesting against its *Right*, and *overcoming* it: And this cannot be betwixt the Attributes of God, without supposing God to be at *Enmity* and *Contradictory* to Himself.

But pray tell me, since you will not have Christ a *Satisfaction* or *Propitiation* for your Sin, what it is that you make of Him?

SOC.

(4.) Of *Christ* as *Mediator* only.

SOC. We think He is our *Mediator* and *Intercessor*; And that it is *for His Sake* that God forgives our Sins, and gives us Heaven.

CHR. And you think this more Rational, than that God shou'd need any *Satisfaction* to His *Justice*. But now upon the Point of *Reason*, does God need any to *Mediate* or *Intercede?* Does not He know and consider whatever any Body else can suggest to Him? For, *who hath known the Mind of the Lord, or who hath been His Councellor*? Rom. ii. 34.

SOC. That is true: But if God please to ordain a *Mediator?*

CHR. And if he *Please* to ordain a *Satisfaction*? Why do you reject *this* as being *against Reason*? And yet set up a *Mediation*, which you confess has *as little Reason*?

(5.) Reasons the *Socinians* give for the *Death* of *Christ*. To Confirm his *Doctrin*.

But how do you solve the *Justice* of Christ's *Death*, who can find no use in the World for His *Death*? For He might *Mediate* and *Intercede* without *Dying*.

SOC. He *Dy'd* to Confirm the *Truth* of His *Doctrine*.

CHR. Many Men have *Dy'd* for an *Error*. *Dying* proves no more than that a Man is *strongly perswaded* of the truth of what he says.

In Hatred to *Sin*.

SOC. God took Christ's Life, to shew God's Hatred to Sin.

CHR, This proves flatly against you, for Christ had no Sin of His own, and therefor it must be, that He took our Sin upon Him, and suffer'd for it, which you will not allow.

But let us leave our own Reasonings and Guessing, they are very fallible, and let us come to matter of Fact, and see what God *has done*, not what we may fancy proper for Him to do.

(6.) *Christ* consider'd in His *Types*.

The strongest Argument to perswade you in this great Point of the *Propitiation* of Christ, is to view Him in His *Types* of the *Old* Testament: And these will give you

you the easy Sense of those Texts of the *New* Testament, which speak of Him as fulfilling those Types of His.

Himself tells you, That one Jota of the Law cannot pass till all be fulfill'd. *Mat.* 5. 18.

And St. *Paul* is so exact in the Parallel 'twixt *Him* and His *Types*, That he gives this for the Reason of that seeming small Circumstance in the Sufferings of Christ, which otherwise, I suppose, no body had observ'd, and that was, That He suffer'd *without the Gate of the City*. But the Apostle tells us That this was order'd by Providence, on purpose that He might fulfill His *Type* of the *Sin-Offering*, or *Expiatory Sacrifice*, whose Body was to be buried *without the Camp*. *Heb.* 13. 11. 12.

And it is notorious, That these Sacrifices were *Expiatory* or *Propitiatory*, for *Attonement* and *Satisfaction* for Sin. That they were to suffer *in our Stead*, and for us: Our Sins were Confess'd over the *Scape Goat*, and *put upon his head*, and he was to *bear upon him* all our *Iniquities*. This was another *Type* of *Christ*, which He was to *fulfill* to the least Tittle. *Lev.* 16. 21.

This was more than bare *Interceeding*. Nay we are plainly told, that ther is no Remission without *shedding of Blood*. Ther must be *Death*. *Death* was threatn'd to Sin, before it was born. And this must be made good. And this did *Consecrate* or *Devote* our *Life* to God; that is, lay it under the Curse of God's Indignation, or *Justice*, and for its sake, the *Blood* (its Vehicle) which therefore was forbidden to be Eaten; it was not ours, it was *forfeited* to God, by our Sin; it was a *Debt* due, and must be paid. This *Blood* thus forfeited to God, He gave to us again, not to eat, or to our own common use, but to a new use, to be a *Type* of the Blood of *Christ*, which only has Vertue to make Attonement for our Sin. And in *its Vertue only*, its *Type*, *Heb.* 9. 22. *Gen.* 2. 17.

the *Blood* of the *Legal Sacrifices*, was said to make *Attonement* for our *Souls*.

Lev. 17. 11. *The Life of the Flesh is in the Blood, and I have given it to you upon the Altar, to make an Attonement for your Souls: For it is the Blood that maketh an Attonement for the Soul.*

Here we are told what it is, that maketh the Attonement, not the naked *Intercession*, or *Mediation*, no nor *Merit* of the Sacrifice: *For it is the Blood that maketh an Attonement for the Soul.* Ther must be *Payment* — another Man's Riches will not *Satisfy* for my Debt, unless he *Pay* the Debt for me. Thus Christ's *Merit* or *Riches*, had not *Satisfy'd* without His *Death*; It was His *Merit* made His *Death* to be *Satisfactory*, which otherwise it had not been for *Sin*. But His *Actual Dying*, was the *Actual Payment* of the *Debt*. And hence it is that our *Redemption* is Attributed to the *Death* of Christ, His *Blood*, the Sacrifice of His *Life* for us.

Do not mistake me, as if this took away His *Mediation*, and *Intercession*. No, It was this which render'd them Effectual.

(7.) Our *Redemption* is by the *Death* of *Christ*.

Be pleas'd to Consider with me some of the Texts which attribute our Redemption to Christ's *Death*.

Mat 20. 28. 26. 28. Joh. 6. 53. Rom. 3. 25. 4. 25. 5. 10. 11. 2 Cor. 5. 15. 21. Gal. 1. 4. 3. 13. Ephe. 1. 7.

He came to give His *Life* a *Ransom* for many— My *Blood* is shed for the *Remission of Sins*— Except ye Eat His *Flesh*, and Drink His *Blood*, ye have no Life— Whom God has set forth as a *Propitiation*, thro' Faith in His *Blood*— He was deliver'd for our Offences— Reconcil'd to God by the *Death* of His Son— by whom we have received the *Attonement*. He *Dyed* for all— God made Him to be Sin for us, who knew no Sin; that we might be made the Righteousness of God in Him. He gave Himself for our Sins, He hath Redeem'd us from the Curse of the Law, being made a *Curse* for us; We have Redemption thro' His *Blood*, the forgiveness

forgiveness of Sins, having made Peace thro' the *Blood* of His Cross. Not by the Blood of Goats and Calves, but by *His own Blood*, He enter'd once into the Holy Place, having obtain'd Eternal *Redemption* for us—— Having therefor boldness to enter into the Holyest by the *Blood* of Jesus—— The *Blood* of Christ shall purge your Conscience—— And for this Cause, He is the Mediator of the New Testament: That *by means of Death*, for the Redemption of Transgressions—— we might receive the Eternal Inheritance. He by Himself *Purg'd* our Sins—— His own self *bare* our Sins in *His own Body* on the Tree—— by whose *Strips* ye were healed. The *Blood* of Christ cleanseth us from all Sin—— He is the *Propitiation* for our Sins—— God sent His Son to be the *Propitiation* for our Sins. Christ *Dyed* for our Sins according to the Scriptures.

Col. 1. 20. Heb. 9. 12. 10. 19. 9. 14. 15. Heb. 1. 3. 1 Pet. 2. 24. 1 Joh. 1. 7. 2. 2. 4. 10. 1 Cor. 15. 3.

SOC. What Scriptures does the Apostle there mean?

CHR. All of the *Old* Testament which relate to the Sufferings of Christ; All the Sacrifices and Institutions of the Law, which are apply'd to Christ; Particularly, of that remarkable Chapter, the 53 *Isaiah*. Where it is said, that He was "*Wounded* for *our Transgressions*, He "was *Bruised* for *our Iniquities*, The *Chastisement* of *our* "*Peace* was upon *Him*, and with His *Stripes* we are "Healed—— The Lord hath laid *on Him* the *Iniquity* "of *us all*—— and made *His Soul* an *Offering* for Sin—— "He shall see of the *Travel* of His *Soul*, and be *Satis-* "*fied*—— because He hath poured out His *Soul* unto "*Death*—— and He *bare* the Sin of many.

And there you have the express word *Satisfied*; That Christ's Sufferings were a *Satisfaction* to God for our Sins.

And again: Christ our Passover is *Sacrificed* for us. Here you have the very Word *Sacrifice*; tho' the former Quotations did in effect prove the same. And every one

1 Cor. 5. 7.

knows, that the *Sacrifices* were appointed to suffer *in Lieu*, or *in the Stead* of the Person offending.

(8.) God's *Covenant* with *Christ*, not *Arbitrary*.

SOC. But all this may be solv'd on the account of God's *Covenant*, to send Christ to Dye for us, Redeem us with His Blood, *&c.*

And this is an Easier way then to talk of *Satisfying* God's *Justice*.

CHR. God tells us that He is *Satisfied* and Appeas'd by the *Sufferings* of Christ.

SOC. That is still on account of His *Covenant*. Because that was His *Covenant*, that He would be satisfy'd by the Sufferings of Christ.

CHR. God makes not Covenants *by Chance*, or *at a Venture*. His Covenant was Declaratory, and in pursuance of His own *Inherent Rectitude* in *Justice* and *Mercy*.

In your Scheme ther was no more reason for God's sending *Christ*, than if He had *Covenanted* to pardon Man upon turning of a *Straw*, or the most insignificant Action in the World.

SOC. Yes, *Christ* was more an *Example* of *Good Life*, than a *Straw*, or any other *Man* cou'd be, and had several other Endowments useful to us.

CHR. But as to the point of *Appeasing God's Wrath towards us*, that you make only upon the account of the *Covenant*, and so, in that respect, the *Straw* might have done as well.

SOC. And, if God had appointed it, so it might, for the *Covenant* of God is *Arbitrary*, and He cannot appoint *Insufficient* means; because His appointing it, makes the means *Sufficient*, the natural Efficacy of the *Means* is not Consider'd at all.

CHR. Then indeed the *Straw* wou'd have done as well. But St. *Paul* was of another Opinion; for he Argu'd that the Old Law cou'd not stand, because of the *Weak-*

ness

nesſ of the *Means*. For it is not *poſſible* (ſays he) *That the Blood of Bulls and of Goats ſhould take away Sins.*

SOC. That is becauſe God did not appoint them for that end.

CHR. You Quoted juſt now *Lev. 6. 6.* to prove that God did appoint them for that end, and accepted them as full Attonement and Satisfaction in order to Forgiveneſs, and that he might do ſo as well as accept the Sacrifice of *Chriſt*. But if it was poſſible for God to have appointed them for that end, then St. *Paul* argu'd wrong. Which muſt be, or elſe, *You* muſt be in the wrong.

SOC. Did God ever appoint means which were not Sufficient for the end for which He ordain'd them.

CHR. No ſure. Becauſe God will not appoint ſuch means.

Therefor St. *Paul* argu'd from the *Inſufficiency* of the *Means* of the Old Covenant, That in order to Forgiveneſs there muſt be a New Covenant, upon *better and more Sufficient means* than thoſe which were in the Old Covenant. Which, in your Scheme, had been abſolute Nonſenſe and Blaſphemy againſt God, calling His means Inſufficient; Nay, that it was not *Poſſible* to make them ſufficient, for, St. *Paul* infers the *Neceſſity* of Chriſt's Blood being ſhed in order to Forgiveneſs, becauſe it was not *Poſſible* the Blood of Bulls and Goats cou'd take away Sin

SOC. Was it not *Poſſible*, if God had appointed it?

CHR. It was not *Poſſible* God ſhou'd appoint it: Becauſe it was not a *Sufficient Means* for Remiſſion of Sin: Therefor the *Apoſtle* inferrs, that if God Deſign'd Remiſſion of Sin, He muſt appoint *other Means*; and make *another Covenant*. And that ther was *Need* and *Neceſſity* for this. For, ſays he, *If perfection were by the Levi-* Heb. 7. 11.

tical

tical Priesthood, what need was ther for another Priest,
18. *and after another order?——And ther is a disanulling of*
the Commandment going before, for the WEAKNESS, and
8. 7. *UNPROFITABLENESS thereof——for if that first Co-*
9. 23. *venant had been faultless, then shou'd no place have been*
sought for the second——It was therefore necessary, that the
patterns of things in the Heavens shou'd be purified with
these; But the Heavenly things themselves with BETTER
Sacrifices than these. And it is of NECESSITY that
8. 3. *Christ offer: Because the Legal Priests, His Types, did*
offer.

