



22-5-

LIBRARY

OF THE

Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Case,

Shelf,

Book,

CO.
1302
v. 1



Mr. *E M L Y N*'s

T R A C T S.



THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

PAUL W. KATZ

PH.D. 1964

1964-1965

A
COLLECTION
OF
TRACTS,

Relating to

The *Deity, Worship, and Satisfaction* of the
Lord JESUS CHRIST, &c.

V I Z.

1. An Humble Inquiry into the Scripture-Account of the Deity of *Jesus Christ*. Anno 1702.
2. A Vindication of the *Worship* of the Lord *Jesus Christ* on Unitarian Principles; in Answer to Mr. *Jos. Boyse*, referring to his *Dublin* Edit. 4to. 1706.
3. The Supreme Deity of God the Father demonstrated, against Dr. *Sherlock*. 1707.
4. A Vindication of the Bishop of *Glocester*, from Dr. *Sherlock's* Charge of *Heresy*. 1707.
5. Remarks on Mr. *Leslie's* first Dialogue, against the *Socinians*. 1708.
6. A Vindication of the *Remarks*. 1708.
7. An Examination of Mr. *Leslie's* Last Dialogue, about the *Satisfaction* of *Jesus Christ*; and of Dr. *Stillingfleet's* Reasons of *Christ's* Sufferings. 1708.
8. A Letter to Dr. *Willis* (now Bishop of *Glocester*) concerning *Persecution*. 1705.
9. An Inquiry into the Original Authority of *1 John 5. 7*. 1715.
10. Dr. *Bennet's* New *Theory* of the Blessed *Trinity* examined. 1718.
11. *Quare*, Whether (on Mr. *Wall's* Principles) *Baptism* was intended for any but such as be *profelyted to Christianity*. 1710.
12. An Answer to Mr. *Martin's* Dissertation on *1 Joh. v. 7*.

To which is prefix'd,

A true *Narrative* of the Proceedings of the *Dissenting* Ministers of *Dublin* against the *Author*, and of his *Protection* and *Sufferings*, &c.

By THOMAS EMLYN.

2 Tim. 2. 9. *Wherein I suffer Trouble as an Evil-doer, even unto Bonds; but the Word of God is not bound.*

LONDON, Printed by JOHN DARBY in *Bartholomew-Close* for JAMES KNAPTON in *St. Paul's Church-Yard*, JOHN SPRINT in *Little-Britain*, and JOHN OSBORN in *Lombard-Street*. 1719.





A TRUE
NARRATIVE

OF THE

Proceedings of the Dissenting Mini-
sters of *Dublin* against Mr. *THOMAS*
EMLYN;


And of his Prosecution (at some of the Dis-
senters Instigation) in the Secular Court,
and his Sufferings thereupon, for his
Humble Inquiry into the Scripture Account
of the Lord Jesus Christ: Annis 1702, 3,
4, 5.

Qui non vult pati, non potest ejus esse qui pro nobis passus
est.

Tertull.

Μακάριοι οἱ περδδιπορήσαντες πρεσβύτεροι — ἔγδ' ἔυλαβῶν-
ται μὴ τὶς αὐτὰς μετασῆση, &c. Happy are those Presbyters
who have finished their Course—— for they are in no
fear of being cast out from their appointed Station. *Clem.*
Rom. Epist. c. 44.





A T R U E

NARRATIVE, &c.

IF the great End of publishing this *Narrative*, had been to disburden my Mind of any uneasy Resentments of my ill Usage, or to load the Authors of it with Reproach, I should not have delay'd it for so many Years; Passion is more in haste, than to bear fifteen or sixteen Years voluntary Restraint. I thank God I have no revengeful Disposition towards the keenest of my Enemies; and am so far from any Uneasiness at the Remembrance of my Sufferings, that no Scene of my Life yields me more solid Satisfaction: The *Peerless Unequal'd* Majesty of the One *God and Father* of all, appears to me both so evident and so important a Doctrine in the Christian Religion, and so directly impugned in later Ages, that if ever I would be tempted to glory in any Suffering, it should be in so noble a Cause, which is the very Basis of Christianity.

But since, what in me was run down with Heat and Fury, as Error, Heresy and Blasphemy,

A Narrative of the Proceedings

has (notwithstanding worldly Discouragements) appear'd to have the Evidence of Truth to many serious judicious Inquirers, both in the established Church, and among the Dissenters, Teachers and People; I think I may venture more freely to lay my Case before the World, in my own just Vindication; and to appeal to the wise and charitable, whether they were such, whose Treatment of me will be related in this Narrative; and which was very different from the more Christian and tender Usage which some others, in like Case and Circumstances, have found among their more candid and compassionate Brethren here. Tho' I am sensible there are many here also, who from an ungovern'd Zeal are forward to hereticate, anathematize and excommunicate their Christian Brethren, and to depose and cast off their Pastors, merely for not assenting to their unscriptural Opinions, and not stretching their Faith beyond the antient Creed and primitive Rule; to whom this Narrative may possibly be useful, as a Caution not to be violent and precipitate in doing what they may afterwards think of with Repentance themselves, or hear of with just Reproach from others.

Indeed the intemperate Zeal of these Men is the chief occasion of my publishing this *Narrative* now, which had been for the substance of it composed many years since, when the Facts were new, and *which* might otherwise have lain by me in silence. For tho' I could easily forbear troubling the World with any publick Complaints of my own injurious Treatment, how grievous soever, while it reach'd no farther than my self; yet when I find the like uncharitable, imposing, and persecuting Spirit, so ready to flame out among some (tho' I hope not the most considerable) of the Dissenting Teachers here, against those

those who are of the same (or like) Persuasion with me; I think I may be justify'd, in acquainting the World with some of the Fruits and Tendencies of this unchristian Spirit: a Spirit that acts under the like Pretence of Zeal for Christ, with theirs, who with Fire from Heaven sought to consume the unbelieving *Samaritans*; but that bitter and well-meant Zeal was reproached for its Ignorance, and rebuked with Indignation, by the Holy *Jesus*, whose Honour they pretended to seek, but indeed betray'd.

Luke 9.
55, 56.

Having been brought up in the *Protestant* Religion, I did sincerely embrace the Principles of that Profession; and accordingly thought (what all true Protestants profess) that I ought not to take my Religion upon the credit of the common Vogue, the Authority of Doctors and Synods, or the Laws of the State; but that I ought to search the Holy Scriptures, as the safest and unerring Guide of Faith, Worship and Practice. I had often heard and read, that the Reverend Prelates and Doctors of the Church of *England*, have glory'd in allowing to Christians a Judgment of Discretion in Matters of Religion; and I knew the Reformation from Popery had been founded on that Principle.

I once thought them very sincere in this matter, that, when they required Men to examine the Doctrines of their Teachers by the Word of God, they truly intended Christians should do as they taught them, without incurring their terrible Wrath thereby.

I had further been instructed, that in all the important Articles of the Christian Faith, a good Christian is bound to an open Profession; yea, and by all sober Methods, to propagate Truth and Knowledge; that he must not only *believe with his Heart*, but also *confess with his Mouth*; and

Mark 8.
8.

that to be ashamed of Christ and his Words, is at the peril of our eternal Salvation. 'Not to profess visibly, what we believe to be true Religion, is an open disowning of God; for he that believes that This is the Will of God, and is ashamed or afraid openly to avow it, declares either, that he is ashamed of God, or that he fears Man more than God.'

ot's
r.
.6.

I might well think it was really intended by Protestants, that a Man should be encouraged in an honest Search after Truth, and a sober Profession of what he sincerely judged to be so; and not suffer the loss of his Liberty and Livelihood for doing what he is required by God, and even directed to do, by themselves. It had look'd like an injurious Reproach in me to have thought any so hypocritical, as to cry up the People's Liberty to search the Scriptures, and to see, with the noble (and so oft applauded) *Bereans*, whether what their Teachers say be conformable thereto; and at the same time to carry an Intention to ruin them, if they dare tell the World, especially if they bring strong Proofs, that they find the Scriptures say otherwise.

I had oft heard the *Romish* Church triumph'd over, with just Reproach, (if others did not imitate her) for treating her Members in so servile a manner, keeping them by a Spiritual Tyranny, in the most ignominious Bondage of an implicit blind Faith in their Teachers: I thought surely Protestants must love the Light, and fear no rational Inquiry into their Doctrines; but upon the Principles by which my Sufferings are to be justify'd, I am at a loss to know what difference there is in this point, which is one of the worst Articles of *Popery*. The Church of *Rome*, I think, deals more above-board in the case, she intends to ruin such as contradict her Doctrine; but

but then she locks up the Scriptures from them, and plainly warns the People not to search, or trouble themselves about such matters, but to be content to believe as the Church believes, at all adventures. This is plain dealing, tho' it be very unreasonable; and is much fairer, than if she set up her Doctors, by writing and preaching, to urge Men, on pain of eternal Condemnation, to search the Scriptures, and not absolutely to swallow the Dictates of the Church, against the Word of God, and then abetted the Secular Arm in ruining them for the Heresy of preferring the Evidence of Scripture to her erroneous Judgment.

The Vassals of *Rome* are like their Idols, they have Eyes but cannot see, for the Key of Knowledge is taken from them; but *Protestants* (in the Case I am speaking of) have Eyes which can, and do, but must not see, at least have Mouths, but must not speak: And this is the hardest Bondage of all; for if a Man may not profess the most important Truths, which he finds clear and evident in the Holy Scriptures, to what end should he read and search them? Is it only to torture his Mind with uneasy Reflections on his unrighteous Imprisonment of the Truth? 'Tis much better to be ignorant with an implicit Faith, than, by much Inquiry, to gain the knowledge of Truths we dare not countenance nor own, on a just occasion.

I could not but observe, that Persecution for Religion, and merely speculative Opinions which hurt no Man's Civil Right, had been oft and generally condemned by Protestants of this Age; and that nothing laid a greater Odium on a late neighbouring Prince than this, that he persecuted his peaceable Protestant Subjects, tho' 'twas under the Charge of *Heresy* and *Blasphemy*. And indeed where Charity is esteem'd (as with St.

1 Cor. 13. *Paul*, the greatest of Virtues, even greater than Faith in all Mysteries, there Persecution, the most cruel uncharitable thing in the World, must needs be deem'd the greatest of Crimes; for which reason, that Apostle reproaches himself as the *Chief of Sinners*, because he had been, tho' with good Meaning, a Persecutor, the worst of Criminals. I think 'tis less wicked in the sight of God, for the matter of the Sin, to rob a Man on the Road, from Necessity, than to spoil him of his Goods and Liberty, and to afflict him with Tortures and Reproaches for not making a Surrender of his Conscience; the one aims to rob a Man of his Money, the other of the Peace of his Mind, and his Eternal Salvation: it looks like a sort of Malice against God himself, and is certainly a worse Heresy than any differing Opinion about the Sense of a Text of Scripture.

Papists indeed may persecute more cruelly (as the Lord Chief Justice told me, in *Spain* or *Portugal* I might have been burnt) but then 'tis to be consider'd, that they act upon Principle, tho' a wicked one; which, we know, heightens Cruelty, when 'tis baptiz'd with the Name of Piety, and numbred among the Graces of Religion: but *Protestants* act against their professed Principles, doing Violence to their Brother and their Religion at once; and they harden *Papists*, when at the same time they reproach and imitate them. And I should but argue just as our Lord *Jesus* himself did, (*Mat.* 23. 35.) if I should say, that persecuting *Protestants*, by oppressing Men for mere Conscience, do bring upon themselves all the righteous Blood, at least the Guilt of all the Violence, the Imprisonments, spoiling of Goods, and Temporal Ruin, which lies at the door of those *Antichristian* and cruel Oppressors.

'Tis a weak Plea, to say, Error may be punish'd, but not Truth, when all sides take themselves for Orthodox; so that on this foot Persecution must go round the Earth, *seeking whom to devour*. A Man had as good say plainly, 'tis a Sin for any others to persecute, but that 'tis his sole Privilege to do it when he judges it fit.'

This, if any thing, is the universal Right of Mankind, to exercise a liberty of Judgment and Conscience, in matters of Faith and the Worship of their great Creator; and to lay the Reasons of their Faith and Worship, soberly and honestly before others, that they may mutually impart and receive Instruction in so important a Concern: and so long as there is no violation of natural Religion, of common Justice, and other social Vertues on which civil Societies are founded, what harm can this Liberty do? It was for the Preservation of Mens Temporal and Civil Rights alone, that they came into Communities under Government; and not to submit their Consciences to any Mortal Rulers, in the matters of positive Revelation and Institution; where they are already under the determination of an higher Authority, not to be superseded or limited by any Combination or Agreement of Men, no, not of all the Men on Earth.

I know 'tis pretended, that the Peace of Societies is oft disturbed by different Opinions and Ways of Worship, openly professed and practis'd: but, tho any thing may prove an occasion of private Jars between Man and Man, I can't see that different Opinions in Religion, unarmed with secular Terrors, should ever affect the Publick, more than Differences in many other Points; in which, tho of less importance than the matters of Religion and Salvation, we
cou'd

A Narrative of the Proceedings

cou'd not without the highest injury have our Liberty restrain'd by force.

'Tis Violence and Restraint makes the Struggle, and raises those Enmities, which die away in a settled Calm of secure Liberty; and therefore *Elijah* (at that time a Dissenting, persecuted Prophet) told the persecuting King *Ahab*, *I have not troubled Israel, but Thou, and thy Father's House have.*

I Kings
18. 18.

Deut. 13.

Men may fancy some countenance given to their Severities from the *Jewish Law*; but 'tis a dishonour to the Holy *Jesus*, to make the Practices of an hard-hearted People, (who were dispensed with in some things not most excellent in themselves) a pattern to his Disciples; who are bound to exceed them so far, in his *New Commandment* of Love and Goodness: And yet, 'tis a plain Truth, that the *Jewish Law* it self never warranted such Severity as Christian Persecutors exercise. It did never teach them to destroy or afflict their Brethren, who believed in the *One True God*, and revered his Law as the sacred Rule of their Faith and Worship, only because they differ'd in their Interpretation of some parts of it, or in the Inferences they drew from thence. No, 'twas only severe toward such as set up other Gods, besides him who was their King and State-Governor, or acted in a known Opposition to his Laws, by a Rebellion, which tended to subvert the very Civil Constitution of that *Theocracy*. Therefore, tho the *Sadduces* erred greatly in their Interpretations, *not knowing the Scriptures*; and thought there was no Resurrection, nor future Rewards, yet were they not persecuted, but admitted into Government, and into the sacred Offices of the Priesthood; nor did our Lord blame the Jews for this *Toleration*, or rather *Comprehension*. 'Tis one
thing

thing to cast off the known Laws of God, by a direct or designed Opposition, and another to misunderstand, or unwillingly mistake them; so that the beggarly Elements of *Judaism*, out-do, in Charity and Mercy, the Christianity of some in this degenerate Age; tho Charity be the distinguishing Badge of a Christian, and not of a Jew.

Might not any Protestant then, all these things considered, venture upon a serious Examination of Modern Creeds by the Light of Revelation, the Words of Christ's own Mouth, and the Writings of his Inspired Apostles? Or might not I, who had been brought up in a diligent Study of the Scriptures, and admitted to be a Teacher of others, justly expect the liberty of declaring what I judged to be the Doctrine of the Gospel, tho rejected by others not more infallible than I?

I am sure I was under too serious Impressions and Concern of Soul to treat the Argument with ludicrous Derision, or indecent Scurrility, or any real token of designed Contempt of the Holy Jesus. I wrote my *Humble Inquiry*, &c. as one grieved in Spirit and afflicted, forsaken of my People, and my Friends, and abandoned to the Reproaches, Indignation, or Contempt of all round about me; cast out as a despised broken Vessel, in which is no Pleasure: so that I had nothing to support me in this Case, but that I was maintaining the Cause of the God of Gods, and the Truth of Jesus his Son. And tho I had given all the proof of my acting conscientiously, that a Man could give, in quitting my beneficial Station among the Dissenters quietly and easily; retiring from all the Respects, and even from all further Acquaintance of my Friends, into a silent and neglected Obscurity; and this, in the very
Vigour

Vigour of my Age (at 38 Years) when, if ever I was capable of signifying any thing, I might most have expected it : yet was I numbred among the vilest Transgressors and Blasphemers. The Pulpits founded with Heresy and Blasphemy, to beget abhorrence; and I was prosecuted and treated as if I had written with the profanest Scorn in derision of Christianity : nor could I ever hear of any other Precedent the Lord Chief-Justice offer'd, but of one *M---*, who had been convicted of Blasphemy, for calling our Saviour a Bastard or Son of a *W---*, and my Case must be like his; and so under Forms of Law, I was made a *Gazing-stock*, and a *Companion to them*, in Bonds, and suffered the *spoiling of my Goods*; but with this allay, that it was in hopes of a more enduring Substance.

Heb. 10.

I am well assured, the true Christian Faith is no such timorous and tender thing, as to fear an exact Examination, or that a Christian may not debate about it, at any less Peril than a *Turk* disputes his *Alcoran*; and that it tends to the discredit of any Cause or Religion, when Texts and Arguments seriously alledged, must be answer'd by *Jays* and *Fines*; according to *Tertullian's* Sarcasm, *Ex officina carnificum solvunt argumenta*.

But no Religion loses its Credit by Persecution, so much as the Christian; because it makes such high Demands of Meekness, Patience, and Charity from all its Disciples; and represents its Holy Author as an utter Enemy to all injurious Usage of any Man, on the score of his different Faith: the whole burden of the New Testament, is Tenderness and Meekness, to those who *oppose themselves*, and much more to those who differ in matters of *doubtful Disputation*, tho never so great. Therefore, if Christians persecute, Infidels and Aliens will either think their Religion

gion teaches to do so, and then they will hate it; or they'll think such Christians don't believe their Religion, and so will suspect it; which is not likely to make 'em Profelytes. Let me here use the excellent words of Dr. *Goodman*. " By Serm. P. 287.
 " Persecution Religion it self is made odious,
 " and loses its principal Glory of being ratio-
 " nal, and Men are tempted to suspect that to
 " be destitute of good Proof, which needs to be
 " supported by force; and all Religions (like
 " Colours in the dark) are alike, when the use
 " of Reason is laid aside, and Force supplies
 " the place of it: Where 'tis become the fashion
 " to knock Men on the head, who will not be
 " converted; it will not seem worth the while
 " to take pains to convince 'em. And, in short,
 " the very Temper of Religion it self will be
 " supplanted, and only a dull sottish Compliance
 " and Hypocrisy succeed in its room."

And yet how many who pretend a Zeal for the Christian Religion, are willing and forward to do it all this Injury?

I deny not the *Arians* in their turn, to have been very guilty of this Crime, nor will I excuse in them, any more than in their Adversaries, so base a Practice, tho it was in retaliation of the Cruelties they had felt. For the first Authors of Christian Magistrates Persecution, were them of the *Nicene* Faith. The first Severity (says the late Bishop of *Sarum*, in his excellent Preface to *Lactant. &c.*) that Christians practised on one another, was the banishing *Arius*, and a few of his Followers. We find in *Socrat. History*, that *Constantine*, who l. i. c. 9. afterwards banished *Athanasius* for Crimes, banished *Arius* for his Faith, and made it immediate Death for any to keep so much as one of his Books; which I think was a Severity beyond
 any

A Narrative of the Proceedings

any of the *French* Edicts, and which the *Arians* did afterwards revenge with Unchristian Cruelty.

But might it not be hoped, that the Spirit of Persecution was long e'er this laid, and that *Protestants* were grown wiser, by long and sad Experience? Of this the Reader may judge by the following Relation, now drawn out into Form, at this cool distance of many Years. And tho' I have used the Freedom of an Historian in relating some things that may be ungrateful, even to my Friends; yet not any but what I think are true, nor these with any Aggravations, that I judge forced or unjust. I rejoice not in vexing, reproaching, or grieving any, who may not have used me well; but 'tis my desire they should be ashamed of their uncharitable imposing Principles, or else that others may guard against them, by knowing their hurtful, if still approved Practices.

I had been a Preacher in *Dublin* (together with Mr. *J. Boyse*) for eleven Years, to a Congregation of Protestant *Dissenters*; who were generally a sober and peaceable People, not unworthy of my Love, nor had been wanting in any Testimonies of Affection and Respect that I could reasonably desire or expect from them.

I own I had been unsettled in my Notions from the time I read Dr. *Sherlock's* Book of the Trinity, which sufficiently discovered how far many were gone back toward Polytheism; I long tried what I could do with some *Sabellian* Turns, making out a Trinity of somewhats in one single Mind. I found that by the Tritheistical Scheme of Dr. *Sherlock* and Mr. *Howe*, I best preserved a Trinity, but I lost the Unity; by the *Sabellian* Scheme of Modes and Subsistences, and Properties, &c. I best kept up the Divine Unity: but then

I had lost a Trinity, such as the Scripture discovers, so that I cou'd never keep both in view at once. 'Till I had upon much serious Thought, and Study of the Holy Scriptures, with many concern'd Address'es to the Father of Lights, found great reason, first to doubt, and after by degrees, to alter my Judgment, in relation to formerly receiv'd Opinions of the Trinity, and *the Supreme Deity* of our Lord Jesus Christ. For tho' the Word of God was my Rule, I could not tell how to understand that Rule but by the use of my Reason; knowing well, that he who tells me I must lay aside my Reason when I believe the Gospel does plainly declare, that to believe is to act without Reason, and that no rational Man can be a Christian; I desired only to know *what* I must believe, and *why*; as to the latter, I was satisfy'd, that divine Revelation is a sufficient ground of Belief; but then I must conceive what 'tis that it reveals, and that I am explicitly to believe and profess: for a Faith of Sounds without Meaning, I understand not; and no more can believe airy Sounds, than I can see 'em with my Eyes. I cou'd not imagine it shou'd be necessary to say my Prayers *with understanding*, and my Creed without it; and cou'd every whit as much edify by Worship, as by Belief utter'd in an unknown Tongue. I did not make my Reason the Rule of my Faith, but employ'd it to judge what was the meaning of that written Rule or Word of God; and thus was led to form Notions different from what others had taught me, without regard either to *Arius* or *Socinus*, not agreeing wholly with either.

Accordingly I was ever careful not to speak against my own Judgment, or what shou'd appear so to a judicious Hearer, that I might not act against Christian Sincerity; and yet I never

confronted the Opinions of others, by an express or unhandsome Opposition: I doubted whether this was my Duty, or was proper in the Pulpit, where I cou'd not have freedom to say all that was requisite in such a Controversy; and whether I ought at once to cast my self out of my Station of Service, without a more particular and direct Occasion given me to profess my Mind; which I did apprehend might offer, and which I was determin'd to accept, when it did.

One of the Congregation, of leading influence gave the Occasion; he had been brought up to the Study of Divinity, but afterwards chose another useful Profession: and had done me formerly so many kind Offices, that I cannot impute what he now did to any Ill-will to me, other than what a mistaken Zeal is apt to inspire. By observing that I avoided the common Opinion, and those Arguments which are supposed to support it, He strongly suspected my Judgment to be against the Supreme Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ: Hereupon, having first put Mr. *Boyse* upon the Inquiry, himself came with Mr. *Boyse* to my House, *June 1702.* acquainting me with these jealousies, and desiring seriously to know my real Sentiments in the matter; adding, after some discourse, that he did not know that any one in the Congregation, but himself, had any such Apprehensions.

I now thought my self bound, as a Christian, to declare my Faith openly in so great a Point, and freely own'd my self convinc'd, that *the God and Father of Jesus Christ* is alone the Supreme Being, and superior in Excellency and Authority to his Son (or to that effect) who derives all from him. I told 'em I had no aim to make any strife among 'em, and offer'd to leave the Congregation peaceably, that they
might

might chuse another, if they pleased, in my place. But this it seems wou'd not be permitted me. Mr. B—— not willing to take such a weighty matter on himself, brought it on the Stage before the meeting of the *Dublin* Ministers, to have his Brethrens Advice; tho I told him, he knew well the Narrowness of their Principles. At their desire I gave them a meeting, and candidly open'd my Mind to 'em; we had, not without mutual Sorrow, about two hours Discourse (as I remember) in which I profess'd my self ready to give my Assent to the Scriptures, tho not to their Explications; judging I might justly use my Reason where they so much used theirs, or other Mens. And I wou'd have done any thing that with a good Conscience I cou'd, rather than have broken off from them, with whom I had lived so many Years in friendly acquaintance; and whom I loved and esteem'd, and still do so, as Men of conscientious Integrity according to their Judgments; none of whose personal Characters wou'd I be thought to blemish, in any things not relating to the present Subject; in which themselves will, I suppose, think there is no reproach, whatever others do.

Upon this *first and only Conference* with me; these Ministers immediately the same day agreed to cast me off, and that I shou'd not preach more; and this without having consulted my own Flock, who as yet knew nothing of the matter, nor had made any complaint in order to such a Divorce as they had decreed: nor indeed had I ever any hearing before them at all. Being acquainted with this their Resolution, by Mr. B. I presently directed the Deacons and chief Managers of the Church, to be call'd together the next day, that I might let 'em know (as I did when they met) somewhat of the Case in

a

generāl;

general, *viz.* that Difference in Opinions had rendred me offensive to some there, and to the other Ministers, so that it seemed best I shou'd leave 'em: therefore I thankfully owned the Kindness and Respects they had shown me for so many Years, and desired their Dismiss. But something more particular as to the Points in Difference, being earnestly insisted on, I told 'em it was in relation to the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, about which there were many disputes on foot among the Learned of the Age, &c.

Having told 'em this, they were under great surprize and sorrow, and, to do justice to him who had occasioned this, himself then wished he had left it (as he said) *in statu quo*. They proposed my lying by some time, without preaching; but I determined not to yield to that, without declaring what it was, for which I was hindred from preaching, lest it shou'd be suspected to be for some Immorality, which I wou'd not lie under the Charge of, tho perhaps not so odious to some, as that of Heresy. And for this reason indeed it was, that I had call'd them together, to tell 'em my Case. It was therefore next proposed to me to go away presently into *England* for a while, that there might be time for further Consideration, and the aforesaid difficulty be avoided: but this was first to be approved by the Ministers, who met the next day and agreed to it, sending two of their Number to acquaint me with it; but withal to *charge me*, as the word was, *not to preach any where*, when I went thither.

To this imperious Message, so full of Affectation of Authority, and expressive of rigid Presbyterian Tyranny (which yet was attended by an Independent Minister as one of the Messengers) I answer'd to this effect; That I did not design

to preach of the Matters in debate, where I went, if that would satisfy them: but that they assumed too much in forbidding me to preach, who had no Authority from them, nor own'd any in them over me; that I had as much Authority to forbid them to preach, as they to forbid me, and should pay no Regard to them herein. Upon which they said, they would then write to the *London* Ministers about it. I bid them use their Discretion, and I should use mine.

And this I suppose is what the *Northern* Ministers (in their *Address and Apology* to *Queen Anne*, in *Answer to the Convocation*) call, my being *solemnly deposed from my Office by a Presbytery*, (tho I never knew any who own'd themselves to be such in *Dublin*) and for this they applaud them; implicitly upbraiding the Ecclesiastical Courts, so much abhorr'd by them in their own case, that had not *brought me to a Tryal*: and then they make this grave and profound Remark upon it, *This shews the Usefulness of such Presbyteries, however censured by the Clergy*. Just as if others should say, upon the Excommunication and Imprisonment of their Ministers and People for Non-conformity, see here the Usefulness of Bishops Courts, however censured by the Presbyterians!

