

Waterland

An Answer to Dr. Whitby's  
Reply

~~D-7~~  
W2993



500

11.44





Dr. *WATERLAND*'s

**A N S W E R**

T O

Dr. *WHITBY*'s **R E P L Y,**

Respecting his **BOOK** Intituled

**DISQUISITIONES MODESTÆ.**



D-7

W2993

A N  
ANSWER  
TO  
D<sup>R</sup> WHITBY'S Reply,



BEING A  
VINDICATION  
OF THE  
CHARGE of FALLACIES,  
MISQUOTATIONS,  
MISCONSTRUCTIONS,  
MISREPRESENTATIONS, &c.

Respecting his Book Intituled

DISQUISITIONES MODESTÆ.  
*In a LETTER to Dr. WHITBY.*

---

By DANIEL WATERLAND, D.D.  
MASTER of *Magdalen-College*, in CAMBRIDGE,  
and CHAPLAIN in Ordinary to His MAJESTY.

---

*Faithful are the Wounds of a Friend.* Prov. 27. 6.

---

C A M B R I D G E :

Printed for CORN. CROWNFIELD, Printer to  
the *University*: And are to be Sold by JAMES  
KNAPTON, ROBERT KNAPLOCK, in *St. Paul's*  
Church-Yard, and WILLIAM TAYLOR, in *Pater-*  
*Noster-Row*, LONDON. MDCCXX.







S I R,

I HAVE read over your *Reply*, lately publish'd. I perceive, you are much disturbed at the Freedom I took with you, in That Part of my *Defense* which concern'd You: And tho' you have, for several Years last past, been acting the part of a *Censor*, and a severe one too (if we consider the *Intention*, rather than the *Effect*) upon many great, good, and learned Men, Antient and Modern; yet when it comes to be your own Case to be animadverted upon (however justly, and upon a necessary Occasion) you are not able to bear it with due Temper of Mind. I am very unwilling to give you any farther Disturbance: And, indeed, were your *Reply* to be read only by *Men of Letters*, I should not have a Thought of returning any Answer to it. But since the Controversy, about the ever Blessed Trinity, is now spread among all Kinds of Readers, I have judg'd it necessary, in so momentous a Cause, to take some Notice of what you have done, for the sake of some well-meaning Men who might otherwise happen to be impos'd upon by it.

You divide your Work into two Parts, *Defensive* and *Offensive*: The *First*, to take off (so far as you are able) what I had Charged you with; The *Second*, to retort the *Charge*, and to raise Objections from Antiquity, chiefly, against the *Catholick* Cause, which I have the Honour to espouse.

B

My

My *Answer*, accordingly, if it shall be thought needful to carry it through, must consist of two Parts: One to show that you have not been able to take off what I had charged you with; the Other to make it appear that your Objections against Us are slight and trivial, not capable of doing our Cause Harm.

### *Part the First.*

*Which is to show that you have not been able to take off what I had charged upon you.*

The *Charge* was contained under Two Heads.

1. General Fallacies, running through your whole Book, intituled *Disquisitiones Modeste*.

2. Particular Defects, viz. Misquotations, Misconstructions, Misrepresentations, &c.

I do not add the Epithets of *gross*, *egregious*, or the like, as you are pleased to do (*Reply*, p. 100.) because, if I can prove the Facts, the Reader may be left to judge how *gross*, or how *egregious* any *Misconstructions*, *Misrepresentations*, &c. are: and because those and the like Epithets, or Decorations, are then only useful, when a Writer lies under the unhappy Necessity of endeavoring to make up in *Words*, what He wants of *Proof*. But to come directly to the Matter in Hand, I must begin with the Charge of *general Fallacies*, which were Three, and which I shall take in their Order.

1. The first *General Fallacy* charged upon you \*, was, your making *Essence* and *Person* to signify the same. One *individual*, or *numerical Essence* you every where interpret to a *Sabellian Sense*; understanding by it one *individual Hypostasis*, or *real Person*. In

\* See my *Defense*, p. 399.

your *Reply*, you admit (*p.* 5.) that the *same numerical intellectual Essence* is, with you, equivalent to *same Person*: So that the *Fact* charg'd upon you stands good, by your own *Confession*.

Now then, let us see whether you have dealt fairly and justly with Bishop *Bull*. I observed what Influence This one Principle, or *Postulatum*, of your's must have upon the State of the *general Question*; and indeed upon your whole Thread of Reasoning quite through your Book. For, if it appears that you have set out upon a false Ground, you must, of Course, blunder all the Way, running into a perpetual *Ignoratio Elenchi* (as the Schools call it) that is, disputing besides the *Question*: which, under pretence and shew of *Confuting Bishop Bull*, is really nothing else but confuting an Imagination of your own. The *Question*, with Bishop *Bull*, was, whether the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers believed the Son to be of an *eternal, uncreated, and strictly divine Substance*. But, with you, it is, whether They believed Him to be the *same numerical intellectual Essence* (that is, as you interpret it, *Person*) with the Father. Thus you have changed the very State of the *general Question*, and must, of Course, argue all along wide of the Point. So, when you come to particular Authors, you still pursue the same Mistake that you began with. You state the *Question* relating to *Barnabas* (*Disquis. Mod. p.* 7.) thus; *Whether He makes Father and Son one numerical Essence*: which is the same, with you, as to ask, whether He makes them the *same Person*. The *Question* is stated the same way, in respect of *Hermas* \*, *Clemens of Rome* †, *Justin Martyr* ‡, and Others. With this kind of grave Impertinence you go on confuting Bishop *Bull*,

\* *Disquisit. Modest. p.* 9.

† *Disquisit. Mod. p.* 12.

‡ *Disquisit. Mod. p.* 25.

without so much as attacking Him; while the main weight and force of your Reasonings (when They really have any) falls not upon any Thing which He has asserted, but upon quite another Thing which you have been pleas'd to invent for Him. It is now Time to hear what you have to say in Defense of this peculiar Piece of Management. Your *Excuses* for it are reducible to Three Heads, 1<sup>st</sup>. That you did not know what Bishop *Bull* meant. 2<sup>dly</sup>, That you had interpreted *numerical Essence* as all the Present *Orthodox* do, whose Cause Bishop *Bull* is supposed to have espoused. 3<sup>dly</sup>, That *numerical Essence* does, and must signify what you pretend, and nothing else. Tho' I have not taken your own Words, yet, I think, I have here given your full Sense; and more distinctly and clearly than you have done. I am next to examine your *Excuses*, one by one.

1. You did not know what Bishop *Bull* meant, or in what Sense He maintain'd the *Consubstantiality*. So you pretend in your Book \*, and repeat it in your Reply †, that you are *not certain whether He* (the Bishop) *pleaded for a Numerical, or Specifick Unity of Essence*; taking it for granted that every *Numerical Unity*, is such as you have describ'd; and that there is no *Medium* between *Numerical*, in your Sense, and *Specifick*; that is, no *Medium* between *Sabellianism* and *Tritheism*. This indeed is the  $\pi\rho\omega\tau\omicron\nu \psi\epsilon\upsilon\delta\delta\omicron\varsigma$ , the prime Falsehood which you set out with, and proceed upon; and which makes all your Discourses on this Head confused, and wide of the Point. But of This more presently. As to Bishop *Bull*, if you had not Sagacity enough to perceive what He meant, you might however *easily* and *certainly* have known, that He did *not mean* what

\* *Modest. Disquis.* p. 31. Præf.

† *Reply.* p. 7.

you are pleas'd to put upon Him; because He has plainly, frequently, and constantly denied *numerical Unity*, in the Sense of *personal Identity*. His Intent was not to prove that the *Fathers* were *Sabellians* (as your way of opposing Him every where supposes,) but that They were not *Arians*. This you could not but know, if you know any thing: And therefore the method and way which you pitch'd upon, of writing against his Book, was, to say the least of it, very unfair and disingenuous. You would have your Readers believe that you have confuted the Bishop, when in reality, after granting you all that you have been able to prove, it is not to the purpose, is no *Confutation* of what the Bishop has asserted, but of another *Proposition* which the Bishop Himself had disowned, as much as you can do. The Charge therefore of *mistaking* the Question stands good against you; and, what is more, *wilful* mistaking, since you could not be ignorant that Bishop *Bull* did not intend to assert *Numerical Unity* in That Sense wherein you oppose it. This is sufficient for me in Defense of my *Charge*. But for the clearer Apprehension of Bishop *Bull's* meaning in relation to this Matter, I will next cite you some of his own Words.

“ As concerning the *Specifick* Unity of Persons, in  
 “ the Blessed Trinity, such as is the Union of *Sup-*  
 “ *posita*, or *Persons*, among Things created (for In-  
 “ stance, of Three Men, *Peter*, *Paul*, and *John*,  
 “ which are separate from one another, and do not  
 “ any way depend upon each other as to their Es-  
 “ sence.) This the Fathers of the first Ages never  
 “ dream'd of. They acknowledged a very different  
 “ Union of the divine Persons, such as there is no  
 “ Pattern of, no Resemblance perfectly answering to  
 “ it, whereby to illustrate it, among created Beings.  
 “ They explain the Matter thus: That God the  
 “ Father

“ Father is, as I said, the Head and Fountain of  
 “ Divinity, from whom the Son and Holy-Ghost  
 “ are derived, but so derived as not to be divided  
 “ from the Father’s Person, but They are in the  
 “ Father, and the Father in Them, by a certain  
 “ *ἁειχώρησις* or *Inhabitation*, so called, as I have  
 “ shown at large. *Defens. Fid. Nic. Sect. 4. lib. 4.*  
 “ *Petavius* Himself contends that from This *ἁειχώ-*  
 “ *ρησις*, *Inhabitation*, a numerical Unity may be in-  
 “ ferr’d, *Petav. l. 4. c. 16.* It is certainly manifest  
 “ that this Explication can no way consist with the  
 “ *Arian Hypothesis*: And it is also manifest that *Tri-*  
 “ *theism* is excluded by it, and the Unity of the  
 “ Godhead made consistent with a *real Distinction*  
 “ of Persons.

Thus far Bishop *Bull*, in his Answer to *Gilbert*  
*Clarke* \*. He speaks much the same purpose also  
 in his *Defense of the Nicene Faith* †. “ As to Nu-  
 “ merical Unity of Substance of Father and Son  
 “ (which *Huetius* says was denied by *Origen*) I can  
 “ make it evident that *Origen* acknowledged That  
 “ Unity as far as any of the earlier Fathers, and even  
 “ *Athanasius* Himself acknowledged it: That is,  
 “ *Origen* believed the Father, Son, and Holy-Ghost,  
 “ tho’ really Three Persons, yet to have no divided  
 “ or separate Existence (as Three Men have) but to  
 “ be intimately united and conjoynd one with ano-  
 “ ther, and to exist in each other, and (as I may so  
 “ speak) to pervade and permeate one another by an  
 “ ineffable *ἁειχώρησις*, which the Schoolmen call  
 “ *Inhabitation*: From which *Inhabitation*, *Petavius* as-  
 “ serts that a numerical Unity must necessarily be  
 “ inferr’d.

From this Account of Bishop *Bull*, it is evident

\* Bull. *Posth. Works*, p. 1004.

† Bull. *Def. Fid. Nic.* p. 130.

that He neither admitted *Specifick* Unity, nor *Numerical* in your Sense: And therefore it was very artificial of you to say that you knew not which of the Two He intended, as if He must have meant One, when it is so plain that He meant Neither, but utterly denied Both. He did indeed assert, as you see, *Numerical* Unity, but not in your Sense, not in the *Sabellian* Sense of *personal Identity*.

2. The Second *Excuse* you make for your impertinent manner of opposing Bishop *Bull* without contradicting Him, is, that you interpreted *Numerical* Essence as all the present *Orthodox* do, whose Cause Bishop *Bull* is supposed to espouse. So you tell us in the *Preface to Modest Disquisitions* \*, that you dispute against the *Consubstantiality*, in no other than the *Numerical* Sense, as asserted by *all the Orthodox*. Now, supposing it were certainly true (as it is certainly false) that all, who at present pass for *Orthodox*, understood *Numerical Essence* in the same Sense as you oppose it in; yet would it not be fair towards Bishop *Bull*, to put That Sense upon Him which He so fully, and so constantly disowns and disclaims. All that you should have done, in this Case, should have been to have observ'd, that Bishop *Bull's* Book is nothing to the purpose of the present *Orthodox*, who are all *Sabellians*, in as much as He has only shown that the Fathers were not *Arians*, has not proved that they were *Sabellians*. And you might have took notice, on this occasion, how weak and inconsistent all the *Orthodox* are, in receiving and applauding Bishop *Bull's* Book, a Book which has proved nothing which can serve their purpose; a Book which is so far from asserting *Sabellianism*, that is, *Orthodoxy* (as it is called) that it rather stands in direct Opposition to it. Now this would have been the fair open way, as well towards the present

\* *Whitby, Disqu. Mod. p. 32. Præf. Reply, p. 4.*

*Orthodox*, as towards Bishop Bull. Towards the *Latter*, because it is a certain Truth that He has by no means served the Cause of *Sabellianism*, or of *Numerical Unity*, in your Sense: Towards the *Former*, because it might have given Them an opportunity of explaining Themselves upon this Head; And They might take their Choice, either to give up Bishop Bull and all the *Fathers* at once, or else (which is most likely) declare what you say of them to be pure Calumny and Defamation. For my part, I make no doubt but it is a Slander upon them; and that you will be found at length to understand as little of the *Moderns*, as you do of the *Antients*. I have good Reason for what I say, from one particular Instance which I meet with in your Reply, p. 102. I am there represented, as having departed from the general received Doctrine of the Church, from the Fourth Century to this present Age, for no other reason but for saying, I mean a real Person and no Mode. Is it then really so, that All the *Orthodox*, from the fourth Century down to the present, have believed a Person to be a Mode, that is, in plain English, a Manner; and three Persons to be three Manners? Believe it that can: I have a much better Opinion, nay, certain Knowledge of them. The *Catholicks*, indeed, down from the fourth (I may say from the first) Century, have believed that there is no Disparity of Nature, no Division of Substance, no Difference in any Perfection between Father and Son; but that They are equally Wise, equally Infinite, equally Perfect in all Respects; differing only in this, that one is a Father, and the other a Son, one *Unbegotten*, and the other *Begotten*, as a Third is proceeding: And these three different Manners, or Modes, of Existence distinguish the Persons one from another, perfectly alike and equal in all other respects. The Phrase therefore of Modes of Existing,



*Existing*, was not design'd to denote the *Persons* Themselves, but their *distinguishing Characters*. This is what *Dr. South's* Authorities sufficiently prove, and all that They prove; and, I presume, all that He meant. For, tho' you are pleas'd to quote Him against Me, He is expressly for Me, where He utterly denies \* *that the Three divine Persons are only Three Modes of the Deity*. However that be, I take my Accounts of the *Antients* from the *Antients* themselves. If you can find any one, I do not say of the fourth, but even of the sixth, or eighth Century, to go no lower, laying it down for *Catholick Doctrin*e that a *Person* is a *Mode*, it will be kind to oblige us with the Discovery. As to the *Antients*, I will be bound to answer for Them, that what you say of them from the fourth Century, is pure Invention and Romance: And as to *Moderns*, I am very Inclinable to hope, I make no Scruple to believe, that you have misreported Them as much as you have done the other.

3. Your third and last *Excuse* is, that *Numerical Essence* does and must signify what you pretend, and nothing else: And therefore it was right to fix it upon *Bishop Bull*, who must be supposed to maintain *Numerical Unity*. This is your meaning (*Reply*, p.4.) tho' you seldom take care to express your self clearly and distinctly. To this I answer first, that admitting that your Sense of *Numerical Unity*, is the only true and proper Sense of it: Yet does it not follow, that you have any right to fix your Sense upon *Bishop Bull* in Contradiction to his declared Sentiments. If any Man has a mind to use Words in an *improper* Sense, provided He gives but sufficient Notice of it, He should not be rigorously dealt with for it, or have a Sense imposed upon Him which He utterly disclaims. A fair and candid Ad-

\* *South. Animadv. c. 8. p. 290, 291.*

versary, in such a Case, should make Allowance for *Words*, and attend to the *Thing*. To make the best of it, it is very unkind and unfair, industriously to mistake an Author's meaning, in such a Case, and to go about to confute what He certainly never intended to maintain; nay, what He is known to have denied and disclaimed. But to come a little closer to the Point; How do you prove, after all, that your's is the only proper Sense of *Numerical*? What if you should fail here, in the main Point of all, wherein your great Confidence lies, and for the sake of which you have rais'd all this Dust upon Bishop *Bull*, and thrown Scandal at large both upon Antients and Moderns? It is very certain, that *Numerical*, or *Individual* Unity has been, and is, maintain'd by *Catholicks*, and *Catholicks* that abhorred *Sabellianism*. Could you prove that your Sense of *Numerical Essence* is the only proper Sense, yet you can never prove that it is the only Sense it has been used in: So that, at length, the Dispute about it would be nothing more than a Dispute about Words.

But I will give you a plain Reason why you can never prove your Sense of the Words to be the only proper Sense: It is because you can never fix any certain Principle of *Individuation*. It is for want of This, that you can never assure me, that three real Persons, may not be, or are not, one *Numerical*, or *Individual* Substance. In short, you know not, precisely, what it is that makes *one Being*, or *one Essence*, or *one Substance*. Here your *Metaphysics* are plainly defective; and This it is that renders all your Speculations upon that Head, vain and fruitless. Tell me plainly, is the *divine Substance* present in every place, in *Whole*, or in *Part*? Is the *Substance* which is present here upon Earth, that very *Individual Numerical* Substance which is present in Heaven, or is it not? Your answer to these Questions  
may

may perhaps suggest something to you, which may help you out of your Difficulties relating to the *Trinity*; or else the Sense of your inability to answer Either, may teach you to be less confident in Matters so much above you, and to confess your Ignorance in Things of this Nature, as I freely do mine.

You tell us very solemnly (p. 4.) repeating it several Times, that the same *Numerical Essence* neither doth nor can signify any more than one *Essence* in *Number*. Which is only telling us, that the same *Numerical Essence* is the same *Numerical Essence*, Aye that it is: And who doubts it? Or who is the wiser for these weighty Discoveries? How shall I ever know, from thence, that three real Persons may not be, or are not one *Numerical Substance*, one Being, one God? You will *suppose*, without doubt, that one *Intellectual Essence*, or one *Person*, are equivalent and reciprocal. And I, on the other hand, will *suppose* the contrary, and then we are just as we began: You have not proved, nor ever can prove that three real Persons may not be properly called *one numerical Substance*. If you have all along gone upon the Supposition that They cannot, you have shown that you can mistake, that you can beg the Question, that you can wander from the Point in Hand, can trifle much and prove little, and That is all.