So that you see God did not make new Covenants, *for Covenant sake.* And that if bare *Covenant* wou'd have done, one Covenant was as good as another. But that the Covenant had regard to the *means*, and to the *End.* And the Covenant of the *Law* cou'd not do it. It was *Impossible:* ἀδύνατον. Rom. 8. 3. *in that it was weak.* Therefor God sent His *Son*, &c.

Gal. 3: 21. *If ther had been a Law given which COULD have given Life, Verily Righteousness had been by the Law.* But says the *Apostle* (Heb. 10. 1, 2.) the Law being but a *Shadow* of Good things to come, *cou'd never* with those Sacrifices make the Comers thereunto perfect; for then, *as he argues*, wou'd they not have ceased to be offer'd——and therefore their *ceasing* was, because they were not means *Proportionable* to so great an End as the Remission of Sin.

In short, God's Covenant in sending Christ was with respect to His *Justice*, which cou'd not without full *Payment*, be *Satisfied:* And if the *Blood* of *Bulls* and *Goats* cou'd have done, by vertue of a *Covenant*, it had not been *Justice* in God (according to any Notion we can have of *Justice*) it cou'd not have *pleas'd the Lord*, as
Isay. 53. the *Prophet* speaks, to Bruise *Christ* and put *Him* to
10. Grief, and to make *His* Soul an offering for Sin, when the offering of a *Bullock* wou'd have done as well: *If Righte-*

Righteousness cou'd have come by *the Law, then Christ is dead in vain.* Gal. 2. 21.

SOC. Crellius in his Book touching *one God the Father*, in the Conclusion of the work, Treats of the *Satisfaction* of *Christ*, and says, It is a great hindrance to *Piety*: for if *Christ* has paid the whole *Debt*, what need we Do any more? Nothing can be required from us.

(9.) *Ob.* That the Doctrin of *Satisfaction* Obstructs *Piety*.

CHR. Yes. *Christ* does require from us a livelyand stedfast *Faith*, in that *Satisfaction* He has made for us, (which he cannot have who does not *Believe* it) together with sincere *Repentance* and *Amendment* of *Life*. And then His *Satisfaction* will be apply'd to Us, by our *Faith*. This is the *Condition*, that is, *Faith* and *Repentance*: And this is offer'd to All. And full *Satisfaction* is made for the *Sins* of the whole *World*. Yet All have not the Benefit of it. Because All will not accept of the *Conditions*. Let me give a familiar Example: Suppose you shou'd Pay all the *Debts* of the *Prisoners* in a *Jail*, and open the Doors, *on Condition* that All who Acknowledg'd your *Kindness*, and wou'd Go out, shou'd be *Free*. And there were Some among them Despis'd your *Kindness*, and wou'd not go out, prefering the *Lazy* and *Sordid Life* of a *Prison*, before the *True Liberty*: cou'd you say that their *Debt* had not been *paid?* And yet it wou'd be true, that they were never the better for it, but the worse. It wou'd be an aggravation of their future Bondage.

Aus.

What a gross Conception had *Crellus* of the Nature of *Sin*? He look'd upon it only as a lump of *Money* to be paid down: That we run in *Debt* to *God* as a man does to his *Creditor*; so that *God* wou'd lose his *Money* if it were not repaid to Him, and so being paid by another, *God* is no Loser, and the Debtor has *no more to Do*, he owes nothing to God his Creditor, But may now *Defy* Him as out of His *reach*; Need be *Pious* no more, *Love*, *Fear*, or *Trust* in *God* no more! This is the *Socinian* Argument against the *Satisfaction*! It wou'd hin-

Difference 'twixt the *Debt* of *Sin*, and of *Money*.

der

der *Piety*! And all this, becauſe *Sin* is call'd a *Debt*. But the *Sophiſtry* conſiſts in not Diſtinguiſhing aright 'twixt the *Debt* of *Sin*, and of *Money*. God does not *Loſe* by *Sin*, as a Man *Loſes* his *Money*. That is a Groſs thought.

Sin a *Debt* to *Love*.

But *Sin* is an *Offence* againſt *Love* and *Goodneſs*, that is againſt *God*, for *God* is *Love*.

And the *Greater* the *Goodneſs* againſt which you *Offend*, your *Offence* is the Greater. The Greater *Love* has been ſhown to you, the more your *Ingratitude*, if you be not ſenſible of it.

(10.) The *Satisfaction* which *Love* must Require, by the *Neceſſity* of its *Nature*. And for our *Happineſs*.

And the Greater *Miſery* to your ſelf too. For *Love* is *Happineſs*, and Conſequently the *Want of Love* muſt be *Miſery*, it is *Envy*, *Malice* and all *Torment*.

Now it is not in the *Power*, that is, in the *Nature* of *Love*, ever to *Forgive* till you grow *Senſible* of your *Fault*. *Love* cannot be brib'd to a Reconciliation with *Pride*, *Envy*, *Malice*, or what is contrary to its own *Nature* It muſt *Hate* theſe, by the ſame *Neceſſity* that it is its ſelf.

And ther is an Exact *Juſtice* in *Love*; It will require that your *ſenſe* of your *Fault*, hold full proportion to the *Goodneſs* offended. If I be but a *little* ſenſible for a *great* Fault, *Love* will reject it, it will be a freſh *Provocation*. On the other hand, If I be as *ſenſible* as I can, and deſire to be more, and humble my ſelf, and repent, Love will accept, and improve the *ſmalleſt Sincerity*, the *Smoaking Flax*, or *Bruiſed Reed*. Whereas all the *Torments* of *Hell* will never move its *Pity*, or one kind thought towards *Hypocriſy*, or any *Treachery of Love*. Behold the *Goodneſs*, and *ſeverity* of *Love*!

SOC. You ſay *Love* will Accept the ſmalleſt *Sincerity*, the *Smoaking Flax* and *Bruiſed Reed*, that is, our *Contrition*, though it be not *Proportionable* to our *Offence*. What need then of any other *Satisfaction*?

CHR.

CHR. This is no *Satisfaction* at all, being, as you say, Not *Proportionable* to our *Offence*. Therefor, *God* Cannot Accept it as a *Satisfaction*. I will tell you presently how He accepts it. But first you may Consider, That what is *Righteous* and *Pure* in the Eyes of *Man*, is not so before *God*. He says, That *we are all as an Unclean thing, and all our Righteousnesses are as filthy Rags. Quasi pannus Menstruatæ.* The most *Impure* and *Filthy* thing in the World, that *Defil'd* whatever it Touch'd. Now *God* is *Purity* it self. Who *Chargeth his Angels with Folly, Yea, the Heavens are not Clean in His Sight.* How then can He Accept of our *Impurities*? He sees *Insincerity* and *Sin* in our *Best* Performances, in our very *Righteousnesses*. And *Insincerity* is a *Sin* against *Love*. *Love* cannot *Accept* of *Insincerity*. It is a fresh *Offence* against *Love*. It is *Hypocrisy*, which *Love* must *Hate* by the *Necessity* of its own *Nature*.

Isai. 64. 6.

Job. 4. 18. and 15. 15.

SOC. By this Argument, *God* must *Hate* the *Angels* too, for He sees *Folly* in them.

CHR. It is said *Folly*, not *Sin*, The *Angels* that *Sinned* are Cast out of *Heaven*.

SOC. But *God* cannot Love *Folly* more than Sin.

CHR. No. He Loves not *Folly*. But all *Created Wisdom* is *Folly* in Comparison with the *Eternal* and *Infinit Wisdom*. And He *Loves* that *Wisdom* He has Given to *Creatures*, though it bears no Proportion to His *Infinite Wisdom*, and is *Folly* in Respect of *That*. But it is not *Sin*. For though all *Sin* be *Folly*, yet all *Folly* is not *Sin*.

But further, we are told, That the very *Angels* of *Heaven* are *Reconcil'd* and *Accepted* through *Christ*. To shew, That Nothing *Created* is *Worthy* before *God*, upon its own Account. Thus we Read, That *it pleas'd the Father, that in Christ shou'd all Fulness dwell. And having made Peace through the Blood of His Cross, by Him to*

The *Angels* of *Heaven* are *Reconcil'd* and *Accepted* thro' *Christ*. *Col.* 1. 20.

Reconcile all things unto Himself, by Him, whether things in Earth, or things in Heaven.

Eph. 1. 10. And again, *That in the Dispensation of the fulness of Times, He might Gather together in one all thing in Christ both which are in Heaven, and which are on Earth, even in Him.*

Now if the *Folly*, though not *Sin*, of the *Angels* in *Heaven* needs a *Reconciliation*; How much more all our Gross and Grievous *Sins*! And if all their *Righteousness* cannot be Accepted, for its own Sake, because of the Mixture of their *Folly* and *Imperfections*, which makes them Unworthy to Appear in the Presence of *God*, but as they are *Accepted* through *Christ*, who is their *Head* and *Reconciler*, as well as ours; How then Can our *Righteousness* be Accepted, upon its own Account, which is all *Impurity* and *filthy Rags*.

SOC. What then is the Meaning of not *Quenching* the *Smoking Flax*, or *Breaking* the *Bruized Reed*, or, as you Infer from thence, Accepting of our *Small Sincerity*?

CHR. That is, as to what is to be Perform'd on our Part. Our *Repentance*, and *Sense* of the *Infinit Goodness* of *God* to Us, in the Wonderfull *Oeconomy* of our *Redemption* by *Christ*. In this *God* will *Pardon* our *Imperfections*, and Accept of our *Smoking Flax* and *Bruised Reed*. But he *Accepts* it not, as any Part of the *Satisfaction* made for our *Sin*. We *must let that alone for ever*, as *David* says, *For it cost more to redeem their Souls.* And *no Man can by any Means redeem his Brother, nor give to God a Ransom for him.* This is perform'd wholly and solely by *Christ*, and we must put in for no *Share* of it, none of the *Merit*. But pay our most Dutifull *Acknowledgments*, in *adoring* his *Goodness*, who has given to *God* a sufficient *Ransom* for us, and has *redeemed* our *Souls*, by the *Blood* of His *Cross*. And this, tho' very *Imperfect* on our Part, *God* will *Accept* in and through the *Merits*

Psal. 49. 8.

rits and *Satisfaction* made for us by *Christ*. And in *That* only.

And to this my Argument drawn from the Nature of *Love* perfectly agrees. For it is necessary towards compleating the full and absolute Notion of the *Justice* of *Love*, That there be a *Sensibility* of the *Fault*, *Proportionable* to the *Offence*. This is impossible for Man to do. For an offence against *Infinit* Love, requires an *Infinit* Sense of such *Offence*. This *Christ* performs, and, taking upon Him our *Nature*, and our *Sin*, He offers to God a *Sense* of Sin, fully *Proportionable* to the whole *Offence*. And then He intercedes for His *Younger Brother*, who is as *Sensible* as he can be in his *Faln-State*, and, in his *Desires*, even *Proportionable* to his *Offence*, that is, *Infinitly*:

And is accepted in the *Fulness* of *Christ's* Satisfaction, and the *Sincerity* of his own *Desires*.

And it is natural, even among men, thus to accept one person in behalf of another, especially one *Brother* for another, or near *Relation*, the same *Flesh* and *Blood*.

But this still supposes the offending person to be as *Sensible* as he can: on the contrary, if he persist *Obstinate*, and will not be reconcil'd, he redoubles his Offence, and his Friends Intercession is a fresh aggravation of his wicked Perversness, and Ill Nature. Thus *Christ's Satisfaction* is the strongest obligation to *Piety* that is imaginable: and he who thinks otherwise, and practises accordingly, will never receive any benefit by it.