If the *Presbyterians* and *Independents* claim such a Power as this, not only to reject from their own Communion, but to depose from their Office, such Pastors of other Churches as conscientiously differ from them in Opinions; and to extend this to other Kingdoms, forbidding them to preach there also: I think they have a mighty Conceit of their own large Dominion, and discover a very ridiculous Ambition. I wonder who gave them this sovereign *deposing* Power over their Brethren, any more than the Pope his arrogated Power of deposing other Peoples Kings:

Nay, who ever heard, in the Primitive Church, of such a strange Creature as a Presbytery made up of the Presbyters of several and different Churches? But to return to the History of Facts:

When they had thus persuaded me, for greater Secrecy and Quiet, to withdraw, I went for *England* the very next day; tho with great Inconveniency, thus hastily leaving my House and Family, with two small Children, lately become Motherless to my great Grief, which was then very fresh, and heavy upon me, tho it gave such a check to all earthly Delights as made me more easy under all that followed. No sooner was I gone, but a loud Clamour was rais'd against me, and my Opinions, and that in part from the Pulpit, where I did not expect it, at least not so soon, that such Advantage should be made of my desir'd Absence.

And now I had leisure to look back; for when so few Days space had made so great a Change in my Condition, that I was turn'd out to wander abroad desolate and in uncertainty, I saw I was enter'd upon a dark Scene, and must arm for various, tho I knew not what, Tryals. What then were the Workings of my anxious Thoughts! what the deep Reflections, and black Presages! what the Conflicts of Spirit! what the Cries and Tears before the God of all Wisdom and Comfort, is best known to him who sees in secret. I could not forbear saying oft with wandring afflicted *David*, *If I shall find Favour in the eyes of the Lord, he will bring me back to see his Ark and his Habitation; but if he say I have no delight in thee, here am I, let him do as seemeth good to him.* I had not been of so unsocial a Nature, not to relish the Society and Love of my dear Friends, nor was insensible of the Pangs of a violent Separation; nor yet so mortify'd to the World, as not

not to feel some difference between Contempt and Respect, Fulness and Straits: but still my Convictions of Truth were so clear, that these things never stagger'd my Resolutions, of adhering to it, in the midst of all Discouragements.

Yet Mr. *Boyse*, in the Preface to his Answer to my *Humble Inquiry*, taxes me with Insincerity in continuing so long in Communion with those of a different Persuasion. But as I think it was matter deserving great Deliberation, so I did not see any thing sinful required of me; we worship'd one God thro Jesus Christ the Mediator, and I had my part in leading the Devotions of the Society: We had no Worship of *Three Modes* expressed; and other Mens different confused Notions did not affect my Worship, when not imposed on me; who still say, that if they worship'd but one infinite supreme Mind, they worship'd the same Object of supreme Worship with me: and as for the secret Worship of *Three Modes*, of which there is not one word in Scripture, I understand no more than themselves what they mean by those Terms, or rather they mean nothing at all by them, that I can find: and I am persuaded, that not Three of the whole Church could agree in the same rational Account (if put to it) of these matters; tho they might say the same Words, as taught, by rote; which yet is not the same Faith or Opinion, when without the same Sentiments. And indeed how should they, when their Ministers themselves have no stated Notions, and own they can't explain them, but hide all under the Covert of Mystery? so that they go in the dark. And therefore if none may worship safely with others that differ in their Notions of God, and a Trinity, the whole Church may dissolve, and Mr. *Boyse* cannot, in Sincerity, join with any number of his People; much less could he so long join

with Mr. *How*, who held *Three* infinite Minds to be God; which I think is more by *Two* than himself will profess to believe.

When I came to *London*, I found some, with whom I could be admitted to converse, with more Candor and Charity; of which the *Dublin* Ministers having the knowledge, they were so offended at it, as to write to some at *London*, blaming them, as I heard, for such friendly Carriage towards one who differ'd from them in such great Points. So hot was their Zeal, that they seem'd to envy me these small Remains of Friendship in another Land, whither they had driven me, and still pursued me.

One thing I think worth mentioning here, *viz.* That tho the very eminent Mr. *How* had run into the *Tritheistick* Notion of a Trinity of *Three Infinite Minds* or Beings, (which, if any thing, is judged to be gross *Polytheism*, and dislike'd by them) yet he was written to, as he told me when with him, to discourse me, and set me right; as if my pretended Fault of holding *Two* Gods was to be cured by admitting *Three*: This looks as if they could have borne well enough with me if I had been made a *Tritheist*, and they had rather I should hold *Three Gods*, than but *One Supreme Person*.

While I was at *London* I published my short Account of my Case; and, out of their Reply to this, in which they pretend to give a more just Account, tho I think it to be much the same, I shall hereafter transcribe those Ministers own Words, that the Reader may compare their Relation, with what I have hitherto said of that matter.

After about ten Weeks Absence, tho I had discouraging Accounts of the great Rage there was against me in *Dublin*, I thought it necessary to return

return to my Family : and finding what an *Odium* my Opinion, and consequently my self lay under, among many who knew little of such matters, I thought I ow'd that Justice to my self, and especially to the Truth, to shew what Evidence from the Scriptures I had on my side: And therefore I wrote my *Humble Inquiry into the Scripture-Account of the Lord Jesus Christ*, intending for *England* in a few days after it was printed. Of this some zealous Dissenters getting notice, resolved to have me prosecuted. Two of them, one of them a *Presbyterian*, and the other a *Baptist Church-Officer*, being then upon the Grand Jury of the Queen's Bench, were for making a Presentment of me, as one of the Church, on that Jury, let me know; but that Method was too slow, and I might probably have been gone unhurt. A more speedy Method therefore was taken: the latter of those Two Dissenters, *viz.* Mr. *Caleb Thomas*, immediately obtain'd the Lord Chief Justice (Sir *Richard Pyne's*) Special Warrant to seize me and the Books, and came himself, with the Keeper of *Newgate*, to execute it on me, into my Chamber, and was a very forward eager Witness at my Tryal.

I, with part of the Impression of the Books, being thus seiz'd, was carry'd before the Lord Chief Justice, who deny'd at first to take Bail, but afterwards told me, if I got the Attorney-General's Consent, it should be allow'd; which was done, and two sufficient Persons were bound, in a Recognizance of 800 *l.* for my Appearance. This was in *Hilary Term, Feb. 1702.* at the end of which Term I was bound over to *Easter Term*; towards the end of which, the Grand Jury found the Bill, in which I was indicted of *Blasphemy*, to which I could not in Justice submit, and so chose to traverse.

A Narrative of the Proceedings

In this Indictment I was charg'd with some Expressions that were not at all in the Book, nor according to my Sentiments; and yet that careless *Grand Jury*, who ought in Conscience to have compared the Indictment with my Book, return'd it to be a true Bill. I spare Names, but, among other Dissenters, one of my own *Deacons* was of this Jury. The Evidence was one *Laurence*, and the *Faylor* who seized the Books with me; but neither of them sware there were such Words in the Book, as the Indictment said, and that Jury found.

I appear'd to take my Tryal on this Indictment, about the middle of *Trinity Term*, 1703. and then I was answer'd, that the Bill was not yet found; tho I had pleaded to it, and had a Copy of it granted me; nay, there had been *Two* Indictments already found: for finding, I suppose, that the first was wrong, as to the Words pretended to be taken out of my Book, the Queen's Counsel brought a second, as I was informed; but that did not please neither, and so a third was to be brought in, which was found by that Grand Jury, (which I think, had been continued over from the last Term) and so my Tryal was deferred to *June 14*.

While I was under Prosecution, expecting my Tryal at hand, Mr. *Boyse's* Answer to my Book was publish'd, and presented to the Lord Chief Justice; which I thought very unseasonable, from a long esteem'd Friend; who pleaded, the Peoples Impatience of Delay. But the worst was, that his Preface contain'd very *inflaming* Expressions, as may be seen in the very beginning. I thought there was no need of tragical Excitations to a Zeal, that was already so outrageous. In that Preface indeed he declares, that *he had no hand in my Prosecution*, then depending; and I entirely

tirely believe it: and moreover, that he was troubled at it, as falling upon me, who since have found his kind Help, (as shall be acknowledg'd) in my Deliverance at last: But then it is as certain, that he has not one word in dislike of that Prosecution by others; nor against such Methods of Persecution in general, or the Actors in it, or in favour of Liberty. I think it had been very becoming him, and I should as readily have expected it from Mr. *Boyse*, as from those in *London*, who, in their late Address to his Majesty King *George*, have declared their Principles to be for a General Toleration of all peaceable Subjects; which they know is suitable to his calm and gracious Disposition, whose Throne is upheld by Mercy: And I hope they'll take good care to establish the Credit of their Addresses, (which their Enemies are ready to call into question) by shewing a better Spirit than I found at *Dublin*. Prov. 20. 28.

On *June 14.* before the Court sat, I was informed by an eminent Gentleman of the Long Robe, that he found I should not be permitted to speak freely, but that it was design'd to run me down like a Wolf, without Law or Game: Which I was soon convinced, was not spoken without ground.

Six or Seven Bishops were present, of whom the two Archbishops, of *Armagh* and *Dublin*, took the Bench: if they had used Arguments with me, or had inform'd the Court how unfit a Jury of Tradesmen were to judge of abstruse Points of Divinity; or had protested, as Holy Bishops of old did, against that, once, *Novum & inauditum Nefas, ut res Ecclesie ante seculare tribunal judicaretur* *; i. e. That strange unheard of Impiety, viz. that a Spiritual or Church-Affair should come before

* Sulp. Sev. Hist. l. 2. sub finem.

before a Secular Judicature! I should have thought it wou'd have been to their Praise.

The Indictment was for writing and publishing a Book, wherein, it says, I had *Blasphemously and Maliciously* asserted, &c. That *Jesus Christ was not equal to God the Father, to whom he was subject*; — and this with a *seditionous Intention*, &c. In the Indictment were three Passages cited, that were but Conclusions from Premises not repeated there.

I knew they would find it difficult to prove me the Author, and I conceive, as the Indictment was laid, I could not be found guilty of publishing it, except I was the Author; because the Indictment said, I publish'd the Book, in which 'twas said, I [*innuendo Tho. Emlyn*] *see no reason*, &c. so that if I was not the Author, I had not publish'd such a Book, wherein I stood for *Thomas Emlyn*.

They put no Question to me about it, but went on to prove the *Fact*, which I did not think my self bound to prevent by a forward Confession. If they had press'd me in the Case, I could not but have considered what our Lord *Jesus* himself said to the ensnaring Question of the *High Priest*, *Why askest thou me? ask them that heard me*: nor was it my *Faith*, but that particular *Fact*, that was now inquired of.

John 18.
21.

As to my being the Author, there was no sufficient Proof; none pretended to swear it: the Printer, tho he had one Half-sheet from me, declared he knew not whose Writing it was. The Queen's Counsel behaved with great Heat and Fury, i. flam'd, perhaps, by the Presence of the *Fathers* of the Church, who were mention'd also as a sort of Terror to the *Jury*, by the *Lord Chief Justice*.

My Case seem'd so odious, that I had found it hard to get Counsel; several, to whom I ap-

apply'd, refused to be concern'd for me; and those whom I did retain, were at the beginning so interrupted and borne down, that they wou'd not attempt it more. I heard one of 'em tell the Sollicitor-General, that he believed he had never seen such a Prosecution since he had been at the Bar.

But finding no more Evidence of my being the Author, they sent away for Mr. *Joseph Boyse*: Being examin'd, as to what I had preach'd of these Matters, contained in the Book, he acknowledg'd that I had said nothing of 'em in the Pulpit directly, but only some things that gave ground of suspicion to some. Then they inquired of him, what I had said in private Conference with the Ministers? Mr. *B.* answer'd, that what I had declared there, was what was judged by his Brethren to be near to *Arianism*. Now this proved only the Agreement of the Book to my Sentiments; but yet strengthened the Presumption, and had more influence upon the Jury than all the rest, as Bishop *Wettenhal* said to me, in Prison, at one of his friendly Visits, but *privately*; for he writ me word, he might not otherwise come alone, *permissu superiorum*.

But forasmuch as what I had said to Mr. *B.* and his Brethren, was upon a free Christian Profession, at their own desire, and not any forwardness of my own; I cannot but judge it was very hard to have this turned into Evidence against me. For my own part, if any Friend of mine shou'd unhappily be reconciled to the *Church of Rome*, and, upon my going to discourse him on the Point, shou'd with the honest Freedom of a Friend, and the Simplicity of a Christian, tell me his Thoughts and his Arguments, I think, if he were brought to a Tryal for it, threatening his Life, or his Ruin, rather than I wou'd
make

make our private Discourse of Religion any Evidence against him in a Secular Court; I say, I think, I cou'd rather suffer as much as I have suffer'd, and that cheerfully too, as in a Case wherein *Justice, Faithfulness, and Mercy*, (the *weightier Matters of the Law*) are greatly concerned. And I am willing to believe that Mr. B. was not pleas'd with this Method himself, nor inclined to do me this wrong; but the Torrent ran high in the Court against me, and probably in that Hurry he might not reflect, nor have those Thoughts, which Deliberation wou'd have suggested; else, I think, he wou'd certainly have earnestly desired the Court to excuse him from so hard a part then, which only the Surprise can excuse now.

This then was the Method used against me: First, to prove what my Opinions were from my private Discourses, at the Instigation of Friends, who treated with me on the foot of Conscience and Religion; and in the next place to raise, or at least thence to strengthen a Presumption, that I wrote the Book which was agreeable to such Opinions; and lastly, to make this Presumption serve the turn of full Evidence; and this in a case, where the Charge was no less than *Blasphemy*, nay, wilful and malicious *Blasphemy*, and *Sedition*: and this too gathered only from speculative Opinions, for which I had, if not unanswerable, yet certainly most plausible Evidences from the Holy Scriptures, and from our Saviour's own direct Words, *My Father is greater than I*.

The Queen's Counsel, sensible they had no more than Presumption, urged it in express terms, that strong *Presumption was as good as Evidence*; and the Court was so well disposed, that the *Lord Chief Justice* seconded it, and repeated it to the Jury;

Jury; and the Torrent was so violent, that my own Counsel cou'd not withstand it.

But all this had only related to the *Fact* of my writing the Book; the main Question remained, *viz.* whether what was related thence, in the Indictment, was *Blasphemy*? But this was never spoken to at all. I intended, after the matter of Fact was over, to have spoken on this head; and to have shown how unreasonable it was to account that Blasphemy, which, for the *Manner* of it, had not been uttered with any token of a designed Contempt; and for the *Matter* of it, was not very different from what divers Learned Men and Dignitaries of the Church had publish'd: I cou'd have shown that Men of great Probity and Character, differ very much about these Matters; and that if mere Error must be judged Blasphemy, by a Party of the contrary Opinion, then may any thing be judged such, let but the adverse Party have the drawing the Consequences. *Calvinists* will be Blasphemers with the *Arminians*, as *these* are with the *Calvinists*, and so it will go round the Church and Kingdom; when yet none of these may be guilty of any real scornful Reproach against *God* or his *Christ*, tho yet every Error is in the Consequence of it contrary to the divine Perfections.

The *Reformatio Legum*, carry'd on under King *Henry VIII.* and *Edward VI.* pursuant to an Act of Parliament, (which is a Book of very good regard, tho not full Authority) makes this difference between Blasphemy and Heresy. *Hæc est* P. 27.
differentia inter Blasphemiam & Hæresin, quod Blasphemia, contemptu, contumelias in deum projicit, & Iracundia; sed Hæresis, errore, falsas opiniones suscipit, & inscienter. i. e. “ Blasphemy is a scornful
 “ and spiteful Reproach utter'd in designed con-
 “ tempt

“tempt of God”; but Heresy is, when false Opinions unwittingly and by mistake are received.”

This last was the worst that any Man cou’d possibly with any reason pretend to charge me with: but *Heresy* was not punishable at Common-Law, and so it must be *Blasphemy*, tho never so unjustly called so.

But my Counsel wou’d say nothing on this head, on my behalf; and they wou’d not let me speak for my self: when I offer’d it, the *Queen’s Counsel* turned upon me, and cry’d, *Speak by your Counsel.*

The *Lord Chief Justice* was forward to sum up the Evidence; which when I saw, I desired I might first speak for my self, but he refused; saying to me, *he did not care, since I wou’d not satisfy him how I had the Books, &c.* (which I, being on my defence, thought I was not bound to do:) And so he went on to the *Jury*, magnifying Presumption, in lieu of Evidence, and standing up with great Anger, told the *Jury*, if they acquitted me, my Lords the Bishops were there, or words to that Effect.

The *Jury* as Men affrighted, never considered how unable they were to judge of such Controversies; nor how little reason they had to suppose a *malicious* Intention in me; and that there was only Presumption of the Fact it self, as was own’d by the *Queen’s Counsel* and the Judge. After a little time, the Court sending to ’em to hasten ’em, they brought in a *Verdict*, (some of ’em were afterwards sorry; the *Foreman*, and one other, came to me in Prison, ready to help me, what they cou’d, when it was too late.) Upon this, Mr. Attorney-General desired I might have the *honour of the Pillory*; and so I was committed to the common Goal, till *June 16.* being the last day of the Term. In this Interval, Mr.

Boyse

Boyse began to shew his great Concern for me, and to use his Interest to prevent the rigorous Sentence that the Attorney-General had moved for.

Being put upon writing to the Lord Chief Justice, as what was expected of me, I wrote in Prison the following Lines :

My Lord,

‘ **T**H O your Lordship may perhaps judge
 ‘ me guilty of a Fault that you cannot
 ‘ admit any Apology for, yet I may presume up-
 ‘ on so much Compassion, as to have leave to
 ‘ offer something by way of Mitigation: I do
 ‘ assure your Lordship, that I have no greater
 ‘ desire than to learn the Truth from the Holy
 ‘ Scriptures; by which I shall always be guided
 ‘ according to my best Light; and if I am mis-
 ‘ taken in my Opinions, God knows, ’tis alto-
 ‘ gether unwillingly. It is most obvious that I
 ‘ have forfeited my Interest, and sacrificed my
 ‘ Reputation in the World, and exposed my
 ‘ self to such Evils, as nothing cou’d ever make
 ‘ me to submit to, but the real Fear of offend-
 ‘ ing God; which your Lordship will, I doubt
 ‘ not, allow for a very great Reason. I am ready
 ‘ to do any thing consistent with my Judgment
 ‘ and Conscience; but I am afraid to do that,
 ‘ for fear of shame from Men, for which, my
 ‘ Conscience may suggest to me, that Jesus Christ
 ‘ will be asham’d of me at the great Day. I
 ‘ imagine, by something spoken on my Tryal,
 ‘ that your Lordship conceived I had written
 ‘ some deriding scornful Expressions of the *Holy*
 ‘ *Jesus*, which I am sure I never designed; the
 ‘ sum of the whole Book being only to shew the
 ‘ *Father* to be greater than he, not denying him
 ‘ any Glory consistent with that. I hope that
 ‘ as

‘ as the great and merciful God will sooner for-
 ‘ give many Errors of the Understanding, than
 ‘ one wilful Crime; so your *Lordship* will make
 ‘ a considerable difference between disputable Er-
 ‘ rors, which Men of Probity and Learning are
 ‘ divided about, and scurrilous Reflections on
 ‘ the *Blessed Jesus*, which are intended for con-
 ‘ tempt, which my Soul shall ever abhor. I shall
 ‘ only presume to add, that as ’tis entirely for
 ‘ my Conscience that I suffer, so I can never be
 ‘ deprived of the comfortable Support which
 ‘ such a Consideration carries in it; having, I
 ‘ hope, learned in some measure, to be conformed
 ‘ to him who endured the Cross, and will shortly
 ‘ appear the Righteous Judge of all. Knowing
 ‘ how much depends on your *Lordship’s* Favour
 ‘ and Clemency, as to the Penalty I am liable to,
 ‘ I entreat for it,

And am

Your Lordship’s, &c.

When I appear’d to have Judgment given a-
 gainst me, the Queen’s Counsel moved, that I
 might retract, which I cou’d not consent to;
 and so the *Lord Chief-Justice* passed this Sentence
 on me, *viz.* To suffer a Year’s Imprisonment, to
 pay a *Thousand Pound* Fine to the Queen, and
 to lie in Prison till paid; and to find Security
 for good Behaviour during Life. Telling me,
 that the Pillory was the Punishment due; but
 because I was a Man of Letters, it was not in-
 flicted: and then with a Paper on my Breast I
 was led round the *four* Courts to be exposed.

This Sentence, for bare Matters of Specula-
 tion and Belief, was thought by some to be very
 severe and cruel. For not only was the *Fine*
 Exorbitant, and Excessive, beyond my utmost
 Ability to pay; but the Crime charged as *Blas-*
phemy,

phemy, was never, that I know of, declared to be *such*, even in any Council, or in the Schools; and some Lawyers say, 'tis not *such* by the Laws of the Land neither. Nor was any Precedent to be found, that I cou'd hear of, but that before-mentioned, of one who rudely and maliciously reviled the Lord *Jesus*, whom I have spoken of with serious Reverence and great Honour, according to the best Judgment I can form of him, from the Sacred Writings. As well might the two contending Doctors, *South* and *Sherlock*, and all the Writers in this Controversy, have been brought under the same Charge of Blasphemy, if at their Adversaries Prosecution they had come before such a Judge and Jury, as I did: each can charge Blasphemy on the other, fast enough, if every thing that looks like Error, and appears to be against God's Perfections, as all Error is, must pass for *such*, tho expressed with conscientious Reverence, and sober Judgment.

And yet upon his passing this rigorous Sentence, the Lord Chief Justice did not scruple to magnify the Mercy of it, because, forsooth, in *Spain*, or *Portugal*, as he said, it would have been no less than burning. As if himself, or any other Protestant who durst openly profess against the Corruptions of *Poper*y, might not be put to death under that Tyranny, and that too without any dishonour, from those mistaken Reproaches of *Blasphemy* and *Heresy*, which wou'd be the pretended Crimes that deserved it; or, as if it was such a mighty matter to boast of, That we are not quite so miserable as they who live under the Cruelty of the *Inquisition*, or as our *Forefathers* were in *Queen Mary's* Reign.

The Proceſs upon the Writ *de Hæretico comburendo* had been happily taken away in *Ireland* by Act of Parliament, but about ſeven or eight Years before, *viz.* 7 *Guliel.* elſe I know not but I might have been put to the fiery Tryal; which I hope I ſhou'd have been enabled to endure, thro him whoſe *Grace is ſufficient.*

After Sentence I was committed to the Sheriffs of *Dublin*, and was a cloſe Priſoner, for ſomething more than a quarter of a Year in the Sub-Sheriff's Houſe; but upon complaint *Oct. 6.* I was haſtily hurry'd away to the common Goal, where I lay among the Priſoners in a cloſe Room, fill'd with ſix Beds, for about five or ſix Weeks; and then, by an *Habeas Corpus*, I was upon my Petition removed into the *Marſhaleſea*, for my Health. There I had more conveniency and room, where I wrote my Answer to Mr. *Boyſe's* Argument relating to the *Worſhip of Chriſt Jeſus*, and therefore it refers to the *Pages* of his *Dublin* Edition 4to, (alſo a more general Answer to his whole Book, which I ſent to *England*, to a Friend who died before my coming, and I cou'd never learn how he had diſpoſed of the Copy.) Here I remained a cloſe Priſoner, till *July 21. 1705.*

During this, more than *two* whole Years Imprisonment, my former Acquaintance (how intimate ſoever before) were altogether eſtranged from me; and all Offices of Friendſhip or Civility in a manner ceaſed; eſpecially among them of ſuperior Rank, tho a few of the plainer Tradesmen of my own People were more compaſſionate and kind.

Of all Men, the Diſſenting Miniſters of *Dublin* were the moſt deſtitute of Kindneſs; not one of them (excepting Mr. *Boyſe*) vouchſafed me ſo much as that ſmall Office of Humanity in viſiting

ing me when in Prison; nor had they so much Pity on the Soul of their erring Brother (as they thought him) as to seek to turn him from the Error of his Way. These my Familiars, with whom I had lived so many Years in intimate Society, never once made the attempt, nor discourfured me about it, from the first time that I met, and declared my Sentiments to 'em: and yet I had never been backward to enter into sober Argument, or to hearken to reasonable Evidence: I suppose they might think this latter part to be in vain; yet what hindred 'em from the former, except that they judged me not of those Objects of Compassion which our Lord in the *last day* will be concern'd for, or enquire about? Mat. 25. and then by the same Reason, if I had hungred they might also not have fed me, nor clothed me if they had seen me naked, nor have afforded me the Kindness which our Lord Jesus not only permits, but requires to pass between a *Jew* and a *Samaritan*.

As to those Reverend *Fathers* who were Assessors on the Bench, and whose Presence gave warmth to the Proceedings; if they had rather used means of Instruction for my Conviction, or if they had been as ready to make me a condescending Visit in the Prison to reclaim me, as to appear upon the secular Tribunal; I can't think it had any way hurt their Character, or been less agreeable to the Pastoral Office.

It might have been remembred also, what generous and tender Kindness many of the Bishops and Clergy of *Ireland*, had found from Mr. *Thomas Firmin*, at *London*, when driven from their late desolated Country; as appears by a Letter of Acknowledgment from *seven* Bishops, printed in the *Life of Mr. Firmin*; who was well known to be the brightest Example of the most active

and diffusive Goodness to the Poor and Indigent, not confining it to any Sect or Party.

But it seems when the Clergy of *Ireland* had an opportunity to shew their Disposition and *Spirit* towards one of Mr. *Firmin's* Persuasion in part, or at least passing under the same Notion, it was quite another sort of Spirit. *Their* Principles appear'd such as wou'd have persecuted and harmed him, tho' *his* were such, as made him employ his Substance, his Time and Labour, to support and comfort them.

But as to the Dissenters, it look'd worse in them to promote and encourage Persecution, when themselves were but connived at, having no *legal* Toleration in *Ireland*. 'Tis not prudent to discover a violent persecuting Spirit, before they can possess themselves of Authority and Power to exert it; or to awaken the *Rods* and *Axes*, when themselves, in the eye of the Law there, are but Criminals. I know they have had the Applauses of Mr. *Leslie* in one of his *Rehearsals*; and indeed it had too much of the Spirit of Popery, to escape his Commendation: but I am fully persuaded, that it will justify all the Severities they may suffer, as *Schismatics* from the establish'd Church, if they'l pretend to justify what was done to me: And if because they had the advantage of a Majority, and of Civil Authority, they might *eject*, and crush me for *Heresy*, (which I am well satisfy'd is not such) why might not the rigid Conformists, who are more their Superiors, than they are mine, eject from their Parishes, and prosecute *them* for *Schism*, as having no Ordination, no valid Sacraments, nor ordinary Means of Salvation among 'em, tho' themselves think they have? They that judge others, shall be judged; and why shou'd not others interpret the Scriptures for them,

as well as they wou'd interpret 'em for me? or make unscriptural Terms of Communion, as boldly as they do? But of this afterwards.

I with all Sides may consider the Wound given to the Honour of the Christian Religion, by a persecuting Spirit, more than by the worst Book of Controversy that ever was written: and 'tis some satisfaction to me, that while I suffer, as if I were an Enemy to the *Lord Jesus*, and his Religion, I can yet think, I have given a greater Testimony by my Sufferings, of my sincere Belief in both, than they who make more worldly Advantages of their Faith, and use those Advantages to the hurt and grief of such as do them no other harm but to differ from 'em.

Thus I continued long under close Confinement, without much appearance of Relief; contented with this, that I knew for whom, and for what I suffered. Mr. *Boyse* made several attempts for my Liberty; whose Kindness I thankfully acknowledge, in that with great concern and much labour he pursued it from time to time; which has abundantly confirmed my Affection and Respects to him, and extinguish'd all uneasy Resentments. I am sensible that what he did against me, was with Regret and *Grief*, what he did for me was with Choice and *Pleasure*. So that I hope nothing in this History shall be any diminution to the Character of his great Worth and good Temper; who endeavour'd to allay the common *Odium* against me as far as he cou'd, without the loss of his own Reputation. At length, thro' *his* frequent Sollicitations for a Reducement of my Fine, and by a very friendly and generous Gentleman's Help, (whom, if I had leave, I wou'd willingly name) I obtained the then Duke of *Ormond's* Favour; who gave directions to the Commis-

ners of Reducement, to reduce my Fine to 100 Marks; according to the *Lord Chancellor's* favourable Report, (to whom my Petition had been referred) that such exorbitant Fines were against the Law.