The Sum then of what I have pleaded to make good my *Charge* of the first *general Fallacy*, is, that you have set out wrong, mistook the very Point in Question, pursued your Mistake all along, and followed your own Wandrings, instead of opposing Bishop Bull: That you have no *excuse* for understanding *numerical Essence* as you do, either from Bishop Bull's Book, who never so understands it, or from the *Catholick* Sense of it, Antient or Modern, which is different from your's, or from the *Propriety* of the Phrase it self, which may, for any

thing you know, admit of another Sense, and which you have no way of confuting but by *begging the Question*; which is not *confuting*, but rather tacitely acknowledging that it is not capable of any Confutation. So much for the first Article: Only here I must be so just to you as to observe, that you do not always wander from the Point in Question. You do sometimes, indeed often, attempt to prove that the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers were of Those Principles which were afterwards called *Arian*. So far is pertinent, and is directly opposing Bishop *Bull*. But then I must observe farther, that lest you should happen, at length, to fail in your first point of proving the *Fathers* to have been *Arians*, you reserve the other point as what you can prove and can never fail of, namely, that They were not *Sabellians*: And This is what the Result of your Arguments generally comes to, after you have carried Them on as far as They can go. The first Point is what you seem most desirous of proving, were it possible to do it: But if you cannot do That, you are content however to prove the Latter, rather than seem to have done nothing. I should here conclude this Article, but that two or three incidental Things should be taken notice of, which must come in here, or no where. I had observed \* several *Guards* which you had put in, in the general State of the Question, as it were with design to secure a handsom Retreat. You say, *all the Ante-Nicene Fathers*; when the *most*, or the *generality* might be sufficient. I had reason

\* Defense, p. 401. *The general Question is thus stated.*

*Whether All the Ante-Nicene Fathers profess'd the very same Doctrine which We ascribe to the Nicene Council; that is, whether all acknowledged the same Numerical Essence of the Father to have been communicated to the Son and Holy-Ghost, and that therefore Both are one God in Number with the Father.* Whitby. *Proem.* p. 2.

to observe this, because Bishop *Bull*, had, in a manner, given up *Lactantius*: Besides, that it is not necessary to assert that every Writer (suppose *Clemens* of *Rome*, or *Barnabas*) has said enough in a short Epistle, from whence it might certainly be inferr'd that their Principles were the same with those of the *Nicene Fathers*. It is sufficient if as many as speak plainly either way, are on our Side; and that none of the *earlier* Writers contradict it, but are in the main favourable to us, and *probably*, if not *demonstrably* ours. Another *Guard* inserted was, *which we ascribe to the Nicene Council*, instead of, *which was asserted by the Nicene Council*. The reason I had to take notice of This, is apparent from what hath been said. *Numerical* Essence, rather than *same* Essence, was another *Guard*: And what use you make of it is visible enough. That this Essence, the same *Numerical* Essence (or *Person* as you understand it) was *communicated* to two other Persons, is what you demand to have proved: And you have some pretence for Cavil at the word *communicated*. This I observed before: And your Reply \* is, that what I call a *Pretence to quarrel at the Word Communicated*, is indeed Arguments produced against it, as it is stated by the Bishop, and which I durst not meddle with nor pretend to answer. The Reason of my not answering your Cavils against the Expression, was because it was foreign to my purpose, and because we were inquiring, whether Bishop *Bull* had truly and justly represented the *Antients*, not whether His Doctrine (the same with the antient Doctrine) is liable to the Charge of Contradiction. If you are able to prove any thing of that kind (as you are not) against Bishop *Bull*, it will hold equally against the *Antients*, and Him too; and is of distinct Consideration from the Point which we are now upon. However, if our Readers

\* Reply, p. 5.

will pardon a small Digression, I shall here examine those weighty *Arguments*, which before, it seems, *I durst not meddle with.*

You object (*Præf. p. 21.*) that the Communication of the Father's Essence to a Person is inconceivable, because the Person must be supposed to have it, to be a Person. This is nothing but Cavilling at a popular way of Expression. In strictness of Speech, the Person of the Son is the very Thing which is derived, communicated, generated; and the Father, in communicating his Essence, generates the Person of the Son.

You object farther; That if the same numerical Essence of the Father be communicated, then it is the same numerical Essence in Both, only existing in a different Manner. To which I answer, if you mean by numerical Essence, the same numerical Person, it is not communicated at all: For the Person of the Father only communicates, the Person of the Son is communicated: And These two Persons, or *Hypostases* constitute the same numerical Essence; which consequently, as personalized in the Son, is *begotten*, as personalized in the Father, *unbegotten*, that is, exists in a different Manner. The two Persons exist after a different Manner; which two Persons constitute one numerical Essence; and therefore I admit that the same numerical Essence does exist in a different Manner, in the two Persons.

You object also \*, that the Essence of the Father is *unbegotten*, the Essence of the Son *begotten*, therefore Both cannot be the same Essence. That Both cannot be the same *Hypostasis*, or *Person*, is very certain, for the reason which you give. But that two *Hypostases*, one *unbegotten*, the other *begotten*, may not constitute one Substance, or Essence, you have not shown. All these Objections of your's turn only upon your

\* *Præf. p. 21.*

mistaken Sense of *numerical* Essence, and amount to no more than a *Petitio principii*; while you take for granted the Thing in Question, that there cannot be two real Persons in one *Substance*, or *Essence*. I can tell you of Some, whose Judgment you much rely on, who must, upon their Principles, allow, that the same *numerical* Substance; is both greater and less than the same *numerical* Substance; is remote and distant from the same *numerical* Substance, is contained in, and contains the same *numerical* Substance (see my *Defense* p. 299.) They must likewise admit of *Being* and *Being*, in the same *numerical* Being; *Substance* and *Substance*, in the same *numerical* Substance: as also *Being* and *Being*, where they cannot say *Beings*, in the plural; *Substance* and *Substance*, where they cannot say *Substances*; *Essence* and *Essence*, where they cannot say *Essences*. (See my *Defense*, p. 167, 168.) These Things, perhaps, may appear new and strange to you: But if you please to consider them, They may be useful to convince you of your fundamental mistake in confining the Phrase of *numerical Substance* to one particular Sense of your own; and may help to satisfy you that there's nothing absurd or contradictory in the Supposition, that one and the same *numerical Substance* may be both *begotten* and *unbegotten*. You may also please to consider that tho' the *Catholicks* (especially after They came to express Themselves accurately) would never, or very seldom, say *two Substances*, *two Essences*, *two Spirits*, *two Lights*, *two Wisdoms*, or *two Wills*, any more than *two Gods*, or *two Lords*; yet They never scrupled to say *Substance of Substance*, *Essence of Essence*, *Spirit of Spirit*, *Light of Light*, *Wisdom of Wisdom*, *Will of Will*, in like manner, as *God of God*. All which is to intimate that the Union is not *Numerical*, in the *Sabellian*, that is, in your Sense: And yet it is *Numerical* in another; insomuch that you cannot here speak of *Substances*.

or *Essences*, in the plural, as you may of Things *specifically* united, and no more.

You object farther \*, *that the same Substance cannot be subordinate to none in the Father, and yet subordinate in the Son or Holy-Ghost.* Yes, it may, if three Persons can be one and the *same Substance*, because these Persons may be *subordinate* one to another. Here, again, you suppose that three Persons cannot be one Substance. And now, is not This shrewd arguing, thus perpetually to beg the Question? You have one *Turn of Wit* more, and it is against *interior Production*, which you pretend is such a *solid Argument* as I had the *Wit* to leave *unanswered*, (*Reply*, p. 6.) This *interior Production*, you say †, is *either the Production of something or nothing.* Wonderful *solid!* Well, what if it be the Production of *something*? For undoubtedly we do not mean it of a Production of nothing, that is, of no Production. Then you say it must be the Production of something *new*, for a Production is always of something *new.* *Solid* again! that an *eternal* Production must be a Production of something *new.* But you cannot conceive, it may be, *how* any *Production* should be *eternal.* And what if you cannot conceive *how* any thing should be *eternal*? I expect a proof of you that it cannot be. Your *Supposing* it cannot, will give me no Satisfaction. I have now run through your little Quirks and Subtilties upon this Head, which yet are not *yours*, but as old almost as the Controversy; despised by Men of Sense all-along, despised even by your self, thirty Years ago; when, with Honour to your self, and to the Satisfaction and Benefit of others, you wrote in Defense of That Antient Faith, which now you revile and blaspheme.

\* *Disquisit. Mod.* p. 23. Præf.

† *Disquisit. Mod.* p. 23. Præf.



But to conclude this Article, tho' I have, in Civility towards you, considered your Arguments drawn from the *Nature* and *Reason* of the Thing, yet I must repeat my Observation, that we may have nothing to do with them, in our present Enquiry relating to the *Antients*; because if They are of any weight, They are as much against the Faith of the *Antients* Themselves, as against Bishop *Bull*, who acknowledges no other *Numerical* Unity than the *Antients* acknowledged. Having made good my first *Charge*, I proceed to a Second.

II. A second *general Fallacy* \*, was your arguing from the Expressions of *Arians* (famous for dissembling and equivocating) to Those of the *Ante-Nicene* Writers; Men of a very different Stamp and Character, and who were not under the like Temptation of saying one Thing and meaning another. I had observed that you had recourse to this *Salvo*, or *Fallacy*, in order to elude the Force of some *High Expressions*, (in respect of the Son's Divinity) which you met with in the *Ante-Nicene* Writers. To this you reply, (p. 9.)

1. That it is not fairly suggested, that you do This when you find some Expressions run pretty high and strong for the Divinity of Christ: For, in all the Places refer'd to, there is no Expression of that Nature but in the last. If you please to look back to your *Prooemium*, (p. 4, 5.) you will there find that you have made use of the *Fallacy* which I charge you with, as a general Answer to invalidate the Force of most, or all Bishop *Bull's* Testimonies. You observe that the acknowledging of Christ to be *God of God*, or *God before the Worlds* was common to many who were utter Enemies to the *Nicene* Faith. You go on to prove This farther by the Author of the *Opus Im-*

\* See my Defense, p. 403, 404.

*perfectum*, which Author you pronounce an *Arian*. You proceed to observe from Bishop Bull Himself, that the *Arians* scrupled not any of the *Catholick* Forms of Speech, save only the Term *Consubstantial*. They would say, for Instance, that the Son was *begotten out of the Father Himself*, and was *true God*; and They rejected with Indignation the Charge of making the Son a *Creature*. Now, what could be your meaning in these Remarks, but to insinuate to your Reader, that let Him meet with ever so *High Expressions* of the Son's *Divinity* among the *Ante-Nicene* Writers; yet unless They have the very word *Consubstantial*, They might possibly, or probably, mean no more than the *Arians* did after by the same or the like Expressions? This is the *Fallacy* which I complain'd of, and which you often occasionally recur to, both in your Book and Prefaces, to weaken the Force of Bishop Bull's Authorities. Some of the Places where you do This, I referr'd to \*, in my *Defense*, which the Reader that has a mind to it may turn to; and I do not yet see that I have *suggested* any thing but what is both fair and true.

2. A second Evasion you have in your *Reply*, (p. 5.) is that you said sometimes *Arians* and *Semi-arians*, whereas I have represented you as if you had said *Arians* only. I do not see that This is at all Material. If either *Arians* or *Semi-arians* used *Catholick* Expressions without a *Catholick* Meaning, They come so far under the same Predicament of *dissembling*, and *equivocating*: And that Both were notoriously guilty of so doing, is clear from all History of those Times. The *Semi-arians* in particular were often charged with it, both by *Catholicks* and *Ano-*  
*means*. You say, farther, that you likewise join mostly with them some of the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers. But you will never be able to show that those *Ante-*

\* *Præf.* p. 4 29. *Disqu. Met.* p. 8, 9, 40. 90. 109. 153. 157.

*Nicene* Fathers were of different Principles from the Council of *Nice*: So that your joining Them with the others was either foreign to the Point, or supposing the very Thing in Question.

3. You reply thirdly (p. 10.) that *sure it must be a very uncharitable Censure to pronounce of near a Thousand Bishops convened at Antioch, Seleucia, Sirmium, Ariminum and elsewhere, that They were a pack of Hypocrites, and equivocating Knaves.* To which I make answer, first, that I know not how you will be able to make out near your Number. If you add the Numbers of the several Councils, you may probably reckon many of the same Men twice or thrice over. Neither were the Men that made up those Councils, all of them *Arians*. There were but 80 of the whole 400 at *Ariminum*, really *Arians*. So that probably 320 were imposed upon by the rest, and the Charge of *equivocating* lies upon the 80 only. And it is evident not only from *Athanasius*, but also from *Sulpicius Severus*, and St. *Jerom*, and indeed from all the Historians, and all the Accounts we have of that Council, that the *Arians* at *Ariminum* carried their Point by *Equivocation* and *Wile*, and that the *Catholicks*, most of them, were imposed upon by *double Entendres*. They went upon those *charitable* Principles which you are pleas'd to recommend. They could not imagine there was so much latent *Insincerity* and *Guile*, under so many fine Words and fair Pretences from Men of their own Order.

2. I answer secondly, that there may be some difference between charging Men with *Equivocation*, and calling Them *Knaves*. There is a Reverend Doctor, whom I scruple not to Charge with *Equivocating*. He says, in a Preface \*, He has many

\* Uꝛ verum fatear, multa sunt quæ me impediunt quo minus a sententia de Vera Christi Deitate recederem, id solum contendo &c. Whitby. *Disqu. Mod.* p. 3. Præf.

Things which hinder Him from receding from the Belief of Christ's *true Divinity*: And it is well known what He once meant by Christ's *true Divinity*, when He wrote a *Traact* \* with that Title, in Defense of it, Who would not charitably believe, from hence, that He still retain'd the same Faith, in the same *true Divinity*? But see what He means by Christ's *true Divinity* (*Disqu. Mod.* p. 25. †) where He commends *Justin Martyr* for maintaining Christ's *true Divinity*, making This an Argument of it, that *Justin's* Sentiments were clearly opposite to the Doctrine of the *Nicene Council*. Hence it is manifest, that the Doctor *equivocates* in the Phrase *true Divinity*. The *Fact* I maintain; but if from thence you'll infer that He is an *equivocating Knave*, remember that the *Inference* is your's, and not mine.

4. You reply fourthly, as from *Sozomen*, that when the Arians first appeared, many Bishops, a considerable Number of the Clergy, and no small Part of the People — favoured his Party; and that two Synods convened at Bithynia, and Palestine, wrote to their Brethren to communicate with those Arians, as being Orthodox. And here you ask, were all those Holy Men and able Judges, those Synods, Bishops, Clerks, and Laity, a pack of Hypocritical Dissemblers, and equivocating Knaves? No; I charitably believe otherwise. The Synods, Bishops, Clerks, and Laity, who received the Arians as Orthodox, were not, probably, the *equivocating Knaves* (as you chuse to express it) but the Arians; who by fair Words, and artful Confessions, appeared

\* Whitby, de vera Christi Deitate: *Traactatus*, Ann. 1691.

† Magnam admirationem mihi iniecit iniqua eorum sententia, qui *Justinum* M. Christianæ Fidei Simplicitatem, in Doctrina de Christi præ-existentia, *Veraque Deitate*, adulterasse suspicati sunt; quo Patrum Nemo, (leg. Neminem) meo quidem iudicio, vel *plura* vel *clariora adversus Synodi Nicenæ placita* docuisse, facile est Demonstrare. Whitby, *Disqu. Mod.* p. 25.

to be what They were not, and so were received as *Orthodox*. You will remember that the Principal of those *Holy Men*, and *able Judges*, that promoted *Arius's* Interest in the Synod of *Bithynia*, was *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia*: The same Man that afterwards profess'd \* his Assent and Consent to the *Nicene Creed*, as the true *Catholick Faith*; and excused his not consenting to the *Anathematizing* of *Arius*, upon this Foot, that He thought *Arius* had been much misrepresented, and that He knew from *Arius's* own Letters, that He was not the Man that the *Council* took Him to be. Now if *Eusebius*, the principal Man of the Synod of *Bithynia*, was thus imposed upon by *Arius's* fair Pretences, no doubt but He represented *Arius's* Case to the Synod, as favourably as He Himself had conceiv'd of it: And then no wonder if a Man was receiv'd as *Orthodox*, who was really believ'd to be *Orthodox*. If you think that *Eusebius*, all the while, knew that *Arius* was not *Orthodox*, in my Sense of the Word; Admitting That, yet He might, for any Thing I know, represent Him as such Then, as well as He did After: If so, the only *equivocating Knave* might be *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia*; the rest might be imposed upon by his Representations and Colourings. *Holy Men* and *able Judges* can Judge no otherwise of Facts, but as They are reported: And how could it be remedied, if *Arius* happen'd to get good Testimonials, tho' Himself an Ill-Man? But enough of this Matter: As to the *Arian Custom* of *equivocating*, and thereby imposing upon Honest Men, The Fact being plain, I shall insist no longer upon it, only referring to a few Authors † who give a summary Account of it.

\* Sozom. E. H. l. 2. c. 16. p. 378.

† Bull. Def. Fid. Nic. p. 293. Cave's *Life of Athanasius*. Cave. Epist. Apolog. p. 96. Clerc. Epist. Crit. 2. p. 52.

III. A Third *general Fallacy*, just hinted in my *Defense*, (p. 405.) was, your arguing against the Faith of the *Ante Nicene* Fathers, in respect of Christ's real Divinity, from this Topic; that They often distinguish *God* from *Christ*, and call the Father *God* absolutely.

Here, again, you complain of Me for *unfair Dealing*. But how, or wherein am I *unfair* towards You? You say (*Reply*, p. 11.) *that your first Instance of this Nature is from the Epistle of Clemens Romanus, where He constantly separates (distinguishes, you mean) Jesus Christ from That God, whom He styles the true and only God, but never once calls Him God.* If this Answer be any thing pertinent, I suppose your meaning is, that your Argument did not turn upon This, that *Christ* was distinguish'd from *God*; but upon these farther Considerations, that *Christ* is constantly so distinguish'd by *Clemens*, and never once called *God*. You may, if you please, call all those Considerations put together, one Argument: But They appeared to me to be distinct and several. You observe \* of *Clemens*, that *He perpetually distinguishes Christ from God (Christum a Deo perpetuo distinguit.)* This was one Consideration, or Presumption in favour of your Principles. A second you add immediately after, *Deum vero ne semel nuncupat, But He never calls Christ God.* You proceed to illustrate your first Observation by such Instances as These following; That *Clemens* wishes Grace and Peace to the *Corinthians* from *Almighty God*, by *Jesus Christ*; That He introduces (*Ch. 20th.*) the *great Creator and Lord of the Universe* distributing his Blessings by *Jesus Christ*; That *Christ* was sent of *God*, *Ch. 42*; and that the Apostles had their Commission by *Christ* from *God*, *Ch. 43*. Now to what purpose were these several Instances produced, except you intended them as so

\* *Disqui. Mod.* p. 16.

many Arguments against *Clemens* his believing Christ to be Consubstantial with Him whom alone He calls *God*, and from whom He distinguishes *Christ*? But I insist upon it, that there is no weight at all in this Argument. Nothing has been more common with Writers, who have fully believed the Doctrine of a Co-eternal Trinity, than this Manner of speaking; especially when They have been thinking on another Subject, and had no occasion to speak of *Christ's* Divinity. And what if *Clemens*, or *Polycarp*, or any other Writer, in a short Epistle, or Tract, has spoke of the Father only, under the Title of *God*, and of the Son as *Lord*, or *Saviour*, or *High-Priest*? How often might the same Thing be observed in modern Treatises, or Sermons of very Orthodox Men? I see no Consequence that can be justly drawn against our Principles, from these Premises. And if *Clemens* called the Father the *only God*, or *only true God*, tho' That be a distinct Argument from the former; yet neither does it prove any thing more than the other, as I have shown in another Place \*.