And *Love* and *Happiness* being reciprocal, consequently he can never return to *Happiness* till he become *Sensible* of *Love*. So that this Method is even *Natural*; and no other way cou'd possibly either Restore a Sinner, or make Atonement for his Sin.

I know this necessity of satisfying God's Justice is generally argu'd upon from another Topick, which is, The *Greatness* and *Majesty* of God. And consequently *Sin* is consider'd as an Offence against, and a Contempt

of Gods *Government* and *Sovereign Authority*. And therefore that the *Honor* of His *Government* requires full and absolute Satisfaction.

And all this is exceeding true. But I chuse rather to explain it by the *Nature* of God, which is *Love*: for from hence flows His *Sovereign Amthority*, and all His other Attributes. And by considering the very *Nature* of God, we discover more plainly the *Nature* of *Sin*, and of that *Satisfaction*, which, even by *Nature*, is due for Sin, and which only can make Atonement for it.

(11.) Ob. That *Christ* had *Despair*.

SOC. You say that the sense which Christ had of Sin was proportionable to the offence, which is measured by the Goodness offended, which is *Infinit*. Hence it will follow that the Sense which Christ had of the demerit of Sin did exceed that of all the *Damn'd*, for theirs is not *Infinite*. And then it will follow that Christ had *Despair*, or something worse, if worse can be, because the Damn'd have so strong a sense of Sin, as to drive them even into *Despair*.

Ans.

CHR. *Despair* of Gods mercy does not proceed from a strong *Sense* of *Sin*, tho' it supposes it. It proceeds from a *weak*, which is a false *Notion* of *God*. Hence it is that one man who *Hopes* in God, may yet have a stronger *Sense* of *Sin* than another who *Despairs*: but then he that *Despairs* has not so strong and true a Notion of *God*.

Thus *Christ* had a *Sense* of *Sin* infinitely exceeding that of all the *Damn'd*, even to Eternity: because he had an *Adæquate* Notion of *God*, and consequently of the *Infinite* Demerit of *Sin*. But, from the same Reason, He cou'd not *Despair*, which, as has been said, proceeds only from a *Low* and *Insufficient* Notion of the Nature of *God*. Tho' in the great Case of *Derelection* upon the Cross, when he cry'd out, *My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me*! He submitted Himself even to that Infirmity of our Corrupted Nature, as much as cou'd possibly

bly be Distinguish'd from *Sin*, and Consist with a right apprehension of *God*; which tho' we may suppose in a great measure Clouded thro' the Anguish of Sufferings, and the Load of Sin in its full weight, which merited the Eternal Desertion of the Comforts of Gods Blessed Influence from the Sinner, and which therefore *Christ* endured to an *Unexpressible* Degree, exceeding, in *Weight*, even the *Despair* of the *Damn'd*; yet *formal Despaire* cou'd never befal *Him*, because it proceeds from a *false Notion of God.*

SOC. You say, That *Eternal* Punishment is the Reward of *Sin.* Therefore if *Christ* did undergo the whole *Punishment* due to *Sin*, He must have Suffer'd *Eternally.* (12.) Ob, That He must have Suffer'd *Eternal* Punishment.

CHR. The *Eternity* of the *Punishment* is only because *Satisfaction* can *Never* be made by the *Damn'd.* Whom *Justice* Detains till they have *Pay'd* the *Uttermost Farthing.* Which they not being Able to *Pay*, consequently are *Prisoners* for *Ever.* But as *Justice* Requires the *Uttermost Farthing*, so when that is *Pay'd*, *Justice* is Oblig'd to *Release.* That *Uttermost Farthing*, which the *Nature* of *Love* Requires, as well as of *Justice* (as I have shew'd) is a *Sense* of the *Sin*, Proportionable to the *Offence.* Which *Christ*, in our *Nature*, having Offer'd in full Tail, He Purchas'd the *Release* of that *Nature.* And gives the *Benefit* to All who will *Accept* of it. Whereas if He had Suffer'd *Eternally*, He had only been a *Prisoner* with us, but had Purchas'd no *Redemption* for Us.

SOC. In Answer to your Arguments Drawn from the *Nature of God*, as explain'd by the *Nature of Love*, I think them too *Notional*,

CHR. It is the *Notion* God has given us of Himself. 1. John. 4. 8. and 16. *God is Love.* And therefor it must be the most certain Topick from whence to argue of

of this *Nature* And to ſay that this is *Notional*, is finding Fault with *Scripture*.

SOC. I like the other Topick better, that is, to Conſider of God only as a Great *Governor*; and not to argue from His *Nature*, but only to conſider what may be Conſiſtent, that is, ſafe to His *Government*.

XXII. Of the *Eternity* of *Hell*.

And in this Senſe I take all His Threats, even of *Hell*, to be no more but *Threats*, in order to ſecure His *Government* over us: And that therefor He is not bound in *Juſtice*, or any way, to inflict thoſe Puniſhments, further then to ſecure His *Government*: And that this is no breach of *Promiſe*, or of His word, more than it is in a *Prince* to remit that Puniſhment, which he, by his Laws, has Denounc'd againſt ſuch an Offence. The Security of his *Government* is all he has to look to. It is no *Injuſtice*, or *Falſifying his Word*, to *Pardon* ſuch an Offence, or to *Mitigate* it, to what Degree he pleaſes.

And therefor, tho' God has Threatn'd *Hell* to be *Eternal*; He may Remit that, either in part, or in whole, without any Impeachment to His *Juſtice*, or His *Veracity*, as He ſpar'd the *Ninevits* after He ſaid He wou'd deſtroy them.

CHR. His Threatning of the *Ninevits* was in order to their *Repentance*; Jonah. 3. 10. and ſo are His Temporal Threatnings to other Nations and Kingdoms, as we are aſſur'd *Jer.* 18. 7, 8, *&c.* And therefore when they do Repent, the end of that threatning is obtain'd.

But it is quite otherwiſe in the Puniſhment of *Hell*. For the Sufferings there are not intended for the Amendment of the offenders (which is in order to pardon) But as a *Satisfaction* to *Juſtice*, the time of *Forgivineſs* being over. As when a Malefactor is brought to Juſtice, to Dye without Mercy for his Offence.

SOC. This is only to ſecure the *Government* againſt the like offenders for the future. And therefore I ſaid that

that God does, and ought to punish, so far as to secure His *Government*; But farther than that Consideration, He is not Oblig'd either in *Justice* or *Honour*.

CHR. Why? Is God afraid! Is He in Danger of having *His Government* overturn'd? What a poor Notion have you advanc'd of *God's Justice*!

Besides, this Argument only takes place as to *this World*; for no body says that the Punishments of *Hell* are only *for Example sake*. Therefore it must be from some other Consideration; and I can see no other but that of *Satisfying* the *Justice* of *God*. But why was Eternal Punishment threatned by God.

SOC. It was of use to have Eternal Punishments *threatned at least*; because less than that wou'd not Deterr Men from Sinning; since we see that that it self does not do it. For,

" The sting of Sin is the terror of *Eternal* Punish-
" ment; and if Men were once free from the *Fear* and
" *Belief* of this, the most powerful restraint from Sin p. 4.
" wou'd be taken away——And therefore if any thing
" more terrible than Eternal Vengeance, cou'd have been p. 11.
" threatened to the Workers of Iniquity, it had not been
" unreasonable, because it wou'd all have been little Enough
" to Deterr Men effectually from Sin. And whoever
" Considers how ineffectual the threatning even of Eter-
" nal Torments is to the greatest part of Sinners, will
" soon be Satisfy'd that a less Penalty than that of Eter-
" nal Suffering wou'd, to the far greatest part of Man-
" kind, have been in all probability of little or no
" force—— The Eternal Rewards and Punishments of p. 19.
" another Life, are the great Sanction and Security of
" God's Laws. And in the last place, that if we suppose p. 20.
" that God did intend that His Threatnings shou'd have
" their Effect, to deter Men from the Breach of His
" Laws; it cannot be imagin'd that in the same Reve-
" lation

" lation which declares these Threatnings, any *Intima-*
" *tion* shou'd be given of the *Abatement*, or *Non-execu-*
" *tion* of them: For, by this, God wou'd have weakned
" His own Laws, and have taken off the Edge and
" Terror of His Threatnings: Because a Threatning
" hath lost its Force, if we once come to believe, that
" it will not be Executed: And consequently it wou'd
" be a very Impious Design to go about to Teach or
" Perswade any thing to the Contrary, and a Betraying
" Men into that Misery, which had it been firmly be-
" liev'd might have been avoided.

CHR. This is Astonishing beyond any thing ever I heard; for I pray, answer me, whether your making Hell *Doubtful*, be not, in your own words, *a very Impious Design, to take away the great Sanction and Security of God's Laws? To make them of little or no force to the Greatest part of Mankind?* And if the *Firm Believing* that Misery (*viz.* the Eternity of Hell) be the means, as you say, to avoid it: then Quære, whether making Hell *Doubtfull*, be the means to make us *Firmly Believe it*? You confess that in Scripture ther is not any *Intimation*, or any to be expected of the *Abatement*, or *non-Execution* of the Eternal Punishment of *Hell*. It wou'd be asked here, How then you came by the Discovery? You prove very well, that it was Gods design that men shou'd *think* Hell to be Eternal.

But it seems you are still to be excepted, who are a man of Reason, and will not be over-reach'd. God cou'd not keep it from you! But suppose you have been admitted into God's Cabinet Council, and this great Secret has been Reveal'd to you; how came you to *Blabb* it, and Frustrat God's design? who intended that men shou'd believe *Hell* was *Eternal*.

SOC. I have told you of the Folly of trusting to this. For may be Hell may be Eternal to some, tho' not to others: And it wou'd not be prudence to run the Hazard, tho'

tho' God shou'd not inflict it. And if Hell shou'd be but for some time, what wise man wou'd venture such terrible punishments, tho' for never so short a time?

CHR. But if less than Mens believing the *Certainty* of Hells *Eternal* Punishment will not, as you say, Deterr Men from Sinning: If that it self does not do it, how will they be perswaded by telling them, that *perhaps* Hell may be but for some short time; or, may be, that God will Remit it altogether: That neither His *Justice*, His *Wisdom*, nor other Considerations does require it from Him to make good His Threatnings, but it is still perfectly in His own Power, and free Liberty to inflict them, or not, at His Pleasure.

SOC. Will you say that it is not in Gods Power?

CHR. I like not the Expression, That it is not *in Gods Power* to do this or that. We say He *cannot* Lye, He *cannot* Sin, *&c.* and we know the meaning of these, and the like Expressions; and perhaps you think to take advantage, and to tye me up with that sort of Expression.

But if it does appear that God *will not* do such a thing, or that He *will certainly* do such a thing; I think we need not word it in that Irreverend and Provoking style, that God *cannot*, that *it is not in His Power* to do this or that, as if we were putting Him to defyance, or had catch'd Him at an Advantage.

Now why I think it most certain that Hell is Eternal, and that God will inflict it, is because he has said so, and *Sworn* to it.

Secondly. Christ did not *Promulgate* this only as a *Law-Giver*; whereby it might be taken as a bare *Threatning*, and, as such, dispensable at the pleasure of the Legislator: But Christ *taught* it as a *Doctor* of His Church: and says, not only, that such things were threatn'd, and Consequently that it was a *Hazard* they might be inflicted; But he speaks of them as things that will most

certainly come to pass, That the worm *will not dye* in *Hell*, nor the *Fire be quenched*. And therefor, whatever you say of the *Legislator*, or His *Prerogative*, Christ is here to be consider'd as a true *Teacher*, or a true *Prophet*, which wou'd not be so, if the worm shou'd dye, or the fire be quenched.

1.) Of the *Punishment* being proportion'd to the *Offence*.

SOC. I will give you a further reason, which exposes the vulgar notion, men have of the nature of *Justice*, and which leads them wrong in all this matter: People have been taught heretofore, that it belongs to the nature of *Justice* to proportion the *Punishment* to the *Crime*: whence an *exact* proportion is call'd a *just* proportion. And from hence they argue From the *Infinite* demerit of sin, an *Eternity* of Punishment.