Yet these *Directions* to the Commissioners were not received by them, as any authoritative Rule; but I was obliged to give in a Petition to *them*, in which I set forth my Case, and that I had acted from no designed Contempt of the Blessed *Jesus*, in whom I truly believed; and was sorry *that any had been offended*, (which also I wrote in a Letter afterwards to the *Primate*) and that my Fine was beyond my Ability. On which they ordered it to be reduced to *seventy Pounds*, which was paid into her Majesty *Queen Anne's Exchequer*.

But it seems I had not yet done; for the *Primate Dr. Narcissus March* (who with the *Archbishop of Dublin* had sat on the Bench at my Tryal) demanded a Shilling in the Pound of the whole Fine, as the *Queen's Almoner*: I thought his *Fees* must have been reduced proportionably to her Majesty's Reducement, and that the *Church* was to be as merciful as the *State*; but I was mistaken herein. In short, after several Applications, and Letters to him, he wou'd have *twenty Pounds* of me, and so it was paid him; who thought it no blemish to his Charity or Generosity, to make this advantage of the Misery of one, who, for Conscience toward God, had *endured Grief*.

And thus after *two Years*, and above a Month's Imprisonment, *viz.* from the 14th of *June 1703.* to the 21st of *July 1705.* and upon giving Security, by two Bondsmen, for good Behaviour during Life, I obtained a Release from my Bonds. But still there remains another, and more righteous

teous Judgment, where all both high and low shall stand and await the Sentence of the great *Judge* and *Bishop* of Souls, who will surely reverse all erroneous Judgments here; for *he will render Tribulation to them who have troubled others; but to them who are troubled, Rest and Peace*: and they who have conscientiously erred, will surely fare better, than those who have persecuted 'em for such Error. For *they shall have Judgment without Mercy, who shew no Mercy*. But I heartily and daily pray, this may never be the Portion of any who have injured me: and as I hope the good God will forgive me if I have erred, since he knows 'tis with sincerity, and that I suffer for what I take to be his Truth and Glory; so I also hope he will pardon them, who have persecuted me, only from a mistaken Zeal; for *they did it ignorantly in Unbelief*.

And now after all, I thank my most merciful God and Father, that as he called me not to this Lot of Suffering, till I was arrived at some Maturity of Judgment, and Firmness of Resolution, so he left me not when my Friends and Acquaintance forsook me; that he supported my Spirit, to endure this *Tryal of my Faith* without wavering; that I was never so cast down, as to be tempted to renounce the Truth; that he preserved my Health under this long Confinement; that I had a few Friends who were a Comfort to me in my Bonds; (the *Lord grant they may find Mercy of the Lord in that Day*) that he inclined any in Authority, to shew, at last, Compassion to me: and that he has brought me out of Prison, and *set my Feet in a large place*; that I have yet Food and Rayment left me; and above all, that he has given me a Mind, I think, as well contented with it, as ever I was in my greatest Prosperity. I am content to want the

A Narrative of the Proceedings

kind and vain Respects of the World, and to give up my Name to mistaken Reproach; or to lose it, if that may be, in silent unregarded *obscurity*. I have suffer'd the loss of many things, and do not repent; but upon the review, I do still count it all but loss and dung, if it has any way advanced the Excellency of the Knowledge of *Christ Jesus my Lord*.

It is a further ground of rejoicing, to see the Light of important Truth breaking forth in many other Parts, and spreading abroad its beautiful Ray; that God has raised up divers others, bold enough to profess it, and able enough, with his Assistance, to defend it; I mean with Weapons of a spiritual Warfare, against those whose great Confidence and Dexterity is in those which are carnal. And tho it has been my great *Gravamen* or Misery to be laid by in silence; so that I have been sometimes ready to lament my self as an *unprofitable Servant*, turned out of his Master's Service: yet if I have contributed any thing to retrieve the injured Honour of the *Peerless Majesty* of the *one God and Father* of our Lord *Jesus*, (whom to be like to, was the great Glory of our Lord *Jesus*, who thought it no robbery or prey, to be * like to God.) And if the things which have happened to me, have fallen out rather to the *furtherance of the Gospel*, I shall not think my self to have been wholly useles; for tho I shall

Phil. 2. 6.

* One reason, why I think, what we render, to be equal to God, may be translated to be like to God, is, that the Word *ἴσος* admits degrees of Comparison, *ἰσότητος, ἰσότητος*. Now a strict Arithmetical Equality consists in an exact Point; and no things can be more or less equal, than what exactly are so: but things may be more or less alike; and therefore tho things that be alike, may be equal, yet they are not hereby proved, or expressed to be so.

ever prefer the Interests of serious Piety, Charity, and practical Holiness, to any barren Speculations; and had much rather a Man shou'd love our Lord Jesus in sincerity, than barely think of him just as I do; yet if I have also served the Cause of his Truth, it may be 'tis beyond what I cou'd have done, by teaching Men only what they wou'd have taught 'em; because there will never be Men wanting to take that Office, while fewer will take the part I have borne, to the hazard of all that the World counts dear and pleasant. However, as matters were, I had no room for an innocent Choice, nor any other part but this left me; being judged unworthy, and made incapable, of all the rest. And if in the whole I may but approve my self to my *great Judge*, and Giver of the Prize; I am not anxious about the Applause or Censures of the Spectators, who shall be judged also.

London, Sept.
1718.

Tho. Emlyn:






A N

A P P E N D I X,

C O N T A I N I N G

The Dublin Ministers own Account, drawn up (by Mr. B. in their Name) in a Pamphlet, viz. The Difference between Mr. E--- and the Dissenting Ministers of D--- truly represented. By which it may be seen how little their Account differs from mine, as to the Occasion of their rejecting me. With some Remarks thereupon, in relation to such an imposing Spirit, and such uncharitable Principles, as they acted from. Their own Words are as follow.

P. 10.


 E cannot (say they) but know, that in his publick Exposition of several Chapters of the New Testament, he had put an Arian or Socinian Sense on such Passages, as we take to be the clearest Proofs of the Deity of Christ. He did not assert his Divinity in expounding the 1st Chapter to the Hebrews: He apply'd 1 John 5.20. wholly to the Father, without taking notice that any had apply'd it to our Blessed Saviour. His Paraphrase on Rev. 2. 23. was, that we know not how far God

may

‘ may communicate to a Creature the Knowledge
 ‘ of Mens Hearts. In two Sermons on *Phil.* 2. 8,
 ‘ 9. he took no notice of the Deity of Christ,
 ‘ but evidently supposed him capable as Man of
 ‘ exercising such an universal Dominion.

‘ And ’twas not till after such apparent and
 ‘ repeated grounds of Suspicion as these, that
 ‘ he was desired to declare his Judgment in this
 ‘ important Point; and in such Circumstances
 ‘ the said Ministers think there was very just
 ‘ reason to put him upon it, to prevent the Dan-
 ‘ ger of the Peoples being perverted from the
 ‘ common Faith.

‘ And as to any other unjust Calumnies cast
 ‘ upon Mr. E——, the said Ministers not only
 ‘ had no hand in them, but did their utmost
 ‘ to rebuke them, and some of them did so in
 ‘ their publick Sermons; and they were sorry
 ‘ they could not free him from the main Charge
 ‘ of denying the *Deity of Christ*, being from his
 ‘ own free Declaration fully convinc’d the Charge
 ‘ was but too true.

‘ But they (the Ministers) cannot think any P. II.
 ‘ judicious Christian will arraign either their
 ‘ Prudence or their Charity, for discountenancing
 ‘ a Doctrine which strikes so deep, they think,
 ‘ at the Foundation of Christianity, &c. Nor do
 ‘ they think any understanding Christians will
 ‘ censure them for want of either Prudence or
 ‘ Charity in their refusing to continue Mr. E——
 ‘ as an allowed approved Teacher among them,
 ‘ who had already began to insinuate this Doc-
 ‘ trine; who, upon Inquiry, openly avow’d it;
 ‘ who himself desired to be dismiss’d from his
 ‘ Charge if his Difference of Judgment in this
 ‘ point could not be borne with: Nay, who pro-
 ‘ fess’d himself uneasy, that he had been so long
 ‘ under restraint from more openly declaring his
 ‘ Sen-

‘ Sentiments concerning it. Nor do they see
 ‘ wherein they could have express’d more Ten-
 ‘ derness to Mr. E —, than they did in confis-
 ‘ tency with their own Judgment, and the Zeal
 ‘ they ought to express in defending the Faith
 ‘ once deliver’d to the Saints; and in which they
 ‘ have the Concurrence of almost *all* that wear
 ‘ the Christian Name. And they are confident
 ‘ that no Pastors in any of the Reform’d Church-
 ‘ es would, in the like Circumstances, have acted
 ‘ otherwise than they have done; for they gave
 ‘ Mr. E — Time to consider the matter, decla-
 ‘ ring their Readiness to receive him, on Retrac-
 ‘ tation of his Opinion. So that Mr. E — has
 ‘ no ground to complain of any unreasonable
 ‘ Hardship in this Matter.

P. 13.

‘ The said Ministers having given this just
 ‘ and true Account of those Opinions of Mr. E ---
 ‘ that were the Ground of their Dissatisfaction
 ‘ with him, do think this bare Relation of the
 ‘ Matters in Difference sufficient to justify their
 ‘ Conduct, without making any further Remarks
 ‘ upon it. And they do declare, they have so
 ‘ great a Respect for Mr. E —’s Abilities, that
 ‘ it was not without extreme Regret and Grief
 ‘ that they thought themselves oblig’d to disown
 ‘ him as an approved Teacher among them. But
 ‘ they look upon the Denial of the Divinity of
 ‘ our Blessed Saviour, to be a Doctrine of too dan-
 ‘ gerous a Consequence to be *Tolerated among*
 ‘ *Them.*

It plainly appears from this Account, that all the
 Instances they alledge, whether exactly true, or
 not, did only give some *Grounds of Suspicion*, as
 themselves say, and were only Negatives; he
did not assert, and did not take notice, &c. of the
Deity (i. e. Supreme Deity) of the Son. Now the
 Question

Question will be, Whether (with Men of Prudence, and Christian Charity) a Suspicion of my different Judgment from theirs, was Reason sufficient first to press me to a full Declaration of my Mind, and then to discard me, or remove me from my People, and from my Ministerial Office, when I had told them my different Sentiments in these Matters; rather than to bear with this Difference, which at most was so tenderly intimated by me, it seems, that not Two of the Congregation were then *known* to perceive it, or to be offended at it, whatever might be indeed, or may be said since; and when at the same time I was willing to receive all that the *Holy Scriptures* declared of this Matter; and only dissented from their Interpretations, and devised Explications of a Subject, which they acknowledge they don't understand, nor could explain.

It appears, their Judgment in the Case is, that the not assenting to the *Supreme Deity of Jesus Christ*, is such a Crime that no one suspected thereof, and who upon their Demand will not profess it, in other Words than those of the *Holy Scriptures*, is to be allowed to preach more, or so much as to be *Tolerated among them*. Upon this I shall make a few *Remarks*; and the rather because the same Spirit is working among some here, both at *London* and in the Country, at this time, with great Animosity.

1: The Foundation on which the *Dissenters* have gone in their Separation from the Establish'd Church, has been this, That *New Terms* of Christian Communion, narrower than Christ has made them, ought not to be imposed by Human Authority; that this imposing, uncharitable Humour is what the Word of God greatly condemns; and that such human Inventions, tyrannically urged on others, is destructive of the Peace

and Purity of the Church. I think I need not prove this, which runs thro' all their Apologies--- *Making New Terms of Christian Communion, or narrowing the Terms which Christ has fixed, is what the Word of God freely declares against*, says Dr. Calamy; and tells us, *This is a main Principle of Conscientious Nonconformity, in which the old Puritans, and modern Dissenters agree. Comfort and Counsel to Dissenters*, pag. 36. And again, pag. 42. *Let us stand to our Principles, which are for Scriptural Terms of Communion, &c.* How often have we had *Hales, Chillingworth, and Stillingfleet's Irenicum*, quoted to this purpose, against the Imposers of new and narrow Terms of Communion? And I remember, in the *Dissenters Address to King William*, on his Accession to the Throne, when they wanted a legal Toleration, they professed their desire was, *That the Rule of Christianity might be the Rule of Conformity.* This is what they have perpetually valued themselves upon, *viz.* That they were for keeping nearer than others to the Scriptural Rule.

2. That the Dissenters, in rejecting me, and others who willingly accept the Scripture, for not assenting to *human Articles, Phrases, and Creeds*, stand chargeable with the Spirit of Imposition, and with *narrowing* the Scripture-Terms of Communion; because we are rejected by them for want of *Faith*, when yet we believe all that the Scriptures reveal, and consent to practise what it enjoins. They'll tell us indeed we don't understand them right, and therefore require us to believe their Sense, and subscribe to their *Explications*. Let them then help us what they can by rational Instruction, to understand them right; but not determine us to their *Explications*, when they seem to us to be groundless and false. What is this but to set up for Judges of Controversy,
and

to usurp *Dominion* over their Brethrens Faith? a thing which the Apostles would not have done: For they did not use to bear down Men with an high Hand, even with their infallible Light it self, but reasoned, and convinced Men, and left them to search the Scriptures, and to judge for themselves, and to be persuaded in their own Minds; and as far as they did attain and agree, to walk together; and for the rest, to wait for more Light from the God of Wisdom. Does the Scripture say there are *Three Persons that make one God?* or that *the Son is the same Substance with the Father and Spirit?* or that *the Spirit is God?* They can't pretend this is said expressly: if it be, then let them shew it, and we will presently assent to it, and to all that the Sacred Writings say.

But, say they, the Scriptures speak what is in effect the same, tho not in direct Words. Well, then in our subscribing to the Scriptures, I hope, we assent to what they say is in *effect* the same; and why then are we rejected? But, say they, you don't think tis in effect the same. Very good! and have you Authority to fix the Sense of Scripture for others? Are they none of Christ's Disciples, or Ministers, who do not honour your Interpretations, and Glosses, as much as *his Law* it self? We say to you, give us *Christ's Revelation*, and *God's Oracles*: and you cry, Nay, but we'll give you as good; we will give you our *Articles*, and *Confessions*, and *Catechisms*, that have all the very Quintessence of the Scriptures, and are a great deal more clear and certain in their Sense than they. The Scriptures, say they, are so written, that assenting to them is no Test of one *sound in the Faith*; but a Man may still be an *Heretick* for all that, unless he believes our Explanations: but is not this to vilify the Scriptures as a *Leaden Rule*, and a *Nose of Wax*? &c. just as

†

the

the *Papists* do, and with the same Design, *viz.* To make it serve as an Excuse for Tyranny and Persecution: so that both in the Way and the End, they imitate the *Papists*. These therefore will have a human Judge of Controversy, and so would these *Dissenters*, and other Imposers. The *Papists* say, they must stand to the Judgment of a General Council; and what do *these* say less? The one say, we must be guided by the Council of *Trent*; the other, by the *Assembly* at *Westminster*. Or if they could say, by the Council of *Nice*, (which they cannot) 'tis all one: *Nice*, and *Trent* Councils, are both alike in Authority, if they impose any thing besides the Scriptures.

'Tis evident when these Men impose their, or any unauthoriz'd Mens Explication, 'tis because the Scriptures speak not in so determinate a Sense as their *Articles* do: this shews, that what God would leave in a Latitude, they will have more restrain'd, and so require more than he has required; and plainly confesses, that the Scriptures speak not so fully for their Opinions as they could wish, wherefore they like them not so well as their own human Compositions: and thus while they cry out of *human Inventions* in Worship, themselves urge *human Inventions* in *Creeds*. Whereas, I should think, if any Men now can give us a better Account, than the Scriptures do, *what God is*, and what we should believe of him, they may also as well tell us, better than the Scriptures do, how to worship him *decently*.

It may be and is pretended, that they do not impose *new Articles of Faith*, but only explain the old: But if I find this Explication different from the old Faith, then it is to me a *new Article* of Faith; and on this pretence Men may innovate as boldly as the *Papists*: for why may not these,

as well plead, that in requiring the *Invocation of Saints*, they only explain that Article of the *Communion of Saints*; and that in the *Doctrine of Indulgencies, and the Pope's Pardons*, they only explain the next Article, *viz. the Forgiveness of Sins*, and so on: and thus the *Trent-Creed* has no more added any new Articles, than the *Dissenters Creed*.

Besides all this, 'tis absurd to suppose a *Creed*, designing to express Fundamentals, should need violent Strainings, and obscure or abstruse Consequences, to fetch in more than is obvious, and plainly to be understood from it; and that about the most important Matters. We find in all human *Articles and Agreements*, that however some accidental and lesser Points may be only implicitly included, yet that the Grand *Fundamental Points* are always *expressly* inserted; otherwise the Composers would be reproached with egregious Stupidity and Folly: and it were very astonishing to suppose a *Creed*, or Form of Fundamental Doctrines intended as a *Test* of Christianity, should leave a *Trinity of three Persons in one God*, and the *Supreme Deity of Jesus Christ*, and the *Holy Spirit*, to be found out by such dark *Logick*, and strange Consequences, as some use in the case, if these were really such Fundamentals in Christianity as is pretended; or that they should not be at all expressed. Was there ever any more said concerning the *Holy Spirit's Nature*, in any Account given of the *antient Creed*, (which most certainly the *first Christians* had and held as sacred) than this, *I believe in the Holy Ghost*? Did the Council of *Nice* go any further? Now will any reasonable Man say, that this is a clear Declaration of his being a distinct Person, and yet *equal to the one God the Father*? The like might be said of other Points: and if neither the Scriptures, nor the

the antient Creed, are exprefs or plain in thefe matters, which *they* would impofe on their Brethren, I leave it to be judged by any fober-minded Man, whether themfelves, who cry out againft Impositions in Religion, be not, even in their low Eftate, as truly guilty of an ufurping impofing Spirit and Praétice, as others whom they can fo freely censure for it. Vain Men! Who has made you fuch Judges and Rulers over your Brethren, that you fhould fet up for fuch *authoritative* decifive Expounders of Chrif't's Doctrines, that Churches and Minifters fhall ftand and fall by your Opinions; and that none fhall be admitted or continued in his Miniftry or Church, who will not call you Master and Father; nor can approve *your* Interpretations as well as *his* Laws, and that becaufe they judge thofe to be inconfiftent herewith?

If it be faid, that without this, we can't diftinguifh Mens Opinions, becaufe a *Socinian* or a *Papift* will fubfcribe to the Scripture and Creed; I give Mr. *Baxter's* Anfwer, *viz.* that it is fo much the better; and 'tis the more fit to be the matter of our Concord. Why fhould Men be fond of Marks of Difinction, which create Strife? *Ubi Lex non diftinguit, non eft diftinguendum.* If God has pleafed to fet down any Doctrines fo generally, that all cannot have the fame Conceptions of them, certainly they are very prefumptuous, and fond of Divifions, who will bind all to believe them, in this or that particular and determinate Senfe. We cannot too often hear thofe excellent Words of Mr. *Chillingworth*; *This reftaining the Word of God from that Latitude, and the Underftandings of Men from that Liberty wherein Chrif't and his Apoftles left them, is and hath been the only Fountain of all the Schifms of the Church,*

See Mr.
Baxter's
Life, p. 198.

Ch. 4.
§. 17.

Church, and which makes them immortal. And this is what these Dissenters are guilty of. Whence I infer two Things more, if they continue in this Method of Imposition and Tyranny:

1. That the *Dissenters* can shift their Principles as Interest or Humour serves. It is notorious how violent they once were against *Toleration*, in the Long Parliament, and *Cromwel's* time: then it was, *The Nation-destroying Sin of Toleration*; and then 'twas said, *We must fetch the Devil out of Mens Consciences*, &c. But it has been said often, That now the *Dissenters* have altered their Notions, and are grown wiser, and of more large and charitable Principles; and that former Weaknesses of their own, and the Sins of their Forefathers, should not be imputed to them, who are of another Temper. This their Adversaries will not easily believe to be really true: they say, 'tis but of late, if the fierce domineering Spirit be laid; and they suspect, if they had Power they would use it much otherwise than now they pretend. And I doubt they'll have some ground for their Jealousy: For if they no sooner have an Occasion given to try their charitable Temper, by some of their Brethren's Dissent from the common Opinions of the rest, but presently they return to their former Spirit of *Imposition* and Tyranny, disturbing other Congregations, excommunicating the *Laity*, and damning, reviling, and deposing such Ministers as reject their *human Articles*; (which are all the ways by which they can shew a persecuting Spirit, while out of Power;) how can they be believ'd? And they who in my Case could solicit the Secular Power, when in *other* hands, will hardly let it sleep when in their *own*, without using the Advantages that Law and their Power may give

give them, to the Hurt of such as differ from them.

I remember well, in their *Addresses to King William*, on his *Accession* to the Throne, they desired the *Rule of Christianity might be the Rule of Conformity*: But in their *Address*, 1697. (when a Toleration was settled) presented by the same hand (Dr. *Bates*) they desire earnestly a Restraint of the *Licentiousness of the Press*, in relation to the *Unitarians Books*; and yet *these Authors* proceeded upon the same Rule of Christianity, *viz.* the *Bible*, tho differently understood: And if that was not sufficient to entitle *them* to Liberty, neither could the *Dissenters* claim it, whose Writings went upon a different Explication of the *Sacred Text*, from what the Asserters of Episcopacy give. So that they go backward and forward, as occasion requires: or else we must say (which is the true state of things sometimes, and perhaps now) that they have two sorts of Men; one for *Liberty and Forbearance*; and, when that is most useful to them, and acceptable to others, *these Men* appear, and it goes for the Declaration and Voice of the *Dissenters* in general: but when they have any particular Provocation, tho only from the Liberty some of their Brethren take of dissenting from the rest of them, then the *other narrow-spirited Part* cry down Liberty, and raise a Hatred and Persecution, if they can, of such Dissenters. The Principle of their admired *Assembly's Larger Catechism*, under the *Second Commandment*, is, That it forbids *Toleration of all false Religion*; and this is their *Form of sound Words*, which they recommend, and have reprinted the last Year. And when these come to practise according to it, their *few moderate Men* lie still, and dare not stir openly to oppose the rest: but if they go on at this rate, what they say on occasions

sion will be little regarded or credited by wise Men, and no body will be the better for the Moderation and fair Speeches of a few.

2. I think, by these Measures, they will very much justify all the Severities they have complained of, from those of the *Establish'd Church*, against themselves. I ask them, Why was I, or why are others, to be rejected and deposed, and turn'd out of Office and Benefice? Is it not because we can't assent to your unscriptural Notions of a *Trinity in God*, and *Personal Union of two Minds*, &c. which we can no more find in the Holy Scriptures, than you there can find *Diocesan Bishops*, and the Church-Government established by Law? And if you think nevertheless that 'tis plain your Doctrines are agreeable to Scripture, others think 'tis as plain that the *Episcopacy* which you dislike, is most agreeable to Scripture, and *Apostolical* Direction; and that you have no Ministry, nor valid Sacraments among you: nay, they think and say, that the *first* stands upon as good Evidence as the *Canon* of the Scripture stands. Now if the Dissenters can justify their ejection of their Brethren, only for holding, tho' never so conscientiously and peaceably, some Opinions and Speculations, different from their Interpretation, but not against the Letter of the Sacred Scriptures; then why might not the Episcopal Party justify their turning out all such *Presbyterian* Teachers from their *Parishes*, as would not approve of Episcopacy, and accept Episcopal Ordination, and declare for absolute Non-resistance, &c? They were not such Fools, not to say they were in the right, and you in the wrong; or not to bring Texts as near to their Point, as I conceive you do. And I verily think, if you can justify the Ejection of me or others, in a like Case, from the Ministry, for a different understanding

of the Scriptures, I cou'd justify the Ejection of your *Fathers* and others, at the Restoration, at *St. Bartholomew* 1662. And so all your tragical Complaints will be answer'd by your selves at last. And the *narrowing the Terms of Communion*, by unscriptural Impositions, shall have your countenance also: So that you will seem to be Converts to them who cast out your *Fathers*; yea, and to their Principles too, on which they did it, and against which your selves have been so long contending.

Such Men may see themselves reproved and reproached by Mr. *Baxter*; who, after long Study and much Experience, and many grieved Thoughts about Church-Divisions, wrote in his later days against hasty judging, and *conceited Knowledge, pretending Certainty in things uncertain*; in his Book of *Knowledge and Love*. Where, speaking, p. 78. of ministerial Subscription, he says, " 'Tis too much to require of him a Subscription that he implicitly believes all that is in the Bible which you shew him, because there may be Errors in that Copy: Nay, such Subscription shou'd not, as necessary, be required of him to all the real Word of God; for if by Error he doubt, whether *Job*, *Chronicles*, or *Esther* be canonical, I wou'd not be he that shou'd therefore forbid him to preach the Gospel. I'm sure the antient Church imposed no such Terms on their Pastors, when *Synesius* was chosen Bishop before he believed the Resurrection. What then shall we say of the *Roman* Insolence, which thinks not all the Scriptures big enough, but Ministers must also subscribe to so many Additions of their own, and to Traditions and Expositions of *Fathers*? &c.— No wonder if such Men do tear the Churches of Christ into pieces."

'Tis not without a melancholy Horror, that considerate Men read the tragical History of the Churches and their Bishops and Councils, for several hundred Years after *Constantine*; worrying and devouring each other, with Rage and fierce Ignorance; casting Firebrands and Anathema's, with wanton Pride and hellish Sport, on all that stood in their way; rending and tearing Christian Societies asunder, who else might have lived together in Love and Peace, and Godly Edifying: and all from a haughty Ambition of making others say as they said, not content with their saying as Christ and his Apostles taught. And after all this woful Experience, shall there yet be no Amendment! Alas, we cry out upon this their way, and say 'twas folly, but yet *their Posterity approve their Sayings*. And the very *Dissenters*, who pretend so long to have borne testimony against human Inventions and Impositions of unscriptural Terms of Communion by others, can themselves act the same cruel Part, and cast out those who receive the whole Word of Christ; and will own none for true *Israelites*, who cannot pronounce their *Shibboleth*, &c. nor join novel inconsistent and unintelligible Phrases to the plain and primitive Creed. *Thou that sayst a Man should not steal, dost thou steal?* I wish they wou'd learn once again from *Geneva*, where, as I am well informed, they require no such Subscription of those whom they ordain, tho they exhort 'em to study the Scripture, and use prudent Caution in what they teach.

I can't but pity young dissenting Teachers, (that are honest, and have not learn'd the cunning Craftiness of the World) who before they are aware are drawn into grievous Perplexities; they find, they cannot please their People without flattering 'em in their Error, and either deny-

nying, or with difficulty and disguise concealing great Truths of Christianity; nor yet dare they offend 'em, by telling them the Truth, for fear of Disgrace or Beggary. I think Parents who have any concern for the Souls or Bodies of their Children, shou'd be afraid to train up any of theirs to the Ministry among the Dissenters, unless they have tolerable Estates, or some other Calling, on which to subsist; and not cast 'em wholly into a dependance on a People weak, and perhaps so humourfom; that if their Prejudices, Errors, and accustomed Notions and Phrases be contradicted, tho by the fullest Evidence of Scripture or Reason, nay, if they be not maintained by him, they rise up in Rage and Scorn against their Teacher, who makes Conscience of telling 'em the whole Counsel of God, and turn him out to Misery and Want. So that the unhappy Man wishes he had rather been of any honest Trade: but alas! his Time for that, and his little Supplies are spent, and he knows not what to do, or how to turn to other Business: he cou'd be content with a very little; but quite to starve his Body, and perhaps his Family, appears very terrible. And 'tis a very sad *Dilemma* he is under, to pinch either his Carcase or his Conscience, and so to get his Bread *with the Peril of his Life*, shall I say, or of his Soul? Who wou'd venture his Child on these Terms, in this day of Light and Inquiry? Especially venture him not with any Improvements of Literature, which are dangerous. And 'tis but a poor Comfort to a Man to say, He can confide so far in the Dulness of his Child's Understanding, that he is secure he'll never think otherwise than he has been taught when a Child; nor go beyond the Standard of Orthodoxy, in the *Assembly's Catechism and Confession*. Besides, at
this

this rate, the Dissenting Interest will hasten into deserved Contempt, and a *Teacher* there, be one of the most abject and servile things in the World.