But you refer me to some *Collections* of your's, in another Book †, from *Origen*; who, it seems, in his Book against *Celsus*, distinguishes and separates (so you say p. 12.) *Christ* from Him who is *God above all*; and declares, in the Name of the generality of Christians, that *Christ* is not *the God above all*. This is not pertinent to the Point in Hand, having no Relation to the *Fallacy* I charg'd you with, nor belonging to the Book which I was animadverting upon. But that I may not stand upon Niceties with you, I will give you an Answer to this *new* Pretence. It is very certain that *Origen* never intended to deny that *Christ* is *God above all*: Because all *Catholicks* ‡ (I might say *Here-*

\* Sermon 4th.

† Pref. de S. Script. Interpr. p. 34, 35.

‡ See the Testimonies in Mills, And my Sermons p. 221.

*vicks* too for the most part) both before and after *Origen's* Time, as well as *Origen* Himself, understood *Rom.* 9. 5. of God the Son, there stiled ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός, or *God above all*. Yet there is a certain Sense in which the Antients have denied Christ to be the *God above all*; namely, when so understood as to make Christ the very *Person of the Father*, as the *Sabellians* understood it \*, or to set Him *above the Father* †, or *above the Creator* ‡ of the World, as some other *Hereticks* pretended. In this latter Sense it is that *Origen* denies the Son to be *God above all*; as He had reason to do, because it would have been denying His *Subordination* and *Sonship*, and inverting the Order of the Persons, to have asserted that *Christ* was in any Sense *above the Father*, or so *God above all*, as to have the *Creator*, or *Father*, subordinate to Him.

Notwithstanding all This, *Origen* Himself, in the very Page before That which you refer to, asserts and maintains the *Catholick* Doctrine in full and express Terms, the very same Doctrine that we contend for at this Day. For, having objected to *Celsus* \*\* the worship of *many Gods*, telling Him that if He would be consistent with his Principles, He should not talk of the Kingdom of *God*, in the Singular, but of *Gods*, in the Plural, He then bethinks Himself that the Argument might be retorted upon Christians, as worshipping two Gods, *viz.* the *Father* and *Christ*. Here was the Critical Place; Here, if any where, we shall see of what Principles *Origen* was. Well, How does *Origen* get rid of the Ob-

\* Vid. Apost. Constit. l. 6. c. 26. Pseud Ignat. Ep. ad Tarf. c. 5. Ad Philip. c. 7.

† Origen Contr. Cels. p. 387. Basil. Epist. 78. p. 892.

‡ Vid. Iren. p. 101. 106. Edit. Bened. Origen in Matt. p. 476. Huet.

\*\* Vid. Origen. p. 385, 386.



jection? Not by saying that the Father *only* is God, in a *proper* Sense: Not by saying that the Father is *supreme* God, and the Son *another* God under Him. No, He was wiser than to make Himself ridiculous to *Jew* and *Gentile*, by such a weak Answer: But He solves the Difficulty by asserting the *Unity* of Father and Son: And, after He had guarded his Assertion from any *Sabellian* Construction, He triumphantly closes up all in these Words; *We therefore, as I have shown, worship one God, the Father and Son* \*. Thus He at once cleared the Christian Doctrine from *Polytheism*, and made good the Charge against the *Pagans*.

From what hath been said it may appear, that *Origen* has denied no more than all *Catholicks* deny, namely, that *the Father is subordinate to the Son*: And has asserted as much as any *Catholick* contends for. We do not say that *Christ* is That Person who is ordinarily, and eminently stiled *God above all*, nor that He is in any Sense, or Respect, *above* the *Creator*, or above *God the Father*, being subordinate to Him; But we assert that He is essentially one God with Him who is the *Father*, and, as such, is *God above all*: And this very Doctrine is plainly *Origen's*, as well as Ours. You have forced Me into this Digression, by making your Objection in a wrong Place; and therefore let That be my Excuse to the Reader for it. Now I return.

I have run through the Three *general Fallacies* which I charged you with. Your feeble Endeavors to take Them off, prove ineffectual: And They now return upon you with the greater Force.

I am next to consider the *particular Defects*. But, before I proceed farther, it will here be proper to remove a Complaint of yours, which you repeat

\* *Ἐνα ἓν θεόν, ὡς ἀποδείκνυμεν, τὸν πατέρα & τὸν υἱὸν θεοπαύμεν.* pag. 286.

more than once: It is a Complaint of my Management, and Conduct relating to your Book.

You tell me (p. 2.) that I have not defended any of the Bishop's Arguments, which you had produced and answer'd; nor made any reply to those numerous Arguments, which you produced from the Ante-Nicene Fathers against Mine and the Bishop's Sentiments.— In another Place, you say thus, (p. 57.) He is obliged, if He would indeed defend the Bishop, to invalidate and refute the Answers that I have given to all his Arguments, and to do this entirely, and not by Culling out two or three Instances, and leaving all the rest in their full strength; That being in all the other Cases, to leave the Bishop in the Lurch.

By all This, you seem to think, that Bishop Bull's celebrated Performance is in some Danger of sinking in its Character, if your *Modest Disquisitions* be not particularly answer'd, Paragraph by Paragraph; and that I ought to have paid so much Respect to your *Work*, as either not to have meddled at all with it, or to have attended you all the way through it. Now, as to this Matter, I will here frankly declare to you my real Thoughts, in the following Particulars.

I. In the first Place, I am so far from apprehending any Danger to Bishop Bull, and his Cause, from your Book, that I should never have given my self the trouble of remarking at all upon it, had it not been given out to *English* Readers (who must take such Things on Trust) that Bishop Bull's famed Piece would receive an Answer, such as should satisfy *All learned and unprejudiced Persons*. I knew that a *Latin* Book could do no Harm, but among Those that could read *Latin*; and such I thought might, for the most part, be very safely trusted, having Bishop Bull's Book to compare with your's, which alone is sufficient to answer for it self, with Men of any Judgment. The  
Danger

Danger was not from the *Book* it self, but from the *Reports* made of it: And it concern'd me to take care that *English* Readers might not be impos'd upon; which was one principal Motive of my doing what I did.

2. I considered farther, that this Controversy being of all others the most nice and intricate, and in which it is the easiest for a Writer, that has a mind to it, to confound and puzzle such Readers as have not been conversant in it; I say, I considered that it might be useful even to some *Latin Readers* to point out the principal Flaws and Fallacies in your Performance, which when done, your whole Book is in a manner answer'd; or however answer'd as far as is needful, to prevent any honest Man's being impos'd upon by it.

3dly, You will give me leave to tell you, with all due Respect (however frankly) that a Writer who begins, and proceeds as you do, has no reason to expect an Answer Paragraph by Paragraph; because there is a shorter, and much better way of dealing with Authors that are not careful to write *pertinently*. Who, do you imagine, would be at the Trouble of telling you a hundred Times over, that this Argument is good against the *Sabellians*, and in such a Sense of *numerical Essence* as is not to the purpose; but in Bishop Bull's Sense, and in the true Sense, the Argument is of no weight at all? One short general Answer is sufficient in such a Case; and is in reality as long as the Objection, which is only Repetition of the same Thing. Had you stated the *Question* fairly, kept close to the Point in Hand, arguing *pertinently* at least, if not *solidly*, all along, directly opposing That, and That only, which Bishop Bull undertook to prove; then indeed it might have concern'd us to attend upon you all the way through; and to have defended the Bishop against your Attacks.

But when, instead of this, you set out upon a wrong Foot, and wander wide and far from the Mark you should have aimed at: When instead of attacking Bishop *Bull* directly, you encounter for the most part a Phantom of your own, and Fight with your Shadow: In such a Case as this, we have no need to be solicitous about the Bishop. Those formidable Preparations, which might be otherwise apt to strike Terror into us, are happily diverted another way: All we have now left to do, is to stand by unconcern'd, look on, and smile. These are my Reasons why I hold my self excused from making any more particular Answer to your *numerous Arguments*, as you are pleas'd to call Them. You may give Us leave to judge how far our Cause may be endanger'd by what you have done: And if We who are Friends to the Bishop and his Cause, are in no pain about Either, nor at all afraid of *leaving Them in the Lurch*, You may be very easy. Now I proceed to make good the Particulars of the Charge upon you, *Misquotations, Misconstructions, Misrepresentations, Reviving of old and trite Objections concealing the Answers, &c.* These, I think, reach to about twenty Particulars, which shall all be considered in the same Order as laid down in my *Defense*.

I. I charged you \* with a *Misquotation* † of *Poly-carp's* Doxology, recorded in the Epistle of the Church of *Smyrna*. You left out, as I said, the two most material Words, *ὅν αὐτῶν*, on which the Bishop's Argument chiefly depended. You acknowledge in your *Reply* (p. 13.) that you left those Words out, and the reason you give, is, because *They are neither in the Edition of Bishop Usher, nor of Cotelerius, from whom you cited the Passage*. This Answer, give me leave to say, is more unkind to your

\* See my *Defense*, p. 406.

† *Disquisit. Mod.* p. 22.

self than the *Charge* I made. I had compared the different Readings of the *Doxology* in the two Editions, *Eusebius's* and Bishop *Usher's*. I considered that if you should pretend to follow Bishop *Usher* and *Cotelerius*, you had falsified in two places, changing μεθ' ἑ into δι' ἑ, and καὶ πνεύματι into ἐν πνεύματι, which are very material Alterations. But if you should pretend to copy from *Eusebius*, there you had left out σὺν αὐτῷ. The latter being a Sin of *Omission* only, and more excusable than putting Words into the Text, I chose to fix the Charge there where it might fall the lightest, and seem rather a Slip than any ill Design. I had another Reason why I was willing to charge it as an *Omission* out of the Text of *Eusebius*; and That was because Bishop *Bull* had followed *Eusebius's* Copy. Now if you had a mind to take another Reading from *Usher* and *Cotelerius*, you should have given Notice that Bishop *Bull* had made use of a faulty Copy, before you had triumph'd over Him; and should have observed that *Usher's* and *Cotelerius's* Reading was the true one. But not a word do you say of This; and the Reason of your deep Silence, in this respect, is very evident. Bishop *Bull's* Argument was strong and good, according to *Eusebius's* Reading: And according to *Usher's* and *Cotelerius's* it would have been still stronger and fuller. Since therefore Neither of the *Readings* would serve your Purpose, you lay aside Both, and invent a new one of your own\*: And then you might securely insult over the learned Prelate, having a *Text* and *Comment* Both of your own contriving.

\* The Readings of the Passage.

Δι' ἑ σοι σὺν αὐτῷ, ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, Euseb. E. H. l. 4. c. 15.

Δι' ἑ σοι, ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, Whitby. Disq. Mod. p. 22.

Μεθ' ἑ σοι καὶ πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, Usher, Coteler.

But, you say, the Words, as they lie in Eusebius thus, δι' αὐτῶ σὺν αὐτῶ (you mean δι' ἑ σὺν αὐτῶ) want good Sense, it being improper to say by the Son be Glory to the Father with the Son. Be it proper, or improper, you ought to cite Passages of Authors, as you find Them: Besides that very wise Men, Antient and Modern, have judged the Expression very proper: And it will be thought that the Compilers of our Communion Office, who scrupled not to say by whom, and with whom &c. understood what good Sense is, as well as the Modest Enquirer.

II. A second Misquotation \* I charged † upon you was of a Passage in Athenagoras ‡. You was pleased to change πρὸς αὐτῶ into πρὸς αὐτῶν, for no Reason that I could see, but to make a weak Insinuation against the Divinity of God the Son. In your Reply (p. 13.) you say; Now This, I confess, is casually done, but (you mean and) without design. But these casual Slips have an ill Appearance, especially in so noted a place as this of Athenagoras. You could not forget that this very πρὸς αὐτῶ, in Athenagoras, is what we set a particular note and value upon, as showing that the Antients did not always say δι' αὐτῶ only, in respect of the Son's Part, or Office in the Work of Creation, but sometimes πρὸς αὐτῶ, A Phrase which may express the efficient Cause, and is not liable to the same Exceptions as the Phrase δι' αὐτῶ. Now, to falsify a Testimony of this kind, tho' casually, betrays however great Negligence, or Omission. You observe that ab eo tanquam Exemplari, serves as well your Turn, as ad eum tanquam Exemplar. That is, if we will allow you your Construction. But you cannot make the former so easily,

\* Whitby. Disqu. Mod. p. 62.

† Defense p. 406.

‡ Πρὸς αὐτῶ γὰρ, ὃ δι' αὐτῶ πρῶτον ἐγένετο. Athen. p. 38. Ox.

or so probably, out of *πρὸς αὐτῆ*, as the latter, out of *πρὸς αὐτὸν*: Besides that by changing *πρὸς αὐτῆ* into *πρὸς αὐτὸν*, you took from us one Sense of the Words which we might think it proper to insist upon, namely, That of an *efficient Cause*. *Πρὸς αὐτῆ*, if it may be construed your way, may also be construed another way, and perhaps more naturally: And therefore we take it not well to be deprived of any Advantage which the Text gives us. I must however observe, that whatever your design was from these Words, They will not answer your purpose, even tho' we should admit your Construction. For no Consequence can be drawn against our Principles, from the Consideration of the Son's being the *Exemplar*, after which *all Things* were made; unless you can imagine that He was an *Exemplar* to Himself.

III. The third Thing I charged you with \*, was a *Misconstruction* † of a celebrated Passage in *Methodius* ‡. The Passage I had produced in my *Defense*, to prove the *eternal Generation* of the Son, as Bishop Bull also had done \*\*. You express'd your self somewhat obscurely in answer to the Bishop. Only this was plain from your Words, (*Frustra Prasule renitente*) that you intended something opposite to the Bishop, and insinuated to your Reader that this Quotation of *Methodius* proved the very contrary to what the Bishop alledged it for. Now the Bishop had cited it in proof of the *Consubstantiality*, and *Coeternity* of the Son: To which purposes it is indeed as full and clear as any can be desired. You are pleased however, in your *Reply* (p. 15.) to object as follows.

\* Defense, p. 406.

† *Disquisit. Mat.* p. 75, 76.

‡ *Method. apud Phot.* p. 950. See my Defense, p. 143.

\*\* Bull. *Def. Fid. Nic.* p. 164 200.

1. That to say that the Son of God was pre-existent before the Ages in the Heavens, is to say no more than all the Arians and Semi-arians have asserted, &c. But the Force of the Bishop's Argument and Mine did not lie in the Words,  $\pi\rho\delta\ \alpha\iota\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega\upsilon$  (tho' They are not without their Weight \*, however the Arians or Semi-arians might equivocate) but in those other Words of *Methodius*, that the Son was, did not become, a Son; That He had no new Filiation; that He is always the same; and in *Methodius's* guarding against the Supposition of a Temporal Generation, by his explaining it of a Temporal Manifestation only. Why do you overlook and conceal the main Points wherein our Argument consisted, and make reply only to That which neither Bishop Bull nor I laid any stress upon? But it was prudent, it may be, to pass over what could not be answer'd.

2. You object to us some other Passages of *Methodius* to confront ours with. He calls the Father  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\rho\chi\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\eta$ , a principium, that had no Beginning. So you translate: Might you not as well have rendered it, A Beginning that had no Beginning? But That would not have served your purpose; The true rendering is, a principium, or Head, that has no principium, or Head. But you had a mind to the words no Beginning, to insinuate as if *Methodius* had said this of God the Father in Contra-distinction to God the Son, who had a Beginning; tho' *Methodius* says no such Thing. He says indeed that the Son is  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\eta$ , a Principle, or Head, after the Father: That is, the Son is the Fountain of all Things, after the Father; not in Time, but in Order; the Father being always primarily consider'd, as Head and Father of the Son. The Sum then of what *Methodius* has there said, is that the Son has a Father, and that the Father has

\* See my Defense. p. 139, &c.



*None.* What *Catholick* would ever scruple to assert the same Thing? No one ever doubted but that the Father alone was ἀρχος, the Son not ἀρχος in this Sense \*.

3. You object, thirdly, the following *Words*, (for I see not the *Sense*) “*Methodius adds that these Words* “*might be congruously applied to Him* (the Son) *in the* “*Beginning* *God created the Heaven and the Earth;* “*and Those of Solomon, The Lord created Me the Be-* “*ginning of his ways.* Now what can an *English Reader* make of these two Passages, as you have represented Them and tacked Them together? From the last of them, I suppose, He is to understand that the Son was *created*, according to *Methodius*. But then, what will He make of the Text out of *Genesis*? Is He to understand that the Son was *created* with the Heavens and the Earth, in the *Beginning*? So one might think, and you are very indifferent, I perceive, what your *English Reader* may apprehend, provided you may but seem to have something to say; and something that may reflect Dishonour on the Son of God. As to the Passage in *Genesis*, *Methodius* interprets ἐν ἀρχῇ (which we render *in the Beginning*) in the *Principle*; understanding by *Principle* God the Son, in whom all Things were created, according to *St. Paul*, *Coloss. 1. 17*. Now since, according to *Methodius*, all Things whatever were *created* in the ἀρχῇ, i. e. in God the Son, it is plain that He exempts Him from the Number of *Creatures*. As to the other Text, out of *Solomon's Proverbs*, you have, without any Ground or Warrant from *Methodius*, render'd ἐκτισε *created*, instead of *appointed*, or *constituted*. The meaning, probably is, according to *Methodius*, that the Father *appointed* or *constituted*, God the Son as the

\* Vid. *Gregor. Naz. Orat. 35. p. 563.* *Damascen. de Fid. l. 1. c. 11. p. 42.*

ἀρχὴν, the *Principium*, *Foundation*, or *Head* over all *Creatures*. This kind of *Construction* of that *Place* of the *Proverbs*, appears to have been known and received in the *Church*, some *Time* before *Methodius*; as is plain from *Dionysius* of *Rome* \*, his *Comment* upon the *Text*: which was afterwards countenanc'd by *Eusebius* †, and other *Catholick* *Writers* ‡. *Athenagoras*, much earlier than any of them, must have understood the *Text* nearly in the same *Sense*. For, after He had declared expressly against the *Son's* being *made*, or *created*, asserting his *Procession* from the *Father* to be a kind of *Substratum*, or *Support* for the *World* of *Creatures* to subsist in, receiving from thence their proper *Forms*, *Order*, and *Perfection*; He immediately cites this *Text* out of the *Proverbs*, as confirming his *Sentiments* \*\*. To return to *Methodius*: He barely cites the *Text* to prove that *Christ* was *prior* to the *Creation*, and that all *Creatures* had their *Subsistence* in Him. He is not so particular in explaining the *Sense* of ἐκπαιε, as *Dionysius* of *Rome*, or *Eusebius*: But it is more than probable that He understood it much in the same *Sense*. Certain it is, that your *Construction* of Him is intirely *unwarranted*; and not only so, but *contradictory* to the *Author's* known *Principles* elsewhere. Upon the

\* Ἐκπαιε γὰρ ἐνταύθι ἀπασιὸν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπέσης τοῖς ἰσὶ αὐτοῦ γεγονόσιν ἔργοις, γαρρῆσι δὲ οἱ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἑοῦ. Dionys. Rom. apud Athanas. p. 232.