CHR. I must confess my self to have been in the number of these mistaken People: for I always thought that it did belong to *Justice* to *Proportion* the *Punishment* to the *Crime*. I wou'd gladly know your reason to the contrary.

SOC. You might have seen that in what I have already told you, viz. That the end of *Justice* was only for the support of *Government*.

p. 11. For, " what proportion, Crimes and Penalties ought " to bear to each other, is not so properly, a Consider- " ation of *Justice*, as of *Wisdom* and *Prudence* in the " Law giver. And the Reason of this seems very plain, " because the measure of Penalties is not taken from " any strict proportion betwixt Crimes and Punish- " ments; But from one Great end and Design of *Go-* " *vernment*, which is, to secure the Observation of whole- " some and Necessary Laws, *And therefore*, If the ap- " pointing and apportioning of Penalties to Crimes be " not so properly a Consideration of *Justice*, but rather " of *Prudence* in the Law-giver; then whatever the " Disproportion may be between Temporal Sins, and E- " ternal Sufferings, *Justice* cannot be concern'd in it.

" And

" And I desire that this Consideration may be more
" especially Observ'd, because it strikes at the very
" Foundation of the Objection.

CHR. Indeed it does at the very Foundation of the *Satisfaction* of Christ, and makes it wholly Unnecessary.

SOC. God *is not oblig'd to execute what He hath threatn'd any further than the Reasons and Ends of Government do require*; And therefor He *may remit and abate as much as He pleaseth of the Punishment that He hath threatn'd.* p. 13.
And that Declaration, *Mat.* 25. 46. that *the Wicked shall go away into everlasting Punishment*, does not restrain God p. 15
from doing what He pleases. *We are all bound to Preach, and you to believe the Terrors of the Lord*; not so, *as saucily to determine what God must do in this Case.* p. 21.
For after all, He may do as He will, as I have clearly shewn. But no doubt they are to be blam'd, *who will desperatly put it to the hazard, whether and how far God will execute His Threatnings upon Sinners in another World.* It is but a *Hazard*, and that not so great as some of you wou'd make us believe; For I do assure you, that the misery of Hell is so terribly severe, that *at present, we can hardly tell how to reconcile it with the Justice and Goodness of God.* p. 22.

CHR. This is a fair Innuendo, that the Eternity of Hell is against both the *Justice* and *Goodness* of God. At least against his *Goodness.*

SOC. We may rest assur'd that if it be any wise inconsistent either with Righteousness or Goodness, which He knows much better than we do, to make Sinners miserable for ever, that He will not do it.

CHR. Since then you cannot *at present* Reconcile it with Gods Goodness; it is plain that you do not *at present* believe the Eternity of Hell; but on the contrary that you rest assur'd (as your self words it) that God will not make Sinners miserable for ever. And that for another Reason,

because, (as you say) to punish Crimes, or at least to proportion the Punishment to the Crime, is not the Work of *Justice*, but only a design of *Government*, to secure the *Observation of wholesome Laws*: And ther being no such *Observation of wholesome Laws* suppos'd in the *Damn'd*; consequently ther must be no *Hell*, not in respect of *Justice*. For that you assure us, is not concern'd in the matter; and not in respect of the *Observation of such Laws*, which are not suppos'd to be observ'd *there*.

Unless you mean to turn *Hell* into a *Purgatory*, where *Repentance* and *Amendment* are allow'd, and consequently *Pardon* and *Release*, which wou'd be of Service to some who find it very Inconvenient to Repent *here*. Especially to make *Restitution*. And this is fairly hinted in our *Historian's* Exposition of 1 *Pet*. 3. 19. 20. Hist. *Unitar*. pag 149.

But you tell us not all your Hypothesis at once. It is new, and wou'd surprize the World too much on the suddain. But I am afraid, that you will improve this Notion, and end in *no Hell at all*, which I cannot but think to be your Opinion, from what I have already observ'd of it.

I desire you will give us a Definition of *Justice*, or if you believe ther is any such thing, other than some *Politique* of *State*, to secure *Government* by terrifying unthinking People, as the Heathen said, *Primus in orbe Deos fecit timor!*

And we know the Principles of some of our own, and late Ages, who took the Name of *Christians* and *Philosophers*, and yet made the Authority, even of *Scripture*, and the very Notion of *Right* and *Wrong* to depend upon the *Civil Magistrate*.

And what is *Right* and *Wrong* but *Justice* and *Injustice*? And what is the *Civil Magistrate* but the *Civil Government*? And your making that the end and measure of *Justice*,

Justice, has *but a little* alter'd Mr. *Hobbs*'s Phrase, his meaning is exactly the same.

You make *Religion* such a perfect *Tool* to the *Civil Government*, as if it were intended for no other End in *This* or the *World to come*, than to keep in Quietness Peoples outward Possessions or Lives, and to Dispose the Minds of Men to the Peace of *this World*.

(2.) The *Chief* End of *Religion*.

" *And for Gods sake what is Religion good for, but to* " *reform the Manners and Dispositions of Men, to restrain* " *human Nature from Falshood and Treachery, from Sedition* " *and Rebellion? Better it were ther were no* REVEAL'D " RELIGION, *than to be Acted by a Religion— that* " *is, continually supplanting Government, and undermining* " *the Welfare of Mankind.* And the Doctrin of the *Law-* " *fulness of Deposing Kings*, and *subverting Government*, " *is as bad, or worse than Infidelity and no Religion.* P. 21.

CHR. This may be *perhaps* like a *Polititian*, but not so very like a *Christian*; because in the Consideration of *Religion*, you totally forget *the other World.* And wou'd rather have *no Religion* than to Disturb the *Government* with it, that is, *rather than be Disturb'd by any Government for it.*

The Religion *of this World* is Peace and Plenty *in this World.* This you make the Standard of your *Religion*; and better have *no Religion* than Disquiet *This.* Sure you think *Joshua* to have been wicked, and his Religion wicked to Disturb the poor *Cananites.*

(3.) If *Religion* may be *Preach'd* without Leave of the *Civil-Government.*

SOC. As to that Expedition of *Joshua*, I will not meddle with it. But (till I be better Inform'd, which I am always ready to be.) I cannot think it Lawfull so much as to Preach the Gospel against the Command of the Civil-Government, unless we had such an Extraordinary Commission as the Apostles, or as *Joshua* had, and cou'd Vouch it with Miracles as they did.

CHR. Not to preach the *Gospel* without Leave of the *Civil Magistrate* is making the Authority of *Scripture* depend

pend upon the *Civil Magistrate* as much as Mr. *Hobbs* himself wou'd Desire, or *Erastus*, or the *Grand Signior*.

So many Friends have you made to your self with this Doctrine of *Mammon*, who when you fail may receive you into their Habitations; nor need you fear to Displease the *Pope* by this, for where he is the Supream *Civil Magistrate*, which he is own'd to be at *Rome* (and others Contend for him all over the World, at least in what they call *Catholick* Countries, even to Depose Kings, to Create and Bestow Kingdoms at his pleasure) There you will allow that the Gospel shall not be preach'd without Licence from His *Holyness*. Nay that the very Notion of *Justice* and of *Right* and *Wrong* must be taken from *him*; which is making him *Infallible*, and even *God*, in the most strict and proper sense; And he must, in your Scheme, not only Judge always Right; But it is Right and Justice *because he does Judge* it: And so of *Truth* and *Falsehood*; for what is that but *Right* and *Wrong*?

But, notwithstanding all these Efforts, the World is still possest, and I hope in God ever will be, That ther is such a Virtue as *Justice*. That ther is *Right* and *Wrong* among men, tho' ther were no *Political Government* in the World; or tho' the Government were so secur'd, that it could not be shaken with any attempts of ill designing men, yet that *wicked* men ought to be punish'd, for the Evils they *have done*, without respect to *what more they might do*: And that ther ought to be difference made twixt *Greater* and *Lesser* Crimes, and their Punishments proportionable even in *Justice*, without regard to *Politicks*.

SOC. Let us return to the Subject we were upon which is the *Satisfaction* of *Christ*.

CHR. What has been said of the nature of *Justice* was necessary to that Subject; for if *Justice* be nothing else but an *Intrigue* of *Politicks*, as you have Disputed, then indeed it infers no necessity of *Satisfaction*: ther is no such

(4) All this Apply'd to the Doctrin of Satisfaction.

ſuch thing as *Satisfaction*, it can be nothing but *Prudence* and *Foreſight*, for that is the Relative to *Juſtice*, if it be taken only for a *Caution* in *Judgment*. But on the other hand, if Juſtice be a *Poſitive* Virtue, if it be one of *God's Attributes*; and conſequently *God Himſelf*, of His very Nature and Eſſence, ſo that God is *Juſtice*, in the Abſtract, then it muſt require *Full* and *Adequat Satisfaction*, for that as is ſaid, is the Nature of *Juſtice*, and conſequently of *God*, who is not God becauſe He is Governor of the World (which is all the Notion ſome men have of Him) But he is *Chief Governor* becauſe He is *God*; It is a Conſequence of His *Nature*; and therefor we muſt compute of His *Government* from His *Nature*; not of His *Nature* from His *Government*; and from the neceſſity of His *Nature*, as He has Reveal'd it to us, we infer the neceſſity of a *Satisfaction* to His *Juſtice*, which is His *Nature*: And conſequently His *Government* muſt of neceſſity proceed purſuant to His *Nature*; that is, His *Juſtice*, and we muſt not meaſure it by that mean and worldly Notion of Government, under poor Politicks and Tricks of State, to keep up their Government and ſecure the Execution of their Laws. If we be *Good*, what do we add to God? And if we be *Wicked* what do we hurt Him? No. He puniſhes Wickedneſs out of His *Inherent Juſtice*; and neither to *Fear*, nor *Flatter* Sinners. Therefor He puniſhes, when the time of *Repentance* is over, that is, in *Hell*.

And, from the ſame neceſſity, all Sinners muſt go thither, if full *Satisfaction* be not made to His *Juſtice*. Juſtice not being ſatisfy'd, does always ſuppoſe that *Juſtice* is *not done*, and conſequently, that ther is *Injuſtice*, for, *coming ſhort* of Juſtice, is *Contrary* to Juſtice.

From theſe Reaſons, we gladly and without Contradiction receive the moſt Rational and Gracious Diſpenſation of the Goſpel; wherein we find a *Full* and *Adequat* Satis-

Satisfaction (for other than a *Full* and *Adequat* Satisfaction, is *no* Satisfaction) to *Justice* for our Sins; without which ther cou'd never have been any Remission, by the same necessity that *Justice* must be *Justice*, and that *God* is *Justice*. And this is the true account we give, and proper end of Christ's coming into the World.

(5.) Of *Christ* Introducing the *Covenant* of *Repentance*.

SOC. I have heard some of our Authors say, That the End of Christs coming, was to shew us a new *Condition*, or *Covenant* for Remission of Sin, that is, *Repentance*, which was more effectual than the *Legal Sacrifices*.

CHR. He might have taught us this without *Dying*, and being *Crucify'd*. Secondly. *Repentance* was no *New* Condition or Covenant. It was the Import of all the *Legal Sacrifices*, and, as such, fully explain'd by the Prophets. *I will have Mercy and not Sacrifice. Bring no more vain Oblations—— wash ye, make ye clean, put away the Evil of your Doings. The Sacrifices of God are a broken Spirit,—— at what time soever a Sinner repents, he shall save his Soul. Rent your Heart and not your Garments.* And many more places. This is the strain of all the *Prophets*.

Hos. 6. 6.
Is. 1. 13, 16.
P. 51. 27.
Ezek. 18. 17
Joel 2. 13.

And *Christ* came not to *Destroy*, or *Alter* any thing of the *Law*, but to *Fulfill* it. Therefor He taught no *New* Doctrin, but fulfill'd His *Types*, which were in the *Old Law*, and brought them to their Fulness and Completion.

(6.) The *Law* and the *Gospel* the same *Covenant*.

The *Law* and the *Gospel* are call'd *Two* Covenants or Testaments; because the one was *before* the other, one *Weaker*, or more *Imperfect* than the other.