I am far from intending by these things, to fix a general Charge upon the *whole Body* of the Dissenters at *London*; whatever those in *Ireland* have done, and whatever Countenance and Ratification some others seem to have given to their Proceedings against me: yet I freely own, here are some of another Spirit, (as also in the Country) who detest this imposing Humour of their narrow-spirited and more uncharitable Brethren; and who are not of the lowest Rank among 'em neither, for Ability or Esteem; and who, if they are not known to be of Sentiments differing from the common *Confessions of Faith*, yet are against the binding *these*, or any *unscriptural Forms* upon their Brethren; and against rejecting 'em from the Ministry for not assenting to them, while they conscientiously promote Love to *Jesus Christ*, and Obedience to his Laws, and confess him to be Lord: and tho it be done to the Glory of the Father as the only *ultimate End*, yet they esteem this not a Crime, for which to depose 'em; they are hearty in declaring for a *general Toleration*, according to the late Address: whereas the *Dublin Zeal* says, in relation to my differing Sentiments, that they account 'em not fit to be tolerated among 'em.

And 'tis not now only that they begin to shew this Moderation; but I must do 'em the justice to acknowledge that several of the Ministers here, even at that time, when I first was driven from my People, did heartily censure and condemn the *Dublin Ministers*, as very imprudent, and, as the expression then was, *infatuated Men*; and this after their own written Account had been

Phil. 4. 5. been read, as well as mine heard. Tho, perhaps they thought one half of the Apostle's Advice not very safe to follow, viz. to let their Moderation be known to all Men, lest it might prevent their Usefulness to their People, or the Peoples Usefulness to them.

P. 4. At that same time, the worthy and peaceable Mr. Sylvester (the great Intimate of Mr. Baxter) did not scruple, (as I since find, in his Preface to some old Sermons, on Heb. 12. Vol. 1.) to express himself thus; *I have sometimes thought (when I read the four Evangelists) that Christ was apprehensive that Men, in and by their pretended Love to him, wou'd quite forget his Father, and terminate their Honour and Affections in the Son; which Christ appears solicitous to prevent: John ch. 14, 15, 16, 17. And this I cou'd copiously demonstrate, cou'd I forget the limits of a Preface.* And by the way let me add, what for a long time I was grieved at: I know no People more chargeable with this Evil, which Christ Jesus is here said to have been afraid of, than one sort of the Dissenters, who so constantly exalt the Son above his God and Father, in the business of our Redemption; wherein they represent him so much more good and aimable than the great God, who is Love it self.

And whereas the Dublin Ministers presumed, that no Pastors of any Reformed Churches wou'd have acted otherwise, in my Case; they may easily see their Mistake: How many Clergy of the Reformed Church of England, have given as full Evidence of their like Sentiments, who have not been cast off, nor their Communion disown'd by their Brethren nor Fathers? And if I mistake not, the Archbishop of D—— himself wou'd not have refused to communicate at the Church of one of 'em, when he was here.

Nor yet have the Dissenting Ministers here, notwithstanding the Attempts of some fiery and narrow Spirits among 'em, made such inquiry into their Brethrens Thoughts, upon as full grounds of suspicion as I had given. I know some of 'em have not liked the *Dublin Zeal* or Conduct so well as to have it imitated.

And more than this, I can tell 'em, that the Holy Primitive Christians in *Justin Martyr's* days wou'd not have done so; as appears in his *Dial. with Trypho*, where he owns, that such *Jewish Christians who confessed Jesus to be Christ*, (viz. the Just. Dial. p. 266, 267. Col. Edit. *Ebionites*, as I take it, whom he numbers among such as confess Christ a little after) ought to be embraced as Brethren, and treated as such—And those who did not believe Jesus Christ to be more than a Man born of Human Parents, viz. *Joseph and Mary*, (denying both his Pre-existence and his Conception by the *Holy Ghost*) he freely declares to be of the same *Society and Body* with them who thought otherwise; only he wou'd not have 'em impose the *Jewish* Observances on, nor shun conversing with, other Christians. A much less degree of Charity wou'd serve to make us embrace those as Brethren, who entertain far more high and honourable Thoughts of the *only-begotten Son of God*, our Lord and Saviour; whom having not seen, they love and serve.

The plain truth is, if Christians wou'd believe with an *holy Religious Faith*, and be content with a Religious, rather than a *Philosophical Creed*, Christianity wou'd better be preserved; for what is it but a *Scholastick* Philosophical Faith, that runs upon Metaphysical Notions of *Essence* and *Persons*, and *Emanations* and *Consubstantiality*, and the *Methods of divine Decrees*, and *God's Physical Operations* and *Concourse*, &c? The Holy Christian Faith regards *God* in a religious Sense, not
so

so much in his Infinity, Immenſity, Spirituality, and other natural and abſolute Excellencies, as in his relative Excellencies and moral Perfections, viz. as our Maker, our Owner, our Ruler, Diſpoſer, Judge, Benefactor, and chief Good: And it regards Jeſus Chriſt as our ſufficient *Mediator*, by whoſe Intervention we are brought into God's Favour, and are taught his Will. And as he is a good Believer in God, who reveres his Maſteſty, is moulded into his Will, loves and truſts in *Him*, and makes him the Centre of his delightful Reſt, and ſatisfying Joy; ſo is he a good Believer in *Jeſus Chriſt*, who owns him as his Lord; who receives and obeys his Laws, credits his Threats and Promiſes, and confides in his Mediation and Interceſſion; without ſubtle philoſophizing upon his Nature and *Generation*; or without *Foreſick* political Diſquiſitions, and logical Quibbles about *Juſtification*. What if all Chriſtians have not the ſame abſtracted Speculations of God and Chriſt, (for all have not the ſame Knowledge) is it therefore not the ſame God, and the ſame Lord? Yes, doubtleſs; if the Jews believed in Jeſus Chriſt when on Earth, tho' they believed not his miraculous Conception, wou'd any ſay it was not the ſame Chriſt that other Diſciples believed in? Surely it

John 8.24. was enough, that Jeſus was *He*; whatever different Notions they had about his Origin: and 'tis the ſame if an honeſt Chriſtian believes him ſufficient to bring him to Salvation, without being able to give a *Philoſophical* or Critical Account how he has this Sufficiency; ſo that here will ſtill be *one God*, and *one Lord*, both *theirs* and *ours*, by which Chriſtians may unite and agree in the Doctrine, which is *according to Godlineſs*. And ſo *Conſtantine* the Emperor ſeems to have meant, when he adviſed *Alexander* and *Arius* not to break Communion for ſuch things, comparatively

tively small, since consistent with the principal Design of Religion, if not too nicely debated and imposed.

And thus 'tis in other Points relating to Almighty God. The Holy Scriptures require no accurate Philosophical Notions of God's *Eternity*, *Omnipresence* and *Immensity*, &c. they are content to give us only popular easy Accounts of these Matters, *viz.* that God was *before the Earth was formed*; and that he *fills Heaven and Earth with his Presence*, that he sees every where, and can exert his Power every where: which are far from being *accurate Notions* of Eternity and Immenity. They trouble not Men with the Niceties of *Eternal Successions*, or an *Eternal τὸ πρὸν*, without Succession; nor with *infinite Spaces*, or of God's being present in *part*, or in *whole*, and the like *Metaphysical Difficulties*. No, if these things offer themselves to natural Light in Men of Capacity and fine Speculation, and they can fancy they have accurate Notions about 'em, 'tis well and good; let 'em enjoy their own Acquisitions: but this is not owing to *Christianity*, but *Philosophy*; and so is not incumbent on every good Christian, nor required as matter of a *virtuous religious Belief*: our Religion imposes no such Difficulties on us of believing with the Understanding, what we cannot so much as *perceive by it*; it only requires us to believe what it reveals to us, *i. e.* to our Understanding and Apprehension. Let the *Wise Men*, let the *Scribes*, let the *Disputers of this World*, busy and tire themselves as much as they please in such Disquisitions; the Christian is happy enough in the easy popular Notions of such divine Perfections, when so powerfully received, as to form his *Mind* into an Holy Admiration, Reverence, and Love of God; and his *Life* to a serious obedient Conformity to his Will and Laws. Let who will
damn

damn or reject him, for not *understanding* their long critical Philosophical Creeds, their *Modes*, and *Substencies*, or *Personalities*; or for not professing them *without Understanding*: the Christian Religion threatens him with no Harm from God himself.

And Men must not think, that like other arbitrary Societies they may appoint what *Terms of Union* and *Communion* they please in the Churches; and then cry, They who like them not, may go elsewhere; and, that their Ministers, when they no longer fancy them, shall be cast off, at Will and Humour, for different Sentiments about *Unscriptural* Words or *Notions*: for a *Christian* Church has its Terms and Laws settled by *Christ*; 'tis *his* Church, and the Table is the *Lord's Table*, and the Ministers are *Christ's* Ministers: and 'tis the highest Usurpation in us to make Inclosures, when he has left it open; and to turn out *Members*, or *Pastors* from their Office, if they walk and act according to the Design of their Christian Station: and Men had need be sure, that the denying their *Unscriptural Tests* and *Shibboleths* is such a Crime as will justify these Proceedings; otherwise, tho it may signify little what has been done to me, the unworthiest of many; yet, in general, he whose *Name was*

Clem. Ep. in the *Book of Life*, Phil. 4. 3. has told us, ἡ μίση ἀμαρτία, &c. 'Tis no small Sin to turn out from their Office, those who have unblameably attended their Ministry.

I know very well that Men of an uncharitable Complexion, think they may justify their Severity and bitter Zeal, from the Apostle's Counsel, to *reject and avoid Hereticks*; but they would do well to consider seriously these few things, lest they abuse and pervert this Counsel.

1. Whether all such *Heresies* were not attended with

with immoral Doctrines or Practices, in a plain and uncontroverted Opposition to the Apostle's Doctrine? And therefore those Heresies are *Works of the Flesh*; vicious, and immoral, and wilful Acts, as *Drunkennes, Adultery, &c.* And the Hereticks were *self-condemned*, without the Decision of a Synod: Accordingly one may see their foul Characters in *2 Pet. 2.* and *St. Jude's Epist.* This made *Augustin* say, *Hereticus esse nolo*; because he could answer for his Will: but when serious Convictions, and real Strugglings of Conscience, force a Man to own Doctrines which he takes to be the Truths of Christ, against all the Interests of the Flesh, and his worldly Comfort, which he had rather lose than offend God; how is it possible, if this Man should be mistaken, that yet he should be such a Heretick? *Nunquam errari tutius existimo, quam cum in nimio amore veritatis erratur.*

Gal. 5. 19.
20.

Aug. de Mendacio.

'Tis his great Love of Truth that makes him err, and such Error cannot be dangerous. *And certain 'tis, that he who after a pious attentive Consideration falls into Error, is more worthy, if not of Praise, yet of Pardon, than he that blindly assents to Truth it self;* says *Bishop Rust.*

Of Reason in Matters of Religion.

2. Whether, in the *Ecclesiastical* Sense of the Word *Heresy*, as noting a *Fundamental Error* about the Christian Faith, any, in the truly Primitive Church, were accounted *Hereticks*, who received the primitive *antient Creed*, before any Council presumed to frame *new ones*? This was wont to be the sufficient *Test* of Christianity and Church-Communion, which I willingly assent to in its plain and fair Sense. No subtle intricate Interpretations were then obtruded as necessarily to be received; and indeed all sides tell us, when they please, that the *Fundamentals of Christianity* are *plain and easy* to be seen; and make this the great Commendation of our Religion: but where should

should they be plain, if not in the *Creed*? The express Words of Bishop *Davenant*, so venerable and judicious in the Sense of all Parties, cited by Mr. *How* in his Sermon of *Union among Protestants*, are thus; *He that believes the things contained in the Apostles Creed, and endeavours to live a Life agreeable to the Precepts of Christ, ought not to be expunged from the Roll of Christians, nor be driven from Communion with the Members of any Church whatever.*

3. Whether, at least, it be not extremely difficult for any to know (if bare speculative Error must be Heresy) what is *Heresy*, and who are *Hereticks* now in these distant distracted Ages, when Christians are so perplexed and divided in their Interpretations and Explications of many Articles? In the Apostles times, 'twas easy to know certainly who were in the wrong, by their open Opposition to them whom all the Churches allowed to be right, and to be the infallible Directors of their Faith, and who contradicted such Errors: but now each Party appeals to *their* Writings, and thinks it embraces their true Meaning. But Bishops and Councils are not Christ and his Apostles. Here let me use the late Dr. *Sherlock's* Words against the Papists, (for in Controversy with them, one may hear what they'll not tell us in disputing against others;) *While nothing, says he, was Heresy, but the Denial of a plain acknowledged Article of the Christian Faith, and there was no dispute who were Hereticks, the Power of deposing Hereticks, was sacred and venerable, and had its just Authority and Effects; but since the Controversy is what is Heresy, and the World is divided about it, (What if he had said so of Schism too?) tho' the Power remains, yet the Exercise of it becomes contemptible, when a Church first coins new Articles of Faith, and then censures, and deposes them for*
Here-

Sherl. Vindicat. of Protest. Princip. about Chur. Govern.
p. 31.

Hereticks who do not believe them. 'Tis not the same thing to reject the Sacred Text, and to mistake its Sense. S. Aug. says something to the same purpose; That * *it could hardly, if at all, be determined what made one a Heretick.* And surely it can as little be determined now, by a wise Man, tho Fools are hasty. And therefore what he said elsewhere, is very rational, and worth considering by those that are fierce and rash in their Charge of Heresy, *Seviant illi, &c. Let them be fierce and cruel who know not how easy it is to err.*

If such things were duly considered by hasty Zealots, they would not be so prodigal of their *Anathema's*; but would find the matter of *Heresy* among conscientious Christians so very *hard*, and the Precepts of Love, Peace, Meekness and Forbearance towards them who differ, so very *easy*, and plain to be discerned, that if an ill Temper did not byass them more to what is cruel and unkind, one would think none could be so bad a *Casuis*t, as not to determine on the plainest and most pleasant side of the Question; and so *let Brotherly Love still continue*: at least it would make any good-natur'd Man speak with *Salvian, Errant, sed bono animo errant; apud nos Heretici sunt, apud De Guber. se non sunt, &c. i. e. They don't think themselves He- l. 5. reticks, tho we do; they err, but 'tis with an honest Mind; and how it will go with them at the Great Day, none but the Judge himself can tell.* This is more Christian, and becoming a modest Sense of our Darkness and Difficulties, than to pronounce honest-minded Men odious to God, and to render them odious to ignorant Men, by charging them

* Quid vero faciat Hæreticum, regulari quadam definitione comprehendi aut omnino non potest, aut difficulter potest. *Præfat. de Hæresibus.*

with, and anathematizing them for, *damnable* Heresies; and that usually by rote as we have been taught, without knowing what, or how to answer what they have to say for themselves, and which perhaps we are afraid should be known to others.

But if, like *Pharaoh's Kine*, the *Lean* must devour the *Fat*; if Zeal must out-go Knowledge; if a pretended *Knowledge of all Mysteries, and all Faith*, be valued above *Charity*; if the warm *Dis-senters* of *London*, or their Brethren in the *West*, shall think fit to erect an *Inquisition* to extort unwilling Confessions, or to fix a *Test of Orthodoxy* in this Point, by which to try their Ministers, or *Candidates*; it is expected they will do it effectually, I mean, so as to purge themselves from *Tritheism*, as much as from what is called *Arianism*: but this I believe, they can never agree to do; for I am well assured, there are among 'em who, with the late Mr. *How*, (which yet gave 'em no such Disturbance) hold *Father, Son, and Spirit* to be *Three Infinite Minds*, each and all of them supreme God; which Mr. *B----* was so wise as to say nothing to, when I had urged it in my *Humble Inquiry*, and would not transcribe it into his *Answer*.

These agree with their other Brethren in this, That *Father, Son and Spirit* are *Three Persons*; and that *one* only was *incarnate*, and not the other *two*: and if they must not suppose one of the Three to be *inferior* to another, then they judge they must be *co-ordinate* and equal Beings. And this they say makes *delicious Society* in the Deity, and on that account becomes necessary. But at this (which carries such Reproach against the infinite Fulness of the ever-blessed God, and is so like to the *Pagan Polytheism*) the other start back and leave them; being convinced that there
is

is but *one* Infinite God, who is a Spirit : and then they unsay all again, and *Father, Son* and *Spirit* are no longer *Three Persons*, in the proper and usual Sense, and such as they had proved them to be, but rather *Modes* and *Properties*. Since this will not do for the Incarnation ; (for a *Mode* is not a *Divine Nature*, and the one *Divine Nature*, if but one among the *Three*, must have all *Three Modes* :) they become good *Trinitarians* again with the former, when they come to the *Incarnation* ; but are *Sabellians*, when they are upon the *Unity of God* ; which, abating the Use of some harsh Terms, is the same with *Socinians*, who can easily allow the Trinity of one *single Mind*. Thus they are in distracted Confusion : now if they have the Wisdom from above, they will act *without Partiality*, and *without Hypocrisy*, and so will take care to set their Zeal against these *Tritheistick* Errors ; for they cannot, for shame, say, that to hold one *Supreme God*, and another *Subordinate Lord*, is, according to them, so great an Error as to hold *Three Co-ordinate Gods*, tho called *one God*. Let them deal honestly, if they are not treacherous Defenders of the *Divine Unity*, and too willing to part with it, as seems by their Silence, and their Charity in this Point, when all in a flame against the Maintainers of the Subordination in the Blessed Trinity.

And on the other hand, they who are convinced, the Scripture-Trinity of *Father, Son, and Spirit*, are three real *Persons* or *Minds*, (if they do think the Errors of others ought to be discouraged by Censures and Tests, &c.) ought in Conscience to be as severe against their *Sabellian Brethren*, who hold the $\tau\delta\ \delta\mu\omicron\upsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\nu$, in that Sense in which the *Council of Antioch* took it, and condemned it ; and who do indeed destroy, in their Opin-

nion, all Existence of the *Son of God*, before his Conception in the *Virgin Mary*, and leave only a Mode, or abstracted Notion in the room of him. If they please to shew their *own* Weaknesses, and *Dissensions*, this way, they are at liberty; but I believe the Consequences will teach them, that it had been better to *cover them* by Charity and mutual Forbearance; which, I hope, is the Advice that some of *cooler Heads* will give, and that the rest will not be so hot, as not to follow it: else they will be look'd on as void of due Modesty, if they make Outcries, of Impositions and human Inventions, against the Establish'd Church, while so full of 'em *themselves*.

I am no Enemy to *their Body* in general, nor to any one Man of them in particular; nor have I published *this* till I thought their Ease and Liberty secured; that none might think I desired any Obstruction to his Majesty's favourable Intentions towards them, or to *render them Evil for Evil*: for I always wish them their Liberty, but that they should not uncharitably treat others, who can as readily, as they, assent to God's *Mysteries*, but not so readily to those of Mens making. I blame no Man's pious Zeal that can say with *David*, *The Zeal of thy House hath eaten me up*; but I blame that devouring Zeal which is for eating up others: and shall conclude it to be a certain *Maxim*, that they who are forward to impose, will be as forward to persecute; for such have usually too much Pride to bear Contradiction with any Patience. And they who are so busy with their *Negative Discouragements* already, by withdrawing their wonted Relief, are, I doubt, no further off from the Use of the *Positive*, and more terrible ones, than they are from having sufficient Power in their hands to do it.

But

But after all, that Men who *dissent, on Principles of Conscience and Liberty*, and find so much Indulgence, from an Establish'd Church, should yet domineer, and impose on their Brethren with such imperious cruel Severity; and even threaten them too with the Execution of those Laws, against which themselves once made such loud and uneasy Complaints, and which they are scarcely got from under the Terror of, is strangely absurd and disingenuous. *O Thou wicked Servant, I for-* Mat. 18;
gave thee all, because thou desiredst me : Shouldst not 32, 33.
thou also have had Compassion on thy Fellow-Ser-
vant ?





Advertisement.

THE usual way of proving the Three Persons to be the One most High God, is not by shewing the Son and Holy Spirit to be Unoriginate, Independent, absolutely Supreme, &c. as the Father is, and the True God must needs be; but by catching at the Equivocal Term or Word God. And thus they argue :

1. That each of the Three Persons is call'd God, (this is granted of Two, but for the Third, better Proof is desired than ACTS 5. 3, 4.)

2. That there is but One God, (which, in the most perfect and high sense is granted, but in another very common sense of the Term, there are Gods many, according to St. Paul.)

3. That therefore these Three are that same One God; which will not be a good Consequence, unless the Three be call'd God in the same high and exalted sense in which there is but One God alone, i. e. One Independent and absolutely Supreme Being. Else one Person may be God, and another be God, and yet not the same God; altho there be, in the noblest sense of that word, but one God. In short, since there is a sense in which there are Gods many, and a sense of the word God, in which God is but One; the question will be, Whether, in that sense in which
God

Advertisement.

God is said to be but One, any but the Father be said in Scripture to be God, 1 Cor. 8. 6. tho in some sense the Son may be call'd so too.

So for the Term Lord, there is a sense in which there is but One Lord; Mark 12. 29. Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord. And yet the Father and Christ are said presently to be two Lords, Ver. 36. For the Lord said to my Lord, Sit thou at my Right Hand. Now if the God of Israel be but one single Lord, and the Father and Son make two Lords, or a Lord and a Lord; Quære, Whether shall we say, that these Two Lords be both of 'em that True God of Israel, who, as Christ says, is but One Lord; or that only One of these Two Lords is the Lord God of Israel, since he was but One Lord, and not Two Lords: Or shall we yet say, that a Lord speaking, and a Lord spoken to, are not Two Lords, but One Lord---- after the Athanasian Creed?



Faint, illegible text, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side of the page. The text is arranged in several columns and appears to be a formal document or report.

10011102



An Humble

INQUIRY

INTO THE

SCRIPTURE-ACCOUNT

OF

JESUS CHRIST:

OR;

A short Argument concerning his Deity
and *Glory*, according to the G O S P E L.


1 Cor. viii. 5. *To us there is but One God, and he is the Father, of whom are all things; and One Lord, viz. Jesus Christ, through whom are all things.*


Augus. cont. Maxim. l. 3. c. 14.

Nec ego Nicenam Synodum tibi, nec tu Ariminensem mihi, debes objicere. Scripturarum Autoritatibus, &c.

Thou shalt not urge me with the Council of Ariminum, nor I thee with the Council of Nice; but let us decide the Cause by Scripture-Authority.







*A Short Argument, concerning
the Deity of our LORD JESUS
CHRIST.*



THAT the Blessed Jesus has the Title of God ascribed sometimes to him in the Holy Scriptures, is not denied by *Arians* or *Socinians*; but it remains to be examined in what Sense

that Character, as given to him, is intended. Nor is this an unreasonable or needless Inquiry, since it is beyond all reasonable Denial, that the Title of *God* is given in very different Senses in the Scripture.

1. Sometimes it signifies the most High, Perfect and Infinite Being, who is of Himself alone, and owes neither his Being nor Authority, nor any thing to another: and this is what is most commonly intended, when we speak of *God* in ordinary Discourse, and in Prayer and Praise; we mean it of God in the most eminent Sense.

2. At other times it has a lower Sense, and is made the Character of Persons who are invested with subordinate Authority and Power from that Supreme Being. Thus *Angels* are stiled *Gods*, *Psal. 97. 7.* *Psal. 8. 5.* *Thou hast made him a little lower than the Gods*, as 'tis in the Margin: So Magistrates are

Gods, *Exod.* 22. 28. *Pfal.* 82. 1. *John* 10. 34, 35. And sometimes in the singular number, one Person is stiled God, as *Moses* is twice so called, a God to *Aaron*, and afterwards a God to *Pharaoh*: and thus the Devil is called the God of this World, *i. e.* the Prince and mighty Ruler of it; tho by unjust Usurpation, and God's Permission. Now as he who alone is God, in the former Sense, is infinitely above all these; so we find him distinguish'd from all others who are called God, by this Character, *viz.* a God of Gods, or the Chief of all Gods, with whom none of those Gods may be compared. So *Philo* describes him, to be not only the God of Men, but the God of Gods also. This is the highest and most glorious Epithet given him in the Old Testament, when it is design'd to make a most magnificent mention of his peerless Greatness and Glory. Equivalent to this, I take that Title to be, which is so much used in the New Testament, *viz.* the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the God of our Lord Jesus, the Father of Glory. For since Jesus Christ is the Chief of all Subordinate Powers, the Prince of the Kings of the Earth, and far above the greatest Angels; the Lord of Lords, and King of Kings: he who is stiled the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, is therein, in effect, stiled the God of Gods, or above all Gods.

Now the Question to be resolved, is, in which of these two Senses Christ is said to be God in the Holy Scriptures? The bare Character of God determines nothing in this case, because it belongs both to the Supreme and to Subordinate Beings in Power and Authority: But the Question is, Whether Jesus Christ be the God of Gods, or above all Gods?

He is indeed the Lord of Lords; but that notes an Inferior Character, compared with that of God of Gods, as appears by *1 Cor.* 8. 5. tho it be included

Exod. 4.
36.
Ob. 7. 1.

Deut. 10.
17.
Jos. 22.
22.
Pf. 86. 8.
Pf. 135. 5.

Eph. 1. 3,
17.

Rev. 1. 5.

Eph. 1. 21.

included in the Superior ; so that he who is above all Gods, is also over all Lords, but not contrariwise. In short, has Jesus Christ any God over him, who has greater Authority, and greater Ability than himself, or not? This will decide the matter : for if he have a God above him, then is he not the absolutely Supreme God, tho in relation to created Beings, he may be a God (or Ruler) over all.

Nor can we more clearly demonstrate this Point, than by shewing, *First*, That Jesus Christ expressly speaks of another God than himself. *Secondly*, That he owns this God to be above or over himself. *Thirdly*, That he wants those Supereminent and Infinite Perfections, which belong only to the Lord God of Gods. Of these I shall treat in a manner suited to vulgar Capacities ; for I judge it very indecent to speak or write of important Articles (which the common People must believe, and must so far understand) in such a manner as leaves them wholly unintelligible.

First, Our Lord Jesus Christ expressly speaks of another God distinct from himself : Several times we find him saying, *My God*, of another, *Mat. 27. 46. My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me ?* So *John 20. 17.* sure he intended not to say, *My Self, my Self, why hast thou forsaken me ?* This God then was distinct from himself, as he declares in other places : *He shall know my Doctrine,* *John 7. 17 ; whether it be of God, or whether I speak of my self.* So *John 8. 42.* where 'tis to be noted that he does not distinguish himself from him, as the *Father*, but as *God* ; and therefore, in all just Construction, he cannot be supposed to be that self-same God, from whom he distinguishes, and to whom he opposeth himself. How manifestly are the one God and the one Lord distinguished, *1 Cor. 8. 6 ?* And that there may be no just Pretence to

say with *Placens*, that the God and the Lord, or the Cause of which all things are, and the Cause by or through which they are, are but two things said of the same one God; we may see them more clearly distinguish'd, *Eph. 4. 5, 6.* where by the interposing other things between the one Lord, and one God, viz. *one Faith, one Baptism*, it appears evidently that these were not intended as two Characters of the same Being. I think that none who impartially attends to the Scripture-History, can doubt whether God, and his Christ, are not two distinct Beings.