† Ἀρχεῖν δὲ τὸ ὅλων ἐπὶ κυρίῳ τῷ αὐτῷ πατρὸς καθεταπισμύθη τῷ ἐκπαιε ἐνταύθ' ἀπὸ τοῦ κατέπαζεν, ἢ κατέπαζεν εἰρημῶν. Euseb. Eccl. Theol. l. 3. p. 151.

‡ Non enim ita *Sapientiam* *Suam* condidit, quasi aliquando sine *Sapientia* fuerit — Hoc *Initium* habeat *Sapientia* *Dei* quod de *Deo* processit ad creanda omnia tam celestia quam terrena; non quo cæperit esse in *Deo*. *Creata* est ergo *Sapientia*, imo genita, non sibi quæ semper erat, sed His quæ ab ea fieri oportebat. Pseud-Ambros. de Fid. Orib. c. 2. p. 349.

\*\* Vid. Athenag. c. 10. p. 38, 39, 41.

whole, you have not been able to answer Bishop Bull's Citations out of *Methodius*, nor to make good your own Pretences against *Methodius's* Orthodoxy. Instead of taking off one *Misconstruction* which I had charged you with, you have only added to it: And have been so far from acquitting your self of your first Offense, that you have more than doubled it.

IV. A fourth Thing which I charged \* upon you, was a Misrepresentation and Misconstruction † of a Passage in Dr. Cave ‡. I blamed you for insinuating as if Dr. Cave had said, or meant, that many, or most of the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers were against the *Divinity* and *Eternity* of Christ. That you really intended to insinuate as much, is confess'd in your Reply, where you tell me (p. 26.) that *the natural import of the Words (Dr. Cave's Words) contains a full Confutation of the whole Design of my Book, which is to prove that all the Ante-Nicene Fathers maintain'd the Consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, and the eternal Generation of the Son.*

I have not mistaken then as to the Matter of Fact, that you really did *insinuate* what I had charged you with. That you was *to blame* for so doing, will easily be made appear as plainly as the other. Two Things I before observed, 1<sup>st</sup>. That Dr. Cave's Words ought not, without a manifest *necessity*, to have been interpreted to a Sense directly opposite to his well known and often declared Sentiments. 2. That there was no such *manifest Necessity* in the Case before us; but rather some probable Grounds, even from the Passage it self, for interpreting Dr. Cave's Words otherwise than you have done. Now as to Dr. Cave's real Sentiments, relating to the Faith

\* *Defense of Queries*, p. 407.

† Whitby. *Disquis. Mod* p. 97.

‡ Cave. *Histor. Liter.* Vol 1. p. 112.

of the *Ante-Nicene* Writers, I appeal to the Passages appearing in the *Margin* \*. You may there see that *Dr. Cave* look'd upon the *Eternity* of the Son as part of the Christian Faith from the very *Infancy* of the *Church*; that it had been *constantly* taught by the *Catholick* Fathers; and that none but meer Strangers to *Antiquity* could make any Question of it: That the most effectual way to confute *Arians*, &c. is,

\* *Æternitatem* Filii, ejusque σύνδρομον τῆ ἀρχῆ τὸ εἶναι (quemadmodum non incite loquitur *Cyrillus Alexandrinus*) concurrentem cum paterno principio existentiam, constanter docuisse Catholicos Patres, Antiquitatis Ecclesiasticæ rudis plane sit oportet qui nescire potest; nec pluribus jam probare opus est quod cumulate præstiterunt Alii. Hanc Ecclesiæ Fidem ab ipsis *Christianissimi Primordiis* traditam, & perpetuo conservatam, omni quo potuerunt nisu totisque viribus oppugnarunt *Ariani*. *Cav. Diff. 3. ad Calc. Hist. Lit. p. 79.*

Liquet, non esse efficaciorē *Hæreses* refutandi rationem, quam si post allegatam SS. Scripturæ Auctoritatem, *Constantem* & *Universalem* veterum Consensum ad Partes nostras advocemus. Expertus est id *Theodosius Imperator* An. 383; quando Catholicos Episcopos cum *Arianis*, *Macedonianis*, *Eunomianis*, coacta Synodo, confligere vellet; Suadebat potius *Nectario* & *Agellio*, qui Ipsum consueverant, *Sisinnius*, ut interrogarent *Hæreticos* istos num admitterent illos Doctores atque Interpretes Scripturarum, qui ante Ecclesiæ Dissidium floruisent. *Cav. Ep. Apolog. p. 22. Vid. etiam p. 17.*

Monebo tantum, in Patrum Scriptis Dogmata Philosophica a *Fidei Articulis* probe esse distinguenda. In His, S. Literis & Catholicæ Traditioni strictius se alligant, & in REI SUMMA OMNES CONVENIUNT: in illis majori utuntur libertate, & opiniones sæpius adhibent quæ in Philosophorum Scholis ventilari solebant; quin & in explicandis Fidei Mysteriis quandoque voces e Schola Platonica petitas admovent, sed ad Christianum sensum accommodatas. *Ibid. p. 48.*

Profiteatur (*f. Clericus*) Se cum Ecclesia Catholica agnoscere, Deum esse Essentia unum, Personis trinum, nempe Unitatem in Trinitate, & Trinitatem in unitate se Colere ac Venerari; credere Se, *Jesum Christum* verum esse & aeternum Dei Filium, Patri vero ὁμοούσιον, & συναιθέριον — tunc demum intelligemus Fidem ejus in principibus his Doctrinæ Christianæ Capitibus, rectam esse, Orthodoxam, & tam Sacræ Scripturæ, quam *primæ Antiquitati* congruam. *Cav. Ep. Apolog. p. 107.*

after

after Scripture, to appeal to the *Constant, Universal* Consent of the *Antients*; with more to the same purpose. Is this the Man whom you quote on your Side? I may add that his *Apologetical Epistle* runs much upon this Topic, to vindicate the primitive Fathers against such Aspersions as You, among Others, are too apt to throw upon Them: And there needs nothing more to show that He was perfectly in my Sentiments, as to that particular, and directly opposite to your's. You may say, perhaps, that Dr. *Cave* was inconsistent with Himself; and at different Times, upon different Occasions, asserted repugnant Propositions. But, with Submission, I think it a Piece of Justice due to every Author, especially One that has bore a Character in the learned World, to suppose otherwise of Him, till it can be evidently made appear, that He has contradicted in one Place what He had laid down in Another. If there be any Room left for a favourable and candid Interpretation it ought to be admitted. I before observed to you, that there was no *manifest Necessity* of interpreting that Passage of Dr. *Cave*, as you do. He recounted about seven Errors of *Lactantius*, referring to others unnamed: And in *Those*, He says, many of the *Antients* concurred with Him. By *in Those*, He might possibly mean in *some*, or *other of them*, not in every *single* particular. To make it the more probable that He really meant no more, I observed that *de Divinitate* stood as a distinct *Article*, and might be construed *of the Deity*. *Lactantius* held very absurd Notions of the *Deity*, as great Errors as any could be. Could Dr. *Cave* take notice of many smaller Slips, and never allude to Those which were the greatest of all? And yet you cannot pretend to say that *Many*, or indeed *Any* of the primitive Fathers concurr'd with *Lactantius* in those Errors concerning the *Deity*. From whence I justly concluded  
that

that the words in *quibus*, were not to be strictly understood of all and *singular* the Errors noted.

To this you reply that *Lactantius* says of God, that He is the Father of all Things, *whose Beginning cannot be comprehended*: As if This were all that *Lactantius* had said. Does He not plainly assert that God had a Beginning, and that He made Himself\*? You observe farther, that This is fully explain'd by Himself l. 2. c. 8. where He says, *God only who is not made, is from Himself, as we shewed in the first Book*. And what if He speaks right here? Does it follow that He has not said what He really has said in another Place? Besides, if you please to admit the same Candor of interpreting one place by another, I can show you also where He has spoke very Orthodoxly of God the Son †; and can as easily acquit Him of the Charge of *Heresy* with respect to God the Son, as you can acquit Him of the like Charge in respect of God the Father. In a word, His *Errors* and *Contradictions* in both Points are visible enough: And give me leave to think that Dr. *Cave* might see Them; and might allude to one in the Article *de Divinitate*, and to the other in the words, *de aeterna Filii existentia*. For, surely, otherwise He would not have put *de* and *de*, but would rather have express'd it as one Article thus; *de Divinitate atque aeterna existentia Filii*, and then have proceeded with another *de*, to a new Article. Upon the whole, you can never make good your point from this Passage of Dr. *Cave*, which is not only capable of a different Construction from your's, but most naturally and most probably requires it.

\* Verum quia fieri non potest quin id quod fit, aliquando esse experit; consequens est ut, quando nihil ante eum fuerit, Ipse ante omnia ex seipso sit procreatus. — Deus ipse se fecit. *Lactant. l. 1. c. 7. p. 32.*

† Vid. *Lactant. l. 4. c. 3.*

You would insinuate (*Reply*, p. 30.) from another Passage of *Dr. Cave*, where He is speaking of *Origen*, that *Origen's supposed Errors* relating to the *Trinity*, were not, in *Dr. Cave's Judgment*, contrary to any *Article of the Church*, or *Apostolical Traditions*: which again is doing That good Man a second Injury, instead of making Satisfaction for the First. *Dr. Cave* does not say that his *supposed Errors* relating to the *Trinity* were not contrary to any *Article of the Church*; but only that many of *Origen's* censured Opinions were not: And what sort of Opinions *Dr. Cave* meant, He Himself tells us in the very place refer'd to\*. Namely, *Intricate Questions that had been canvass'd only in the Schools of the Philosophers, and some Notions of his own Invention that were minus commodæ, not so just or accurate as They should be.* Now what is This to our present Purpose? See the Passages of *Dr. Cave* before cited, sufficiently showing that He thought the *Doctrine of the Trinity* to be a fundamental *Article of the Church*, and an *Apostolical Tradition*. But I am weary of attending you through so many trifling Pretences. To conclude this Head: The most that can be made out of *Dr. Cave's* Expressions here, or elsewhere, is no more than This, that some of the *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, in some Places of their Works, express'd themselves sometimes *improperly, uncautiously*, or it may be, now and then *dangerously*, in respect of the *Doctrine of the Trinity*, before the meaning of Terms was adjusted, and settled; and those Articles reduced to a more *certain*, and more *accurate Form* of Expression. In the *Sum* of the *Matter*, in the *main Doctrine*, the *Ante-Nicene Fathers* were agreed. This was *Dr. Cave's* real Judgment; as may be seen by his own Words before cited: And, I suppose, He may be allowed to be his own best Interpreter. He was not only in those Senti-

\* *Hist. Liter.* Vol. I. p. 77.

ments, but *zealous* for Them, being a true Lover and Admirer of the primitive Fathers. How would the good Man have been filled with Indignation to have found His Name, and His Authority made use of, to such purposes as you have done! But enough —

V. I charged \* you farther, as reporting falsely, that the Titles of τῷ παντός ποιητῆς, and ἄλλων δημιουργῶς (That is, *Creator*, or *Framer* of the Universe) were such as the Writers of the *second Century* always distinguish'd the *Father* from the *Son* by. I was indeed so tender in this Point, as not absolutely to charge this *Falschood* upon you: But I observed that either This must have been your Meaning, or else you had made a very trifling Observation. Those Words of your's on which I grounded my Remark, I have now thrown into the Margin †, for every *Latin* Reader to judge of. You defend your self (*Reply*, p. 16.) with these Words: *The Words of Athenagoras there cited are these*, One unbegotten and eternal Maker of all Things. By which Epithets, &c. *Now of these Epithets thus joined, my Words are certainly true; nor had the Doctor any right to separate what I had thus joined.* One can hardly forbear smiling at This invented Answer. If what you now pretend was really your Meaning, How came you to say Epithets, in the Plural, rather than Epithet in the Singular? Why did you distinguish the several Epithets with Comma's? Again, why did you take

\* *Defense of Queries*, p. 409.

† Ex quibus omnibus, ex *Athenagora* Sententia, Deum illum unum Quem Christiani prædicabant, non alium fuisse quam Deum ingenitum, æternum, τοῦ παντός ποιητῆν, ἄλλων δημιουργῶν, *omnium Opificem*, liquet. Quibus Epithetis istius sæculi Scriptores Deum Patrem a Filio semper distinguebant, Deumque Filium ab Hoc omnium Opifice ex eo distingui docuerunt, quod sit Ille per *Quem*, aut cujus Ministerio Pater fecit omnia. *Whitby. Disqu. Modest.* p. 60.



such particular notice of *per Quem, By Whom*, which you say was attributed to the Son, to distinguish Him from Him that was *omnium Opifex, Maker of all Things*. Does not your Sense here, and your Sense in what went before (as I have represented it) answer to each other, like Two Tallies, exactly? I defy any Man that reads your Words in the *Latin*, to understand you otherwise. But if you will needs have it that you intended only to say that the Epithet of *one unbegotten and eternal Maker of all Things*, was peculiar to the Father, in the *second Century*, you shall have the Honour of making a shrowd Observation, when you tell me, in what *Century* downwards to this day, That *Epithet* has not been peculiar to the Father as much as Then. I before left you the *Alternative*, either of being found *trifling* in a peculiar manner, or making a *false Report*; and so I do still. One might think by what follows in your Reply to this Article, that you had a mind to own the *Report*, and to vindicate it from the Charge of *Falshood*.

You say, *Justin Martyr* made a difference between the word *ποιητὴς* and *δημιουργός*, and a little after, that He always speaketh of the Son as being another, not from the *δημιουργός*, the Builder, Framer, or Artificer, but ἀπὸ ἑ ποιητῆς ἑ παντός, or τῷ ὅλων, from the *Maker of all Things*, Reply, p. 17, 18. However that be, I showed you plainly, from three express Testimonies \*, that *Irenæus*, of the same Century with *Justin*, made no such Difference. The Son is *ποιητὴς τῷ πάντων*, *Maker of all Things*, according to *Irenæus*, over and over, in as full and strong words as the Father Himself can be: So that your Remark, as to the Writers of the *second Century*, has no Truth in it. What you observe of *Justin*, is not

\* See my Defense, p. 189.

strictly true. He tells us \* indeed; that *Plato* made a difference between ποιητής, and δημιουργός, understanding by the former one that *makes* a thing from nothing, and by the latter one that *frames* any thing out of *pre-existent* Matter. *Justin* takes notice of this, in order to show that *Plato's* inferior Gods must be *corruptible*, upon *Plato's* own Principles: For the *great God* is stiled by *Plato*, not ποιητής, but δημιουργός of the other Gods. Consequently They were made of Matter, which is corruptible, and therefore are *corruptible* Themselves. What is this to the purpose we are upon? Or how does it appear that *Justin* himself always observed *Plato's* Distinction? Besides that if He did, it is certain that *Justin Martyr* supposes God the Son to be ποιητής, or *Maker* of Man whom He calls the πνίμα, *Creature* of Christ †. And there is no reason to doubt, but that He supposed Him to be as truly ποιητής, *Maker* of all other Things, according to the constant Doctrine of the Church in that very Century, as appears from *Irenæus*, *Clemens* of *Alexandria*, and Others.

You go on, in pursuance of your first Mistake, to observe that δημιουργός being of an inferior sense to that of ποιητής ἢ ὄλων, it is no wonder that the Fathers sometimes give it to the Son under one of these Distinctions, where they say with *Origen* the Father is πρῶτος δημιουργός, the first or chief Worker, the Son is so in a secondary Sense. This is writing just as if you had never seen the Fathers. I repeat it, that *Irenæus* gives Both those Titles indifferently to God the Son, as do other Fathers after Him; which you might have seen in my *Defense* (p. 189.) Yet you are loth to admit even so much as δημιουργός to have been

\* Just. Mart. Parxn. p. 91. Ox. Ed.

† Just. Mart. Dial. p. 187. Jeb

applied to the Son, except with a Distinction; *quoting*, I would say, *misquoting Origen* to countenance your Pretences. If you please to look again into *Origen* \*, the Word is *πρώτος* not *πρώτος*, signifying not that the Father is the *First Worker*, as if there were *Two Workers*, but that He is *primarily* Creator. And, what ruins all your fine airy Speculations at once, *Origen*, in that very place, asserts the Son *ποιῆσαι* (not *δημιουργεῖν*) τὸν κόσμον, to *Make*, not *Frame* only, the World: which is as much as if He had called Him τῷ κόσμῳ, or τῷ ὅλων ποιητῆς.

You quote *Eusebius* as stiling the Father ἀπάντων δημιουργός, the Son αἴτιος δεύτερος. You should have remember'd that the same *Eusebius* stiles the Son ὁ μέγας τῷ ὅλων δημιουργός. † Had This been applied to the *Father* instead of the *Son*, what Speculations might we not have expected upon the Force of ὁ μέγας, the *Great* Creator? You forget also that *Eusebius* scruples not to use the Title of ποιητῆς τῷ ὅλων, *Maker of all Things*, speaking of the *Son*; as I observed in my *Defense* ‡. This is directly against you: And if there be some Expressions in *Eusebius* which We neither approve nor vindicate; so there are many others that You cannot approve, or make consistent with your Principles: Quotations therefore from *Eusebius* will signify little on either Side. What you produce (*Reply* p. 18.) out of *Methodius* has been solidly answer'd by *Bishop Bull* \*\*.