But in regard that one was the *Shadow* or *Type* of the other, and was *Fulfill'd* and *Perfected* in the other, they were both but *One* and the *Same Covenant* It was *One* and the *same Christ* who was *Figur'd* in the *Law*, and *Plainly Exhibited* in the *Gospel*.

He

He was meant, when the *Priest* was Commanded to *Eat* the *Sin-Offering*, that he might *bear the Iniquity of the Congregation to make Attonement for them before the Lord.* *Lev. 6. 26. c. 10. 17.*

This *Sin Offering* was so *Holy*, or *Devoted*, to bear God's Indignation for *Sin*; That none must *Touch* it but who was *Holy*, the *Garment* must be *Washt*, on which any of its *Blood* had been *Sprinkled*; and the *Earthen Vessel* wherein it was *Sodden*, must be *Broken*; and the *Brasen Pot Scour'd* and *Rinsed*. *Lev. 6. 27.* (7.) *Christ taking our Sins upon Himself was Typify'd in the Sin-Offering.*

Yet this *Devoted* and *Cursed Thing*, Loaded with the *Sins* of the *whole People*, the Priest must *Eat*, and turn it into his own *Flesh* and *Blood*, that he might bear their *Iniquity*, as it were *Incorporated* in his own *Body*:

And thus it was that *Christ* was made a *Curse* and a *Sin* for us, and *Bore* our *Iniquities*; they were *Incorporated* in Him, made *His own*, and He bore them *in His own Body* on the *Cross*; and *Suffer'd* for them, as if they had been *His own*.

He made Himself liable to our *Debt*, by becoming our *Surety* for the Debt, and so made it *His own*. And then He was *Bound* to Satisfy the *whole Debt*, because it was *His own*. (8.) *Christ our Surety.*

And no Man calls it unjust to become a *Surety* for a Friend, or for the *Surety* to pay the Debt, especially when the *Principal* is not able.

SOC. That is true, as to Personal Actions, *Debt*, or the Like. But can we find any such thing us'd among Men, as *Sureties* for *Life*?

CHR. Yes. It is common to be bound *Life for Life*. You have several Instances of it in Scripture. 1 *K.* 20. 39. 40. 42. 2 *K.* 10. 24. And *Hostages* are us'd in all Nations, and ever have been, nor can War and Publick Faith be manag'd without it. *Our Hostage*

SOC. Can you find any place in Scripture, where *Christ* is call'd by the name of a *Surety*?

CHR. The name signifies nothing; You have seen the thing, under other names of as much import as that, *viz. Redemption, Ransom, Propitiation, Attonement* and *Sacrifice.* But if the very word will perswade you more, you have it too, *Heb.* 7. 22. *Jesus was made a Surety.*

SOC. Christ there is not call'd *our* Surety, but *the Surety of a better Testament.*

Heb. 7. 22. Explain'd.

CHR. That is, of the *New Testament*, or *Covenant.* And are not *We* a *Party* in this *Covenant*? Therefor he is *our Surety:* As he that is bound in a Bond with *me*, is *my Surety*; So that being Surety of a *Covenant*, is being Surety for the *Person* on whose behalf the *Covenant* is made.

What if we perform our part of the Covenant?

SOC. No Question he that is *Surety* of the *Covenant*, is *Surety* to *You* for the Performance of what is due to *You*, by the *Covenant* from the *other Party.*

CHR. And is it not *Reciprocal*? That if I break my part of the Covenant of Grace, then the *Surety* of the Covenant is bound to *God* for *Me*, That I shall *Pay* according to the *Covenant*?

SOC. This is still only upon the account of the *Covenant.*

CHR. Let it be upon what account it will, *Christ* is our *Surety.* But that of the *Covenant* we have Discourst already, and upon what account it is; I now only shew you, That *Heb.* 7. 22. *Christ* is call'd *our Surety*, by being call'd *Surety* of the *Covenant* made 'twixt *God* and *Us*; of which *David* spake, when he Pray'd to God. Be *Surety for thy Servant. Psal.* 119. 122. and *Job* was not ignorant of this Notion, when he said to God. *Put me in a Surety with Thee.* Job. 17. 3. So that ther are no Names nor Expressions wanting, whereby to signify the *Satisfaction* of *Christ*; Even the very word *Satisfaction*

53. 11.

SOC.

SOC. I have heard from our Authors, an Exposition of that Text, *Isai.* 53. 11. in another Sense than you have taken it. *He shall see of the Travel of His Soul, and be Satisfied.* That is, *Christ* after he is gon to Heaven, shall reflect upon His past Sufferings, and shall be *Satisfied*: That is, *Pleas'd* with it.

(3.) The *Socinian* Interpretation of *Isai.* 53. 11.

CHR. This is like one of the formention'd *Interpretations*: The business is, This *Text* must be got over, and this is one way! But this is a long *Paraphrase* instead of an *Interpretation.* Is ther any thing in the *Context* of *Christ's* going to *Heaven*? And that this was to be understood not till His *Ascension.*

SOC No. But in our Sense, we cannot find another time when *Christ* should look with pleasure upon his own Sufferings.

CHR. That whole *Chapter* is treating of *Christ's* Sufferings, and Describing *His* Passion: And the very *Verse* next before that *Text*, tells us how it pleas'd the Lord to bruise *Him*, and put *Him* to Grief; and so goes on, recounting the Sufferings which the Lord laid upon *Him*, of which these words are a part, *He shall see of the travel of His Soul and be satisfied.*

Now if this were no Inconvenience to your Opinion, wou'd it not be Easier to mean those words in this Sense, That *God* who put *Christ* to Grief, shou'd see of the travel of *Christ*'s Soul and be satisfied with it; Rather than to make so great and unseen a Transition from the *Passion* of Christ, to Him in *Glory* Looking back upon *Him*, meaning *Himself.* *He* said to *Him*, or *He* Lookt upon *Him*, being Phrases never us'd in English for a Man's saying, or Looking to *Himself.*

SOC. I confess if it were not for the Difficulty appears in that *Text* to our Opinion, your Interpretation is what offers at first view from these words, and seems most natural and agreeable to the *Context*, and scope of that *Chapter.*

But all this is a digression from our *Author*, and the
p. 164. Subject we are at present upon. If you please let us return. He says, the distinction of two *Natures* in *Christ* (a *Divine* and a *Human*) is clearly overthrown by the 8, 9, 10 and 11th Arguments mention'd in the first Letter.

CHR. And I refer to the answers given to them.

(18.) A notable *Turn* against the *Divinity* of *Christ*.

SOC. He says further, That if a thing, otherwise true of Christ, may be deny'd of Him, because it is only in one of these (pretended) *Natures*, and not in the other. If our Saviour, saith he, can do nothing of Himself, only because He can do *Nothing* of Himself according to His *Human* Nature, and can do *all things* of Himself according to his (pretended) *Divine* Nature, than it is Lawfull and allowable to say, *Christ* is *no Man*, was *never Born of the Virgin*; never was *Crucify'd*, *Dead*, or *Buried*, &c. And on the other hand, no fault can be found
p. 165. with a *Socinian*, when he shall say *Christ* is *not true God*, was *not Generated* of the *Essence* of His *Father*, was *not from Eternity*, for all this may be said of Him, according to his *Human* Nature, for according to that, he is *not* true *God*, was *not* Generated of the Father's Essence, was *not* from Eternity, *&c*.

This is his argument and he thinks it Invincible.

CHR. And to surprize him the more, I will answer it by granting it all: and shew his *Sophistry* by a Plain and Familiar Example.

Suppose any shou'd question my *Legitimacy*, and say I was not such a Man's *Son*? And when he came to the Proof shou'd say, that my *Soul* was not begotten by my Father; and he only spoke in relation to that, and not of my *Body*, which he allow'd to be Legitimatly begotten by my Father? Wou'd this save him from being a pitifull *Sophister*, and paying me just Damages? And yet I do grant all that he said to be true: But his

Con-

Condemnation lies in speaking with *Design* to be misunderstood.

Thus it is with the *Socinians*. If they will explain themselves, and tell what they mean, *viz.* That Christ is *not* God, *nor* Eternal according to His *Human* Nature. That He did *not Suffer*, or *Die* according to His *Divine* Nature. No good Christian will be Offended, because he also says the same.

But when we know the *Socinian* Principle, and hear them deny *Christ* to be *God*, we have reason to take it in the same Sense they meant it; and to Judge them accordingly. And to think this *Shift* as Poor and Contemptible, as if a Man shou'd deny I *Eat*, *Slept*, or *Talk'd*, and say, that he meant only that my *Soul* did not *Eat*, &c.

SOC. Now we have done with our Author; but a *Friend* of the *Publishers*, of Excellent Learning and Worth, adds a *Letter* of his own, to prove three things. 1. That the Doctrin of the *Trinitarians* is no *Necessary*, or *Fundamental* Doctrine of *Christianity*. 2. That the *Socinians* are not to be put under any *Penalties* of the *Law*. 3. That the *Trinitarians* ought to own the *Unitarians* as *Christian Brethren*. p. 163.

Arguments of the *Socinians*.

CHR. Give his Reasons as to the first point, That the Doctrin of the *Trinity* is not *Fundamental*.

(1.) That the Doctrin of the *Trinity* is not *Fundamental*.

SOC. The first Reason is, That it is *Difficult* to be *Understood*.

CHR. So is the Nature of *God*. The most Learned have very obscure and imperfect Notions of it, and some common People have even Blasphemous and Contradictory Apprehensions of *God*. Yet you wou'd not exclude the *Belief of a God* from being a *Fundamental Article*. God Reveals Himself as He thinks fit, and we are to Learn all that we can. And God will require no more than He has given. The *Angels* know Him not perfectly.

ly. But is it not therefor *Fundamental*, whether *Christ* be *God*, whether what we *Worship* be *God*, or no *God*.

SOC. His second Reason is, That to make the Do-
p. 169. ctrin of the Trinity *Fundamental*, is to joyn hands with the *Papists*, in Contradiction to the *Protestant* Doctrine; owning, with them, that the *Scriptures* are *Obscure* and *Insufficient*, even in *Fundamentals*.

CHR. What he dare not *Prove*, he slily *Insinuats*, *viz.* That the *Protestants* think the *Trinity* is not sufficiently Reveal'd in *Scripture*. The Contrary to which we assert, and think it has been shewn.

SOC. He says, The *Papists* have in reality, the advan-
p. 170. tage of the *Protestants* in that matter.

CHR. That is, he wou'd have it so, because it makes for the *Socinian* Principle. But we must maintain the Truth, tho' *Papists* and *Socinians* are join'd against us; and that *Lord* too of whom he tells the fine Story.

SOC. His third Reason is, That the first Ages of the Church had none but the *Apostles Creed*; and that the *Apostles Creed* does fully agree with the *Socinian*, but by
p. 171. no means with the *Trinitarian* Doctrin of *Fundamental* Faith.

CHR. We have seen already that the *Apostles Creed* does express the *Trinity*, and cannot be reconcil'd to Sense without it: And the after Creeds were only farther Illustrations of it.

SOC. His fourth Reason is, That the *Sixth* Article of the Church of *England*, says, that nothing is to be requir'd of any Man as an Article of *Faith*, but what is in the *Scripture*, or may be prov'd *thereby*.

CHR. What does this Prove against the *Trinity*.

SOC. Nothing, unless you will Confess, that it cannot be prov'd from *Scripture*.

CHR. This was his Fetch in his *second* Reason, and it was dull to bring it in again.

SOC.

SOC. Will you hear his Reasons to the second Point (*viz.*) That the *Socinians*, or *Unitarians*, ought not to be put under any Penalties by the Law.

p. 172. (2.) That the *Socinians* ought not to be *Prosecuted*.

CHR. I think none have a Right to claim a *Toleration*, or *Immunity* to their *Religion*, whose Principle it is not to allow the same to other *Religions*; and who do not practise it, when they themselves have the Power. And whether the *Socinians* or *Unitarians* be of this Number, the Bitter Persecution of the *Arian* against the *Orthodox* will sufficiently witness.