Secondly, Our Lord Jesus owns, not only another than himself to be God; but also that *he is above* or over himself, which is plainly intimated also by his Apostles: Himself loudly proclaims his Subjection to the Father in many Instances; in general, he declares his *Father to be greater than he*: he says, he came not in his *own*, but his *Father's* Name or Authority; that he sought not his own, but God's Glory, nor made his own Will, but God's, his Rule; and in such a Posture of Subjection *he came down from Heaven* into this Earth: so that it should seem, that Nature which did pre-exist, did not possess the Supreme Will, even before it was incarnate. Again, he owns his Dependance upon his God and Father, even for those things which it is pretended belong to him as God, viz. the Power of working Miracles, of raising the Dead, of executing universal Judgment; of all which he says, *Of my own self I can do nothing*. In like manner his Apostles declare his Subjection to another, not only as his Father, but *as his God*; which is emphatically expressed, in calling the most Blessed God, *the God of our Lord Jesus*, after his Humiliation was over, *Eph. 1. 17.* and the *Head of Christ is God*, *1 Cor. 11. 3.* They declare his Headship over the Universe, and

John 14.

28, 50.

Ch. 10. 29.

John 5. 43.

Joh. 6. 38.

John 5.

19, 20.

Ver. 26.

Ver. 27.

Ver. 30.

and the very Foundations of his Claim to Honour and Service, to be owing to the gracious *Gift* of God, *ἐχαρίσθη αὐτῷ*. and yet these are some of the Phil. 2. 9. highest Glories of Jesus Christ.

Let me only add under this Head that great Text, so full of irresistible Evidence for proving an Inferiority in the Son to his Father, or to God, *1 Cor. 15.* from *ver. 24,* to *29.* where the Apostle says several things to this purpose.

1. That all things are to be *put under Christ's Feet*; all Enemies and Powers are to be subdued to him: But adds, that 'tis manifest, *God must be excepted* out of these things that are under him; and that for this Reason, because 'tis he *who did put all under him*. And how comes it to pass, that it is so evident a thing, that another must be supposed to be the great Author of this Triumph of Christ? Why might it not be done by himself independently, if the Supreme God? and then there need have been no Exception of any one *Being* out of the all things under him: But the Apostle knew that Jesus Christ must needs triumph by a Power deriv'd from God, to whom it was most eminently to be ascribed; and then to one who had such Thoughts, it was manifest that there must be one excepted from the all things under him, because he must needs be above Christ, who enables him to subdue all things, or *makes him a God over all*.

2. The Son shall *deliver up his Kingdom to God*, even the *Father*, that is, not to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as some pretend, but to the *Father only*; since it was the Father who *gave him all Power in Hea-* Matth. 28.
ven and Earth, and who made him *King in Zion*: 18.
Into his hands he will make a Surrender of all, in testimony of his having done all in a Subordination to him; and having acted and ruled in Dependance on him, who shall have a satisfactory Account of

all given to him in the end. This is a Glory peculiar to the Father as Supreme.

3. *Then the Son himself shall be subject to him that put all things under him, i. e. to God his Father, that God may be all in all; that is, his Subjection shall be then manifested by an open solemn Acknowledgment of it, when he shall recognize the Supremacy of the Father in that publick Act of Surrender: So that, tho formerly (in the present State) all Judgment and Rule was committed to the Son; yet then it shall be otherwise, and God will more immediately appear in the Government of the future State, which shall not be so much shared probably, between him and the Redeemer, as the present Administration appears to be. This then will be the Issue of all our Disputes; God all in all, and the Son himself subject under him. Can any thing be more expressive of an Inequality between God and Christ?*

But it will be said by some, That by the *Son* here, is meant the Son of Man, or Christ as Man; while as God, he shall not be subjected to the Father.

Resp. As there is no Intimation of any such Distinction between the pretended *two* Natures of the Son here; so there is enough in the Words to shew, that they are spoken of him, under his highest Capacity and Character; insomuch, that Monsieur *Claude* maintains it to be true of the Son of God, as to his (supposed) Divine Nature. But tho there is no need of supposing such a *Nature* (which I think the Text plainly contradicts) yet his Reasons will hold so far, as to prove the Words do speak of Christ, under the highest Character he bears, by the Name of Son: for, *First*, as he says, 'tis not said the *Son of Man*, but the *Son* absolutely, which he thinks in the Scripture-Use is wont to mean more than the Son of Man;

Man; and undoubtedly it imports all that comes under that Title: Nay more, 'tis said, *even the Son himself*, with great Emphasis; *q. d.* as great and glorious as he is with all his Grandeur and Power, he *himself* shall be subject. *Secondly*, His Subjection being opposed to his Reign, both must be understood of the same Subject; be sure the delivering up the Kingdom can only be done by the same to which it was committed, and by which it was managed. Now I shall allow, that only in his Human Nature, Christ could give up his Kingdom; but then 'tis *because* 'tis as Man delegated, and inhabited by God, that he sways and manages this Kingdom; and if this be allowed (as I think it needs must) that the Man Christ is sufficient, by help from God, to manage his Universal Spiritual Kingdom, I see no Reason there will be to oppose those *Unitarians*, who think him to be a sufficient Saviour and Prince, tho he be not the only Supreme God: nor can any, with Reason, attempt to prove him to be such, from his Works and Office as King of his Church, since 'tis implied, that as such he must do Homage to God the Father, in *delivering up his Kingdom to him*. And this very Expression, *to God the Father*, makes it plain, that there is no God the Son, in the same Sense, or in the same Supreme Essence with the Father; because if there were, then he ought not to be excluded from his Glory of having such open Homage paid to him, which is here appropriated to the Father only. And since the Apostle speaks of the same God (whom he explains to be the Father) to the end of this Discourse, and says he shall be *all in all*; how evidently does he shew him to be far beyond all that are *not* God the Father, whatever Character else they bear? So then, Jesus Christ, in his highest Capacity, being inferior to the Father; how

how can he be the same God, to which he is subject, or of the same Rank and Dignity?

Thus it appears that Christ is so God, as to be under a superior God, who has set him over all: And suitable to this, is that Account which the Scripture gives us of the Godhead of the Blessed Jesus, *viz.* Because he is invested with a God-like Authority and Power, from the Supreme God his Father. Thus when he was accused by the captious *Jews*, for assuming the Character of the Son of God (which they perversly would stretch, as tho it imply'd an Equality with God) he explains in what Sense only he justified it, *viz.* as one whom the Father had sanctified, *i. e.* called to a greater Office, and honoured with a higher Commission than those Magistrates, on whom the Scripture so freely bestows the Title of *Gods*.

John 10.
35, 36.

Heb. 1. 8,
9.

So when he is called God, 'tis explained in what Sense, or of what sort of God. 'Tis to be understood, by saying, that *his* God (intimating that he had a God over him) had *anointed him with Oil*, &c. that is, had invested him with Royal Power and Dignity (as Kings were installed in their Office, by anointing with Oil, among the *Jews*) which is an Explication of his Godhead or Dominion: And this is said to be *above all his Fellows*, not sure above the Father and Holy Spirit, (which only are pretended to be his Fellows, as God, by them who understand it of the Supreme Godhead) but above all other subordinate Beings. This is one plain Scripture-Account of his being called God, for these things are spoken to him, and of him, under the Character of God; *O God, thy Throne*, &c. I think Men should be well assured on what Grounds they go, before they assign other Reasons of this Character, so different from the Scripture-Account: Let it

Acts 2. 36. suffice us, that God hath *made him both Lord and Christ*;

Christ; that he has exalted him to be a Prince and Saviour. Ch. 5. 31.

However, our Adversaries will gain nothing by ailedging Texts to prove the Title of God to be given to Christ, since that may be, and yet it will not prove him to be the Supreme Independent God, but only one who is inhabited of, and commissioned and enabled by Him who is so. As to that place, which is corruptly rendred in our Translation, *he thought it no Robbery to be equal with God*; it is confessed by our Adversaries themselves, that it shou'd be read thus, *viz.* that he did not *assume*, or arrogate, or snatch at, or *covet* an Equality with God: the Words are never known to be used in any other Sense, as is shown by Doctor Tillotson in his Discourses against the *Socinians*; also by Dr. *Whitby* in his Exposition on that Place, and others. So that this rather denies than asserts Christ's Equality to God, tho still he was in the *Form of God*, as that notes the outward *Resemblance* of him in his mighty Power and Works, &c. which is the constant meaning of the word *Form* in the New Testament. Philip. 2.6.

But because some think such Perfections are in Scripture ascribed to Christ, as will prove him to be God in the highest Sense, I proceed to shew;

Thirdly, That our Blessed Lord Jesus disclaims those infinite Perfections which belong only to the Supreme *God of Gods*. And 'tis most certain, that if he want one, or any of these Perfections that are essential to the Deity, he is not God in the chief Sense: And if we find him disclaiming the *One*, he cannot challenge the *Other*; for to deny Himself to have all Divine Perfections, or to deny Himself to be the Infinite

nite God, is the same thing. Let us observe some Instances for the Proof of this Point.

1. One great and peculiar Perfection of the Deity, is Absolute, Underived Omnipotence: He who cannot work all Miracles, and do whatever he list of *Himself*, without help from another, can never be the Supreme Being, or God; because he appears to be an *Imperfect* Defective Being, comparatively, since he needs Help, and can receive additional Strength from another than Himself.

Now it is most evident, that' our Lord Jesus (whatever Power he had) confesses again and again, John 5.30. that he had not Infinite Power of Himself; *Of my self I can do nothing.* He had been speaking of great Miracles, *viz.* raising the Dead, and executing all Judgment; but all along takes care, Men shou'd know that his *Sufficiency* for these Things was of God the Father. In the beginning of the Discourse, he says, *The Son can do nothing but what he sees the Father do:* So in the middle, *The Father has given to the Son to have Life in Himself:* and as if he cou'd never too much inculcate this great Truth, he adds towards the Conclusion, *I can do nothing of my self, ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ,* or from nothing that is my *self* do I draw this Power and Authority. Sure this is not the *Voice* of God, but of a Man! For the most High can receive from none; he cannot be made more Mighty or Wise, &c. because to absolute Perfection can be no Addition. And since Power in God, is an Essential Perfection; it follows, that if it be derived, then so is the Essence or Being it self: which is Blasphemy against the most High, for 'tis to *Ungod* Him; to number him among poor dependent derivative Beings; whilst the Supreme God *indeed* is only He who is the *First Cause*, and Absolute Original of all.

Ver. 19.
V. 26, 27.
Rom. 11. 35.

Nay further, our Lord considers himself here, in opposition to his *Father*; who, he says, gave him all Power: Now if he had such an *Eternal Divine Word*, united more nearly to Him than the *Father*; surely he wou'd have owned his Power to be from that *Word* or *Divine Son*.

How comes he to ascribe nothing to that, since 'tis supposed to be equal in Power to the *Father* himself, and more nearly allied to *Jesus Christ*, as the operating Principle in Him? *My Father in me does the Works*; by which, 'tis evident there was no *Divine Agent* in and with Him, but the *Father*; He only has all Power of himself, and needs no Assistance. John 14: 10.

2. Another Infinite Perfection, that must needs be in the Deity, is Supreme Absolute Goodness: *All Nations* have consented to this by the Light of Nature; that *T'αγαθον*, & *Optimus Maximus*, are the Prime Characters of the *Supreme*: as the Orator says, he is One, *quo nec melius, nec majus concipi potest*; the Fullest, and Highest of all that are called *Good*: for indeed all other Good is derived from Him.

Now the Lord *Jesus* expressly disclaims this Character: *Jesus said to him, Why callest thou me Good? there is none Good but one, that is God*; where 'tis most evident that he distinguishes Himself from God, as not the same with Him, and denies of Himself what he affirms of God: And as to that Divine Perfection of Supreme Infinite Goodness, he challenges the Man for presuming to say what seemed to attribute it to Him, and leads him off to Another, who, and who only was more eminently so. Mat. 19: 17.

'Tis astonishing to see what Violence is offered to the Sacred Text, by such as maintain the Equality of *Jesus Christ* to God his *Father*: What a strange fetch is it, to suppose our Lord's
Meaning

An Humble Inquiry into

Meaning to be this? *q. d.* I know, Man, thou dost not take Me for God, as I am; Why then dost thou give Me the Title belonging to Him only? when there is not one word in the Context looking this way: For Christ never challenges the poor Man with this, that he thought too meanly of him (as they suppose) but quite contrary, that he thought or spake too *highly* of him. And verily if the Man's Error lay in this, that he thought too meanly of Christ, whilst his words otherwise were justly enough apply'd to him; I cannot think our Lord would have rebuked him in that manner: for instead of keeping him still to the right Object, and rectifying his Apprehensions about it, which only were wrong, he seems clearly to carry him off to another from *Himself*, as not the right Object, without rectifying his Thoughts of Christ at all; and to what End cou'd Christ reprove him in such a way, as never tells him what was his Fault, rather tempts him to run into another, and leads him out of the way?

It shou'd seem rather (if any such Notion had been then conceiv'd by any) that the Man did think Him to be God: for if he thought Him to be the *Supreme Good*, that was to make Him *God* in his eye; and if he did not intend so much, but only meant it of an *Inferior Good*, how could Christ rebuke him for it, since that was no Fault or Error? And truly they who say Christ's receiving *Worship*, when on Earth, proves his Deity, can hardly give an account why the Man should give, or Christ receive *Worship* from him, as he *did*, Mark 10. 17. if he did not take him for God. However, whatsoever the Man thought, he says what Jesus Christ *thought*, was only proper to be said of God, and
too

too much to be said of himself, as the obvious Sense of his Words declares.

And let me add, that if our Lord Jesus had on purpose left the Matter disguis'd, not willing to discover who he was then; yet 'tis strange that the Evangelists, who many Years after relate the Matter, when it was *necessary* to have it believed that Christ was Supreme God (as it is pretended) that they, I say, should not unriddle the Matter, by inserting some cautious Clause, as that this he said to prove him, or because he knew he denied his Godhead, or the like: For sometimes on less Occasions they enter such Cautions, *John* 6. 6. *Ch.* 21. 23. And yet tho *Three* of the Evangelists relate this Discourse, they all do it the same way, and not one of them says a tittle to direct us to this secret way of Interpretation, but leaves us to the hazard of a most fatal Mistake (even recommended to us by this History;) if Jesus Christ were indeed the Supreme Good in as high a Sense as God his *Father*, which he so apparently here denies, and by that denies himself to be the most High God.

3. I will only add one Perfection more, *viz.* *Absolute Omniscience*, or unlimited Knowledge of all Things, *Past, Present, and to Come.* *Pf.* 147. 5. *His Understanding is Infinite.* So *Isa.* 41. 23. *Acts* 15. 18. *Known to God are all his Works from the Beginning.*

Now, 'tis plain our Lord Jesus Christ had not this Infinite Knowledge, particularly not of *future Things*, such as the Day of Judgment. *Mark* 13. 32. Says he, *Of that Day knows no Man, no, not the Angels in Heaven, nor the Son, but the Father only.* Here the *Son* professes his Knowledge to be *limited*, and inferiour to the *Father's*,

ther's, *i. e.* the *Son* of the *Father*, or *Son* of *God*; the *Son* as *above* Angels in Knowledge, the *Son* in the most *Eminent* Sense. Now how is it possible the *Son* can be *God* Infinite, and yet have but a finite Understanding? or can he be equal in Knowledge to the *Father*, and yet not know as much as the *Father*? And be sure if he was not an Infinite *God*, when on *Earth*, he cannot be such afterwards. Thus we have seen *Christ* himself, with his own Mouth *disclaiming* Infinite Original Power, Goodness and Knowledge to belong to Him, but he attributes them to his *Father only*, as another, distinct from himself, from whom he derived of each in a dependent limited manner.

What can be said against these plain Arguments? I imagine our Opposers have but one *Shift* left for the evading them, and that is a Distinction which serves 'em in all Cases; for they say, *Jesus Christ* speaks these Things of Himself, as *Man only*, while he had another Nature as *God*, which he reserved, and excepted out of the Case: So that when he says, *I cannot* do thus my self, or I am not to be called the *Chief Good*, or do not know this, &c. according to *them*, the meaning is, I have not these Perfections in my *human Nature*; but yet I know, and can do all unassisted, and am the chief Good in my *Divine Nature*, which also is more properly my self. The Vanity of which Subterfuge I intend now to lay open, by shewing how absurdly this Distinction of the *two Natures* is pretended, to take off the Force of such Expressions from *Christ's* own Mouth, which in their natural and undisguised appearance do proclaim his Inferiority to *God*, even the *Father*. And I shall dwell the more upon this, because

because 'tis the most popular and common Evasion, and comes in at every turn, when all other Relief fails.

It would be no unreasonable Demand, to ask, what Intimation of any such *Distinction* of two Natures they can point us to, in any of these Discourses of Christ? Why should Men devise or imagine for him, such a strange, and seemingly deceitful way of speaking, from no Ground, nor Necessity, other than that of upholding their own precarious Opinion? But I have several Remarks to make upon this common Answer.

That which in the *First* place I have to object against it is, That our blessed Lord Jesus Christ, if *Himself* was the Supreme God in any Nature of his *own*, cou'd not have said such things, as I conceive, in any consistency with Truth and Sincerity, (which he always maintained strictly) he cou'd not say *Himself* cou'd not do, or did not know the Thing, which all this while *Himself* cou'd do, and did know very well, as before if he was the Supreme God, he cou'd and did; for this were to make him say what is most false, and to *equivocate* in the most deceitful manner: for tho we shou'd suppose he consisted of two infinitely distant Natures, and so had two Capacities of Knowledge, &c. yet since *Himself* includes them both; it follows, that the denying a Thing of *Himself* in absolute Terms, without any Limitation in the words, or other obvious Circumstances, does plainly imply a denial of its belonging to any part of his Person, or to any Nature in it. For tho we may affirm a Thing of a Person, which belongs *only* to a part of him; as I may properly say a Man is wounded or hurt, tho it be only in one Member, suppose an Arm:

yet I cannot justly deny a Thing of him which belongs only to one part, because it belongs not to another; as I cannot say a Man is not wounded, because tho' one Arm be shot or wounded, yet the other is whole.

For instance, I have two Organs of Sight, *two Eyes*. Now suppose I converse with a Man with one Eye shut and the other open; if being asked whether I saw him, I shou'd dare to say I saw him not (without any limitation) meaning to my self, that I saw him not with the Eye which was shut, tho' still I saw him well enough with the Eye which was open; I fear I shou'd bear the Reproach of a Lyar and *Deceiver*, notwithstanding such a mental Reservation as some would attribute to the *Holy Jesus*. For Knowledge is the *Eye* of the Person; Jesus Christ is supposed to have two of these knowing Capacities; the *one* weak, the *other* strong and piercing, that discerns all Things. Now as *such* an one, the Disciples repair to him, and Mat. 24. 3. ask him, when the end of the World and time of his Coming shall be? He answers them, by giving them some general Account of the Matter, but says that the particular *Day and Hour* he knew not, nor did any know but the Father, *meaning* (say my Opposers) that he knew it not with his *Human* Knowledge, tho' he knew it well enough with his *Divine*, at the same time that he said, *the Son knows it not*, absolutely and indefinitely.

And yet if Jesus Christ had a *Divine* Knowledge and Nature, no doubt his Disciples (who, if any body, must be supposed to believe it) directed the Question to that, rather than to the imperfect human Capacity; and yet in answer to it, he says, he *knew not the Day*, which wou'd not be counted Sincerity or Truth in Men,

Men, much less was Jesus Christ in danger of it, in his Mouth *no Guile was*; let us not impute it to him.

That you may see this is fair Reasoning, hear how some of the other side own it, when out of the heat of this Controversy. See Dr. *Stillingsfleet's* Sermon on *Mat. 10. 16.* speaking of the Equivocations of Popish Priests, whose common Answer, when examined about what they have known by Confession, is that they *know it not*, which they think to vindicate from the charge of lying; by saying, that *in Confession, the Priest knows Matters as God, not as Man, and therefore he denies to know them, meaning it as Man.* But says the Doctor, this is absurd; because to say he does not know, is as much as to say he doth not *any way know.* Now if this be a good Answer against the *Papists*, as no doubt it is; then 'tis so in the present Case. Therefore when Christ says, he knows not the Day of Judgment, 'tis as much as to say he does not *any way know* it; and consequently, 'tis a vain Shift to say, it was as Man only: we must beware lest we bring the Holy Jesus under such a reproach for Equivocation, as the Romish Priests lie under; and make the *Jesuits* themselves think they have a good Title to that *Name*, by imitating herein his Example, which in this very instance they challenge with so great Advantage, according to this Interpretation.

2. As a farther Evidence, that Jesus Christ intended no such Distinction of two Natures, as is pretended; 'tis to be observed, that he puts not the *distinction*, or opposition between the Son of *Man*, and the *Eternal Word* (as some speak) but between the *Son* and his *Father*: *Not* Mark 13.
the Son knows, but only the Father; by which 'tis 32.
plain, he had no thought of including any Per-

son or Nature of his own among the excepted : for whatever was not the *Father*, he says, was ignorant of that Day. Now 'tis certain, that in *no Nature* was the Son the Father ; and consequently where *None* but the Father knows, none who is *not* the Father, can be intended : and since our Lord was making an exception in the Case, he wou'd not have forgotten to except the *Eternal Word* too, if there had been such a Divine Principle in himself, *equal* to the Father and distinct from him ; for 'tis a known *Rule*, that an Exception from a general Assertion, confirms it as to other Instances not excepted.

Will they say, that by the *Father* is meant all Three Persons here, *viz.* Father, Son, and Holy Ghost ? What ! can the *Father* as opposed to the Son, be put for the Father and the Son ? What woful work will this make with Scripture, to suppose that what are opposed to each other, do include each other, under the very Characters by which they are opposed ? As well may they say that in the Baptifimal Form, by the *Father* is meant, Father, Son, and Spirit, tho he be distinguished from the other two. And I shou'd despair of ever understanding the Scriptures above all Books that ever were written, at this rate of Interpretation. No doubt therefore, but the *Father* as opposed to the Son, excludes all that is the Son ; and then there cou'd be no Son of God that knew of that Day which only the *Father* knew of, and consequently no Son that is God *equal* to the Father.

3. Moreover, That Interpretation must needs be unjust, which if admitted, will make all, even the most plain Speech, *uncertain*, and utterly insignificant ; as this Interpretation of Christ's words wou'd do. For as I ask the *Patrons* of this Opinion, in what words Jesus Christ cou'd

in brief have denied himself to be God most High, if he had a mind to do it, more plain and full than these? in which he says, he knew not all things as the Father did, nor cou'd do all things, &c. So I wou'd fain have them shew me, what Words of that nature he cou'd have used, which the *same way* of Interpretation, as they here use, will not *evade* and make insignificant. For had he said, or *sworn* in plain words thus, *viz.* *I tell you I am not the Supreme God,* and none but my Father has that Glory; they wou'd upon the *same Reason* still have said, This was to be understood of him as *Man* only. So that no words professing himself *not* to be God, cou'd be a proof of it, if this way of Interpretation be allowed. I may therefore safely say thus much, that the Blessed Jesus has declared himself *not* to be the Supreme God, or equal to the *Father*, as plainly as words cou'd speak, or in brief express; and that this Declaration made by him already, is not to be evaded any *other way*, than what will make it impossible his Mind shou'd be understood by any words he cou'd have designedly used in the matter. Let any one try if this do not hold true: and sure it must be an absurd way of Interpretation, which leaves a Man no Opportunity or Power of speaking his Meaning *plainly*, so as to be understood.

4. Again, this way of Interpretation, which the Advocates of the Opinion I oppose, are so much necessitated to for upholding their Cause, does plainly overthrow it again, and may be turned against themselves: for if it be just and true to deny of Christ absolutely what belongs to him in one Nature, because there is another Nature in which it belongs not to him; *then*, since to be the chief God belongs to him (ac-

ording to our Adversaries) only in *one Nature*; and not in respect of the other, or human Nature, it follows that it may as justly be said Jesus Christ is not God, nor to be *worshipped* or trusted as such; nay, that he was not before the *Virgin Mary*, according to them, and the like; and this without adding any limitation or restriction, any more than our Lord does in the place mentioned.

What wou'd they say to one who shou'd speak or preach so, *That Jesus is not God*, that he cannot do all things, nor is equal to the Father, &c? Wou'd they not conclude he was a Denier of the Deity of Christ, else he wou'd never speak so unguarded? Upon the *same* account, when Jesus Christ himself says, that he cannot of *himself* do all things, nor knows all things, and makes no reserves in his words, we may conclude he also *denies* his being Supreme God; *else*, if it be a just way of speaking in him, it cannot be unjust in us to imitate him, by denying him indefinitely to be, what he in any one Nature is not, *i. e.* that he is *not God*, without adding more.

Nay, after this way of Speaking which they attribute to Christ, a Man may be taught to say his Creed *backward*, and yet make a true Profession of his Faith, by denying of Jesus Christ in absolute Expressions, whatever may be denied of one of his Natures. Thus since the *Apostles Creed* takes notice of nothing to be believed concerning Christ, but what belongs to his *Manhood* (which is strange, if there were any Articles relating to his Supreme Deity, which must be most important) one may venture to deny them all, with this *secret* unexpressed Reserve, *viz.* meaning it of the Divine Nature (to which they belong not.) So that one may say, I believe not that
Jesus

Jesus Christ was Conceived of the *Holy Ghost*, or *Born* of the *Virgin Mary*; I believe that he never was Crucified under *Pontius Pilate*, nor was Dead or Buried; that he never *Rose* nor Ascended, nor will *Return* visibly again: for his Divine Nature (which 'tis pretended he had) was not capable of these Things. And since they say, the Personality is Divine, here seems more warrant to be bolder in denying indefinitely of the Person what belongs not to the Divine Nature, whose the *Personality* is, than in so denying of the Person what only belongs not to the human Nature; as this Interpretation makes Christ to do.

5. Finally, it weighs something with me, in opposition to this way of Interpretation, that the Evangelists never take any occasion (when they had so many) to subjoin any *Caution* against taking Christ's Words in their obvious Sense, when he says, *He did not know the Hour*, &c. and the like. If, as we said, our Lord had no mind to reveal his Divinity (tho I see not still why he shou'd deny it thus) yet sure his Apostles who wrote so many Years after, whom it concerned to reveal all important Truths most clearly, wou'd not fail to have set the Reader right, by removing such obvious Objections as these are against the Supreme Deity of Christ; and saying, he spake this only in respect of his *Manhood*, *that he knew not all things*, &c. But here is not one *Caution* given, as often we find John 2.21.
Ch. 11.12. there was about less Matters. No doubt it was because they wou'd have the thing understood as it fairly lies, not thinking of any such secret Reserve in Christ, of a *Divine Nature* in his Person, to be tacitly excepted, when he had denied such Perfections of his Person indefinitely.

Thus it remains good, that Jesus Christ disclaims infinite Perfections to belong to him as to the Father; and therefore that he is not the same infinite God with him, if we can believe his own Words. But before I conclude this Argument, I shall endeavour to answer what our Opposers offer on the *contrary* side: they say there is abundant Evidence from other Scriptures, that Jesus Christ has those Perfections in him, which I have shewed in the forementioned places he denies of himself. These they lay in *Ballance* to the other; and since both sides cannot be proved, it must be examined, which ought to yield. Particularly they say, *Omniscience* is ascribed to Jesus Christ, even such as is peculiar to the Supreme God; and since this indeed is that infinite Perfection which they seem to alledge the most plausible Testimonies for its belonging to him, therefore I chuse to single out this in particular. I think I have made good the *Negative* already from his own Mouth, that he did not know all things: Nor can any thing of equal Evidence and Force be produced for the Affirmative, as will appear upon considerate Examination.