You next cite *Tatian*, as a true Disciple of *Justin Martyr*, saying, that *Matter* is produced ὑπὸ τῷ πάντων δημιουργῷ, from the *Maker of all Things*, but

\* Origen. Contr. Cels. p. 317.

† Euseb. Eccl. H. l. 10. c. 4. p. 316.

‡ Defense of *Queries*. p. 189.

\*\* Bull. Def. Fid. Nic. p. 165.

*the Son was* εαυτῶ τὴν ὑλίω δημιουργήσας, *Worker of this Matter.* But sure the *Disciple* was strangely forgetful of his *Master's* Distinction between ποιητὴς and δημιουργός: Otherwise, when He was talking of God's *producing* Matter, He should have stiled Him ποιητὴς, not δημιουργός. And you are as forgetful of what you had said but the Page before: Otherwise you should have made the Father no more than *Worker* of the Matter, as well as the Son; because of the word δημιουργός. See how strangely you are bewildred in your Observations, confuting and contradicting your self. Nothing succeeds with you; and I will venture to predict that nothing will, so long as you are espousing the Cause of *Heresy*, in Opposition to the Faith of the *Catholick* Church.

VI. I charged you, sixthly, with three Misrepresentations together: One relating to *Basil*, the other Two to *Athanasius* \*. *Basil* you represented as declaring against Unity of *Essence*, where He intended nothing but against Unity of *Person*. To which you make answer (p. 21.) that you dived not into *Basil's* Intentions, but cited his Words fairly, viz. that the *Sabellian Doctrine* was corrected by the word *Consubstantial*. A pretty way This, to cite Authors without considering whether They intended any thing to the purpose They are cited for, or no. You cited † *Basil*, to prove that two Things *Consubstantial* make two *Essences*; whereas *Basil* meant no more than that They make two *Persons*. This you call *fairly citing his Words*. You mean, I suppose, that you *fairly* transcribed his Words, at the same Time very *unfairly* perverting his Sense.

As to *Athanasius*, I observed that you understood

\* See my Defense, p. 409.

† *Disquisit. Mod.* p. 32. Præf.

what He had said against the ὁμοίῳσιον, as if it had been said against the ὁμοῦσιον, betwixt which Two, that accurate Father always carefully distinguish'd. To this you reply, that you cited *Athanasius* to confirm this Proposition, that *They who say the Essence of the Son is like, or equal, to that of the Father, do by that ascribe to Him another numerical Essence from That of the Father.* I perceive, you do not yet understand a Syllable of what *Athanasius* was speaking about. See his meaning explain'd in my *Defense*, pag. 409. *Athanasius* is so far from supposing *like*, and *equal* to be equivalent, or even consistent, that He denies That Essence to be *equal*, which is only *like*; and He is not observing that either an *equal*, or a *like* Essence must be another *numerical* Essence, but that an Essence which is only *like* to *divine*, must be an *inferior* Essence. It is very strange, that after a Key had been given you to that Passage in *Athanasius*, you should still go on, as before, to confound your Self, and your Readers. As to the other *Misrepresentation* of *Athanasius*, whom you suppose an Assertor of *numerical Identity* (which is making Him a *Sabellian*, according to your Sense of *Numerical*) as to this Charge upon you, you are pleas'd to say never a Word. That therefore stands as it did.

VII. In the next place, I blamed you for representing *Barnabas's* Epistle, ἐν ῥόθῳσι, interpreting it *Spurious*, tho' That be not the Sense of ἐν ῥόθῳσι, as it lies in *Eusebius*. To This you make answer (p. 20.) that you *neither there, nor elsewhere interpret those Words at all.* This is another Instance wherein you appear to be more unkind to your self, than I had been to you. You declare, page 19<sup>th</sup> of your *Disquisitions*, that *Barnabas's* Epistle was by the *Antients* held for *Spurious*. This false Assertion appeared to have some *Colour*, supposing that you interpret

terpret *ἐν ῥόδοις* in *Eusebius*, to mean *Spurious*: But without That, you have made a *misreport* of the *Antients*, and have no Pretence at all for it. Show me what *Antients*, or where They reckon'd *Barnabas's* Epistle *Spurious* \*. If you chuse rather to have it thought that you have told us an Untruth without any *Colour* for it, than with any, be it so: I was willing to put the most *candid* Construction upon the Thing; and I shall do so still, if you will give me leave. For, I observe that after you had said † that *Eusebius* ranked this Epistle *ἐν ῥόδοις*, you immediately subjoin these Words, *Cotelerius confesses that He inclines to the Opinion of Those who think it is not the Apostle's*. Now, this is so very like Commenting on the Phrase, *ἐν ῥόδοις*, just going before, that hardly one Reader in a Hundred could ever suspect that you understood by *ἐν ῥόδοις*, any thing else but *Spurious*; that is, falsely ascrib'd to *Barnabas*. In a word, It seems to me very much the same thing, whether you interpret a Passage thus, or whether you lead your Reader into such *Interpretation*: The Reader is equally deceived either way. However, if you insist upon it, that you neither *interpreted* the Words at all, nor intended to lead your Reader into any such *Interpretation*, I acquiesce; provided only that you give us any tolerable Account of your saying that this Epistle was look'd upon as *Spurious* by the *Antients*.

VIII. The next Thing which I found fault

\* Certe quicquid de hac Epistola dicant recentiores Critici, eam *Barnaba* nostro constanter ascribunt *veteres*. Nemo certe fuit, inquit ὁ πρὸς Cestriensis noster, qui hanc Epistolam *Barnabæ* non tribuerit; neque in ea quidquam apparet, quod eam *atatem* non ferat. Cav. *Hist. Literar.* Vol. 1. p. 11.

† *Disqu. Mod.* p. 9.

with

with \*, was your partial Account of the antient *Doxologies* †. To This, you reply (p. 19.) that you freely acknowledge your Account of the primitive *Doxologies* to be imperfect, as wanting the *Doxologies* of St. Paul and St. Jude, which are the best *Rule and Standard* of *Doxologies*. What? better than St. *John's*, or St. *Peter's*? But This it is to aim at Wit. You may please to remember that we were not talking of the *Scripture-Doxologies*, but of those which are to be met with in the Writings of the Fathers. You had told us in your *Disquisitions* a notorious Untruth, that the Fathers of the first and second Century never used that Form of *Doxology*, which has been especially called *Catholick*; but that the *Arian* Form had obtained among the early Fathers. This false Account, I softly called a *partial* Account; to be as tender of you as possible. It is well known that *μετά*, or *σύν*, in *Doxologies*, is the same as if the particule *καί* be used to connect the Persons: And all such Forms come under the Name of *Catholick*, as opposed to such *Forms* as have only *ἄλλο*, or *ὄν*: Because, tho' Either of those Forms may indifferently be used, and have been used by *Catholicks* both in former and latter Times: Yet after the *Arians* had perverted One to an ill Sense, the *Catholicks* chose for the most part, to make use of the Other. Now of those called *Catholick* Forms, I referr'd to *Polycarp's* ‡, the Church of *Smyrna's* \*\*, and *Clemens's* of *Alexandria* ††, all

\* *Defense of Queries*, p. 410.

† *Disqu. Mod.* p. 23.

‡ *Μετ' εὖ σοι καὶ πνεύματι ἁγίῳ ἢ δόξα &c.* Polycarp.

\*\* *Μετ' εὖ δόξα τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ Ἐ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι*, *Eccles. Smyrn.*

†† *Τῷ μόνῳ πατρὶ Ἐ ἡγίῳ, ἡγίῳ καὶ πατρὶ, παιδαγωγῷ καὶ διδασκάλῳ ἡγίῳ, σὺν Ἐ τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι πάντα τὰ ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ πάντα, δι' ἃ ἐν τὰ πάντα ἔθ, δι' ἃ ἐν τὸ αἰεὶ. εὖ μέλη πάντες. εὖ δόξα. αἰῶνες πάντα τὰ ἀρχαῖα, πάντα τὰ καλὰ πάντα τὰ πρῶτα, τὰ δικαῖα τὰ πάντα ἢ ἡ δόξα καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τὰς αἰῶνας.* *Clem. Alex. Pædag.* l. 3. p. 311. Ox. Ed.

within the Two first Centuries, and standing Evidences of the *Falseness* of your Report, supposing you meant that neither  $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$ , nor  $\sigma\upsilon\nu$ , nor  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  were applied in Doxologies to the *Son* or *Holy-Ghost*. Indeed, if any of them are applied to Either of those two Persons, it is a Contradiction to the *Arian* Pre-*tence* that Neither of Them should be glorified *with* the Father, but the Father glorified *in*, or *by* Them. You tell me by way of *Reply* (p. 20.) that the Words of Polycarp, and the Church of Smyrna, comparing the Variation of Copies, are certainly against me. How certainly? I know of no Variation there is with respect to the Church of *Smyrna's*: *Eusebius's* Copy, being but an Abstract, wants the latter part of the Epistle. As to the Variation of *Polycarp's*, it cannot be pretended to make any thing certain against me, unless it be certain that *Eusebius's* Reading be the better of the two; which is by no means probable. Besides, that at the worst,  $\sigma\upsilon\nu$  is applied to the Son, even in *Eusebius's* Copy: I suppose, you do not insist upon the Variation of your own contriving. Besides these, *Clemens* his *Doxology* will still stand good against you, and *St. Basil's* Testimony concerning the Doxologies of the earlier Centuries \*, tho' the Doxologies produced by Him reach no higher up than the beginning of the Third. But the Subject of *Doxologies* having been accurately handled of late by Others, I shall content my self with referring to their learned and useful Tracts upon it †.

IX. I censured your Account of *Justin Martyr*, as being one continued Misrepresentation. I confi-

\* Basil. de Sp. S. c. 29. p. 218. 222.

† Seasonable Review of Mr. Whiston's Account of primitive Doxologies. Second Review by the same Hand.

Bishop of London's Letter defended. By a Believer.



dered what I said; and shall now justify my Censure. You are pleased, indeed, to put on a more than usual Air of Assurance upon this Occasion. The *brightest Evidence of Truth* is what you pretend to, (p. 31.) You resolve to *vindicate* your Self from this *false Imputation*, and to *make* Me *sensible of my Conundr*; that I have *very artificially, very falsely represented* Justin Martyr (p. 31.) have been guilty of *pious Frauds*, and *notorious Artifice* (p. 37.) such *Artifice and Fraud as you have seldom met with* (ibid.) *A Crowd of Falshoods and Misrepresentations* you charge upon me (p. 40.) Yet, after all these big Words, and fine Flourishes, (the Feeble vaunts of a desperate Cause that needs them) I will venture to refer the Matter in dispute to any Man of tolerable Capacity, and moderate Skill in the learned Languages. I intimated in my *Defense* (p. 432.) the Drift and Design of *Justin Martyr's* Dialogue, of that Part which we are now principally concern'd with. It was to show that there was a *divine Person*, One who was really God of *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*, and was not the *Father*, but was the *Logos, or Christ*. This Account of *Justin*, I will first demonstrate to be true and right; and next show how easy it is to take off all your boasted *Reasons*, or rather *Cavils* to the contrary.

I. *Justin Martyr* observes, in the Beginning of his Dialogue †, that the Christians acknowledged *no other God*, than the *Jews* did. “ There never will be, O  
 “ *Trypho*, nor ever was, since the World began, *another God* (ἄλλος Θεός) besides the *Maker* and  
 “ *Disposer* of the Universe: Nor do we imagine that  
 “ our's is one God, and your's Another, but it is  
 “ one and the same, that brought your Fathers out of

\* *Defense of Queries*. p. 410.

† *Justin. Mart. Dial.* p. 34. *Jeſ.*

“ *Egypt* with a mighty Hand, and stretched-out Arm :  
 “ Nor do we rest our Hopes in any Other (for  
 “ there is none Other) but in Him whom you Hope  
 “ in, the God of *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*. From  
 hence may be seen how far *Justin* is from asserting *two*  
*Gods*. There is not, according to Him, nor ever  
 was, nor will be ἄλλος Θεός, *another God* besides  
 the God of the *Jews*, the God of *Abraham, Isaac,*  
 and *Jacob*. Thus far He and *Trypho* were agreed.

2. It was agreed likewise between *Justin* and *Trypho*, that one certain Person, the same that created the World, and who is often spoke of in the old Testament, as *Creator* of the Universe; who was own'd by the *Jews* under that Title, and by Christians more especially under the Name of *Father*; I say, it was agreed that That Person was God of *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*.

3. *Justin Martyr*, over and above, asserts that *That Person*, had another Person with Him, a *real and proper Son*; which Son was also *God and Lord*, and God of *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*. This was the chief Matter in debate between *Justin* and *Trypho*; and upon which *Justin Martyr* spends many Pages in his *Dialogue*, alluding to it also elsewhere. Now, the main Point in dispute between You and Me, is, whether This was really *Justin's* meaning, or no. I must prove every Syllable of what I here assert; and therefore must dwell the longer upon this Article. *Justin*, I say, asserts *another Person, besides the Father*, to be really *God, God of Abraham, &c.* He maintains that ἄλλος ἐστὶ Θεός \*, or ἕτερος Θεός †, *Another is God*, which He elsewhere expresses by ἄλλος τις ‡, *another who is God*, besides the Father; which comes to

\* Just. Martyr. Dial. p. 147. 163.

† Just. Dial. p. 158. 161. 164.

‡ Just. Dial. p. 161. 165.

the same as *another Person* besides the Father. Instead of saying *Father*, He generally expresses it by the Title of *Creator of all Things*; the reason of which I conceive to be, that both He and *Trypho* received Him under that Notion; but under the Notion of *Father*, in *Justin's* Sense, He was not received by *Trypho*, the Question betwixt them being chiefly This, whether He was a *Father* in a proper Sense, that is, whether He had really a *Son*. Hence, I conceive it is that *Justin* so often denotes the *Father* by the Title of *Maker of all Things*, rather than by the Title of *Father*. Yet He does sometimes make use of the Title of *Father*, instead of the other. He says in one place ἔχ ὁ πατὴρ ἦν, \* instead of saying ἔχ ὁ ποιητὴς τῶν ὅλων ἦν: which, tho' not so accurate while disputing with a *Jew*, serves however to show that those two Titles were only different Expressions, denoting the same Person. *Justin*, in his first *Apology*, where He is again upon the same Argument, stiles the *Father* ὁ πατὴρ τῶν ὅλων, *Father of all Things*; in the same place censuring the *Jews* for not acknowledging that He had a *Son* †, that is, not acknowledging Him to be a *Father*, in a peculiar and proper Sense. This I take notice of to confirm what I have already observed, that it was not proper for *Justin*, in dispute with a *Jew*, to call the *Father* by a Title which the *Jews* did not own, but rather by Another which was acknowledged on both Sides; viz. *Maker of all Things*, or however, *Father of all Things*, not *Father* simply. To proceed: *Justin* asserts and often inculcates that this *Maker*, or *Father*, of all Things has a *Son* ‡, an *only-begotten Son* \*\*, be-

\* Just. Dial. p. 261.

† Just. Apol 1. p. 122.

‡ Justin. Mart. Dial. p. 296. 374.

\*\* Just. Dial. p. 309.

gotten before the Creation<sup>1</sup>, begotten of Himself<sup>2</sup>, (Ὁν Θεὸς, and ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ) without Abscission or Division<sup>3</sup>, strictly and properly<sup>4</sup> (ἰδίως, and κυρίως) a Son, and really (not nominally) distinct from Him<sup>5</sup>. He asserts farther and proves at large, that this very Son is really God, not called God only, but is God<sup>6</sup>: And Justin never says that He is God by voluntary Appointment, or as Representative of the Father; but as Son of God, He is God<sup>7</sup>. The same is God of the Jews, God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, according to Justin. This last particular is what You and I chiefly differ upon; and therefore I must be the more full and copious in the Proof of it.

It is a Rule and Maxim with Justin that God the Father never appeared; which, I suppose, I need not prove to you, because you your self contend for it, and in the Title-Page of your Reply, recommend the Determination of the Sirmian Synod in Anathematizing any that should say, the Father appeared to Abraham. Please then to take notice, that Justin Martyr quotes<sup>8</sup> Exod. 3. 16. where it is said, The Lord God of your Fathers, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob appeared unto me, &c. These Words Justin, upon his Principles, must have under-

1 Justin. Mart. Dial. p. 183. 187. 295. 296. 364. 375. 395. Comp. Apol. 1. p. 69. 90. 101. 123. Apol. 2. p. 13.

2 Just. Dial. p. 183. Apol. 1. p. 44.

3 Just. M. Dial. p. 183. 373. Comp. Paræn. p. 127.

4 Just. Mart. Apol. 1. p. 44. 46. Apol. 2. p. 13.

5 Justin. Dial. p. 373.

6 Ἐστὶν καὶ λέγεται Θεὸς καὶ κύριος ἕτερος ὑπὲρ τῆ ποιητῆν τῶ ὅλων, ὁὖ καὶ Ἄγγελος καλεῖται. Dial. p. 161. Ἄγγελος καλεῖται καὶ Θεὸς ὁ ἄρχων. p. 187. Θεὸς καλεῖται, καὶ Θεὸς ἐστὶ καὶ ἕτερος, p. 176. Θεὸν ἰσχυρόν καὶ παρασκευητὸν χειρὸν ὄντων ἐδήλωσε, p. 231. Θεὸν φησὶν εἶναι, p. 367.

7 Just. M. Dial. p. 364. 366. 371. 370. Apol. 1. p. 123.

8 Just. M. Dial. p. 178. 779. Comp. Dial. p. 366.

stood of *Christ*: He was the Lord God, the God of *Abraham*, &c. who *appeared*. And indeed *Justin* quotes the Text for that very purpose, to prove that *Christ is God*. Soon after He asks the Company, whether They did not yet perceive that He who appeared to *Moses*, had declared *Himself* to be the God of *Abraham*\*, &c. This Passage I before cited in my *Defense* (p. 37.) to prove that, according to *Justin*, *Christ Himself* was God of *Abraham*. This you complain of, very ridiculously (*Reply*, p. 37.) calling it a *Piece of Artifice*, and I know not what, as if I had *stopp'd* where I ought not; whereas it is impossible that *Justin's* Words should have any other meaning than That which I have given: The following Words in *Justin* are so far from confronting this Sense, that They do nothing more than repeat and confirm the same Thing. For after *Justin* had thus plainly asserted that *Christ was God of Abraham*, &c. proving it from the Text in *Exodus*; *Trypho* objects, that possibly it might be an Angel only that *appeared*, and God (that is God the Father) might speak to *Moses* by that Angel. To which *Justin* replies, " Admit that both God and  
 " an *Angel* were concern'd in that *Appearance* to  
 " *Moses*, as has been proved from the Text cited,  
 " yet (I insist upon it) that the *Maker of all*  
 " *Things* was not the God, (or that Divine Person)  
 " who told *Moses* that *He Himself* was God of *Abra-*  
 " *ham*, and God of *Isaac*, and God of *Jacob*; but  
 " it was He of whom I have proved to you, that He  
 " appeared to *Abraham*, and to *Jacob*, administering  
 " to the Will of the Maker of all Things †. *Justin*

\* Ὁ ἄνδρες νοοῦκατε, λέγων, ἐπ' ἐν λέξει Μωσῆος ἄγγελον εὐ περιφραγῶς λελαληκέναι αὐτῷ, οὗτος αὐτὸς Θεὸς ὃν σημαίνει τῷ Μωσῆϊ, ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐστὶν ὁ Θεὸς Ἀβραάμ, καὶ Ἰσαὰκ, καὶ Ἰακώβ; Just. Dial. p. 179.