Your Friend *Grotius* de Jure Belli. Lib. 2. c. 20. S. ult. whom you Quoted on your side, Observes out of *Athanasius* [Ep. ad. Solitar. Vit. agentes. ep. Tom. 1. Vide Hilarium Orat. ad *Constantium*] That the *Arians* were the first of any who call'd themselves *Christians*, that *Persecuted* others for *Religion In Arianam Hæresin acriter invehitur* ATHANASIUS, *Quod prima in Contradicentes usa esset Judicum potestate, et quas non potuit verbis inducere, eos vi, plagis, verberibusque ad se pertrahere anniteretur*, whom they cou'd not perswade by fair means they endeavoured to bring over to their side by Force and Persecution. Of this you will be Satisfied abundantly not only in the Reigns of *Constantius* and *Valens*, but of the *Gothick* Kings in *Spain*, and the *Vandal* Kings in *Africa*, whose Persecutions are writ by *Victor Vitensis*.

If we shou'd, tell them that they shou'd have the same Quarter they gave to Athanasius, what Objection cou'd they make against the Justice of the Sentence. And what Security cou'd they give, or Reason to make any one Believe, that if they had a *Socinian Prince* (which God avert) they wou'd not *Persecute* as Bloodily as they did Formerly? Or that *Socinian Bishops* in this Age would be more *Christian* and *Merciful* then those in the Ages past, and wou'd not make use of the *Temporal Power*, as they did before, to *Deprive* the *Orthodox Bishops* and

and *Seize* upon their Sees for themselves; And Prosecute those for *Schismaticks*, who refus'd to Join with them in *Communion*; And as Obnoxious to the *Temporal Law*, who shou'd Dare to own their *Depriv'd* Orthodox *Fathers*. When they can secure us that, in this case, the *Orthodox* ought not to be put under any *Penalties* by the *Law*; then, and not till then, it will be time for them to plead that the *Socinians* ought not to be under any *Penalties* by the *Law*. of which they are under no apprehensions at present, nor can they ask more Liberty than they have, unless to be *Establish'd* by *Act* of *Parliament* as the *National Religion*; of which I will not say, whether they have hopes or not; or whether now, or in a little longer time, when their *Principles* shall be more generally spread, and as publickly own'd in the *Country*, as they are in and near the *City*. For what other End should they Desire a *Repeal* of the *Penal Laws*, I cannot see at present, for they are in Face as much *Suspended* towards the *Socinians*, as towads other *Dissenters*. The *Socinians* have now for a Long time had an Open *Meeting-House* in *Cutlers-Hall* in *London*: Their *Preacher* one *Emlin*, formerly a *Dissenting Preacher* in *Dublin*, but forc'd to Fly out of *Ireland*, for his Open and Notorious *Socinianism*. I have seen a very Long *Catalogue* of the many *Volumes* of *Socinian* Tracts *Printed* since this *Brief History* we are now upon. And they have been Dispers'd with Great Diligence all over *London*, without *Caution* or *Secresie*, and are still to be Bought *Openly* in the *Book-sellers* Shops. Yet no *Inquiry* or *Prosecution*! I have heard *Socinianism* by Name Openly Defended in Publick *Coffee-Houses*, and the Persons own themselves to be *Socinians*, and no Notice taken! What *Liberty* wou'd they have? Or what *Persecution* do they Fear? They all pass under the Name of good *Protestants*! For they are not *Papists*.

SOC.

SOC. This brings me to the Third Point, which is, That the *Trinitarians* ought to own the *Unitarians* as *Christian Brethren.*

(3.) That we ought to own them as our *Christian* Brethren.

CHR. You Charge us with *Polytheism* and *Idolatry.* and *that Christ* whom we Worship as *God*, you say is but a *Creature* what Greater Difference can ther be in *Religion?* As soon may *Contradictions* Reconcile, and *God*, and *No God*, mean the same thing, as we be *Christian Brethren.*

The *Jews* and *Heathens* confess *Christ* to be a Man, and a *Good Man*; The *Turks* own Him for a *True Prophet*, and the *Messiah* sent from God: These too must be *Christian Brethren* upon the same Score.

Besides you Reject the only way we know to Heaven, which is, by the Satisfaction of *Christ.* How then can we be *Christian Brethren*, we go not so much as the same Rode together?

SOC. Must every Body be Damn'd that does not believe the *Satisfaction* of *Christ?*

None saved but by the *Satisfaction* of *Christ.*

CHR. I will not say that, But I do firmly believe, that no Man can be sav'd but *by* the *Satisfaction* of *Christ. Infants, Fools, Mad-Men,* and those who *never heard of it*, are excus'd from Believing it, but yet are sav'd *by the* Vertue of it.

SOC. Why then does *Athanasius* say, That except we believe we shall be *Damn'd*, and *without doubt, Perish Everlastingly?* are not these words too Positive.

CHR. They are no more than our *Saviour* said, *Go Preach the Gospel to every Creature. He that believeth shall be sav'd, but he that believeth not shall be Damn'd.*

Mark. 16. 14, 16.

SOC. But why does *Athanasius* put in such positive words, as to say *without Doubt* they shall Perish, *&c.* As if he were so sure of it?

Ob. of *Athanasius* saying *without Doubt shall Perish.*

CHR. Is not what *Christ* says true *without Doubt?*

SOC. Yes sure.

CHR. Then *without Doubt* they who believe not shall be *Damn'd*

SOC. This is a Hard saying.

We must *Work*, because *God* Works *in and with us.*

SOC. If we lean so wholly to the Merit of *Christ's* Righteousness, then we need not *Work* our selves. So say the *Solifidians.*

CHR. That has been sufficiently answered already, And it is Resolv'd *Phil.* 2. 12. 13. *Work out your own Salvation——because it is God who worketh in you both to Will and to do of His Good Pleasure.*

God gives us *Power* to *Work*, that we might *Work.* We must work because God commands it, and we must do all we can, because he gives us *Ability*, and it is, that we might *Use* that *Ability*: But when we have done all we can, we are *Unprofitable* Servants; we must trust nothing to any thing we do; it is all *Unclean*, and cannot appear before God. Nor can ever, for its own sake, be accepted by Him; It must be *Hid* and *Cover'd*, and *Cloath'd* with the *Righteousness* of *Christ*; that nothing of it self may appear at all in the presence of God, (as has been said) who sees *Folly* in His *Angels*, and the
Job. 4. 19. *Heavens* are not *Clean* in *His* sight; how much less them that Dwelt in *Houses of Clay*, whose *Foundation* is in the *Dust*, who are *Crush'd* before the *Moth*?
14. 4. And who can bring a *Clean* thing out of an *Unclean*?

Yet must be *Unclothed* of them all, and *Clothed* in the *Righteousness* of *Christ.*

You that trust in your own *Works*, appear to me as a man *cloath'd* in *Filthy Raggs*, (for such is all our *Righteousness*) and brought into *Court*, *rubbing* and *scrubbing* and *patching* these *nasty Clouts*, striving to make Himself *Clean* and *Fine* and *well Drest* as the *Courtier* he sees there.

Who may commend his Skill and Industry in *Darning* or *Cobling*, but must withall Pity his *Ignorance*, if he thinks ever to make his *Dress* Fashionable by such means. But if he shou'd presume to make one, in that *Garb*, at a *Solemn Feast*, made upon the most Glorious occasion, The *Marriage* of the *Kings Son*, he must not only be thought *Mad*, but expect to be Severely *Punisht*, and thrown out of *Court* with *Disgrace*, for such *Impudence.*

Esther 4. 2. If none Cloath'd in *Sackcloth* (the weed of *Mourners*) must

must enter into the *Kings Palace*, much less shall one *Besmered*, and in *Filth* come into His *Presence*, Sit down to *Table* with Him, Nay be admitted to His *Bed*, made *One with Him* and *Marry'd* to Him, and sit with Him in His *Throne*. For such High prerogative has *Christ* obtain'd for all true *Believers:* Who when they come to *Heaven*, are not, for *Christ's* sake, admitted in their *Filthy Raggs*, nor is His *Covenant* with His *Father* to *Patch* and *Scoure* their *Raggs*, No, they can never be made fit for that place. But as the *Serpent* Leavs all his *Sting* behind Him, they are *Stript* and *Divested* of all their *Earth Stain'd sinful Weeds*. And as the Custom is in some Courts, they are New Cloath'd in the Fashon of that Court to which they come, as God said to *Joshua* (Zech. 3. 4.) *Behold, I have caused thine Iniquity to pass from thee, and I will Cloath thee with Change of Raiment.* New *Botching* the *Old* will never do; we must have *all New*, a New *Wedding Garment* put upon us, we must throw of the *Old Man*, not seek *Excuses* for him, or to *Reconcile* him to *God*, who *Hates* him, and all *Wickedness*, by the same Necessity that He Loves Himself. Nor can *Christ* plead for such: That wou'd make Him *Wicked* too; He hates *Sin* as much as *God* does.

Rev. 3. 21.

Matt. 22. 12. Col 3. 9, 10.

Give me Leave to suppose, that you had now all your *Death-bed* Thoughts about you; place your self, in your own Imagination, in the utmost *Scene* of your *Life*, and just ready to breath out your last; and to be carry'd to hear the *Irrevocable Sentence* pass upon you. Wou'd you delight to bring the *Sincerity* of your own *Performance* before the most Extream *Scrutiny* of *Infinit Justice*, so as to stand or fall by it to all *Eternity*? Or wou'd you think it greater *Comfort*, if you cou'd believe that *Christ* wou'd appear, not to plead for *God's* Acceptance of your *Provocations*, for such have been all your *Performances*: But that having made you a *Member of His own Body, of His Flesh, and of His Bones*, and consequently given you a *Title* and a *Right* to all that was His; as every *Member*, even.

An *Appeal* to the *Socinians*.

Ephe. 5. 30.

even that which is *Grafted*, partakes of the *Nature* and *Privileges* of the *Body*: And that is truly a *Member*, which is *Enliven'd* and *Actuated* by the same *Spirit*, and receives Nourishment from the same *Head*; Whence the Apostle
Rom. 8. 11. inferrs the necessity of our *Resurrection*, because that *Spirit* which rais'd up *Christ* from the Dead, must raise us up, being *Members* of His *Body*, and acted by His *Spirit*. I say if you cou'd *Believe*, That the *Merit* of *Christ's Righteousness* were thus made *Yours*, so that you might *Plead* it as *your own*, as a full *Satisfaction* to the utmost Demand of *Justice*, paid by your *Surety*, such a *Surety* as has made *your* Debt *his own*, by making *you one* with *Himself*. If you cou'd *Believe* this, wou'd it not give you more *Comfort* and *Delight*, more *Light* and *Assurance* to your Mind, than any *Excuse* you cou'd Fancy to be made for all your *Failings*, so as to make *God* in Love with them, and *Accept* them upon whatever Arbitrary and Fancy'd *Covenant* you may suppose 'twixt him and *Christ*, to *Accept* them, which is contrary to the *Nature* of them Both? And that upon the only Reason of an *Innocent Persons* being *Murther'd* by those *Sinners*, without any *Need* or *Necessity* for it at all, upon Account of *Satisfying* the *Justice* of *God* for our *Sins*, for so you *Socinians* say. But yet give no other Reason at all for the *Death* of *Christ*. But suppose a *Covenant* for it, without any *Why* or *Wherefore*, when all might have been done as well without it; which is opposit to all *Sense* and *Reason*; while you reject as *Irrational* the *Satisfaction* of *Christ*, which is strictly Consequential, and necessary to the Nature of *Justice*, which is *God*: And the *Covenant* of *Remission*, grounded upon it, flows necessarily from it, carries its own *Light* and *Assurance* with it, and leaves no *Doubt* or *Suspence* in that *Heart* which can *Believe* it: He that thus follows *Christ*, walketh not in *Darkness*, but I will be judg'd by your self whether your way be not *Dark* and *Slippery*? Whether you can Lean your *Souls* absolutely, and without Hesitation upon that Foundation of your being accepted without

without any *Satisfaction* made for your *Sins*, trusting only to the *Sincerity* and *Perfection* of your own *Performance* of those *Conditions* which *Christ* hath enjoyn'd, as the *Terms* of that *Arbitrary Covenant* you suppose He made with *God*, without any *Covenant* of *Satisfaction*? Which of these *Covenants* wou'd you Desire to Plead before your *Judge*, before the Face of the utmost *Justice*, unerring Essential *Justice* in the Abstract, which cannot Forgive, or Remit the least farthing, more than it can cease to be what it is, that is *Justice?* Wou'd you appear there Pleading your own *Righteousness*, or *Sincerity* of your *Repentance*, as an *Atonement* for your *Sins?* That wou'd be Cleaning of your *Filth* with a *Filthy-Cloath*. Wou'd you not rather (to end in the words of *Scripture*) have the *filthy Raggs* of *your own Righteousness* taken quite away, and to be *Cloath'd* in the *Wedding Garment* of the *Righteousness* of *Christ?*

SOC. Ther is no dispute but the latter wou'd be chosen, If it were in our Choise, that is, if it were in our Power to *Believe* it. It has *Comforts* in it beyond all Imagination.