The Instances usually alledged to prove the infinite *Omniscience* of Jesus Christ, are either, 1. Such as speak of his knowing *all* things in general; or, 2. Of his knowing Mens Thoughts and *Hearts* in particular. To both which I reply;

First, 'Tis objected, that the Disciples ascribe to him the Knowledge of all things, as *John* 16. 30. *Ch.* 21. 17. *Thou knowest all Things.* I answer, That as those Expressions are words of Admiration from the Disciples *not yet inspired*; so they are intended only to express a very great and comprehensive Knowledge, far from Infinite Divine *Omniscience*: as appears,

1. By Christ's own words; he knew not what the Father knew, *viz.* the particular Time of the Day of Judgment.

2. In that it was common to ascribe all Knowledge to Men of extraordinary Wisdom, especially when any intended to commend them highly, and were affected with Wonder; for Admiration and Praise naturally inclines to run out into *Hyperboles*. Thus the Woman of *Te-koah*, under a surprizing wonder of *David's* Sagacity, cries out: *My Lord knows all things on Earth, and is as wise as an Angel.* 2 Sam. 14. And the Apostle in commendation of some Christians says, *They know all things.* And yet 'tis plain such Encomiums must have their limitations. 1 John 2. 20, 27. And indeed the *Jews* seem to have thought their Prophets knew, in a manner, *all Things*: Thus when a Woman of ill Fame anointed our Lord's Head, the Pharisee says of him, *If this Man were a Prophet, he would know what manner of Woman this is.* Luk. 7.39. And when the Woman of *Samaria* found that he told her of all her secret Acts that ever she did, she concludes thus, *Sir, I perceive thou art a Prophet.* 'Tis no wonder then if the Disciples speak thus of him, *Thou knowest all things,* without esteeming him more than the greatest of Prophets. John 4.19.

3. 'Tis evident they never intended more, by attributing *all Knowledge* to him, from their own words in one of the Texts mentioned, *John 16. 30.* where the Disciples tell us, how much they inferred from his great Knowledge (which they describe and extol, by saying, *Thou knowest all things*) not that he was God, but one sent of God, *By this we believe that thou camest forth from God: Not that thou thy self art that God.* So that by these large Expressions, they only intend to attribute to him what a created Being is,

is, by Divine Assistance, capable of: and therefore 'tis Violence to their words, to infer from them, that Jesus Christ is *God*, when themselves infer no such thing, who best knew their own meaning.

And yet if it were granted that our Lord Jesus knows all things, *i. e.* which actually are; yet if he knows not all *Futurities* too, which himself denies, he comes short of infinite Omniscience. For ought I know, a finite Being may have a Knowledge commensurate to this poor Earth, which is but *a dust of the Ballance*; and yet not know all God's secret Purposes, or the Seasons which the Father keeps in his own hand, *Acts* 1. 7.

2. 'Tis objected, That the Knowledge of the Heart is ascribed to Christ, *John* 2. 25. *Mat.* 9. 9. but especially *Rev.* 2. 23. And this they say is what belongs to God only, as *Solomon* judges, *1 Kings* 8. 39. and God claims it as his eminent Glory, *Jer.* 17. 10. and yet *Jesus Christ* says, *I am he who searches the Heart*; therefore say they, surely he must be that God, *who only knows the Hearts of all the Children of Men*. I take this to be the strongest instance that can be produced from the Sacred Text, for proving any Infinite Divine Perfections to belong to the Lord Jesus Christ, and it shall be seriously considered.

In answer hereto, I shall shew *Two* things. 1. In what Sense, the searching and knowing the Heart is made peculiar to God, and incommunicable to others, by those Texts. 2. That notwithstanding it be peculiar to him in some Sense, yet these Acts may in another Sense be justly attributed to another, and performed by him who is not the most High God.

1. As to the former, tho *Solomon* says, *Thou, Lord, only knowest the Hearts of all Men*; yet
what

what if I say, 'tis no wonder that *Solomon* shou'd not know of any other to whom that Excellency was communicated, since this *Mystery* of the unsearchable Riches and Fulness of Christ, and of God's being *manifest* in his Flesh, and his high Exaltation of him, was hidden in the Ages past, and only manifested in the times of the Gospel: for 'tis in these latter times that our Lord Jesus has obtained his great Authority and Dignity, for which he has received answerable Abilities. Yet I add, such Expressions in Scripture, appropriating some Perfections to God, do only import that God has *no Equal* herein, or that there is an *Eminent* Sense only in which such Perfections are peculiar to God, and incommunicable to all others; tho still in a lower Sense something of them may be communicated by him to others. And this shall be seen to be no forced Supposition, but according to the current strain of plain Scripture, in a multitude of Instances. Thus 'tis said, that *God only is Wise*, Rom. 16. 27. 1 Tim. 1. 17. So Ch. 6. 16. *God only has Immortality*. So thou *only* art *Holy*, Rev. 15. 4. And yet there are Wise and Holy Men, and immortal Holy Angels and Spirits. But the meaning of those appropriate Expressions is, that the Blessed God is Wise, and Holy, and Immortal, in a more excellent Way and higher Sense than all others, and in which Sense others cannot be so. So when 'tis said, God only knows the Hearts of Men, it must be interpreted the same way, *viz.* That there is none can know the Heart as God does, so universally, so immediately and independently; and yet 'tis no contradiction, to say that he enables another to do it, in great measure, under him. And as he would argue but very weakly, who shou'd go about to prove an Angel to be God,
from

from this, that he is called Holy and Wise, &c. which are said to belong to God only: even so in the same manner must they argue, who would prove Jesus Christ to be the Supreme God, from his knowing Mens Hearts, because 'tis said to belong to God only; except they can shew that Jesus Christ knows in the same excellent independent Manner, and Degree as his Father, and that he is no more beholden to him for Ability and Assistance, than he is to his Son *Jesus Christ*. So I might argue from *Isa.* 46. 9. that God only knows *Futurities*, and yet how often have the Prophets foretold them from him?

And 'tis not hard to suppose, that as Holiness and Wisdom, so to know the Thoughts and Hearts of Men, hath been communicated to Prophets and Apostles. Was there not something of this, if not in the Prophet *Elisha's* telling the secret Counsels of the *Syrian King*, *2 Kings* 6. 12. yet at least in the *Spirit of discerning* mentioned *1 Cor.* 12. 10. and in the Case of *Ananias* and *Saphira*? I grant this was by Divine Assistance of the Spirit of God, and by Revelation: Neither is our Lord *Jesus Christ* ashamed to own that his Knowledge is sometimes owing to *Revelation from God his Father*, *Rev.* 1. 1. If any should ask, how Jesus Christ comes to know all that he reveals in those seven Epistles to the seven Churches, &c. the very first Words of that Book of the Revelations may be an Answer; *It was the Revelation which God gave to Jesus Christ*, &c. No wonder then that he says, he knows their Works, their Hearts, and their approaching Judgments and Tryals, when his own vast Abilities are assisted by God's Revelation.

But it will be said, that his *searching the Heart*, imports it to be his own Act. *Answer*; So it may very well be; for whatever a Man knows, he

he knows it by his own Act. And why may not the *Mind* search, and yet be under the Light of Revelation, and the Influence of superior Assistance? But yet after all, these Words of searching the Heart, are only an Expression that denotes the *Accuracy* of his Knowledge, not the *Manner* of attaining to it; for taken *properly*, as apply'd to God, 'tis dishonourable to say, he is put to make a *search*, since all things are naked and open to his view. And if they must be taken *strictly* and *properly*, as apply'd to Christ, then they belong not to him in the *same* Sense as they do to God, and so can be no Argument of his being that God. Which leads me to shew,

Secondly, That there's no Absurdity in attributing *this* Knowledge of the Heart to *Jesus Christ*, tho he be not the Most High God. That he knows things with some Limitation as to the *Degree*, and in dependence on his Father as to the *Manner*, appears by what has been said already. And therefore the Knowledge of the Heart attributed to him, must be such as is consistent with his Subordination to the Father's *greater* Knowledge.

'Tis pleaded, That 'tis not possible for a *Finite* Being to have such universal Knowledge of the Hearts and Ways of Men, as is ascribed to Jesus Christ, and which as *Head* and Ruler of the Church and World, he ought to have, and therefore he is infinite God.

Answer; I am pretty sure it can never be demonstrated, that it exceeds a finite Capacity to know the Concerns of all on this Earth, when the enlarged Understanding is assisted in the highest manner by Divine Influence and Revelation. The Reason is, because the *Object* is finite; and I challenge any Man to shew me how it can be impossible for a finite Capacity to comprehend a
finite

finite Object, as this World is, and would be, tho it were ten thousand times greater than it is? I am satisfy'd this can never be demonstrated to imply any Contradiction in it; and that all such Imaginations concerning it, proceed chiefly from too high a Conceit of Man, and too low Apprehension of the infinite God; as if the distance between these two were so small, that there could not be one made of a Capacity so much above Men, as to be commensurate to them all, but presently he must be the Most High God: as tho that Supreme Being could not produce one who should be a thousand times beyond all this Earth and its Inhabitants, and yet it be infinitely below himself. Methinks, if the *Sun* was but an intelligent Creature, and could diffuse his intellectual Influences as he does his natural, could but see and understand with his Beams and secret Influences, 'tis easy to imagine what a penetrating and comprehensive Knowledge he might have: but we may entertain much greater thoughts of the *Sun of Righteousness, Jesus Christ*.

And I conceive a strong Argument to prove Jesus Christ as Man, capable of such deep and extensive Knowledge, may be drawn from the Offices of Dignity and Power conferred on him by God: For God has given to him to be Head over all things. He has given or committed to him all Judgment; and that as the Son of Man. In short, his Kingly Office, by which he rules over all the World; and takes special Care of all his Members, as it necessarily supposes his Knowledge of the whole Estate of his Church and every Member of it, as far as is necessary for the Discharge of that Trust; so I think it undeniably proves this large Knowledge to be exercised by him as *Man*, however he gains it.

For, since this Office and Power is given, it cannot *terminate* in the Divine Nature; for who can *give* to God any Dignity or Power, who has all *originally* in his own Being? it must then be given to the *Man*, or Human Nature only: And if the Man Christ Jesus sustains this Office, and be invested with this Kingly Power, even with all Power in Heaven and Earth; then *as Man* we cannot deny him to be suitably qualified for it with all requisite Abilities, lest we reproach *God*, as calling one to an Employment, who is not fitted for it, or *Himself* in assuming a Trust which he is not able to discharge. Besides, unless his Human Nature can execute this Power, it cannot be said to be given to it; for a Power which cannot be exerted, or is impossible to be executed, is not given nor received, any more than a Commission, or Grant to a Stock or a Tree, to bear Rule, not over the other Trees, (as in *Jotham's* Apologue) but over a Nation, or to command an Army: 'Tis no Gift at all, if this were the Case, that the *Man* Christ Jesus be utterly incapable of the Office and Government lodged in him.

If it be said, That tho the Office and delegated Authority be committed to the Human, yet 'tis only executed by the Divine Nature in Christ: I answer, 'Tis most unreasonable to suppose this *Trust* committed to the Man Christ, who must at last *deliver* it up; and yet the Management of 1 Cor. 15. it belong only to another Being. How can he be 24. commended for being *faithful over the House of* Heb. 3. 2. *God, to him who appointed or constituted him,* when 6. 'tis not expected he should execute his Office? I grant indeed that his *Kingly Office* is executed by the Assistance of God, as he exerts his divine Power and Wisdom, through the Human Nature of Christ, and communicates of them in *all Fulness* to him, in whom it dwells: But to say, that the
 Man

Man Christ does not exercise his Kingly Universal Power, but that his Divine Nature (supposing it) does solely and immediately execute the Office given to him as *Man* or Mediator (for to God can nothing be given) is in my Mind a most gross Absurdity: for 'tis to say, That God officiates for Man, in execution of a *delegated* or subordinate Authority; or that he acts under the Authority and in the Name of a Creature, which is not meet to be said of the Supreme God. *It remains* therefore, That as Christ's universal Kingdom and Headship, is by Gift from God (of which only the Man Christ is the Receiver) committed as a *Trust* to him, so he certainly wants no Ability to execute that Trust in the *Nature* entrusted with it; I say, no Ability, whether of Power or Knowledge, sufficient to render him a careful, vigorous, and every way most effectual *Head* of his Body, and Ruler of the World: and to deny this, is to rob him of his greatest Glory.

Besides, what Benefit or *Gift* is it to the Man Christ, that the Divine Nature should execute a Power which it *always* had, and could exercise without any Gift to him? What Reward, or what Addition was this to him?

Another *Argument* may be drawn from that comfortable Ground of Confidence in a *Christian's* Address to God, which the Scripture lays down, *viz.* The sympathizing Compassion of our Lord Jesus Christ towards his distressed Servants, arising from his own Sufferings when on Earth: *Seeing we have not an High Priest, who cannot be touched with the feeling of our Infirmities, but was in all points tempted as we are; let us therefore come boldly to the Throne of Grace.* Christ's having been try'd with Sufferings, makes him a more compassionate earnest Advocate for us; and this is our Comfort.

Heb. 4.
15, 16.

Now 'tis certain, this Compassion arising from his own Experience of Trouble, can belong to none but his Human Nature; the Divine Nature is compassionate, but not for this Reason, *because* it was tempted, or grieved with Misery: No, it was only the Man Christ suffered, and consequently feels a *Sympathy* from hence with his distressed Servants. And 'tis most certain, that if he sympathizes with them in their Troubles, he must then know them in *that Nature*, which only has a *Fellow-feeling* of them; for none can sympathize with the Miseries of others which he knows not of: So that they who deny Christ's Human Nature to be capable of the knowledge of all our Miseries, do in effect deny him to be such a *Compassionate* Advocate as the Scripture represents him, and rob us of this strong Ground of Consolation and Hope in our Approaches to God, which the *Apostle* would have us to build on.

And this Doctrine has been so far from appearing either impossible or *absurd* to the Reason of Mankind, that I might produce the Consent of a very great number of learned Men, even among them who oppose my other Opinions. The *Lutherans* allow the Man Christ a sort of universal Knowledge, as well as universal Presence, which they plead for. The School-men, both *Thomists* and *Scotists*, allow him universal Knowledge, tho they differ in their way of explaining it.

And there was a time in the Sixth Century; when in the Christian Church some were branded with *Heresy*, under the name of *Agnoeta*, who held Christ was ignorant of any thing, which I conceive must have been in relation to his *Human Nature*; for those Persons owned him to have a *Divine Nature*, and 'tis hard to imagine they could attribute Ignorance to that. But (waving that Matter which is disputed) it is
D
enough

enough for my purpose, *viz.* to prove what Sense the Christian Church then had of Christ's *extensive* Knowledge, as *Man*; that they who wrote against those *Hereticks*, do expressly deny any Ignorance in Christ as *Man*; for this we may produce *two* famous *Patriarchs* of the Christian Church at that time, *viz.* *Eulogius* of *Alexandria*, and *Gregory* of *Rome*: Those *Hereticks* produc'd for their Opinion, Christ's Words, That he knew not the Time of the last Judgment, as an Instance of his Ignorance. To this the *former* Person says, That he was not ignorant of it, *not as Man, and much less as God*. The *latter* says, *In Natura quidem humanitatis novisse, sed non ex Naturâ humanitatis*. He knew it with the Human Nature, but that Knowledge did not rise from the Humanity; which is what I maintain as to the Knowledge I attribute to him, but not extending it so far as to all *Futurities*, which they did.

And I find not a few of the *Modern Reformed Divines*, who (when out of this Dispute) speak agreeably to this, and are far from thinking it Idolatry, to ascribe as much Knowledge as I have done, to the *Man* Christ. Thus the Reverend *Mr. Baxter*, in his Notes on — *Eph. 4. 16.* plainly intimates, that he conceives an *Angel* might be made capable of ruling the *Universal* Church on Earth by Legislation, Judgment, and Execution: For having said this Task was impossible to any Power but *Divine*, he corrects himself by adding, *or Angelical at least*: and sure the *Man* Christ's Ability is far superior to Angels; besides that he has them ministering to him, and giving him notice of matters if there be any occasion; for he has seven principal Spirits, who are the *Eyes of the Lamb sent forth through all the Earth*, as the *same* Author interprets. *Rev. 5. 6.*

So the Author of the little Book, called, *The Future State*, the same who wrote the *Good Samaritan*, a worthy Divine of the Church of *England*, says many things very rational concerning the large extent of Christ's Human Knowledge; that probably, *He can as easy inspect the whole Globe of this Earth, and the Heavens that compass it, as we can view a Globe of an Inch Diameter*: P. 46, 47. *That he intercedes as Man; and can he intercede in a case which he knows not?* So again, P. 150. The like says *Limborch* in his *Theol. Christ* lib. 5. c. 18.

Let me add only the Testimony of *Dr. Thomas Goodwin*, who was never I suppose censur'd for an *Idolater* among *Dissenters*; and yet 'tis scarce possible that I should attribute greater Knowledge to the *Man* Jesus Christ than he. See his *Select Cases*, Part III. where he says, *The Human Understanding of Christ takes in all Occurrences which concerns his Church. And that as he said, All Power in Heaven and Earth his given me of my Father; so might he say, All Knowledge in Heaven and Earth is given me, that is Beams pierce into every corner, that he knows the Sore of every Heart*: And concludes with these remarkable Words, *That as a Looking-Glass wrought in the form of a Globe, represents the Images of all that is in the Room, so the enlarged Human Understanding of Christ takes in all things in Heaven and Earth at once.* It seems these Men did not take it to be the peculiar Perfection of the Divine Nature to know the *Hearts*; so as that no Creature could parrake of it by Divine Assistance and Revelation.

Indeed, as to the Manner of knowing the Heart, we cannot tell how the Inhabitants of the other World have access to our Minds, or to each others; but without doubt, *Jesus Christ*, whose Eyes are as a *Flame of Fire*, has more proper Abilities for Penetration, as well as more

Revelation from God, and more Capacity for receiving and treasuring it up, than all others. In short, 'tis evident, Christ as *Man* is the Great Administrator of God's providential Kingdom; as *Man* he must judge the whole World, which implies vast and universal Knowledge. Who then dares say, that the *Man* Christ Jesus has not a Knowledge as large as this narrow Earth, or as the Sand by the Sea-shore, without any *Hyperbole*? I think 'tis beyond all reasonable doubt: and as this Doctrine has appear'd rational enough, and escaped all Censure, as far as I know, when delivered by others than the *Unitarians*; so I hope it must not be counted *Heretical* in them, for which others never forfeited the glorious Title of *Orthodox*.

Thus it appears, That all which is said of Christ's extensive Knowledge in Scripture, is far from proving him to be the Supreme *Infinite God*; it may be accounted for *otherwise* very fairly: And the like may be also said with respect to other (which some call) *Divine Perfections* attributed to him, that they are no more *truly* infinite, as attributed to him, than this of Knowledge, but that there are plain Evidences of their being attributed to him in a *limited* and inferior Sense, in comparison of what they are, in the most Glorious *God over all Gods*; and therefore Men had need produce other sort of Arguments for the Supreme *Deity* of Christ, than from these *Topicks*.

Nor do I doubt but I could maintain my Cause with equal Advantage, upon the Head of *Divine Worship*, which is another *Topick*, whence my Opposers would infer the *Deity* of the Lord Jesus Christ: it were easy to shew, there is no *Instance* of supreme *Divine Worship* given *ultimately* to him in Scripture, but on the *contrary*, that all
the

the Honour it assigns to him is such as speaks him to be inferior to the Father, and dependent on him; since it is wholly grounded upon what God his Father has graciously *bestowed* on him. Thus he requires *Baptism* (if that be an Act of immediate proper Worship) *in his Name*, because *all Power* in Heaven and Earth was *given to him*. Thus we must honour the *Son* as (truly, not as greatly as) we honour the *Father*; because the *Father hath committed, or given, all Judgment to him*. Thus at the *Name of Jesus must every Knee bow, and every Tongue confess him to be Lord*; because as a Reward of his Obedience, the *Father hath given him a Name above every Name*: And 'tis added, that all this Homage is ultimately to the *Glory of the Father*. Worship which is thus grounded upon *derived* and borrowed Excellency, is not supremely Divine, and cannot be offered to the Infinite, Self-originate, Independent *Deity*, without a great Affront, because 'tis not the most Excellent, *Mal. 1. 14.* To praise an independent God for Honour and Power granted to him by *another*, supposes a Falshood, and mingles Reproaches with Praise.

John 5.
22, 23.
Phil. 2.10,
11.

So that however there may be the same common *external* Acts or Words (such as bowing the Knee, and saying *Glory and Praise, &c.*) used to God and the *Mediator*; as also in some Instances, they are given in common to *ordinary* Men; yet the Mind of a rational Worshipper will make a Distinction in his inward *Intention*, as no doubt but those devout *Jews* did, who in the same Act *bowed their Heads, and worshipped both God and the King*. But I shall not pursue this any farther at present.

1 Chron.
29. 20.

Moreover, I judge, that to assert Jesus Christ to be the *Supreme* God, subverts the Gospel-Doctrine of his *Mediation*; for if I must have one

who is *supreme God and Man*, for my Mediator with God, then, when I address to Jesus Christ as the Supreme God, where is the *God-Man* that must be my Mediator with him? To say he mediates with *himself*, is the same as to say, that I must go to him without a Mediator, and turns the whole Business of Mediation into a *Metaphor*, contrary to the common Sense of things, as well as against the *Scripture*; and I would gladly know what is the Notion of going to God without a Mediator, if this be all, that he mediates with himself? Who ever doubted the Exercise of his own *Wisdom or Mercy*, that these do in a sort plead in him? But sure the Scriptures speak of a Mediator without him, when they set forth Jesus Christ as such; and who is this *Mediator*, when we go to Jesus Christ as the *ultimate Object*? If it be said *his Human Nature only* acts in this Mediation, tho' as united to the *Divine*; I answer, That as this is still to make *Christ* Mediator with *himself*, so the Human Nature is not *God-Man*; and if the Man, or Human Nature *alone*, be capable of doing the part of a Mediator, then 'tis not necessary that *Jesus Christ* should be more than a *Man* inhabited by, and related to God, in order to that Office. Nor may it be said, that the *Union* to the Divine Nature gives an *infinite Efficacy* to those Acts, of which the Human only is the Principle; for unless by that Union, the Human Nature was turn'd into an Infinite or Divine Nature, its Acts can no more be reckon'd properly and *intrinsically* Infinite in this Case, than his *Body or Human Understanding* are Infinite, because so united to an Infinite Nature.

But what fully demonstrates, that the Human Nature of Christ can never be an *effectual* Mediator (according to them) no, not tho' it were personally united to the Divine, is this, *viz.* That they

they deny this Human Nature so united, to have the Knowledge of the secret mental Prayers, the inward Desires and Distresses of all Christians, or to know any one's *Heart*: And how then can he be a compassionate Intercessor in cases that he knows nothing of? Or how can he have a *Fellow-feeling* of their Sufferings, which he knows not that they feel at all? What Comfort is there in this Account of Christ's Mediation? The Divine Nature is precluded from it, because they direct us to seek to that as the *ultimate* Object thro a Mediator; and the Human Nature, they say, may know nothing of our Case, nor knows *our Hearts*, whether we worship sincerely, or repent sincerely, or hypocritically only; and so knows not how to represent or recommend us to God. What a Case now do these Men bring us into? There is no *Mediator* left to interpose with the Supreme God; so that we must deal with him *immediately* and alone, which they will own is *far* from the Gospel-Doctrine or Method. Thus is the Lord Jesus turn'd out of his *Office*, on a pretence of giving him higher Honour. So that upon the whole, as far as I see, we had even as good be content with the Apostle's fair and plain Account of this Matter; if its being so very *intelligible*, may not be an unpardonable Objection against it, *viz.* That *there is but one God, and one* 1 Tim. 2.
Mediator between God and Man, the Man Christ Jesus. 5.
 Never let us fear, but *Paul* knew how to describe the *Mediator*, without leaving out the better half of him, or the principal Nature. Our Mediator, according to him, was only a *Man*; who also is by Office a *God*, or Ruler over all, made so by him who *puts* all things under him.

And indeed as there are two principal *distinguishing* Doctrines of *Christianity*, relating to the *Unity* of the Supreme God, and the *one Mediator* with

him; so the *Trinitarians* have lost them both among their several *Parties*. For as they are divided into two principal *Parties* (besides several Sub-divisions) both among Conformists and *Dis-senters*, one part holding *three* real Persons, or *infinite Beings*, the other but *one*; (for they are not yet agreed whether they worship *three* infinite supreme Beings, or but *one*) so between them both, these *two great Doctrines* are subverted, the *Realists* leave room for a *Mediator in the Godhead*; but they destroy the *Unity of God*, who is *one* Infinite Being: on the *other hand*, they who hold true to the *Divine Unity*, or one Infinite Being under *three Modes*, or Properties, or Relations, do, by plain consequence, leave no place for such a *Mediator* as they require, *viz.* One who is an *infinite God*, to be a *Mediator* with the Infinite God, when there is no other *infinite Being* but his own, and he cannot be thought to intercede with *himself* neither. So that to keep the Gospel-Faith whole and *undefiled*, 'tis necessary that we avoid both these Rocks, by believing *God* and his *Christ* to be two Beings, that so there may be room for one to mediate with the other: And that these two are not two equal or supreme Beings, but one *subordinate* to the other, that so we may preserve the *Unity of the Supreme God*.

Let us then bethink our selves seriously, not what the Church in latter days has thought of *Jesus Christ*, but what his own *Apostles*, *when inspired*, have thought of him. Methinks none was more likely, or ever had a fairer Occasion to represent his Lord in the height of his *Glory*, than the *Apostle Peter* in the Day of *Pentecost*; that Day of Triumph, with the newly and visibly inspired *Apostles*: Hear how magnificently he describes his glorious *Lord Jesus* before his Murderers,

Ye Men of Israel hear these Words, Jesus of Nazareth, Acts 2.22.
 a Man approved of God among you, by Miracles, Won-
 ders and Signs, which God did by him in the midst of
 you. Again, Let all the House of Israel know assu- Ver. 36.
 redly, that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye
 have crucified, both Lord and Christ. Now 'tis
 observable, the Apostle was aiming at such a
 Description of Jesus Christ, as might strike the
 Hearts of his Murderers with the greatest Horror Ver. 23.
 of their Crime; and therefore could never omit
 the most emphatical Branch of his Description,
viz. his Infinite Deity, if he had really been such.
 What a terrifying Argument had that been to
 beget Conviction in his Persecutors beyond all
 the rest, to tell them, they had shed the Blood
 of the Infinite God himself? 'Tis certainly all flat
 and low that Peter says in comparison of this,
viz. That he was a Man approved of God. Did
 he not understand, or would he betray his Cause
 by such an Omission? And yet he only represents
 Christ as a God by Inhabitation and Exaltation;
 when he was far from being daunted with any
 Fear to own Christ fully. Nay, if this Deity of
 Christ were a fundamental Article of the Christian
 Faith, how comes it to pass, that when poor con-
 vinced Souls, in Anguish for their Crimes, seek
 Direction how to be saved from them, the Apo- Ver. 37.
 stle should not acquaint them with this Article,
 but directs them to believe in this Jesus, such as
 he had described him? Did he direct wounded
 Souls to an insufficient Saviour, without telling
 'em, he was the Infinite God? Yet they are bap-
 tiz'd and added to the Church, and numbred
 among such as shall be saved: How can this be,
 if the Supreme Godhead of Christ be a fundamen-
 tal Article of the Christian Faith? So Acts 10. 38.
 God was with him. This was all.