† Οὐχ ὁ ποιητὴς τῶ ὅλων ἔστι Θεὸς ὁ τῷ Μωσῆϊ εἰπὼν αὐτὸν εἶναι Θεὸν Ἀβραάμ, καὶ Θεὸν Ἰσαὰκ, καὶ Θεὸν Ἰακώβ, ἀλλ' ὁ ἀπειραχθεὶς.

goes on to prove this from the Absurdity of supposing that God the Father should appear in that manner: upon which *Trypho* is convinc'd that He that appear'd to *Abraham*, and was called God and Lord, and was God, was not the *Maker of all Things*; not God the Father, but Another, who was also an *Angel*. Then *Justin* proceeds to give farther Proof, that none appeared to *Moses* in the Bush but He only, who is called an *Angel*, and is really God, namely Christ the Son of God. To these Testimonies I shall subjoin one more out of *Justin's* first Apology, which in English runs thus. " Now what was said to *Moses*, out of the Bush, I am the I AM, the God of *Abraham*, and the God of *Isaac*, and the God of *Jacob*, and the God of thy Fathers, denotes that They, tho' dead, are still in being, and are *Men of Christ Himself* \*. In this Passage, *Christ* is plainly asserted to be the ὁ ὢν, the I am, or God of the *Jews*, God of *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*. By four express Testimonies out of *Justin*, this momentous Point is establish'd; And the whole Tenour of this Father's Writings confirms it. The Sum then of *Justin's* Doctrine is This. That there is no other God besides the God of the *Jews*, the God of *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*: That God the Father is God of the *Jews*, God of *Abraham*, &c. That there is Another besides the Father, who is also God of the *Jews*, God of *Abraham*, &c. and this Other is the *Logos*, or *Christ*, the proper and only Son of the Father, undivided and inseparable from Him, tho' Begotten of Him. The Conclusion from all is, that *Christ* is

ἑνὸν ἄρθρον τῶν Ἀβραάμῳ καὶ τῶν Ἰακώβ, τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῶν ἁγίων ἑλεῖν καὶ ἰσομετῶν. Just. Dial. p. 180.

\* Το εἶς εἰρημένον ἐκ βίβρα τῆς Μωσῆ, ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὢν ὁ Θεὸς Ἀβραάμῳ, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς Ἰσαάκ, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς Ἰακώβ, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πατέρων σου, σημαντικὸν ἔστι ἀποδεικνύει ἐκείνως μένει, καὶ εἶναι αὐτοῦ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποδείκνυται. Just. Apol. 1. p. 123. Οκ.

God, and yet not *Another God* from the Father, but ἄλλος τις, another *Person* only\*. This is *Justin's* true, genuine, certain Doctrine, which being thus proved and fix'd; all your Pretences to the contrary drop at once. However, that I may not seem to neglect any thing you have to say, I shall briefly examine your Objections, one by one.

1. One is, that *Justin* often speaks of Θεὸς ἕτερος ἄλλοι τὸν ποιητὴν τῶν ὅλων. *Another God besides the Maker of all Things* But I have shown from *Justin's* own Interpretation, (besides that in strict Propriety, the Words require no more) that the meaning is only this, that there is ἄλλος τις, *another who is God*: besides Him whom both Sides acknowledged under the Title of *Maker of all Things*; that is, besides Him whom Christians call the *Father*. *Justin* then meant only that there is *another Person* besides the Father, who is also God. To this you except †, that the word *Person* or *Hypostasis* was not known to *Justin*. And what if He uses not the *Word*, might He not without the *Word*, assert the *Thing*? Ἄλλος τις really signifies, and is rightly rendered *another Person*. But you except farther, that *Justin* does not only say ἕτερος, *another*, but ἀριθμῶ ἕτερος, *another in Number*; and how can Father and Son be *numerically* the same God, if they be *numerically* differing? To which I answer that They are different Persons, *numerically* different: And that this was really *Justin's* Sense, is manifest from his opposing the Word, ἀριθμῶ ἕτερον, *another Thing in Number* to that which ὀνόματι μόνον ἀριθμεῖται only differs *nominally*, not really ‡. He did not in-

\* See my *Sermons*, p. 299, 300.

† *Disquis. Mod.* p. 29.

‡ *Vid. Justin. Dial.* p. 273.

tend to say that Father and Son were *two Gods*, but only that They were more than *two Names* of the same Thing; as some *Hereticks* taught, before *Sabellius*. In this Sense, none of the *Post-Nicene* Writers ever deny'd that the Son is ἀριθμῶ ἕτερος, or ἕτερον τι, *Another*, or *another Thing*, really distinct from the Father \*. The same way of speaking you will find in the Church, as low as *Damascen* †. But you say, (*Mod. Disquis.* p. 29.) that the *Post-Nicene* Fathers guarded their Expressions by the Word *Hypostasis*; which *Justin* does not. And what if the Disputes which happen'd after *Justin's* Time, made it necessary to guard such Expressions as having been used formerly without Offense, came at length to be perverted to an ill Meaning? There is nothing strange in This. It is well observed by the judicious and learned *Du-Pin*, speaking indeed of *Theognostus*, but the Remark is applicable to others of the *Antients*, who may claim the like Favour of Interpretation. “ *Photius*, says He, has wrongfully accused *Theog-*  
 “ *nostus* to have erred concerning the Divinity of the  
 “ Son, upon the Score of a few Expressions that  
 “ did not agree with Those of his own Age; with-  
 “ out taking notice that tho’ the *Antients* have spo-  
 “ ken differently as to this Point, yet the Founda-  
 “ tion of the Doctrine was always the same; and  
 “ that it is an horrid Injustice to require Them to  
 “ speak as nicely, and with as much Precaution as  
 “ Those that lived after the Birth and Condemnation  
 “ of *Heresies*. In a word, tho’ *Justin* has not used  
 the like *Guards* with the *Post-Nicene* Writers, since  
 He had not the like Occasions; Yet His Sense,

\* Basil. Ep. 300. p. 1070. Athan. Orat. 4. p. 619. Contr. Sabell. p. 41. Cyril. Alex. Thefaur. p. 60. 110. Ambr. de Fid. l. 3. c. 15. Greg. Nyss. Cat. Orat. cap. 1.

† Vid. Damascen. l. 1. c. 6. lib. 3. c. 6.



without any such *Guards*, is plain enough to any Man that duly weighs and considers it.

2. You pretend from *Justin* (*Disqu. Mod.* p. 33.) that Christ is not *Maker of all Things*. But this you can never prove out of *Justin*: For, all that *Justin* meant, by distinguishing Christ from the *Maker of all Things*, was only This, that Christ is not *that Person*, ordinarily and eminently stiled *Maker of all Things*; that is, He is not the *Father* Himself, as some *Hereticks* pretended, and as the *Jews* in effect taught, by applying these Texts to God the *Father*, which *Justin* interprets of God the Son.

3. You object that Christ does nothing of his *own Power*. This is no where said by *Justin* of Christ, considered in his highest Capacity. *Justin* indeed admits that both the *Power* and *Substance* of the Son is derived from the *Father*. But This is a different thing from saying that Christ did nothing by his *own Power*. The *Father's* Power is his Power, Christ's *own Power*.

4. You object (*Disqu. Mod.* p. 30. 33.) That Christ is *no more than the Chief Power* ( $\pi\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\eta\ \delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma$ ) after the Chief God,  $\mu\grave{\epsilon}\tau\grave{\epsilon}\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \pi\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\omicron\nu\ \Theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\nu$ . But *Justin* no where puts those Words together as you have done. He does indeed say, that the Son is the *principal Power* after (that is next in order to) the *Father of all Things*\*: which is no more than to say, that He is the *next Person* to the *Father*, as all allow. What Inference can you draw from thence against our Principles? As to the Words  $\pi\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\omicron\ \Theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ , *Chief God*, it is *Plato's* Expression, and, as such, cited by *Justin*.

5. You object that Christ *hath all that He hath from the Father*. This is true, and acknowledged by

\* *Just. Mart. Apol. 1. p. 66.*

† *Just. Apol. 1. p. 114.*

all *Catholicks*, before and after the *Nicene-Council*, from *Justin* \* down to *Damascen* †.

6. You object that, according to *Justin* (*Disqu.* p. 33.) *Christ could not be saved but by the Help of God*. This is I spoke of *Christ*, in respect of his *Humanity*; and brought in among the Proofs of *Christ's* being a *Man* ‡. And it was suitable to *Christ's* humble State on Earth, for an Example and Lesson to other Men, to refer all to God.

7. You object that *Christ* is manifestly distinguish'd from the God of *Abraham*. But this is manifestly false, in your Sense of it. *Christ* is plainly God of *Abraham*, according to *Justin*; as hath been before shown. You may say, if you please, that the *Father* is distinguish'd from the God of *Abraham*; which is true, as He is distinguish'd from the *Son*, who is God of *Abraham*: In like manner, I presume, we may allow that the *Son* is distinguish'd from the God of *Abraham*, and leave you to make your utmost Advantage of it. You observe, that when the *Son* is distinguish'd from the God of *Abraham*, there is added, *besides whom there is no other God*. From thence you may learn, that tho' the *Son* be God of *Abraham*, as well as the *Father*, yet there are not two Gods of *Abraham*: The *Son* is not another God of *Abraham*, but another Person only.

8. You object farther (*Disqu. Mod.* p. 27. 33.) that *Christ would not suffer Himself to be called Good, but remitted that Title to the Father only* \*\*. You should have added, as *Justin* does in the same place, that *Christ* was a *Worm*, and no *Arian*, the Scorn of

\* Αἰσχος αὐτοῦ τὸ εἶναι, καὶ θνατός, καὶ κελίον, καὶ δειρῶ. *Just.* Dial. p. 374.

† Πάντα ἐν ὧσι ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἔχει, καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ εἶναι. *Damasc. de Fid. Orth.* lib. 1. c. 10.

‡ Vid. *Just. Mart. Dial.* p. 298. *Comp.* 303.

\*\* *Just. Mart. Dial.* p. 298.

*Men, and the out-cast of the People*: and then the Reader would have seen plainly what *Justin* was talking about.

9. You object that *Christ* is *not called God* by *Justin*, on account of his having the *Father's Essence* communicated to *Him*, but because of his being begotten of *Him* before the *Creation*: That is, *Justin* has not said it in *Terms*, tho' He has in *Sense*. To be the proper *Son* of the *Father*, and to be begotten of *Him inseparably*, and without *Division*, (which is *Justin's Doctrine*) is the same Thing as to have the *Nature or Essence of the Father* communicated to *Him*. This is clear from *Justin's Similitudes and Illustrations* \*. For, I suppose, one *Fire* lighted of another, is of the *same Nature* with that other: And thus it is, that the *Nicene Fathers* supposed the *Son* to be, as it were, *Light of Light*; intending thereby to signify his *Consubstantiality*.

10. But you object, that the *Son* (according to *Justin*) is *God by the Will of the Father*. This might be understood in a good *Sense*, had it been asserted by *Justin*. But the *Passage* which you build this upon, does not say so much; as shall be shown in another *Place*, and as I have before observed in my *Defense*, p. 131.

11. But *Christ*, you say, is *subservient* to the *Will* of the *Father*. And what if it pleased the second *Person* of the *Blessed Trinity* to transact all *Matters* between *God the Father* and *Mankind*: Be thankful for it, and make not your self a *Judge* of the *divine*, and *mysterious Dispensations*. I observed in my *Defense*, (p. 289.) that one *Person* may be *Delegate* to another, without being of an *inferior Nature*: Otherwise one *Man* could not be *Delegate* to another. This *thin Piece of Sophistry*, you undertake to answer

\* Vid. *Just. Dial.* p. 183. 373.

(*Reply, p. 73.*) in these Words. *One Man may be Delegate to another, because He is another Individuum of the same Species, but different in his particular Essence from Him; But dares the Doctor say the second or third Person thus differs from the first?* To which I reply, that, from your own Confession, it is manifest that meerly from *Delegation* no Argument can be drawn to *Inferiority of Nature*; which was the Point I was upon, and which is sufficiently proved by that Instance. As to the Persons differing from each other, as one Man differs from another, I readily deny any such *Difference* among the *divine* Persons: And I leave you to prove at leisure, that all *Delegation* requires it. When you can do That, I shall submit to the Charge of *Sophistry*: In the mean time, please to suffer it to lie at your own Door.

Having thus consider'd all, or however your most considerable Pretences from *Justin Martyr*, and shown them to be weak and frivolous; I hope I may have leave once more to say, that your Account of this *Father* is *one continued Misrepresentation*. You have, under this Article, took a great deal of pains to weaken the Force of an Argument which I had used in my *Defense*, Query 2d. p. 28, &c. It would break my Method too much here, to attend you in it; to show how you have left my main Arguments and Testimonies untouched, and have done little more than endeavoured to confront them with other Testimonies; which, notwithstanding, when rightly understood, are nothing at all to the purpose. If the Reader pleases but to consider and compare what I have said in my *Defense*; I am not apprehensive that your Pretences can have much weight with Him. However, if a proper Occasion offers, and if need be, or if I have not sufficiently obviated them already, I may perhaps take some farther notice of them, either in a

*second*

*second Part* to This, or elsewhere, whenever my Adversaries shall favour me with a large and particular Examination of the whole Piece. I shall now proceed, in my Method, to another Article of the Charge.

X. The tenth Thing which I charged you with (*Defence*, p. 411.) was, that in your *Disquisitions* (p. 61.) you took occasion from the *Latin* Version to misrepresent *Athenagoras*, insinuating from it that the Son is not like the Father. Here you are so ingenuous, as to plead Guilty, and to give me leave to *Triumph*; (*Reply*, p. 14.) but with this Sting in it, that it is *the only Argument I attempted to answer*. But whether That be so or no, our Readers, I suppose, may be the properest Judges; to whom I leave it and proceed.

XI. I charged you farther (*Defence*, p. 411.) with another Misconstruction of a Passage in *Athenagoras*; a very famous one, and of Singular use in this Controversy. You appeared to Me to construe the Words ἔχ' ὡς γενόμενον \*, not as *eternally generated*; which is a very new and peculiar Construction. You deny the Fact, as indeed you may well be ashamed to own it. But I shall literally translate that Paragraph of your Book, and then the Reader may the more easily judge of it. “ Hence it appears that *Athenagoras*, with the Christians of the same Age, believed the Father only to be Θεὸν ἀγέννητον καὶ αἰδίου, *God unbegotten and eternal*, and the Son of God the Father to be styled πρῶτον γέννημα, *The first Off-spring*, ἔχ' ὡς γενόμενον, not on the account of any eternal Generation, properly so called, such as might constitute the Son ζῶντα καὶ ὑφεστῶτα, *living and subsisting by Himself*, in, or

\* Πρῶτον γέννημα εἶναι πρὸ πατρὸς, ἔχ' ὡς γενόμενον, ἐξ ἀρχῆς ᾧ ὁ Θεός, νῆς αἰδίου ἀν, εἶχεν αὐτὸς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὸν λόγον ἀδίως λογιστέον. *Athenag. c. 10. p. 38.*

“ out of the Father; but because the Father being  
 “ Himself an eternal Mind had from Eternity λόγον,  
 “ Reason, in Himself, αἰδίως λογικὸς ὢν, being eter-  
 “ nally rational \*. The Reader must here observe  
 that as you intermix *Greek* with your Sentences six  
 Times, in the same manner; so in five of them, the  
 Words immediately following the *Greek*, are plainly  
 intended as the Construction, or Interpretation of it.  
 I had therefore good Reason, from parity of Circum-  
 stances, to take the Words immediately following  
 those *Greek* Words ἔχ ὡς γινόμενον, as your Con-  
 struction, or Interpretation of Them: especially  
 since you begin with the *negative* Particle, just as  
 the *Greek* does. You seem to be so sensible of This  
 your self, that when in your *Reply* (p. 14,) you come  
 to give your *English* Reader a different Turn of the  
 Passage, you are forced to leave the *Greek* Words  
 ἔχ ὡς γινόμενον quite out: For had They appear-  
 ed here in your *Reply*, as They do in your *Disqui-*  
*sitions*, the Reader would have seen at once that my  
 Censure was just. But let us, for Argument sake,  
 admit your Plea, that you did not intend those Words  
 following *Athenagoras's Greek*, as an Interpretation of  
 it; do you consider how unaccountable a Part you  
 have acted in citing the Words at all? They are  
 Words which we greatly Value, and lay a Stress up-  
 on, as being of irresistible Force against the *Arians*.  
 Ought you not, while you were pleading the Cause  
 of *Arianism* from this very Passage, to have attempted  
 some Solution of the Difficulty arising from those  
 Words, which so plainly stare you in the Face?  
*Sandius*, and *Gilbert Clerke* thought themselves obliged  
 to say something, however weak and unsatisfactory;  
 which was better than to attempt nothing at all. But  
 what do you, if we are to take your own last

\* *Whitby. Disquisit. Mod. p. 62.*

Thoughts upon it? You could not but know that these Words, in their obvious natural meaning, are directly repugnant to the Conclusion which you are aiming at; you see the very Words, you transcribe them, and leave them as you find them, without any Interpretation, or Solution. Now, what is This but to show that you was aware of the Objection, and was not able to answer it, nor so much as willing to endeavour it; and yet resolutely persist, even against Conviction, to wrest and force the Passage to your own Meaning? I am persuaded you might more prudently have submitted to the first Charge, than have took this way, of getting rid of it. But it is frequent with you, for want of considering, to double the Fault which you hoped to excuse; and for the avoiding of one Difficulty, to run your self into more and greater.

To conclude this Article, if you intended an Interpretation of *Athenagoras's* Words, as I conceive you did, then you have, in the whole, misrepresented the Author, but with something of Colour for it: if you did not, still you have, in the whole, misrepresented Him, and without any Colour for it. Either way, you have dealt unfairly with *Athenagoras*, and have endeavoured to impose upon your Readers.