CHR. We are told by St. *Paul*, Eph. 21. 8. That this *Faith is the Gift of God.* All Arguments will prove ineffectual without the *Influence* of *God's Blessed Spirit*; *His Grace*, like the *Sun*, is that which must Inspire the *Ground* of our *Heart*, to make it Capable of Receiving the Good *Seed* of His *Word*, and bringing forth *Fruit* into *Salvation*; without this, all our own Manuring and Cultivation is but lost pains. Yet we must prepare the *Ground*, and *Cleanse* our *Heart*, but that is only to render it susceptible of the Influence of this Blessed *Sun* of Righteousness, which only giveth *Life*. Therefor all the *Glory*, all the *Praise* is not to him that *Soweth* or *Watereth*, but to him that giveth the *Increase*. To *him* the Doctrin of *Satisfaction* restores the whole of our *Salvation*, without taking any thing from the Obligation of our own *Endeavours*, not as Partners in the *Merit*, but as natural and bounden Duty of *Creatures*, and *Sinners* receiv'd to *Pardon* and *Grace*; which therefor to neglect is *Rebellion*, and

The *Grace* of *God* Necessary to work true *Faith* in us.

Contempt

Contempt of *God*, and renders us Incapable of the Influence of *His Blessed Spirit*, which will not Descend into an *Impure*, or *Polluted*, nor into a *Stubborn* and *Disobedient* Heart; much less into an Heart fraught with the Conceit of its own *Sincerity*, so as to think it has no need of any *Satisfaction* for its *Sins*, more than the *Integrity* and *Perfection* of its own *Hepentance*. Upon which your selves are forc'd to Confess, you cannot leave your Souls confidently when you come to *Dye*, but *Wish* for that *Satisfaction* against which you *Dispute*.

A Perswasive *Inference* from the whole.

Judge then with your self whether you had reason to avoid all the plain *Texts* which speak of the *Satisfaction* of *Christ*, and of His *Divinity*, upon which it is Grounded and Consequently that of the *Trinity*, without which the other cannot be: And to strain your Witt to find *Salvo's* to turn them to another Sense, which may be done to the plainest words can be spoken in any Language?

And Consider, that, by the Adorable providence of God, ther are no Doctrines wherein all Christian Churches are so much United, as in the *Trinity*, The *Incarnation* and *Satisfaction* of Christ. And therefor Judge, to Destroy this Doctrin, you had reason to decline the Evidence and Authority of the *Catholick* Church in all Ages, which declar'd the meaning of these *Scriptures*, we have Debated, as the *Church* this Day does Interpret them!

And whether you Consulted your own advantage, when you chose for your *Guides*, the most wretched *Heriticks* in the several Ages, who oppos'd their Lewd Fancies to the Receiv'd Doctrin of the *Orthodox*, wherein themselves had been Educated and stand to this Day Condemn'd in all the *Churches* of the *Christian World*?

And all this only to carry you off from that Foundation of Faith which once deliver'd to the Saints, is most according to the Letter of the *Scripture*. Gives most Glory to, and takes least to our selves: Which only can give you *Comfort* or *Assurance* in the Hour of *Death*; or dare be pleaded on the *Day* of *Judgment*!

All Glory be to The one only *God*, The Eternal *Power*, *Wisdom*, *Goodness*, *Father*, *Son* and *Holy Ghost*, *Three Persons* and *One God*; *Creator* of *all things* *Redeemer* of *Mankind*, *Sanctifier* of the *Elect*, whose is the *Kingdom*, and the *Power* and the *Glory*, for ever and ever. *Amen.*

FINIS.

Mr. *LESLIE*'s Answer to the *Remarks* on his *first Dialogue* against the *Socinians*.

SInce the *First Dialogue* was Printed ther is come out a *Socinian Sheet* against it, Intituled, *Remarks on Mr. Charles Leslei's first Dialogue on the Socinian Controversy*. And I think it Proper to take notice of it here, for it may help to Illustrat more at Large what is there said in short. And because I hear some say, it is well Wrote, and that many lay Stress upon it.

(1.) First I Observe that this *Remarker* has not kept up to that Character the *Socinian Writers* give themselves (but without much Reason, as I have shew'd in these *Dialogues*) of being the *fairest Adversaries*, and an Example to all others of Managing *Controversy* without *Heat* or *Passion*, or *Personal Reflections*. For he has treated me in a very *Rough* Manner, calling the Instances I bring *Ridiculous*, p. 1. And that I am *Paganish* in in my Notions, p. 6. And says, p. 1. *If such poor Philosophy, such shallow Reasoning, and such gross Divinity, must baffle the Socinians, I confess they ought to be the last who pretend to the Character of Men of Reason.*

But notwithstanding all this *Contempt* of what I have said, I cannot but think it has given him some Trouble, because it has made him so *Angry*. For it is *Losers* that have leave to Talk at this Rate. And as you shall see him Talk afterwards.

(2.) My Argument was, That we cannot Charge any thing to be a *Contradiction* in one *Nature*, because it is so in *Another*, unless we understand both *Natures*. Because a *Nature* we understand not cannot be Explain'd to us but by Allusion to some *Nature* we do understand. And ther is that Difference in *Natures* that no *Allusion* will lie betwixt them, that is, none that is *Proper*, that will come up to the thing, or give a Person who Knows not the *Nature* a true *Idea* of it, or even Reconcile it from *Contradiction*, while he Considers the *Nature* he do's not Understand, by way of *Allusion* to another *Nature* which he do's Understand.

(3.) To Illustrate this I gave several *Instances*, of which this *Remarker* has p. 1. pick'd out *two* to shew his *Wit* upon. One is, That if a Man cou'd he Suppos'd to be without *Thought*, it wou'd be *Impossible* to make *Him* Apprehend what it was, or the *Progress* of it, as from Hence to *Rome* in an Instant, &c. It is Common to say to a Man that is *Musing*, *Where are you*? And to Answer I was at *Rome*, or such a *Place*. Now supposing any one (if it were possible) not to know what *Thought* was, he wou'd Apprehend your *Body* was Remov'd to *Rome* and Back again as soon as you cou'd speak. And by *Allusion* to the *Motion* of *Body*, this cou'd not be Reconcil'd to him from being a Flat *Contradiction*, that any thing cou'd move a Thousand *Miles* as soon as a *Yard*.

In answer to this the *Remarker* tells you p. 1. *That when you think of Rome or any other Place, 'tis only the Idea of it in your Imagination which you Contemplate,*

templat, and not a Leap or Local Motion of your Thoughts to it.

Who knows not this that has any *Thought*? But upon the Supposition that a Man did not know what *Thought* was, he cou'd have no Apprehension of it but as of a *Local Motion*. And what you call *Idea* he wou'd fancy to be some *Horse* or *Coach* that Carry'd you very *Swiftly*; which yet wou'd not solve the *Contradiction* as to him, because the *Swiftness* of the *Motion*, suppose it a *Cannon Bullet*, cannot go *two* yards so soon as *One*.

(4.) But because it may be too Extravagant to suppose a Man without *Thought*, tho' some have very Little; and *Suppositions* are Allow'd in Argument even of what never was; yet I Insist not on this, but have given another *Instance* which is *Fact*, and daily before us, that is, of a Man Born *Blind*. And how you cou'd give him any Notion of *Sight*, or Explain to him how the *Eye* can Reach a *Star* as soon as the Top of the *Chimney*? He can feel his *Eye* with his *Hand*, and that it is there *Fixt* and do's not go out of his *Head*, how then can he Imagin it gets a Thousand *Miles* off in an Instant, while he Feels it do's not *Stir* at all? He can have no *Notion* of this but by *Allusion* to some other of his *Senses* which he has. And by the word *Reach*, how the *Sight* can *Reach* a *Star*, he fancies *Arms* or *Legs*, that being all the way by which he can *Reach* to any thing. And then knowing that the *Motion* of *Legs* or *Arms* must go *one* yard before it go's *two*, he takes your Description of *Sight* to be not only some *Strange* and *Wonderful* thing, which he will readily Grant; but he will Insist that it is a flat *Contradiction*. And therefore that he must not *Believe* it. And it is Impossible to Explain it so to him as to Reconcile it from being a *Contradiction* to him.

To this says the *Remarker* very Ingeniously, *when we see the Stars, our Eyes move not up to them, but their extended Rays strike upon the Eye*. But the man Born *Blind* wou'd say, Nothing *Strikes* upon my *Eye*, for then I shou'd *Feel* it. And he knows nothing what you mean by *Rays* or by *See*. Nor cou'd think of any other way but that the *Eye* must get up to the *Star*, or the *Star* come down to the *Eye*. And your talking of *Rays* will not Solve the *Contradiction* one bit as to him. Nor can he be any otherwise Convinc'd than by Persuading him that what is a *Contradiction* in one *Nature* he understands, must not be Concluded to be so in another *Nature* he do's not understaand, and that the *Nature* of *Sight* is such as that no *Allusion* from any other of his *Senses* can make him Apprehend what it is. Nothing but this can Silence his Murmurings about *Contradiction*.

Is it not Reason then that our *Murmurings* about *Contradiction* in the *Nature* of *God* shou'd be *Silenc'd*, seeing it can be told us no otherwise than by such *Words* and *Allusions* as are Proper to *Man*; And that the *Divine Nature* is Infinitly more *Distant* and *Diverse* from the *Nature* of *Man* than one of our *Senses* is from another? And as the *Contradiction* the *Blind-man* conceives in the Nature of *Sight* is Caus'd by his comparing it with the Motion of his *Legs* or *Arms*, and that occasion'd by improper *Words* we must use to him, all others being *Unintelligible* to him but what have *Allusion* to some of the *Senses* he has: So in like manner those *Contradictions* we Conceive in the Nature of *God* are all Occasion'd by the improper *Words* which must be us'd to us in Expressing of His *Nature*, all *Words* being totally *Unintelligible* to us, which have not *Allusion* to something we understand. And thus we Conceiving of

of *God* after the manner of *Men*, make all those things to be *Contradictions* in *God* which in our Conception of the *Words* are a *Contradiction* to *Men*. As that several *Persons* shou'd not be several *Men*, and that the *Father* shou'd not be before the *Son*, &c. Whereas these *Terms* of *Father*, *Son*, *Persons*, &c. are not proper to the *Nature* of *God*, (tho' the most *Proper* we can use or understand) And therefor we are not to Conceive of them in the manner they are us'd and apply'd to *Men*, nor draw *Consequences* from them as we do when these *Words* are Apply'd to *Men*. Otherwise we shall Run into the like *Contradictions* as the *Blind-man* about *Sight*.

This will throw off all that the *Remarker* says of Inferring three *Gods* from the Term of three *Persons*, because it is so among *Men*. He talks like a *Blind-man* of *Colours*, of things *which* he must Confess he do's not understand; yet will be inferring *Contradictions* in them. He owns he cannot speak *Properly* of them, yet finds fault with the *Terms* we use, because they are not *Proper*, tho' he can find none more *Proper*.