An Humble Inquiry into

To conclude, God and Christ (or one anointed) are two *Disparates*, or different Things, as much as Christ's *Body* and *Bread* are, and therefore cannot be predicated one of the other, in a proper Sense, or without a Figure, as all our Writers against the *Romish* Transubstantiation argue; and is of equal force in the present Case. *To be anointed*, imports, to be raised by Authority and Honour conferr'd; 'tis in effect to say, the Person is a Creature, or inferior Being: and therefore to say, that properly Christ is most High God, is to say, the Inferior is Supreme, and the Man is God; which cannot be, only by a Figure, as the Bread is Christ's Body, *viz. by Relation, &c.* And truly if the Business can be salved here, by making a personal Union between God and Christ, I see not why the Papists may not set up such *another Union* between Christ's Body and the Bread in the Eucharist, and then they may stoutly defend that 'tis the Body of Christ properly. But indeed nothing is more obvious than the Unsteddiness of many Protestant Writers, when they write against the *Papists* and the *Unitarians*: How do they go backwards and forwards? And when they have triumphantly and fully beaten off the vain Assaults and Objections of the Papists, they take up their baffled Arguments, and urge them the same way (as others did against them) against the *Unitarians*: and what they have maintained against the former, as good Argument, notwithstanding *Romish* Evasions; these Arguments they oppose, when the *Unitarians* turn them against themselves, in the point of the Trinity, and they betake themselves to like Shifts and Evasions. Thus let the *Papists* object to them the Novelty of the Protestant Religion, and ask them where was their Religion and Church before *Luther*? they think

think it a weak Cavil, and can tell 'em their Religion was in the Bible, and their Church among the Primitive Christians, however it lay hid in the time of common Apostacy: and yet to the *Unitarian* they can make the same Objection, Where has any Christian Church, for so many Ages, held that Christ was not God? Against the Papist they will prove, that the *Fathers* did not hold the Elements to be Christ's real Body and Blood, because they oft call them the *Images* thereof: But let the *Unitarians* argue that Christ is not the Supreme God, because the Scripture stiles him the *Image* of God, and therefore not the God whose Image only he is; then the Thing it self and its Image must be the same thing. Against the Papist they can prove St. *Peter* was inferior to the Church, and the rest of the Apostles, (tho not singly to each) because he was *sent* up and down by them. This *Baronius* takes hold of, and tells them, by the same reason they must grant the *Arians* Argument to be good, *viz.* That the *Father* is greater than the *Son*, because the *Son* is *sent* by him. But let an *Unitarian* argue thus, and then, tho the *Father* sends, and the *Son* be *sent* by him, yet they shall both be *equal*, and this shall make no Difference. Against the *Papists* they will boast, that they don't hoodwink the People in Ignorance; but bid them enquire and examine, and the more the better, while 'tis ground of Suspicion, that the *Papists* cheat Men, by their keeping them from the Light: but now having to do with the *Unitarians*, they tack about, and bid beware of Reading and Disputing; they are for an *implicit Faith*, without examining into deep Mysteries; they bid us believe, not pry into them; tho we only desire to examine whether the *Scriptures* do reveal any such Mysteries at all; the *rest* we will believe

lieve, if we could see that, and desire no other liberty in interpreting Scripture, than they take so justly in interpreting Christ's Words, *This is my Body*. Upon Protestant Principles the *Unitarians* think they can stand their ground, and defend themselves in these Matters, as easily as the *Protestants* can against the *Papists*.

As to Primitive Antiquity, so many *Inquirers*, both among the *Romish* and *Reformed* Writers, have given their impartial Testimony, that it runs for *Arius's Doctrine*; and have made such poor Apologies for those *Fathers*, as tho they knew not, or were not careful of their fundamental Articles of Faith, till they came to be banded about in *General Councils*, that I think it not needful to say more here: only one thing I would suggest; That allowing the Primitive Writers to speak in different places with great, at least seeming Discord (which any ingenuous Man must grant) sometimes plainly declaring Jesus Christ inferior to, and the *Servant* of the Father, *before his Incarnation*; at other times giving him high Titles, as of one equal with *God*: yet 'tis far more reasonable to suppose the higher Expressions should be expounded according to the *other*, than the contrary; because in discoursing of, and pleading for a *beloved* admired Object, as the Lord *Jesus* deserves to be, 'tis very easy, and natural to run out into Strains of Eloquence, and lofty *Flights* of Praise, which must be interpreted not with strict Rigour, but with great Abate-ments; as is to be observed in some of their high *Encomiums* on the venerable Mystery of the Eucharist, as tho with the *Papists*, they took the Elements for Christ's real Body, which yet they evidently did deny. But *on the contrary*, no Men are wont ever to speak *diminutively* on such occasions; they could not have a thought to lessen their
their

their Master's Glory; and therefore if they ever represent him as *not* the Supreme God, nor equal to him, we have all reason to think, they then spake only the Words of Truth and Sobriety, what the exact Matter required.

For my own part, as I write this under the serious Impressions of those great Relations in which the Blessed *Jesus* stands to me, whom I credit as my great *Teacher*; whom I desire to admire and love as my gracious endeared *Benefactor*, beyond Father and Mother, or Friends, &c. whom I reverence as my *Lord* and Ruler, and solemnly expect as my final glorious *Judge*, who is to come in his own, and in his *Father's* Glory; Luke 9. 26. and in the mean time deal with *God* thro him, as my only *Mediator* and Intercessor: So I earnestly profess, that 'tis not without grievous and bitter Resentments, that I should be employ'd in writing Things, which by so many well-meaning Christians will be *misinterpreted*, to be derogatory to the Honour of this great Redeemer. But I know he loves nothing but Truth in his Cause, and will never be offended, I hope, with any who stand by his own Words, *viz.* The *Father* John 14. 28. *is greater than I.* I think it a dangerous thing to say, *God is not greater* than he, or is not the *Head of Christ*; for, *whom will ye equal to me,* Isa. 40. 25. *saith the Holy One?* I am persuaded 'tis Truth I plead for, and that supports me.

However, I wish they who are Adversaries to my Persuasion, would learn at least the Modesty of one of the earliest Writers for *Christianity* since the Apostles, that we have, I mean *Justin Martyr*; disputing with a *Jew*, and pleading for the Honour of *Jesus Christ*, whom he calls *God by the Will of the Father*, and one who *ministred to his Will*, before his Incarnation, This Person attempts to shew, that *Jesus Christ* did

did *pre-exist* of old, as a God, (in *his* Sense) and was born afterwards of a Virgin: but because, as he says, there were some who confessed him to be Christ, and yet denied *those Points* of his Pre-existence and his miraculous Birth of a Virgin, that Father calmly says to his Adversary, *If I shall not demonstrate these things, that he did pre-exist, &c. and was born of a Virgin; yet still the Cause is not lost, as to his being the Christ of God: if I do not prove that he did pre-exist, &c. it is just to say that I am mistaken in this Thing only, and not to deny that he is the Christ; for whosoever he be, that is every way demonstrated, that he is the Christ.* And as for those *Christians* who denied the above-said Things, and held him to be only a Man, born in the ordinary way, he only says of them, *To whom I accord not.* He does not damn them who differed from him, nor will say the *Christian Religion* is subverted, and Christ but an *Impostor*, and a *broken Reed* to trust on, if he be not the very Supreme God, (the ranting *Dialect* of our profane Age) no, but still he was sure he is the true Christ, whatever else he might be mistaken in. 'Tis desperate Wickedness in Men to hazard the Reputation of the Truth and Holiness of the Blessed *Jesus*, upon a difficult and disputable *Opinion*; to dare to say, That if they are mistaken in their Opinion (which I verily believe) then *Jesus Christ* is a Lyar and Deceiver, a *Mock-Saviour*, and the like. What is this but to expose him to the Scorn of Infidels?

So that I see with Sorrow, that to this very day, even among professed *Christians* themselves, Christ crucified is to some a Stumbling-block, and to others Foolishness. If he be not as Good and Great as the God who appointed him for a *Saviour*, tho' he be allowed to be a *Man approved of God*, by Signs and mighty Wonders which God did

did by him ; and by whom God made the *Worlds*, as the Instrument ; tho he be granted to be *One* in whom *dwelt* all the Fulness of the *Godhead*, so John 14. as it never dwelt before in Prophets or any other ; ^{10.} tho He be *One with the Father*, by Unity of Consent and Will, as *Calvin* interprets *John* 10. 30. *One in Testimony* with the Father and Spirit, as *Beza* and many others understand that in *1 John* 5. 7. tho he be the most lively visible *Image* of God that the World ever saw, so that he who sees him does in great measure *see the Father*, as in a *bright Mirror*, *John* 14. 10. tho he be owned and served, as one *far above* Angels and Archangels, and *over all* Powers in Heaven and Earth, a God or Ruler, the great Administrator of God's Kingdom, both on Earth and in the invisible *Hades*, as *having the Keys*, or Ministerial Power of *Death and Hell* : yet after all Rev. I. 18. this, if he be not the very *Supreme God* himself ; nay, to complete the Absurdity, if he be not the *same* very God, whose *Son* and *Image* he is ; he shall be no *Mediator* for them : they do *ex Hypothesi*, or on this Supposition, openly disown him for their Saviour and Confidence ; they are ashamed to trust in him, and seem rather to deride and reproach him, as *Insufficient* and *Contemptible*, than to believe on him. These things are to me a very grievous *Offence*, who think it a great pity that so excellent a Constitution as the Gospel is, so *amiable* to contemplate, so proper to entertain our thankful *Admiration* for the *Grace and Wisdom* it contains, should either be lost in the Clouds of an *affected* Obscurity, or exposed to the Derision of ungodly Scoffers.

'Tis yet a farther Grief to think what a fatal Stop is hereby put to the Progress of the Gospel ; whose Rejection by *Jews*, *Mahometans* and *Pagans* is undeniably occasioned by the *common*
Doctrine

Doctrin of the Incarnation of God. One may read in *Le Compté's* History of *China*, how the Heathens derided the Christians Doctrin of a *Mortal God*; and upon that account look'd upon Christianity as *fabulous* as their own Religion. And Doctor *Causabon*, in his Book of *Credulity and Incredulity*, says, He could prove by many Instances out of History, that this *Doctrin* has kept more People from embracing the *Christian Faith*, than any other thing he knew of. Now tho I grant, that if it be the certain *Truth of God*, this must be no Argument against receiving it; yet surely it should make Men very cautious and impartial in their Inquiry about it, lest they bring on themselves the *Woe* denounced against them by whom Offences (that is, *Stumbling-blocks* in the way of the Gospel) do come.

In the mean time, in the midst of these Troubles, 'tis a great and sweet *Refreshment* to wait and hope for a Remove to the *Mount Moriah*, the Land of *Vision* above, where all these Shades of the melancholy Night shall vanish away, and an eternal Day of clear *Light* and Peace shall shine on them who love our Lord *Jesus* in *Sincerity*; in whose glorious Dignity I rejoice; nay, I desire to boast and glory in this Exalted, Enthroned *Redeemer*; for worthy is the *Lamb* to receive *Glory*, and Honour, and Blessing, and Power. *Amen*; So be it!

Now to *Him* who loved us, and washed us from our Sins in his own Blood, and hath made us Kings and Priests to *God*, even the *Father*, to *Him* be *Glory* and *Dominion* for ever.

But this I confess unto thee, that after the way, which they call Heresy, so worship I the God of my Fathers, believing all things which are written in the Law and the Prophets. Acts 24. 14.




A
VINDICATION
OF THE
WORSHIP
OF THE
Lord JESUS CHRIST,
On the Unitarian Principles.


In Answer to what is said on that Head, by
Mr. *Jos. Boyse*, in his *Vindication of the
Deity of Jesus Christ*.

O Son of David, have mercy upon us. The Liturgy.


He (*Origen*) saith, *We ought to pray only to the God over all,
and to his only Son the First-born of every Creature; who, as
our High Priest, offers our Prayers to his God and our God.*
Dr. Stillingfleet's Idolat. of the Church of Rome, p. 130.







Mr. B's Argument for the Supreme Deity of JESUS CHRIST, from the Worship paid to him, consider'd and answer'd.

OW popular soever the Argument may seem, when from the Worship due to our Lord Jesus, the *Trinitarians* infer his Supreme Deity; and how great soever the imaginary Triumphs are, with which Mr. *B.* flatters himself upon this head, as tho he had quite baffled the Cause of the *Unitarians*: yet I doubt not, but by a thorow Examination, and right stating of this matter, upon *Unitarian* Principles, to answer the Arguments, and to overthrow the Opinion of their Adversaries, by making it plain, that no truly Divine Worship, or Supreme Adoration, is, upon Christian Principles, given to the Blessed Jesus, which is the Supposition Mr. *B.* goes on.

Let it first be premised, to prevent Obscurity and Confusion, That the Term *Divine*, when added to Worship, may be used as equivocally, or in as different Senses, as is the Term *God*, to which it relates. For as this is used sometime for the

absolutely *Supreme* Being, or first Cause, and at other times for one of inferior Authority; just so *Divine* Worship may either signify what is given to the Supreme, or what is due only to an inferior Being of subordinate Authority. For in the same sense as the Object is Divine, the Worship of it is so. And in this lower Sense I understand *Socinus*, when he pleads for Divine Worship to be given to *J. C.* since he expressly says, he intends by it not the same as is given to the *Father*, but much less. See his Epist. 3. *ad Radecium*; where speaking of that Text, *That all may honour the Son as they honour the Father*, he denies it to signify *plenam similitudinem*; and says, that he makes *non minimam differentiam*, no little, but a mighty Difference between the Worship due to God, and that due to Jesus Christ, tho he calls this Divine Worship too.

If this were duly considered, Mr. *B.* and others might have spared their Pains in proving the Absurdity of giving Divine Worship in the highest Sense (which *Socinus* was not for) to one who is not God in the highest Sense. Therefore I shall freely grant the Absurdity of that Point, and so need not concern my self with that part of Mr. *B.*'s Argument, which Mr. *E.* never gave him any ground to expatiate so upon. I shall use the Terms *Divine Worship* in his own Sense, for what is most properly such; and agree with him in the general Notion of it, that it imports *the Respect due to a Being of Infinite Excellency, and Supreme Authority, which only the Blessed God is possessed of*; whether it be internal Worship or external. So p. 107. But I do maintain, in opposition to what he asserts to the contrary, that the Holy Scriptures, 1. Do never require us to pay such Divine Worship to our Blessed Saviour Jesus Christ, as he is distinct

distinct from the Father, who dwells in him, and is worshipped by us. 2. But that they do allow and require us to pay him an inferior Religious Worship.

These two Points answer the whole of Mr. B's, and other Trinitarians Arguments, on this head of Worship.

First, I utterly deny that the Scriptures require any such Divine Worship of Jesus Christ, or that any Injury is done to our most dear and blessed Saviour, by not giving him the same Supreme Worship which we give to the Father. All Mr. B's Citations from Scripture, are very short of proving his Point. He first brings on for a general Proof, that Text, *John 5. 22, 23. That all should honour the Son, as they honour the Father.* Whence he would infer that it must be the same, and as great Honour, as is due to the *Father.* Whereas Mr. E. had said it only design'd to oblige us to honour the Son as truly (not equally) as the Father; which Dr. *Whitby* Idolat. of the Ch. of Rome, p. 223. tells us was the great *Origen's* Comment, and therefore not only Mr. E's presumptuous Addition, as Mr. B. insinuates.

I shall wave the Inquiry, whether the Text speaks of the Honour of Worship, or not rather of that of Obedience, (for *honorandus* and *adorandus* are two things) but supposing it to relate to the former, the whole stress of Mr. B's Argument must lie upon the Particle *as*, which he supposes to be a Note of Equality, or Identity. But if it only denote the Reality of the thing, or some Resemblance, tho of an inferior Nature and Degree, then all his Argument is spoil'd. And indeed it happens for him very ill, that the Particle *as* scarcely ever notes more than Similitude. This is so obvious and vulgar a Remark, that 'tis a wonder Mr. B. should be-

gin with so weak an Argument, which he knew every one could except against; which yet he says nothing to remove. As well might he prove Christ's Disciples to be equal Objects of the *Father's* Love with himself, because he says, that *he loved them as he loved him*, John 17. 23. Nay, thus it will help the *Socinians* to a good Argument, *viz.* That the *Father* and *Son* are no more *one* Being, than a Multitude of Believers, because *they are one, as the Father and Son are one*, ver. 22. *i. e.* equally one, according to this Sense. Whereas indeed such Expressions only note a general Similitude in the Reality of the Thing. 'Tis plain our Lord intends no more, but that as the *Father* had *his* Honour, so the *Son* had some due to himself, by the *Father's* Favour; and therefore he adds, that *he that honours not the Son, honours not the Father who sent him*. He does not say, he that honours him not as much as the *Father*; no, but *he that does not honour him*, offends the *Father*. As he who despised an *Apostle*, despised *Jesus Christ* who sent him; so to reject, or not honour *Jesus Christ* his *Son*, is a Contempt to the *Father*, whose Messenger he was. On which account only the Text requires us to honour him, *viz.* as having *God's* Commission, and consequently could never intend an Equality of Honour to him and the *Father*; only that as the *Father* was to be honoured highly, so some great Honour ought to redound to the *Son* of *such* a *Father*, and so authoriz'd by him. 'Tis to so little purpose that this Text is alledg'd to prove equal Worship due to *Christ* as to the *Father*, that I shall hereafter from *hence* prove that the Worship due to *Christ* is of an inferior nature. But let us next consider the particular Instances of

Worship

Worship given to Jesus Christ, which he pretends are *Divine* Worship.

I need not trouble my self to answer the particular Texts he cites, to shew that Prayer is to be made to Jesus Christ, nor to distinguish which only are pertinent, and which do not concern *him*, or do not imply *Prayer* to him; because I rely upon other Answers.

I observe not one Instance of Prayer to Jesus Christ when absent, either required in the Precept, or reported in the Example, thro the whole New Testament, only what is suppos'd under the general Phrase of *calling on his Name*. Stephen saw him visibly, *Acts* 7. And those Instances, *1 Thess.* 3. 11. *2 Cor.* 13. 13. seem to be only *Wishes*, just like those in the Salutations at the beginning of most of the Epistles, which either are no Prayers, or may not be directed to Jesus Christ, tho they be for Benefits by him.

'Tis but like that Prayer, *Rev.* 1. 4. *Grace be to you from the seven Spirits*; which * Mr. *Jos. Mede* * *Exercit. on Zech. 4.* has clearly proved to be seven Angels (as Mr. *Baxter* and others cannot deny or disown) and says that it may be a Prayer for Benefits by their Ministry, tho directed to God, as *Gen.* 48. 16. We may say, Peace and Protection from good Angels be to you, and yet not pray to them. So may the Apostle say, *The Grace of Christ*, and *the Communication of the Holy Ghost be to you*; and yet only pray to the Father for it.

So then I see no Instance of Prayer to Jesus Christ, when absent and invisible: only we read of Christians *calling on his Name*. If that Phrase signify any more than professing his Name, *saying, Lord, Lord*, or using his Name in Worship; yet it can amount to no more, under the Gospel-Constitution, than calling on him as *Me-*

diator, to come in to our help as an Intercessor. But I deny this Prayer to be *Divine* Worship of him, or to be the same with praying to God, as the *ultimate* Object thro a Mediator. He may be sought to as Mediator, as he was by *St. Stephen*, when he saw him *standing at God's Right Hand*, ver. 56. *i. e.* in a ministring posture as an Advocate: but he is never the *ultimate* Object of Supreme Worship; and no transient subordinate Worship is to be given to the Supreme God, but only to the subordinate Being, to which I may not give the *Divine Honour* of terminating my Faith, Worship, and Rest in him, without seeking to go further, even to *God*, his and my Father.

John 16.
23.

It should seem, that he forbids such Prayer to himself, as belongs to God his Father: *In that day ye shall ask me nothing, but shall ask the Father in my Name.* On which words *Origen* condemns direct Prayer to Jesus Christ (*i. e.* other than praying to God by him) as *Dr. Whitby* † observes. 'Tis evident by the Context, that he speaks of asking in Prayer, rather than of asking *Questions*; because he opposes to it their asking the Father in his Name, which will not be deny'd to relate to Prayer. And tho the Word do often signify to ask by Inquiry, yet does it also signify to ask by Intreaty or Prayer, as well as the other Word in the latter Clause; as appears *ver. 26.* where *Christ* uses it in saying, *I will pray the Father for you*; and the Context more fairly introduces this Sense. And indeed if they might pray to him universally for all things, I cannot see any pretence why they might not as well ask Instruction, and the Solution of their Difficulties, as any thing else. He plainly represents them as in a craving Condition, *In that day ye shall ask, &c. v. 26.* And I believe as long as they would want other things,

† On the
Text.

things, they should want Instruction (even when inspir'd) more and more. And therefore to suppose, our Lord should tell 'em they would not need to *ask* any more for Information, whilst yet on Earth, and whilst they would be craving other Mercies, seems to me a wild Supposition. For can it be thought that the Apostles never pray'd to God the *Father*, for Information and Light in any Point, after Jesus Christ had ascended? We are told by some, that when St. *John* (who records this Text) set about writing this very Gospel, he engaged the *Asian* Bishops to assist him by Prayer and Fasting; and did he not pray himself, think we, for Light and Instruction? So that it seems very hard to understand Christ's Words of *such* asking; and if they had occasion to ask the *Father*, why not *him* too, if an equal Object of Worship? No, they should indeed ask the *Father*, but not him; save as Mediator to offer their Prayers to the *Father*, not as the *ultimate* Object.

And 'tis apparent, that the current Method of the *New Testament* is to pray to God by Jesus Christ, or in his Name as our Intercessor, *ver.* 26. And this is the constant strain of the truly primitive Writers, as appears in *Clemens Romanus*, in *Polycarp's* Prayer, in *Origen*, &c. they offer'd their Prayers to Jesus Christ, as their *High Priest*, to present them to God. So that tho' it seems, in some sort, to be one Act of Worship, yet is there a Subordination in the *two* Objects that are so conjoin'd, whether I pray expressly to God, or Jesus Christ. For if I pray to God, 'tis that he will accept and help me thro' Jesus Christ; and if I pray to Jesus Christ, 'tis that he will help me by interceding with the *Father*. 'Tis God only to whom I principally and ultimately pay my Worship, tho' I honour

Of the Worship of Jesus Christ,

honour the Son as my great Advocate, and *Priest* to present it with advantage. This is the plain easy Sense of the Gospel. I no otherwise call on him, than as I believe on him, and come to him, which is only as *the way to the Father*, not as to the Supreme Himself, which he never requires.

Next Mr. *B.* comes to the *Internal Acts* of Worship, *viz.* Faith and Love, &c. 'Tis but poor arguing to say, that because we must trust in Jesus Christ, therefore it must be with the *same* Faith and Respect, as Trust in God implies; when 'tis plain Jesus Christ propounds two Objects of Faith, *John 14. 1. Ye believe in God, believe also in me.* He that trusts in *Man* so as to forget God, or *depart* from him as his main stay, is *curst*; but as I may safely believe in, or believe (the Phrase in Scripture importing the same) a faithful Man or Prophet, as the

Exod. 14. 31. *Israelites did believe in Moses*, so much more in Jesus Christ. And yet 'tis one thing to trust in one as a subordinate Minister, and another as the Supreme Author and End of all. *By him we believe in God*, says the Scripture. So that it seems he is not the *ultimate* Object of Faith, and so is not prov'd to be God, by any *Faith* in him which the Gospel requires.

The like I say of our Love to Jesus Christ. Here I find Mr. *B.* is sadly baffled, when he pretends to prove Jesus Christ to be the Object of the same Supreme Love as God his Father claims, from Scripture. The Texts which he brings to shew it, do plainly evidence on the contrary, how warily the Writers of the New Testament avoid it. *Love thy God*, says Jesus Christ, *with all thy Heart, and all thy Soul, &c.* But when he bids us love Himself, he uses no such Terms, but only bids us love him *above*

Father

Father and Mother, and all this lower World. Mat. 10.
 Again, says *Paul* (when he describes Christians 37
 by this Love to Jesus Christ) they *love our Lord* Eph. 6.24.
Jesus Christ in Sincerity. Is this the same as to
 love him equal to God, with Supreme Love?
 Far be it from me to think that I can love that
 blessed Saviour equal to his transcendent Love
 to me, or that ever I can love him enough with
 a regular Gospel-Love; in comparison of *whom*
 all in the World is but *Lofs and Dung*; and I
 humbly own it is my Sin, that I am so defect-
 ive in Love to so dear a Benefactor, and so
 great a Lord: Yet I am sensible that our Esteem
 and rational Love must ascend higher than *he*,
 and not rest till it center in his *God and ours*.
 I challenge any one to produce a Text for the
 Supreme ultimate Love of Jesus Christ.

Nor are we ultimately to dedicate our selves
 to him, but to God thro him, to *him* only as Heb. 7.26
 our Mediator. And so did Christians dedicate
 themselves ministerially to the *Apostles*, under 1 Cor. 8.5
 Christ.

The same I say, as to all other parts of Wor-
 ship internal or external. 'Tis to no purpose
 to say, that this or that Honour is given to
 him, which bears the same general Name with
 what is given to the *Father*; unless it can be
 shown that it has the same high and ultimate
 respect to Jesus Christ, which the same common
 Name, or joint Exercise, is no proof of at all.
 I shall ever stand to it, that no Worship is
 truly Divine, but what is Ultimate and Supreme;
 and Mr. *B.* himself must remember, that in his
 Description of the Nature of Divine Worship,
 he has imply'd so much, in saying, 'tis *the Re-
 spect due only to a Being of Supreme Excellency and
 Authority*. But he will never shew me one In-
 stance where Jesus Christ is respected in any part
 of

of Worship, as one of Supreme Authority, or as higher than *Mediator*; which he owns is an inferior Character.

P. 145. Nay, more than once Mr. B. is forced to grant that the *Father only is the ultimate Object of Worship*, (of which more presently) which subverts all his pretended Proofs for the Divine Worship of Jesus Christ, when he grants in effect, that he has no ultimate Worship. What! is transient mediatorial Honour the highest that Man can give to God? Or, is he God most High, to whom none of the highest Worship is paid? He, besides whom, there is one to whom Worship is *more eminently* due than to him? as Mr. B. allows, p. 24. These are great Absurdities.

Mat. 28. 18, 19. As to *Baptism* into the Name of Christ, 'tis but a listing our selves under him, as God's commission'd *Son* and Minister, as the very Introduction to the Ministerial Commission shews: *All Power*, says Jesus Christ, *is given me of my Father: Go and baptize, &c.* Just as the Soldier is listed under his Colonel, as well as under the King, and yet they *two* are not equal; and he is far more the Servant of his King than of the other, tho' at once listed under both. The Sense of Christ's Words there, is very justly given by a late Expositor, Chaplain to the Bishop of *Norwich*, q. d. *Baptize them into the Profession of that Gospel-Faith, which was reveal'd and sent by the Father, brought and publish'd by the Son, and confirm'd by the Holy Spirit.*

Para-
phrase of
Mr. Sam.
Clarke on
the Text.

So that it signifies nothing, that the Son is join'd with the *Father*, towards the proof of the *Son's* receiving equal Honour to his; any more than it will prove that the Apostles had the same Honour with Jesus Christ, because their Disciples *gave*, or dedicated *themselves* (the great

2 Cor. 8. 5. business of Baptism) *to the Lord, and also to them;*
or

or that *Moses* was equally honoured with God, because at once *Israel* believed in both, as they did at once worship both God and King David. Mr. *B.* is hard put to it, when he knows not how to excuse this latter, without supposing they first bow'd to God, and then turn'd about to worship the King, when the Text speaks of it more like one single Act; and this was in effect the same, as to have said in Words, *We give Honour to God and the King.* I ask Mr. *B.* whether he be baptiz'd in the Mediator's Name, *i. e.* (with him) in the Name of the *Son of God*, and the *Son of Man* both? Dares he say the *Son of Man* is excluded, and that he has no Honour in our Service, nor is regarded in our Baptism? And if we are baptiz'd into him as the *Son of Man* also, or into his whole Person, then are we baptiz'd jointly into the Name of God and of a Creature (for the Man Christ is no more) and 'tis a false Suggestion to say, that the Three into whose Names we are baptiz'd, are to be taken for one God. This is unwarrantable Presumption.

'Tis a poor Reply to the Instance of *Israel's* being baptized into *Moses*, to say that we cannot produce such a Form for it as that of *Christ's*. What then? Is not the Thing it self, or the main End and Effect of it, as much as the Form? As weak is that Difference which he would make between the baptizing into *Moses*, and into his Name; when 'tis so evident, that they import the same thing. See *Gal. 3. 27. Rom. 6. 3.* where they who were according to the usual Form of Baptism baptiz'd into his Name, are said only to have been baptiz'd into *Christ*; and sure the Person is at any time as much as his Name.