XII. The next Thing I laid to your Charge \*, was a ridiculous Representation † of *Tertullian*; as if *Tertullian* believed two *Angels* to be as much one, as God the Father and God the Son are. To this you reply (p. 21.) that you say nothing of what *Tertullian* believed: but only from these Words (the Son of God is called God from the Unity of Substance, for God is a Spirit) you think it evident that *Tertullian* concludes hence the Unity of the Father, and the

\* *Defense*, p. 412.

† *Disqu. Mod.* p. 108.

*Son, that They are Both Spirits; which two Angels, and two Demons also are.* Is there then no regard to be had to what an Author is otherwise known to believe? Or is it fair and just to construe an *ambiguous* Sentence (supposing this *ambiguous*, and not rather plain enough against you) in direct Opposition to his certain undoubted Principles? But what makes it the more unjust in this Case, is, that *Tertullian*, in that very Paragraph, within a Line or two of the Words which you ground your Remark upon, resolves the Unity of Father and Son into This, that They are *de Spiritu Spiritus, de Deo Deus, de Lumine Lumen; Spirit of Spirit, God of God, Light of Light.* Can This be said of two *Angels*, or two *Demons*, that They are *Light of Light*, or *Spirit of Spirit*? Have They any such Relation to, or intimate Conjunction with, each other, as is here plainly signified of Father and Son? Well then; What is the Result? You have misunderstood *Tertullian*, or rather perverted his Meaning. He does not say that Father and Son are *One*, because *They are Both Spirits*; any more than He says they are *One*, because They are *Both Gods*: nor would it be sufficient for one to be *Spirit*, and the other to be *Spirit*, or one to be *God*, and the other *God*, unless one were also *of the other*, inseparably united to Him, and included in Him. *Tertullian* indeed observes that God the Father is *Spirit*, as He had before observed of God the Son:

\* Et nos etiam *Sermoni*, atque *Rationi*, itemque *Virtuti* per quæ omnia molitum Deum ediximus, *propriam Substantiam Spiritum* inscribimus, cui & *Sermo* insit prænantianti, & *Ratio* adfit disponenti, & *Virtus* præsit perficienti. Hunc ex Deo prolatum didicimus, & prolatione generatum, & idcirco Filium Dei & Deum dictum ex unitate Substantiæ. Nam & Deus Spiritus: & cum radius ex sole porrigitur, portio ex summa: sed Sol erit in radio, quia Solis est radius, nec separatur Substantia sed extenditur. Ita de *Spiritu Spiritus*, & de *Deo Deus*, ut *Lumen de Lumine* accensum. *Tertull. Apol. c. 21. p. 202, 203. Lugd.*

And



And This was right, that so He might come to his Conclusion, that They are *Spirit of Spirit*; which They could not be, unless Each of them were *Spirit*. This therefore is mention'd, not because it makes them *One*, but because They could not be *One* without it. They must be *Spirit* and *Spirit*, to be *Spirit of Spirit*: But the latter contains more than the former; and it is into This that *Tertullian* resolves the formal Reason of the Unity; or rather, Both Considerations are included in his Notion of *Unity of Substance*. This will appear from a bare literal rendring of his Words. " We have learned that He (*God* " *the Son*) is *prolated*, and by his *Prolation* generated, " and upon that Score, He is stiled *Son of God*, and " *God*, from *Unity of Substance*. For even *God* (*the* " *Father*) is *Spirit*: And when a *Ray* is produced " from the *Sun*, a Portion from the whole, the *Sun* " is in the *Ray*, because it is the *Sun's Ray*; and the " *Substance* is not *separated*, but extended: in like " manner, here is *Spirit of Spirit*, and *God of God*, as " *Light of Light*. You see how *Tertullian* makes it necessary to *Unity of Substance*, that the *Substance* be not *separate*: And thus Father and Son are *One*, not merely because Each of Them is *Spirit*, but because Both are *undivided Substance*, or *Spirit*; *Spirit of Spirit*. When I wrote my *Defense*, I thought a Hint might have been sufficient in Things of this Nature; little imagining I should ever have the Trouble of Explaining such Matters as these, which appear by their own light, upon a bare Inspection into the Author.

XIII. In the next Place, I charged you \* with a Misconstruction of a noted Passage in *Irenaus*. To This you make no Reply at all; wherefore it stands as before; And I have, I suppose, your tacite Al-

\* *Defense*, p. 412.

lowance to *Triumph* here, as, in a former place, your *express* Permission.

XIV. I found fault \* with your Representation † of *Tertullian*; as if that Writer believed God the Son to have been, in his highest Capacity, *ignorant of the Day of Judgment*. To this you make answer (*Reply*, p. 22.) That you only cite his *express* Words without any *Descant* upon Them. It is very true that you make no formal *Descant* upon those very Words; but both before and after, you are arguing, with all your might, against *Tertullian's* belief of the *Eternity* and *Consubstantiality*. I hope, it is no Affront to suppose that you had some meaning in bringing in the Passages about the Son's *Ignorance*; and that you would have your Readers think them *pertinent*, at least, to the Point in Hand. The whole design of your Book, and what goes before and after, in the same *Section*, sufficiently show your Intention in citing those Passages; and are, interpretatively, a *Descant* upon Them. Your meaning and purport in it is so plain, that no Reader can mistake it: Wherefore your pretence now that you have made no descant upon the Words, after you find that you are not able to defend your Sense of Them, is a very poor Evasion. There were two Citations from *Tertullian* about the Son's *Ignorance*. I had shown that one of them plainly relates to Christ's *Human Nature*; and I might reasonably judge from thence the same thing of the other also, since Both are of the same Author. It is not therefore strictly true that I *answer nothing*, as you pretend, to the first Citation: For, by answering one, I have, in effect, answer'd Both. It was your Business to prove that Either of the Passages were to be understood of Christ, in his highest Capacity: But for want of Proof, you are content to

\* *Defence*, p. 414.

† *Disquis. Mod.* p. 147.

*insinuate* it only, to your Reader; and so you leave it with Him, trusting to his Weakness, or Partiality. However, instead of asking a Proof of you, I gave you a Proof of the Contrary; demonstrating from the Context (especially from the Words *Exclamans quod se Deus reliquisset*, which *Tertullian* in express Words interprets of the *Human Nature*) that the supposed *Ignorance* of Christ was understood by *Tertullian* of Christ's *Humanity* only. Now you say (p. 22.) that *the Words*, known only to the Father, *exclude the Son in all Capacities*. Very well then; I had the good fortune to hit your meaning before, though you made no *Descant* upon the Words. As to your Pretence from the Term *only*, there is no Ground for it. No Man of any Judgment, that is at all acquainted with *Tertullian's* way and manner of Explaining the *Exclusive* Terms\*, relating to this Subject, would ever draw any such Inference from them. But you have a farther pretence, that *all the Words preceding speak not of the Son of Man, but of the Son of God*. The Reason is, because He was to prove that the *Son of God* was really distinct from the *Father*; and that the *Father* was not *incarnate*, as the *Praxeans* pretended. He proves it unanswerably from this Topic, among others; that in regard to the Son's *Ignorance of the Day of Judgment*, Father and Son are plainly spoken of, as of *two Persons*; one as *knowing*, the other as not *knowing*, tho' in a certain respect only: Wherefore the Father Himself was not the *Person incarnate*, which was to be proved. In this view, *Tertullian's* Argument is just and conclusive; and the Text relating to the Son's *Ignorance* pertinently alledged, tho' understood of Christ's *Humanity*. This I observed before, and explain'd more at large in my *Defense*,

\* Vid. Tertull. Contr. Prax. c. 2. §. 18, 19.

p. 415, 416, &c. You resolve, notwithstanding, to proceed in your own Way, and to make a show of saying Something, tho' you find your self already foreclosed, and every Objection obviated. You say thus: *From this Mistake of Tertullian's citing Texts relating only to Christ's Human Nature, He saw this Objection would arise, that the Fathers argued impertinently against the Sabellians.* I did indeed foresee, that there might be some Colour for such an *Objection*, among Those that take Things upon the *first View*, without looking any farther. I proposed the *Objection* fairly, and then fully answered it; as the Reader may please to see in my *Defense*. And now, what have you to reply? I had said that *Catholicks* and *Sabellians*, Both allowed that *God* was *incarnate*, and that the main *Question* (that is, so far as concerns the *Incarnation*, whereof I was speaking) was, whether the *Father Himself* made one *Person* with *Christ's Human Nature*, or no. In answer hereto, you make a show of contradicting me without opposing me at all, except in one particular wherein you are plainly mistaken. You run off for near a Page together, telling us only trite Things which every Body knows, concerning the Dispute between *Catholicks* and *Sabellians*. If by *singular Essence*, be meant the same with *Hypostasis*, or *Person* (as you understand it) That indeed was the main Article of Dispute between *Catholicks* and *Sabellians*, whether *Father* and *Son* were one and the same *Hypostasis*. But when the Principles of each Side were brought down to the particular Case of the *Incarnation*, then the main Point in Question was, whether the *Hypostasis* of the *Father* was *Incarnate*, or no. The *Sabellians* allowing but one *divine Hypostasis*, and yet admitting *God* to be *Incarnate*, were of Course obliged to assert it: And the *Catholicks*, on the other Hand, admitting more *divine Hypostases* than one, denied it. How the *Catholicks*

*rholicks* proved their Point, I showed you distinctly; and you have nothing of Moment to reply to it. Only you are pleased to acquaint us with an Invention of your own, that the *Sabellians* allowed in *Jesus* only *Flesh*; and by the Spirit of *Jesus* They understood the *Godhead of the Father*. But who, before your self, ever reckon'd it among the *Sabellian* Tenets, that *Christ* had no *Human Soul*? It is very peculiar of you to cite *Tertullian* in Proof of it, on account of these Words, *dicentes Filium Carnem esse, id est Hominem, id est Jesum; Patrem autem Spiritum, id est Deum*: when *Tertullian*, in the very Passage, interprets *Flesh* by *Man*, and *Jesus*; and interprets *Spirit* by divine Spirit, or God. As to the Belief of *Christ's Human Soul*, it was an establish'd Article of Faith in *Tertullian's* Time, as appears from several Passages\*; and before *Tertullian*, as is clear from *Irenaeus* †, and *Justin Martyr* ‡. How then comes it to pass that none of the *Catholicks* ever took notice of this Error of the *Sabellians*, their denying a *Human Soul*? I mention not how the *Sabellian Hypothesis* must have been very needlessly and stupidly clogg'd by such a Tenet: For They could never have given any tolerable Account of the Son's praying to the Father, of his increasing in Wisdom, of his being afflicted and sore troubled, and crying out in his Agonies and Sufferings, without the Supposition of a *Human Soul*. What? Was it only *walking Flesh*, or *animated Clay*, that did all this? Or was it the *Hypostasis* of the Father, the eternal God, as such, that did these Things? You allow only these Two; and not caring, it seems, how *stupid* and *senseless* you make all the *Sabellians*, one of these you must, of Course, father upon Them. It is true that They supposed the *Father* to have *suffered*, and

\* *Tertull. Contr. Prax. c. 16. 30. de Carn. Christi c. 10.*

† *Iren. l. 5. c. 1. p. 292. Ed. Bened.*

‡ *Justin M. Apol. 2. p. 26. Ox.*

They were therefore called *Patricians*: That is, They supposed the *Father* to suffer (as we believe of the *Son*) in the *Human* Nature. But They were never so gross and wild in their Imaginations as to suppose the *Godhead*, as such, to *suffer*, to be *fore troubled*, to be in *Agonies*, to *cry out*, &c. And yet it is ridiculous to apply this to *Flesh* only without a *Soul*: Neither can it be reasonably imagined of the *Sabellians*, unless They believed of Men in general, that They have no such Thing as a *Soul* distinct from the Body. In short, their retreating at length to This, that there were two *Hypostases* \* in Christ, a *Divine* and *Human*, in order to solve the Difficulties they were press'd with, sufficiently discovers their Sentiments. For neither could that Subterfuge do them any Service, unless *Jesus* was supposed a distinct *Person*; nor could They be so weak as to imagine a *living Carcass*, a Body without a Soul, to be a *Person*. To conclude this Article, the *Sabellians*, when They retired at length to that *Salvo*, taking Sanctuary in two *Hypostases*, understood one of them to be *God* the *Father*, the other, the *Man* Christ *Jesus* †: which was afterwards the Doctrine of *Paul* of *Samosata*, and of *Photinus*, who thus refined upon the *Sabellian* *Heresy*. But I have been rather too long in confuting a Pretence, which has nothing to countenance it in History; besides that it is plainly repugnant to good Sense.

XV. The next Thing I charged you with ‡, was your pretending, falsely, that Bp *Bull* had not shown that the Fathers of the *second Century* resolved the *Unity* into the same Principle with the *Nicene* Fathers. I observed that the Bishop had shown it,

\* Vid. Tertull. Contr. Prax. c. 27. Comp. Athanas. Contr. Sabell. Gregal. p. 29. Ed. Bened.

† See this expressly asserted in Athanasius, Tom. 2. p. 39. before referr'd to.

‡ Defense, p. 117.

referring you to the Place where \*. You now say in your *Reply* (p. 24.) *That which the Bishop has done in that Section is fully answered and refuted*, p. 197, 198. I have turn'd to those Pages, in your *Disquisitions*, and can see nothing like it; except it be your Fancy, or *Fiction*, that the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers, when They speak of the *Logos* as existing in the Father before his coming forth, mean it of an *Attribute* only, and nothing *real*. This groundless Surmise is at large confuted by Bishop *Bull* †: And give me leave also to refer you to what I have observed ‡, on that Head. What you add, relating to *Clemens Romanus*, is only *gratis dictum*, and wants to be proved.

XVI. I blamed you \*\* farther for referring †† to *Basil*, as an Evidence that *Gregory Thaumaturgus* believed God the Son to be a *Creature*. You tell me, in your *Reply* (p. 24.) that you say nothing of his (*Gregory's*) *Faith*. Please to look back to your *Modest Disquisitions*, and revise your own former Thoughts, which run thus. “ Lastly, it is to be noted that “ neither *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, who, as *St. Basil* “ witnesseth, *depressed Christ into the Rank of Creatures* (in *Creaturarum censum depressit*) nor *Dionysius* “ of *Alexandria*, who, as the same (*Basil*) witnesseth, “ denied the *Consubstantiality*, could have thought “ rightly (*recte sentire potuisse*) of the proper Eternity of Christ. Is this saying nothing of *Gregory's Faith*? Tho' He *depressed* the Son into the Rank of *Creatures*, as you tell us He did; and tho' He could not think (i. e. believe) rightly of Christ's proper Eternity, as you also say; yet you have said nothing of *Gregory's Faith*. Ridiculous: you have said it, and

\* Bull. Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. 4. c. 4.

† Bull. Def. Fid. Sect. 3. cap. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.

‡ *Defense*, p. 148. &c. *Sermons*, p. 244.

\*\* *Defense*, p. 418.

†† *Mod. Discou.* p. 84.

quoted *Basil* for it; notwithstanding, that Bishop *Bull* had demonstrated the contrary even from *Basil* Himself; as I before observ'd, and you do not gainsay. And now, to use your own Words, relating to this Article, *Let the Reader judge where the Falshood lies.* Your repeating some Things from *Petavius* and *Huetius*, upon this Occasion, signifies little. Bishop *Bull* had consider'd, and answer'd what those two great Men had said: And you come up again with the same baffled Objections; though you are so sensible that They have been fully answer'd, that you have not a Word to reply, but are forced *tacitely* to allow that *Gregory's Faith* was right; however He happen'd to drop some suspected Words, which were made an ill use of.

XVII. I charged you \* with the Revival of an old Objection, which Bishop *Bull* had ingenuously set forth in its full Force, and as fully answer'd †.

To this you reply (p. 25.) that you *have fully confuted this pretended Answer of the Bishop's, in your Dissertation de Scriptur. Interpret. p. 51, 52.* and also in the place cited of your *Mod. Disquis. p. 87, 88.* I have turn'd to your *Dissertation*, and find what you point to, in the *Preface, p. 51, 52.* There I meet with two or three Exceptions, mostly wide of the Point, and scarce deserving Notice. We must suppose our Readers acquainted with the Argument we are upon, which it would be tedious to give at length: And now I will show you how slight your Objections are.

1. First, you say, that the *Appearance of Christ's Divine Nature* (to the Patriarchs) *under Human Form, did not make the Logos another God from the Father.* No certainly; Nor did any of the *Ante-Nicene Writers*

\* *Defense.* p. 418.

† *Bull. Def. Fid. N.* p. 267.



pretend it: But if the *Logos* appeared in a certain Manner and Form, and the *Father* never appeared in any Manner or Form; the *Logos* is not the *Father*: which was the Thing to be proved.

2. You object, that *certainly the divine Nature of Christ was in Heaven, when it appeared on Earth.* Undoubtedly: And those very Writers who represent the *Father* as being in Heaven, and the *Son* as being on Earth, yet acknowledge them Both to be equally present every where: And They refer it to the *οἰκονομία* \*, that the two Persons are represented as it were in different Places; one Here, the other There.

3. You object, that *those Antients who look'd upon it as impious to ascribe to the Father such Things as they made no scruple of applying to the Son,* must have thought there was some difference between the *Father* and *Son*, in those Respects. I answer, that They thought of no more Difference than This, that one was a *Father*, and the other a *Son*; and that one was to be *incarnate*, and the other not. It would have been *impious* to ascribe to the Person of the *Father*, what was proper to the Person of the *Son*; not only because the *Father* was never to be *sent*, nor to act a *ministerial* Part, any more than He was to be *Incarnate*; but also because the Tendency of such Pretences was to make *Father* and *Son* one *Hypostasis*, or *Person*, and was in reality to deny that there was any *Son* at all. Your Citations from *Tertullian* and *Justin Martyr* are not pertinent, unless you supposed your self to be arguing against *Sabellians*. Having done

\* Habes Filium in Terris, habes Patrem in Cælis: non est separatio ista, sed *Dispositio* divina. Caterum scias Deum etiam intra Abyssos esse, & ubique consistere, sed vi & potestate: Filium quoque ut individuum cum ipso ubique. Tamen in ipsa *οἰκονομία* Pater voluit Filium in Terris haberi, se vero in Cælis. *Tertull. adv. Prax. cap. 2.*

with your *Dissertation*, let us next come to *Disquis. Modest.* p. 87. There, I must observe, you have hardly one word to the purpose. All that you prove, is, that Father and Son are not one *Numerical Essence*, in your Sense; that is, They are not one *Numerical Person*, which is readily allowed: As also that They have not one *Numerical Will, Power, &c.* in your Sense, tho' They have in Another. *Voluntas de Voluntate, Potentia de Potentia* is the *Catholick Doctrine*, as much as *Substantia de Substantia*, or *Deus de Deo*. In short, if you would do any thing towards confuting Bishop Bull, you should answer the Authorities which He brought, to prove that those very *Ante-Nicene* Writers (who argued that it could not be the Father that *appeared*, and *descended*, and was found in a *place*) acknowledged, notwithstanding, that the *Son* was, in his own Nature, *invisible*, and *omnipresent* as well as the Father; and that the same Writers (some of them) expressly interpreted those *Appearances*, &c. of the *οἰκονομία*, *Oeconomy*, or *Dispensation*, which it pleased God the Son to run through; transacting all Matters between God the Father, and the World of *Creatures*. As to the *οἰκονομία*, and what Bishop Bull intends by it, the Reader may see in his *Defense of the Nicene-Faith*, (p. 10.) What you mean by denying it is very hard to conjecture, unless you have some weak Evasion (*Reply*, p. 26.) in the Words, *Beginning from the fall of Adam*: For you say, and seem to lay some Stress upon it, that it *begun from the Beginning of the Creation*. Does Bishop Bull deny That? See his own Words, in the Margin \*. But, it seems, you are to construe Bishop Bull's saying, that it was as high

\* Deus Pater, quemadmodum per Filium suum mundum primitus condidit creavitque; ita per eundem Filium se deinceps mundo patefecit. *Bull. Def. F. N.* p. 10.

as the Fall of Adam, (in Opposition to such as supposed it to commence at the *Incarnation*, and no looner) as if He had said it *began* from the Fall of Adam: And This you are to do, only to find some Pretence for contradicting Bishop Bull, and diverting the Reader from the Point in Hand. I referred you (*Defense*, p. 418.) to Authors \*, Antient and Modern, who asserted the *οικονομία* in Bishop Bull's Sense. To which you have nothing of any moment to oppose; only you discover a great Dissatisfaction that Bishop Bull had so well guarded his Point, and vindicated his Doctrine, that all your most pompous and plausible Pretences fall before Him.