(5.) He may as well say, That *God* is not *Eternal*, because we have no word to Express *Duration* higher than the word *Beginning*, and ther can be no *Beginning* in *Eternity*.

He may say it is a *Contradiction* that all things shou'd be *Present* with *God* (which yet he will not Deny to be an undoubted Verity) because it is a *Contradiction* to *Men*, that the *Past* or *Future* shou'd be *Present*, because then a thing wou'd be *Past* and not *Past*, *Future* and not *Future* at the same time.

These and other things I mentioned in my *first Dialogue*, but the *Remarker* takes no notice of them, nor will own the *Absurdity* of inferring *Contradictions* in *God* from *Contradictions* in *Man*, occasion'd by the Improper *Terms* we are Forc'd to make use of to Express *God* after the manner of *Men*.

(6.) But he has laid his Stress upon this Instance I brought of the *Blind-man*. And here he thinks he has an Advantage of me. And I am willing to join Issue with him upon it, That if he can find out any *Words* that are *Proper*, whereby to Express the Nature of *Sight* to a Man Born *Blind*, and that he will give the *Blind-man* leave to draw *Consequences* and infer *Contradictions* from such *Words* according as he understands them; then I will undertake to solve all the *Contradictions* that he pretends to muster up in the *Terms* whereby we Express the Holy *Trinity*. And let him shew any Difference betwixt these Cases if he can, only this, That far greater *Disparity* ought to be Allow'd as to the *Propriety* of *Words* when *Terms* belonging to *Men* are spoke of *God*, than when what belongs to one of our *Senses* is Apply'd to another.

(7.) And now let the Reader Judge what occasion he had of thus Insulting me, p. 1.

" But are you indeed *(says he to me)* " so very weak as to think you move " all the way to *Rome*, and are got thi- " ther as soon as you think of it? No, " Sir, whatever hast you may be in thi- " ther, you go no faster than your " Legs can carry you. And shou'd " *You* Challenge all the *Philosophy* in " the World? Who have so little " as not to know, that when you " think of *Rome*, or any other Place, " 'tis only the *Idea* of it in your I- " magination which you Contem- " plate, and not a Local Motion of " your Thoughts to it. In like man- " ner, when we see the *Stars* our

Eyes

" *Eyes* move not up to them, but " their Extended *Rayes* strike upon " the Eye. I see you have a Head " much fitter for entertaining and " coining Mysteries, than for Explai- " ning or Defending 'em. It's a " wonder you did not think rather, " that *Rome* or *Constantinople* shift and " come into your Head: And then " since in other Cases a lesser Ves- " sel cannot contain a greater, nor " a Nut-shel hold an House; you " might wonder how your little " Head should hold such great Ci- " ties; And with the same Philoso- " phy infer, that what is a Contradi- " ction to *Nutshels* is none to *Heads*, " and Challenge all Philosophy to Re- " concile it.

Now, Reader, has he not fully understood me, do you think, and answer'd me smartly?

(8.) But will you see him freely *Confessing* what he thus *Ridicules*? He says in this same p. 1.

" Indeed there may be something " attributed to one Nature, where " there is nothing Inconsistent, or " Contradictory to it; while if at- " tributed to another it might meet " with somthing Inconsistent, whence " a *Contradiction* will arise in the " one and not in the other.

Now this is the whole of what I have been contending for. I desire no more of him. And having granted this, how can he Deny that what is a *Contradiction* in one *Nature*, that is, of *Man*, may not be so in another *Nature*, that is, of *God*? Or are ther any two *Natures* more *Distant* and more *Different* than the *Nature* of *God* and of a *Creature*? Or do we understand the *Nature* of *God* more *Perfectly* and *Clearly* than our own *Nature*? Is it not Reasonable then what I said, as he Quotes my words, p. 2. *That we must not object Contradictions in the Incomprehensible Nature of God, from Comparing it with our own.* Because we *Understand* not his *Nature*. To which the *Remarker* says,

(9.) " I should grant this, in an " object of which we have no know- " lege at all: But surely if I have " some, tho' a partial knowlege of " the Infinite God, I may discern " what is Contradictory to that lit- " tle knowlege of him. Nor is any " thing more usual or Just, than to " Deny such or such a Doctrine, be- " cause Incompatible to the Divine " Attributes, to his Spirituality, Eter- " nity, Goodness, *&c.*

To which I reply, That the *Nature* and *Attributes* of any thing are Different. We may know the *Attributes*, when we cannot know the *Nature*. As we may see the *River*, but cannot Reach the *Spring* whence it flows. And this Dispute of the *Trinity* is not about any of the *Attributes* of *God*, but Concerning His very *Nature* and *Essence*, and how His *Being* is Compos'd, (if I might use that Word) of which I may say we are totally Ignorant, it is a *Light* Inaccessible to us, we know Nothing of it at all. And therefore cannot Charge *Contradiction* in the *Revelation* that is given to us of it. If we look Directly upon the *Sun* in its Strength, we see Nothing at all, it Strikes us *Blind*. But if we turn our Backs, we Discern the *Light* that comes from it. The *Attributes* of *God* are the *Rays* of the *Sun*, but His *Nature* is the *Sun* it self, we cannot Look upon it. It is Utter *Darkness* to Us, through the Excess of the *Light*. We can Discern Nothing at all in it, or say it is *Thus* or *Thus*, or that *This* or *That* is *Contradictory* to it. Alas, how little do we know of our own *Nature*;

ture? We know it only by the *Effects* and the *Qualities* we find in our Selves. But what it is in its self we cannot tell, we are Exceedingly in the *Dark*. And so as to the *Nature* of *Trees*, *Flowers*, *Plants* &c. We find by Experience such *Effects* and *Vertues* in them, but we know not the *Nature* or *Essence* of them, no not of a Pile of *Grass*, why of that *Colour*, *Shape*, or *Vertue*. How then can we Know what the *Nature* of *God* is? Or can we say it is not Rightly *Reveal'd* to Us in the Holy *Scripture*? Do we Know of what *Composition* our own *Souls* are made? Or how they *Act* in Us? Do we Know any thing at all of the *Soul* but by the *Effects*? We Know we *Think*, therefore we Conclude we have a *Soul*, but what that *Soul* is in its self, we Know not. Yet we wou'd Know the *Nature* of *God*!

(10.) This brings me to a *Criticism* of the *Remarker* upon the *Parallel* I made use of concerning the three *Faculties* of the *Soul*. He says, p. 3. That the *Memory* is not *another Faculty*, but only an Act of the *Understanding*. Now I thought that the *Understanding* was only Conversant about what was then *Present* before it. And that the *Memory* brought back *Past* things, and so made them *Present* to the *Understanding*. Whence a Man may have a good *Understanding*, and yet a bad *Memory*. Do we say of the *Understanding* that it *Forgets*? I take *Truth* or *Falshood* to be the *Objects* of the *Understanding*. But is *Love* or *Hatred* so? A Man may have an *Aversion*, and not know the *Reason* of it.

Non Amo te, Sabidi, nec possum dicere Quare,
Hoc tantum possum dicere, Non Amo te.

Are ther *Antipathys* in the *Understanding*? I think this is generally Attributed to the *Will*, and it is Agreed that it is a Distinct *Faculty* from the *Understanding*. And if ther be Different *Faculties* in the same *Soul*, it Answers all the Purpose for which I brought that *Parallel*. Nay, if it be but so Thought, it do's as well for me, to Solve the *Objection* about *Contradiction*, That Men shou'd not think a *Plurality* of *Persons* in *God* to be a *Contradiction* when the same *Difficulty* arises from a *Plurality* of *Faculties* in the *Soul*. For Three *Faculties* can no more be *One Faculty*, than Three *Persons* can be *One Person*. And yet these Different *Faculties* make up but *One* and the Self same *Soul*.

(11.) But I have Sufficiently Caution'd that I intend not to bring any *Proof* from these *Parallels*, Nor lay the stress of the *Cause* upon them, yet I thought them not altogether Useless, to shew Men how far they may Mistake in Charging *Contradictions*; from one *Nature* to another.

(12.) I have likewise told, That no *Parallel* in *Created Natures* can Answer *Exactly* or Come up to the *Nature* of *God*, only Point *Him* out at a Great *Distance*, and with Infinite *Disproportion*. And therefore that we must not Argue *Strictly* from the *One* to the *Other*. Yet the *Remarker* will not Observe this, but Argues of the *Persons* of *God* as of *Human Persons*. And says, p. 4. *If three Divine Persons be like three Human Persons——And if three Divine Persons should as Properly be accounted three Gods, as three Human Persons can, in Strict Speech, be accounted three Men*—— Thence he Infers *three Gods* &c.

He

He cannot I think but see the Fallacie of this Argument, after all that I have said. But he will not see it! He will still Argue *Strictly* from the Word *Person*, and Apply it to *God* in the same manner that it is Us'd among *Men*. If he wou'd Apply the word *Father* so, (which himself gives to *God*) or *God*'s being said to *Repent*, to *Grieve*, &c. What Work wou'd he make, what *Contradictions* might he Infer? His Brother *Socinian* Mr. *Biddle* (as I have shew'd) turn'd *Anthropomorphit* by this sort of Argument, and from Man being said to be made after the *Image* of *God*, held *God* to have a *Body*, and of *Human Shape*. And he might as well have made Him a *Bird* too, because ther is Mention made of His *Wings* and
Psal.xci.4. *Feathers*! This Savours not of the *Sagacity* the *Socinians* think Peculiar to Themselves.

(13.) From the like Gross Conceptions the *Remarker*, p. 7. raises Difficulties how a *Begotten Being* can be *God*. Thinking of *Begetting* after the Manner of *Men*! And then the *Father* must be in *Time*, as well as in *Nature*, before the *Son*. And it having been told him that supposing the *Sun* to be *Eternal*, its *Light* wou'd be as *Eternal*, he Replys, p. 7. That this *Parallel* will not do, for that the *Light* which (says he) *You call an Effect of the Sun, is indeed the very Sun it self, so may well be as Old*. By which the very *Sun* we see in the *Firmament*, and is many times Bigger than the whole *Earth*, can Creep through a *Cranny*, and be All of it in this Room, and in a Thousand other Places at the same Time! This will help *Trans-Substantiation* not a little! But is it so indeed that this Subtile *Socinian* can see no Difference betwixt the very *Sun* it Self, and the *Light* that flows from it? It is then time to have done Disputing with him. And he Runs into as Great *Absurdities* to get Rid of these *Parallels* as he Charges upon me for making Use of them.

He says (as before Quoted, *Sect.* 4.) *That when we See the Stars, our Eyes move not up to them, but their extended Rays strike upon the Eye*. But if the *Rays* or the *Light* be the *very Star it self*, then the very *Star* it self *Strikes* upon the *Eye*. Let him Consider whether ther is any thing so very *Gross* as this in any of the *Parallels* I have produc'd. And on whose side lies the *poor Philosophy*, and *Shallow Reasoning*.

(14.) Therefore leaving this Subject, I will now only Answer an Observation he makes from *Scripture*, wherein he says, p. 2. *God Almighty is Perpetually express'd* in the *Singular* Number, *Under One*, *He*, *Me*, *Thou*, &c. Now lest the Reader of these *Remarks* should be Carry'd away with this, I must mind him, That this *Socinian* says this, without taking any Notice of the *Texts* I have given to the Contrary in the 2d *Dialogue* p. 32, *&c.* Beginning with the *first* of *Genesis* where *God* is Spoken of in the *Plural* as well as the *Singular*. Number according to the *Hebrew*, *He* is there called *Gods*, and *Us*, as well as *God*, and *Me*. And is He not spoken of in the *Plural* Number in the *Form* of *Baptism* in the Name of the *Father*, and of the *Son*, and of the *Holy Ghost*? The *Remarker* ought to have *Mark'd* this, and not to have put the *Objection* over again, without saying something to the *Answer* had been made to it.

If this sheet gives him not full Satisfaction, I shall be willing to hear from him again.

Con-

Contents.

FINIS.

Pr now printed 1710. Nov: 9.

Mr Leslies Answr to the Examination of his Last dialogue & to Mr Clendons treatise of the word Person