XVIII. I charged you † with setting *Clemens* of Rome, and St. Paul, at Variance; and yet giving the Preference to *Clemens*, as *laying Christianity before us in its naked Simplicity*. To this Article you are pleased to say never a Word.

XIX. I took notice also, in another place ‡, of your Sophistical way of reasoning against the Belief of *Mysteries*, or Matters above Comprehension. I called upon you (p. 318, 319.) to explain your Meaning, and to let us know distinctly, what there is in the Doctrine of the ever Blessed Trinity, to give you such Offense, and to raise your Zeal against it; whether it be that the Doctrine is, in your Judgment, *Contradictory* to Reason, or only *above Reason*; or that it is *unscriptural* only, and no more: But to This also you vouchsafe no Reply.

XX. I charged you farther (p. 131.) with using a bad Art, to serve a bad Cause: which was the severest Thing I had said of you, and which you had

\* Tertull. Contr. Prax. c. 2, 3. Clem. Alex. p. 831. 955. Fd. Ox. Tatian. c. 8. Ed. Ox. Hippol. Contr. Noet. p. 12. 15. Fabric. Vales. Not. in Euseb. p. 5, 6. 90. 253.

† *Defense*, p. 420.

‡ *Defense*, p. 308.

given me just occasion for; as I showed plainly in the place referr'd to. In Apology for your self (*Reply*, p. 56.) you cite a Passage of my *Defense*, (p. 433.) where I say, "A Writer is not to be  
 "blamed, in some Cases, for taking what is to his  
 "purpose, and omitting the rest. To which give  
 me leave to answer in my own Words, as they fol-  
 low in the same Page; "But, as the Case is here,  
 "the best, and indeed only light to direct the Rea-  
 "der to the true meaning of what is cited, is left out.  
 You say, your *design being only to prove from the Words*  
*of Justin, that Christ was God, κατὰ βουλὴν αὐτοῦ,*  
 according to the Will of his Father, *what Reason*  
*could you have to add that He was also stiled an Angel?*  
 But, do you not yet perceive that the Question is,  
 whether Christ be said to be God κατὰ βουλὴν αὐτοῦ,  
 according to the Will of the Father, in that Place of  
*Justin*, or no? The Words, literally rendred, run  
 thus: "Who according to his (the Father's) Will,  
 "is both God, being his Son, and an Angel as mi-  
 "nistring to his Father's Will. The meaning of the  
 Passage is not, as you represent it, that Christ is  
 God, by the Will of the Father (tho' even That might  
 bear a good Sense) but that it pleased God that his  
 Son, who was God already, as God's Son, should be  
 an Angel also. That He was God, was a necessary  
 Thing; but that He should be Both, was not so.  
 This I took to be the true Sense of the Passage.  
 For, *Justin* gives the Reason why He was God; it  
 was because He was God's Son. He resolves his Di-

\* Τὸν κατὰ βουλὴν τὴν ἐκείνης καὶ Θεὸν ὄντα, ἕν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἁγίον  
 λόγος ἐν τῇ ἑσσηστῶν τῇ γνώμῃ αὐτοῦ. Dial. p. 370.

Compare the Words of Novatian.

Personæ autem Christi convenit, ut & Deus sit, quia Dei  
 Filius; & Angelus sit, quoniam paternæ Dispositionis Adnun-  
 tiator est. *Novat. c. 26.*

vinity into *Sonship* here, as indeed every where; and *Sonship* into *Communication of Substance*, as I have observed above. Now, let us consider what you had done with this Passage. The *Latin* Version runs thus: *Qui juxta Voluntatem ejus, & Deus est, Filius quippe Ipsius, & Angelus ex eo quod sententia illius est administrator.* Instead whereof you give us This: *Qui ex Voluntate Ipsius, & Deus est & Filius ipsius.* Here, by putting in the Particle *Et*, before *Filius*, and leaving out *& Angelus*, you determine the Words to your own Sense, tho' capable of another Sense as they lie in the Author. This is what I had just reason to complain of, that you should take upon you to leave out, and put in, what you please, to tie the Words down to your own Meaning; when the Words otherwise may, or rather must, bear a different Construction, if you please to let them appear intire, and without any Interpolation.

You say (*Reply*, p. 56,) that you had *Authority* from *Justin's own Words* to do this. What? Had you *Authority* from *Justin's own Words*, to change both his Words and his Sense? He does not say that *Christ was God, and a Son too by the Will of the Father*; but that He was, according to the Will of the Father, both God, as being his Son, and an Angel. I insist upon it, that the meaning may be no more than this, that it pleased God that He who was already God, should not only be God, but an *Angel* also; and that tho' it was owing to God's good Pleasure, that He was *Both*, yet it was necessary for Him to be *one*, as He was partaker of the divine Substance, being God's Son. You cite other Passages of *Justin*, declaring that Christ was Θεός ἐκ τῆς εἶναι τέκνον πρωτότοκον τῶ ὅλων κτισμάτων, *God as being Born (or begotten) before all Creatures*: and that He was

\* *Whitby. Disquisit. Med.* p. 32.

Θεός, Θεὸς ὑπάρχων, *God as being the Son of God.* Now, these and the like Passages make against you, as showing that *Justin* resolved *Christ's Divinity* into his *Sonship*, that is, *Communion of Essence*, or *Substance* \*, not into *voluntary Appointment*. If it be objected that He was a *Son* καὶ βεβλήω according to *Justin*, and that therefore He must be *God* καὶ βεβλήω, if He be *God as God's Son*; I answer, that the Consequence is not just. For while *Justin* understands the *Sonship* of a *Temporal* and *Voluntary* ἀποθέουσις, or *coming forth*, He supposes the *Logos* not to have been ἐξ οὐ ὄντων, but from the very *Substance* of the *Father*; and therefore He was *God*, as having ever existed before his *coming forth*, in and with the *Father*. In a word, He *came forth*, was not *created*, and therefore He is *God*. Had He been produced *from nothing*, as *Creatures* are, He could not be *God*: But since He came forth as a *Son*, of the same *divine Substance* with the *Father*, therefore He is *God*. This I take to be the true *Account* of *Justin's* Principles relating to this *Head*; as also of all the other *Fathers* that speak of a *voluntary* *Generation*. See my *Defense*, *Qu. 8*. You see then, how wide a difference there is between your *Account* of *Justin* and mine. I desire only to have *Justin's* *Text* fairly represented as it is. To put in, or leave out any thing here, and thereby to determine the *Sense* against us, in so critical a *Place* as This, is very *unfair* and *unjust*; and deserves the *hardest* *Names* that I could give it. Let us have no *Tampering* with *Texts*. You may argue and reason for your *Sense* of the *Passage*, if you please; as I do also for mine. Only let our *Readers* see plainly what the *Words* of the *Author* are.

\* Vid. *Justin. Dial.* p. 183. 373. *Comp. Apol.* 1. p. 44. 46. *Apol.* 2. p. 13.

To do otherwise is corrupting the Evidence, perverting Judgment, and giving Sentence before the Cause comes to a fair Hearing. This kind of Management, especially in so weighty a Cause, wherein the Honour of our *God* and *Saviour* is so nearly concern'd, is what I cannot account for: And if, upon this Occasion I express'd some Wonder and Astonishment, that any should be so *resolutely eager to ungod their Saviour, as not to permit the Cause to have a fair Hearing*; I suppose, it might become me much better in Defense of my Saviour's Honour, than Those intemperate Words of your's, *Impudently false Assertion*, become you, in your blind Zeal for your own.

I have now finish'd what I intended by way of Answer to your *Defensive* Part. Upon the whole, it does not appear to me, that, of all the Things laid to your Charge, whether *general Fallacies*, or *particular Mistakes*, you have been able to take off so much as one. What you have done, or shall do, in the *Offensive* Way, may perhaps be consider'd hereafter. I think it best to *postpone* my *Second Part*, because you are still going on to supply me with new Matter for it: And you have promised the Publick great Things, to appear in due Time. I am now pretty well acquainted with you; and may therefore presume to exhibite to the Reader, or to your Self, a brief Account of your chief Materials, with which you are to work in this Controversy, and upon which your Cause is to subsist.

I. In the first place, you have a strong *Presumption*, that *Two, or more Persons cannot constitute one Individual, or Numerical Being, Substance, or Essence*. You produce Testimonies of *Fathers* in great Numbers, proving Nothing but a *real Distinction*; and by *Virtue of the Presumption* laid down (which stands only upon *Courtesy*) you perswade your self, that those  
Testi-

Testimonies are of some weight, and pertinently alledged, even against Those who admit a *real* Distinction, as much as the *Fathers* do.

2. In the second place, you have another strong *Presumption*, that no kind of *Subordination* is or can be consistent with such *Equality*, or such *Union* as we maintain. Hereupon you produce a farther Cloud of Testimonies from the *Antients*, proving nothing but a *Subordination*: which Testimonies, by virtue of this your second *Presumption* (standing only upon *Courtesy*, as the former) are conceived to be of Weight, and to be pertinently cited, even against Those who readily admit of a *Subordination*, in Conformity with the *Antient Fathers*. From what I have observed here, and under the former Article, you may perceive that, at least, nine Parts in ten of your Quotations are intirely wide of the Point; and it may save you some trouble for the future, to be duly apprized of it.

3. Besides this, you have some Expressions of *Origen*, chiefly from those Pieces which are either not certainly Genuine, or not free from Interpolation \*, or wrote in a Problematical Way †, or not containing *Origen's* mature and riper Thoughts; published perhaps without his Consent, and such as He Himself afterwards disapproved, and repented of ‡. And those you urge against us, notwithstanding that we appeal chiefly to his Book against *Celsus*, which is certainly *Origen's*, and which contains his most mature Sentiments; and from whence it is demonstrable that *Origen* was no *Arian*, but plainly *Anti-Arian* \*\*.

\* Vid. *Ruffin. de Adulter. librorum Origen. p. 240. Ed. Bened. Huet. Origenian. p. 233.*

† Vid. *Pamph. Apolog. p. 221. Ed. Bened. Phot. Cod. 117. Athanas. Vol. 1. p. 233.*

‡ Vid. *Hieron. de Error. Orig. ad Pammach. Ep. 41. p. 347. Ed. Bened.*

\*\* Vid. *Bull. Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. 2. c. 9.*



4. You lay a very great Stress upon *Eusebius*, as if He were to speak for all the *Ante-Nicene* Writers: tho' we might more justly produce *Athanasius* (with respect to his Two first Tracts) as an *Ante-Nicene* Writer; And his Authority is, at least, as good as the other's. *Eusebius* must be of little weight with us, wherever He is found to vary either from Himself, or from the *Catholicks* which lived in, or before his Time. Nothing can be more unfair than to represent Antiquity through the Glafs of *Eusebius*, who has been so much suspected; Besides that we can more certainly determine what the Sentiments of the earlier Writers were (from their own Works still extant) than we can what *Eusebius's* were; whose Writings are more doubtful and ambiguous; inso-much that the learned World have been more divided about Him and his Opinions, than about any other Writer whatsoever.

5. Lastly, You bring up again, frequently, some Concessions of *Petavius* and *Huetius*; such as They uncautiously fell into, before this Matter had been thoroughly canvass'd, as it hath been since by Bishop *Bull*, and other great Men. From that Time, most of the learned Men in *Europe*, *Romanists* \* as well as *Protestants*, appear to have the same Sentiments of the *Ante-Nicene Faith*, which Bishop *Bull* had. It is therefore now much out of Time, and very disingenuous to lay any great Weight upon the Judgment of *Petavius*, or *Huetius*, however valuable and learned, since this Matter has been much more accurately inquir'd into, than it had been at that Time. *Huetius* has lived to see Bishop *Bull's* Works (as we may reasonably presume) and cannot be ignorant how highly They have been valued Abroad: Yet we do not find that He has ever complain'd of

\* See Nelson's *Life of Bishop Bull*, p. 345. &c. 388.

any Injury done Him by the Bishop, or that He ever thought fit to vindicate Himself, or his great Oracle *Petavins*; to whose Judgment (as He Himself laments) He had once dearly paid too great a Deference \*.

It may suffice, for the present, to have left these few general Hints; by means of which an Intelligent Reader, without farther Assistance from Me, may readily discover the Fallacy of your Reasonings, and answer the most plausible Objections you have to urge against the received Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity. If any thing more particular be necessary hereafter, I shall (with God's Assistance) endeavor to do Justice to the Cause which I have taken in Hand; and, as opportunity serves, shall proceed in detecting Sophistry, laying open Disguises, exposing Misreports, Misquotations, Misconstructions, or any other Engines of Deceit, as long as there appears to Me any probable Danger from thence arising to Honest Well-meaning Men, less acquainted with this momentous Controversy. In the Interim, I am with all due Respect,

S I R,

Your most Humble Servant.

\* Vid. *Huetii* Comment. de Rebus ad illum pertinent, p. 70.

---

E R R A T A.

Pag. 11. line 17. for *or* read *and*.

p. 43. l. 12. for ἀπάρταρ read ἀπρίπταρ.

BOOKS Printed for, and Sold by CORN.  
CROWNFIELD, at Cambridge.

**A** *Vindication of Christ's Divinity: Being a Defense of some Queries, relating to Dr. Clarke's Scheme of the Holy Trinity, in answer to a Clergy-Man in the Country. The Third Edition, Octavo 1720.*

*Eight Sermons Preach'd at the Cathedral Church of St. Paul, in Defense of the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; upon the Encouragement given by the Lady Moyer, and at the Appointment of the Lord Bishop of London. With a Preface containing Remarks upon Two late Pamphlets: One Intit'led, Modest Plea, &c. Continued, &c. The other, Unity of God not inconsistent with the Divinity of Christ, &c. Both by Daniel Waterland, D. D. Master of Magdalen College in Cambridge, and Chaplain in Ordinary to His MAJESTY. The Second Edition, Octavo 1720.*

*Twenty two Sermons on several Subjects, By Dr. Creighton, Canon-Residentary of Wells, late Greek Professor of Cambridge. Octavo 1720.*

*Remarks upon a late Discourse of Free-Thinking: In a Letter to F. H. D. D. by Phileleutherus Liptiensis. In Two Parts. The Fifth Edition.*

*C. Julii Cæsaris quæ exstant Omnia. Ex Recensione Joannis Davissii, cum ejusdem Animadversionibus ac Notis Pet. Ciaconii, Fr. Hotomanni, Joan. Brantii, Dionys. Vossii & aliorum. Accessere Metaphrasis Græca Librorum VII. De Bello Gallico, nec non Indices necessarii. Quarto 1706.*

*M. Minucii Felicis Octavius, ex itera Recensione Joannis Davissii, cum ejusdem Animadversionibus, ac Notis Integris Des. Heraldii & Nic. Rigaltii, nec non Selectis aliorum. Accedit Commodianus, Ævi Cypriani Scriptor, cum Observationibus antehac Editis, aliisque nonnullis, quæ jam primum prodeunt. Octavo, 1712.*

M. Tullii

M. Tullii Ciceronis de Natura Deorum libri Tres. Cum notis integris Paulli Manucii, Petri Victorii, Joachimi Camerarii, Dionys. Lambini, & Fulv. Ursini. Recensuit, suisque Animadversionibus Illustravit ac Emaculavit *Joannes Davifus*, L. L. D. Coll. Regin. Cantab. Magister, & Canonicus Eliensis. Accedunt Emendationes Cl. *Joannis Walkeri*, A. M. Coll. Trin. Socii. 1718.

Lactantii Firmiani Epitome Divinarum Institutionum ad Pentadium Fratrem. Eam ex vetustissimo MSto Taurinensi nuper editam recensuit, & suis animadversionibus illustravit, ac emendavit *Joannes Davifus*, Juris & Theologiæ Doctor C. R. C. M. C. E. *Octavo* 1718.

Suidæ Lexicon, Græce & Latine. Textum Græcum cum Manuscriptis Codicibus collatum a quamplurimis mendis purgavit, Notisque perpetuis illustravit: Versionem Latinam *Æmilii Porti* innumeris in locis correxit; Indicesque Auctorum & Rerum adjecit *Ludolphus Kusterus*, Professor humaniorum literarum in Gymnasio Regio Berolinensi. 3. Vol. *Folio*, 1710.

C. Crispi Sallustii quæ extant; cum Notis Integris Glareani, Rivii, Ciacconii, Gruteri, Carrionis, Manutii, Putschii, Doufæ; Selectis Castilionei, C. & A. Popmæ, Palmerii, Ursini, J. Fr. Gronovii, Victorii, &c. Accedunt Julius Exsuperantius, Porcius Latro: & Fragmenta Historicorum Vett. cum Notis A. Popmæ. Recensuit, Notas perpetuas, & Indices adjecit *Josephus Wasse*, Coll. Regin. apud Cantab. Socius; & Nobiliss. Marchioni de Kent a Sacris Domesticis. Præmittitur Sallustii Vita, Auctore V. Cl. *Joanne Clerico*. Quarto, 1710.

Q. Horatius Flaccus ad nuperam *Richardi Bentleyi* Editionem accurate expressus. Notas addidit *Thomas Bentleyus*, A. B. Collegii S. Trinitatis apud Cantabrigienses Alumnus. *Octavo*, 1713.