But

But if Mr. B. thinks the baptizing into the Name of *one*, should imply him to be the Supreme God; I shall clearly prove the contrary from 1 Cor. 1. 13, 15. *I thank God I baptiz'd none of you, &c. says Paul, lest any should say I had baptiz'd into my own Name.* Cou'd Paul suppose, that by charging him with baptizing in his own Name, they meant to impeach him of setting up himself for God? No, the Context plainly shews, that all his Apprehension about it was this, that they would have taken it as a ground of denominating themselves his Disciples, as they already were apt to do, saying, *I am of Paul, &c.* as if he, instead of Jesus Christ, were the Head of their Profession, and Master of the Christian School. This he intimates would have justly follow'd from his *baptizing into his own Name.* But if it had imply'd him to be God most High, they could never be suppos'd to be so absurd, as to charge *Paul* with such a foolish and monstrous Crime. Which shews what was their Sense of the matter in hand, in the beginning of Christianity.

So that to be *baptiz'd into the Name of any one*, is only to enter one's self his Disciple, and to be denominated after his Name; as they who

John 9. 28. were baptiz'd into *Moses* were *Moses's* Disciples.
 Ch. 3. 25. They who were baptiz'd into *John's* Baptism, were *John's* Disciples. So to be baptiz'd into the Name of *Jesus*, is to profess our selves his Disciples, and to take his Name upon us. As the Wife and Servant did *transfire in Nomen Mariti aut Domini*, were called after their Names, so we are called Christians from *Christ*; being baptiz'd into his Name, we are called his Disciples. And therefore in the Gospel-History we

Acts 2. 38. read only of Christians being baptiz'd into the
 —19. 5. Name of the Lord *Jesus*, because they were
 eminently

eminently to bear the Mediator's Name, having before been the profess'd Subjects of God, under whom the Lord Jesus was now constituted the chief Head and Administrator.

Nor is the *Lord's Supper* any Instance of *Divine* Worship paid to Jesus Christ, tho it be a Celebration of the Memory of his Death. I grant there are concomitant Acts of Worship both in this and in *Baptism*, viz. Prayer and Praise, which are not requir'd to be offer'd to Jesus Christ neither, but to the Father (for we must only do as he did, which was not to pray to himself) But that this of eating or drinking is any *immediate* Worship, Mr. B. will hardly prove. 'Tis an Act of Obedience, not of *Worship* as distinct from Obedience. At least 'tis no Act of external Worship distinct from Prayer, or from Love and Faith, &c. which he must intend, because he distinguishes it from those Parts of Worship, as a particular distinct Instance. Something to this purpose, against its being immediate *Worship*, Mr. B. may find in a Book, call'd, *Remarks on the Bishop of Derry's Discourse*, &c. p. 117.

Besides, we then remember Christ in his Death only, or as *a Man slain*; where we see nothing that resembles him as a *God*, or that signifies any such matter to us. All that Solemnity may justly belong to him, as an honourable Remembrance of so excellent a Friend, tho there were no pretence of a *Deity* in the case.

As to all *external* Acts of Worship, they are wholly equivocal, and cannot determine what the Worship intended is. Let Mr. B. shew that God has appropriated any of these to the *Supreme* Being, and that they are given to Jesus Christ. He will own that our Lord Jesus receiv'd Homage as a *Prophet* only of *eminent Sanctity*; P. 75.

tity; which is *moral* Reverence, or *religious* Worship, such as *Peter* refus'd. By which 'tis plain, that such external Acts cannot prove his *Deity*.

The Objections from *Peter* and the *Angel*, who refus'd such Worship, which Jesus Christ received without any check to them who gave it, are frivolous; since they *two* had no such Claim to that Worship, which *he* had; and therefore they might well refuse what it became him to accept. And sure he may challenge what an *Angel* refuses, and yet be below the Supreme God, tho' greater than Angels. Nay, 'tis evident enough, that under the Old Testament Angels did receive as great Worship from others, as that which the Angel refus'd from *St. John*, because he was an Apostle, and so not much in Honour below Angels.

And what tho' the *Angels of God* worship Jesus Christ? This shews he is Lord over 'em, but not that he is their Supreme God. So that in all this heap of seeming Arguments, which are rather *numbered* than weighed, here is not one that comes home to the purpose, so as to prove *Supreme* and *Divine* Worship to be due to Jesus Christ. *Prayer, Praise, Love, Faith, Prostration,* &c. may be given to one, so as to be *Divine* Worship, when ultimate and supreme; and to *another*, so as to be only *subordinate*; which it is, when given to Jesus Christ, for any thing that *Mr. B.* has made appear to the contrary.

Having thus in vain attempted to produce any one plain Instance of *Divine* Worship paid to Jesus Christ, from the Nature of the *Acts* themselves, he pretends next to prove it from the *Foundation* on which those Acts of Worship are grounded, which, he says, are his *infinite Divine Perfections; and Supreme Dominion*. Now here

here I will join issue with him, and if he can shew me one Instance of Scripture, in which the Worship due to Jesus Christ is ever grounded upon his *Supreme Dominion or infinite Perfections*, I will yield up the Cause. But if contrariwise the Scripture always grounds his Worship upon his *deriv'd subordinate Authority*, or upon his Commission from the *Father*, then I must in all reason be allow'd to carry it.

Mr. B. thinks he does enough for his purpose, to strain some Texts for the proof of *such Perfections* being in him (which yet, in the Instances produc'd, are far from being infinite Perfections or supremely Divine.) But I find he does not pretend to bring one Text, to shew that the Worship paid him is grounded on those Perfections themselves. On the other hand I observe, that when the grounds of Worship are mention'd in Scripture, 'tis expressly upon a limited and deriv'd Authority; *The Father committeth all Judgment to the Son, that all should honour the Son. He has given him a Name above every Name, that at the Name of Jesus every Knee shall bow—to the Glory of the Father.* Is this like grounding his Worship upon Supreme Dominion or Perfection, when 'tis wholly founded upon the *Father's* free Gift as a Reward? What! has the Father no higher grounds for the Worship he claims, than a *borrow'd or bestow'd Power*? Sure he is worship'd as the *God of Gods*, as one who possesses all Glory and Perfection of himself, and is beholden to none for what he is and has. 'Tis not possible a deriv'd dependent Being should be deem'd equal to a self-existent one, who gives the other *all* he has. And tho' this deriv'd one should have all Power and Universal Knowledge commensurate to the Earth or Church, yet are these things far from being infinite

John 5.
22, 23.

Phil. 2. 9,
10, 11.

finite or supreme Perfections, or equal to the self-existent independent *Father*.

Nor will *Ministerial Creation* or Preservation entitle him to Divine Worship: and I suppose Mr. *B.* can't shew more than this to be attributed to Jesus Christ (whatever Creation it be, whether the Old or New that is spoken of) or that ever this it self is assigned as the Ground of Worship.

In the matter of *Redemption*, I see no Shadow of any Ground for Divine Worship, since he is therein consider'd only as a *Mediator* (which Mr. *B.* allows to be an inferior Character) who has redeem'd us by the Will and Command of his *Father*, and to the Glory of *him* as the Principal: *Thou hast redeem'd us to God.* Under that subordinate Consideration, the Church does *there* celebrate his Praises, and so can only intend a subordinate *inferior* Honour to him. So that upon the whole, they seem to go upon very slight and rash Grounds who give *supremely divine* Worship to Jesus Christ, for any thing that Mr. *B.* has said in Vindication of it; since the whole Current of the New Testament is against him, as well as that of the first and purest Ages of *Christianity*; and since 'tis so highly injurious to the Honour of the *Father*, in whom alone are found the solid Grounds of Divine Worship, *viz.* native, original, infinite Perfection, and supreme underiv'd Dominion.

One would think it an invincible Argument against the supreme Worship of Jesus Christ, which Mr. *E.* had laid down, *viz.* in that *the Worship given him is grounded on deriv'd and borrow'd Excellency.* And 'tis but a poor come-off in Mr. *B.* when in answer to it he says, *If he mean by deriv'd and borrow'd Excellency, such Excellency as God communicates to a dignify'd Creature, I deny that the Worship which the Scriptures require*

is to pay to Christ is grounded on such deriv'd Excellency. For as Mr. E. had said nothing at all, whether Jesus Christ was ever created, or not, (tho Mr. B. very unjustly charges him with it) or was only generated; so no doubt but, when he spake of deriv'd or given Excellency and Power, he meant it of such as is any way deriv'd and borrow'd, be it by Creation or Generation: and tho he had never such great Excellencies belonging to his Nature originally, that is *ab origine*, yet if that Nature it self be but deriv'd (for Mr. B. grants his Essence is so) the Case is the same still; it can challenge but an inferior respect: and unless he can shew, that to be deriv'd and dependent (let it be what way deriv'd he will) is as great a Perfection, as to be self-existent and independent, and that it challenges as great Veneration from us, he says nothing in all the rest that can avail his Cause.

Nothing can be more apparent, than that the Homage due to Jesus Christ, is not grounded upon any original infinite Excellency of his own, but on his Father's Grant. Words can hardly speak it more expressly than that Text, *Phil. 2. 9, 10, 11.* But Mr. B. catches at the Phrase, *That every Knee may bow to him*: and because he finds God had said of himself, *That to him every Knee should bow*, presently (according to his usual way of arguing, from the same or like Words to the same Sense, without minding the Difference of the Subjects they are apply'd to) he confidently concludes, That Jesus Christ must be the self-same God to whom all Knees must bow: which is just as if, because in one place I read I must love God, and in another, that I must love my Neighbour; therefore I should conclude, that doubtless God and my Neighbour are the same, P. 124.

because the same thing, *viz. Love*, is requir'd for both.

But 'tis not merely from the same Words being apply'd to both *God* and *Christ*, that he proves them to be the same; but he thinks to *father* his Conclusion, and his way of inferring, on *St. Paul*, who alledges, That agreeable to the Declaration of God in the Prophet, of every *Knee's bowing to him*, as an Accomplishment of it, we must all stand before the Judgment-Seat of *Christ*. Now, says *Mr. B.* If the *Apostle's Reasoning* be just, our Saviour must be that *Jehovah*, to whom the Prophet had foretold, that every *Knee* should bow. Why so? *Else*, says he, it would not follow, because every *Knee* should bow to *God*, that all must stand before the Judgment-Seat of *Christ*. But I think it will follow very well, without making *St. Paul* pass for a shallow Reasoner. Is it not a great Instance of *God's* prevailing Sovereignty and Dominion, and of the *World's* universal Subjection to it, that all are accountable to his Minister and *Delegate*? Is any so blind as not to see that it is *God's* Judgment and *God's* Authority is own'd, when his commission'd Judge is submitted to, as if it were himself? If a Prince say, I will have all my *Subjects* submit to my Authority, and from thence one concludes, that they must be accountable to his commission'd Judge or *Delegates*; will it follow thence, that these Judges are the very King? Must *St. Paul* be censured as one that knew not how to argue *justly*, because he intends not such a weak Consequence, or rather such a *Non-sequitur*, as *Mr. B.* draws unreasonably from his Words? It is enough for justifying his Argument, that *God the Father* is bow'd to, in *Mens* Appearance at *Christ's* Bar as his Minister. I wonder *Mr. B.* should venture on such trifling Pretences.

But

But not being able to prove *divine* Worship to be due to Jesus Christ with any reasonable Evidence, from clear Scripture-Instances, he endeavours next to bring it in at a Back-door. He finds that some Worship is to be given him: but, says he, *There is no religious Worship to be given to any but God alone*; and that all such religious inferior Worship as is given to another, is a giving away God's Peculiar, which he has *appropriated* to himself, and so is no better than *Idolatry*. And hence he concludes, that what Worship is given to Jesus Christ, is not this inferior Worship, and therefore it must be *divine*. Of these Principles I shall endeavour to shew the Falshood and Weakness.

That there is no Evidence brought by Mr. B. of any divine Worship due to Jesus Christ, I have already manifested. What remains next, is,

Secondly, To shew, that there is an inferior religious Worship of Jesus Christ which the Scripture allows; and to answer his Cavils and Exceptions against it, from that general Position of his, (and others) *That all religious Adoration of any but the Supreme God, is Idolatry*: Like to that of the Pagans, which was oppos'd by the *Primitive Fathers*, &c.

Arg. 1. First then I maintain, that *de facto* there is an inferior Worship due to Jesus Christ. And this appears,

In that he is to be worship'd as *Mediator*. Now Mr. B. grants, that as Mediator he is *inferior to* P. 26. *the Father*. Whence it will follow, that the Worship paid *him* under this inferior Character, must needs be inferior Respect; because the relative Act must needs bear a proportion to its Object. Which side of the Question Mr. B. takes, *An Christus qua Mediator sit adorandus, an non?* I know not. But if he join with those who are

for the *Negative*, I think he lists himself among those who seem as ungrateful to the Redeemer for all his rich Grace and Love, as any whom they accuse. 'Tis evident that they join not with that desirable Society, who take so much pleasure in adoring and praising the *Lamb who was slain*, and that for shedding his Blood; which certainly is as *Mediator*: for the Lamb is only that Nature which was sacrificed, or which became an Offering; so that the same Nature is intended to be honoured which endured the Smart, and that Nature is glorified by the Saints, which was so by God. Nay I may, without rashness, venture to say, that to deny all Worship to the Man Jesus Christ, or to him as Mediator, and that as to one *unworthy* of it, is to put very great Contempt on the Blessed Jesus: 'Tis to run quite counter to the Scripture, and to contradict their triumphant Congratulations of the Redeemer's Honour, who say, *Worthy is the Lamb slain, to receive Glory, Honour and Blessing, &c.* And if it should be found that there is no *Son of God*, but what is a distinct *Being* from the Father (as some verily believe) and to him they deny all Adoration as idolatrous; I fear lest they be found among those who worship not the *Son of God* at all; and *he that honours not the Son* (even tho he be another Being from the Father) *honours not the Father*. In short, 'tis as Mediator that the grounds of Worship in Scripture do respect him.

Further, our Lord Jesus Christ is in the same respect an Object of Worship, as he is an Object of Faith, (for Mr. B. instances in Faith as a part of his internal Worship.) Now I would know if he dare say that we must not have Faith in him as Mediator. Nothing is more evident, than that the Scripture requires *mediate* Faith in him, (1 Pet. 1. 21. (which is but subordinate Worship.) *Thro him we* John 14. 1. *believe in God*. So again, *Ye believe in God*, says Christ,

Christ, *believe also in me, i. e.* as Mediator, as the *Trinitarian* Comments will tell us. So then here is Worship of him as Mediator, or as one inferior and subject to the *Father*; and therefore it cannot express a Respect equal to that of the *Father*.

Again, Mr. *B.* allows, that as *Mediator*, he P. 122. has all Dominions; and this is the true ground of Worship or Homage.

Nor indeed have the learned *Trinitarians* deny'd that he is to be pray'd to as Mediator. Mr. *Jurieu*, in his *Pastoral Letters*, shews, That the *Papists* do indeed make a difference between the *Worship of Angels* or *Saints*, and that of *God*, because they only pray to them as *Mediators*; but that they make none between that and the *Worship of Jesus Christ*, to whom, says he, we address thus, *Pray thou for us, intercede for us with thy Father*. This is without dispute to pray to him as *Mediator*, and in a subordinate inferiour way, below our Prayers to the *Father*, or *Supreme*. So *St. Stephen* pray'd to *Christ* as *Mediator*, says Mr. *Baxter*, because he petition'd for an *Act of Mediation*, *Acts 7*. Now mediate and ultimate Worship must needs be unequal, and the former be as much inferior to the latter, as the *Mediator, qua talis*, is to the *Father*, with Mr. *B's* own Consent.

Vol. 3.
Let. 15.

His last
Work of a
Believer,
P. 10. to
which he
refers in
his Para-
phrase.

Again, I argue from the usual *Apostolick* Salutations at the beginning of most of the *Epistles*, (which Mr. *B.* sticks not to mention for one of his *Proofs of Divine Worship in Prayer to Jesus Christ*) *Grace and Peace from God the Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ*. From hence I argue, that (even according to the *Trinitarians*) *Jesus Christ* cannot be pray'd to here as *God*, but as *Mediator* below *God*; and therefore with *inferior* *Worship*: which I gather thus, I observe the

Of the Worship of Jesus Christ,

Holy Spirit is never once join'd with the *Father* and the *Son* in those Salutations; so that either he is wholly left out from among the Persons worshipp'd by Christians, or the word *Father* must be taken for the whole Deity, including the Three Persons, as they sometimes tell us; there is no other way to fetch in the Third Person into this Worship. If Mr. B. will say, that God the *Father* notes the First Person of the Trinity, and Jesus Christ the Lord, the Second Person; then the Spirit is not included in the Object of Divine Worship at all. What shall be said to this? Is this to make the Holy Spirit equal to the other two? What, to pray distinctly to two Persons in particular, all along, and never once to the third! What is this but plainly to teach all the Churches that there was no Third Person of equal Honour; since he would not have been so constantly neglected by the Apostles in their publick Worship?

Well then, I'll suppose to avoid this the *Trinitarians* must say, that the Term *Father* is put for the whole Deity, including the Three Persons. But tho' this is very odd, and looks like a Shift for a desperate Cause, to say that the *Father*, when distinguish'd from the *Son of a Father*, as 2 *John ver. 3.* should be put for the Father and the Son; yet allowing this, that the Second and Third Persons are included in the *Father*, I then ask, what shall be intended by the Lord Jesus Christ join'd with the *Father*? It cannot be said that he is pray'd to as the Second Person there, because he is suppos'd to be included as such in the Term *Father*. There he is consider'd as God among the Three, and therefore it would be a gross and groundless *Tautology* to pray to him again under the same Character as God. Or, why should he be mention'd first in general and
common,

common, and then in particular, more than the other two Persons? So then it must be granted, I conceive, that having been pray'd to before in common as God, according to them, he is next particularly pray'd to as *Mediator*, and not as God; and then I have what I design, *viz.* a Proof that he is worshipp'd as Mediator, and as inferior to the Father; and consequently, that inferior religious Worship paid him in the New Testament, is neither *Divine*, nor yet *Idolatory*.

Arg. 2. Because Jesus Christ cannot be worshipp'd with *Divine Supreme Worship* (according to Mr. B. and other *Trinitarians*) therefore 'tis with inferior Worship, if at all. The reason why he cannot be worshipp'd with *Supreme Worship* is, because (as Mr. B. will allow) there is no Worship of God the *Supreme Being*, according to the Gospel, but what must be offer'd thro Christ as the Mediator, (that is, says Mr. B. and others, a God-Man.) Now if Christ be to be worshipp'd with *Divine Worship as God Supreme*, who can be the Mediator, where Christ himself is the *ultimate Object*? What *God-Man* comes between Christ's *Divine Nature*, and the suppliant Sinner? So that if I worship *him* with *Divine Worship as God*, then 'tis worshipping God without a Mediator; but since this is not Gospel-Worship, 'tis not to be maintain'd, that any Instances of Worship paid to Jesus Christ in the New Testament are of this Nature, *viz.* *Divine Supreme Worship*, but only inferior Respect.

And indeed Mr. B. being press'd with this Argument, grants the main Point, *viz.* *That the Divine Nature, as in the Father, is the ultimate Object of our Addresses.* So again, p. 24. *The Father is, sometimes in Scripture, propos'd as the ultimate Object of religious Worship, Eph. 2. 18. Thro*

Of the Worship of Jesus Christ,

him we have access to the Father, i. e. to the Divine Nature as primarily subsisting in the Father. He must mean, that the Father *only* is the ultimate Object, else 'tis nothing to his purpose; for he gives it as an Answer to the Question, Who is Mediator when the Divine Nature *in the Son* is the ultimate Object of Worship? To this he answers, The Divine Nature, *as in the Father*, is the ultimate Object; that is, as in him only, and not as in Christ: for if Christ also be such an ultimate Object of divine Worship, then the Difficulty remains unanswered, in *such* Worship of him, who being the ultimate Object, cannot be the *Mediator* also in the same Worship; since that would be to mediate only with himself, (which the Father may do as well as the Son) whereas 'tis evident, the Mediator in Scripture is understood of another distinct Person, and implies such Mediation as belongs not to the Father to act in, but the *Son* only.

Mr. *B.* cannot say (as we may) that the Human Nature acts alone, in this Mediation with his Divine, because he denies it to be capable of *knowing the Hearts of Men*; (without which there can be no sufficient Mediation for them) for he says, this is peculiar to God, and *solely* is to be found in him, not only in the most eminent Sense, as Mr. *E.* had said, but in any Sense.

Besides, then it will follow, that the Man Jesus Christ is a sufficient Mediator of Intercession with God the Father too, and there will need no second Person in the Deity for this matter; for surely such a Mediator as will suffice with the Divine Nature in the *Son*, may suffice as well with the same Nature in the Father, if they be equal in Justice and Glory: So that one divine Person, together with the Man Jesus Christ, will answer the whole Affair of Worship by a Mediator.

Mediator. And if it will suffice for *Intercession*, I suppose it will easily follow, that the Human Nature of Christ may also suffice in the business of *Redemption*; because these two are supposed to be connected and dependent one on the other: and we are oft told (in arguing against the Papists) that none can be a sufficient Mediator of *Intercession*, but who is also of *Redemption* by his Sacrifice, on which they say his *Intercession* is grounded. If therefore the Human Nature in Christ can sufficiently act the part of *Mediation* in it self, without the interceding *Mediation* of the *Divine*, in one part of it, *viz.* *Intercession*; then it must be supposed to have had the same Sufficiency in the other, *viz.* as a *Propitiation*. Moreover, there will be the very same Objection against Christ's mediating with his own Divine Nature and Justice, by way of atonement, in his own Divine Virtue, as there is against his mediating with his own Divine Nature in *Intercession*, in that same Divine Virtue: for to satisfy himself, is no Satisfaction to the Demands of his Justice, 'tis to sit down without any amends; just as to intercede with himself only, is to do it without any proper Intercessor at all.

If it be said, that the human Nature could not do this, but from the Dignity it receives by the personal Union to the divine Nature, and therefore must be a *God-Man* in the Case; I answer, That Union it self could not make the human Creature *Infinite*, nor truly Divine, and therefore not a Subject of Infinite Virtue and Merit neither: if any such Virtue be, it must be reckon'd only to the Divine Nature, and then all the *Mediation* bottom'd on it, will be still in its own Virtue, which is to mediate with it self. Besides, the *Unitarians* will allow the Man Jesus Christ to be united to the Father, who dwells in him, and who was manifested in

Of the Worship of Jesus Christ,

in his Flesh. And if that *Rule* of the *Trinitarians* be allow'd, that the Word *God* put absolutely, does use to signify the *Father*, who is eminently stil'd *God* (as says *Mr. B.* also) then such Texts as speak of *God's being manifest in Flesh*, and of *God's purchasing the Church with his Blood*, may be understood of the *Father*, and so do intimate as near an Union of *him* to the *Man Jesus Christ*, as can be pretended of any (suppos'd) second Person in the Deity. So that we may gain this Point, that to assert only one Person in the Divine Nature, is enough to answer the Gospel-account of *Christ's Mediation* with *God* for Sinners.

This I say only follows, in case any *Trinitarian* should be driven to say, that only the Human Nature acts in mediating with the Divine Nature of *Jesus Christ*, when 'tis ultimately and divinely worship'd (without which he is not worship'd as *God*) as they must say, except it be worship'd without a *Mediator*, to come between this *God* and us, which is against the Gospel. In short, either *Mr. B.* must say, That the most High *God Jesus Christ* (to use the *Trinitarian*, not *Scripture-Dialect*) is approachable by us without a *Mediator* against *Scripture*; or that the *Man Jesus Christ* is a sufficient *Mediator* in his created Nature; or that he is not worship'd as *God* at all, so as to need any *Mediator*. Either of the two latter will serve the *Unitarians*, tho'tis the last that I am now driving at, viz. that *Jesus Christ* is not worship'd as *Supreme God*, or as the ultimate Object of *Worship*. And if the *Son* be not the ultimate, but *mediate* Object only, I believe few can be so forsaken of their Reason, as to affirm *mediate* *Worship* to be truly *Divine*, or proper for the *Supreme Being* to receive, who is the *last End*

in all Worship and Service : and he who has no right to this, is not the Supreme God.

So then since Mr. *B.* seems not to allow Jesus Christ to be the ultimate Object of Worship, it will follow that he has only a subordinate or mediate Worship; and then I wonder to what purpose he went about to prove his Supreme Deity from *Divine* Worship being paid to him, when he must own, that none of his Instances from Scripture do prove him to be the Ultimate or Supreme Object of any such Worship, or to be *equal* to his Father, whose single Glory it is to be so. Thus in few words he subverts all his own Arguments, from that Topick of Divine Worship, for none is *such* but ultimate Worship.

I find Mr. *B.* complains it was hard to understand this Argument of Mr. *E's*, p. 145. but he that sees what Reply he makes, will be apt to think the difficulty lay somewhere else, since he understands it far better than he answers it; by owning the *Father* to be the ultimate Object of Worship, leaving it to the Son only, to be an Object of *mediate* or inferior Worship, or of none at all.

Arg. 3. I argue from those grounds and reasons, on which the Scripture bottoms his Claim to Worship, which are such as will only support an *inferior* Worship. Dominion or Superiority is the ground of Homage and Worship, which is only an Expression of our Subjection to another in whose power we are. *He is thy* Psal. 45.
Lord, and worship thou him. And from all *Sub-* 11.
jects some Homage is due. Now since the *Man*
Jesus Christ is undeniably possess'd of some Dominion over us; tho, absent and invisible, *he is* Acts 5. 31.
exalted to be our Prince and Saviour : It is therefore most unreasonable to deny him all Homage or
 Worship,

Acts 17.
31.

Worship, when he has such a Foundation for it. Angels have no Dominion over us that we know of; they are not our Lords, Lawgivers, or Judges, tho they may exercise their natural Powers for us; but Jesus Christ, as Man, is our Judge and Lord. But yet since all the Dominion, upon which the Gospel founds the Claim of his Worship, is but subordinate and delegated *from* and *for* another, *viz.* God or the *Father*, it follows also that the Worship claimed cannot be supreme, as what is truly Divine is.

Now that 'tis in regard of his subordinate derived Dominion that he must be worship'd, those two Texts alledg'd, *Phil.* 2. 9, 10, 11. and *John* 5. 22, 23. are home-proofs, if taken in their fair native Sense. But Mr. B. labours to make 'em unintelligible, by drawing an artificial, or rather a confus'd Cloud over their clear Light. *The Father has committed all Judgment to the Son, that all should honour the Son as they do the Father*, i. e. as truly, not equally, as Dr. *Whitby* reports *Origen's* Interpretation to be. Is it not plain, that the Honour due to Christ (supposing it to be Worship, rather than Obedience) is grounded on a delegated Authority, which he is invested with from the *Father*? Is not a commission'd Authority given him, on purpose to be the Warrant and Reason for our doing him honour? which in all fair reasoning will imply, that without this Commission there wou'd not be so sufficient Warrant and Ground for it. And 'tis as evident, that this *given* Authority cou'd be no reason for giving him *Divine* Worship, which is not due upon any thing that can be *given*; because 'tis due only to *original*, underived, and independent Infinite Perfections. And if Jesus Christ had such underiv'd Excellencies, that had been a more noble ground
of

of Honour, more worthy to be alledg'd in the Case; and withal, there had been no need of the *Father's* Gift, to procure his *Son* this Honour, if it was already antecedently due to him in the utmost degree, upon an infinitely *higher* Reason than this Gift. Nay, the Reason proceeded on in the Text, is contradictory to a Claim founded on *original Infinite* Supremacy, because a Gift of Power cannot be made to *him*, who, as *God*, has all Power, and so must be both the Fountain of that Gift, and Receiver of it too. The same *Divine Nature* cannot sure have all Power originally, or *underiv'd*, and then have that by *Derivation*, which it had underiv'd; he who has all originally, can receive no Gift or Addition. There can be no Truth more plain than this, nor any Reasoning more natural and unstrain'd.

It were a most absurd Interpretation of the Text to make our Lord's Meaning to be this, *viz.* The *Father* has committed all Judgment to my *Human Nature*, that Men might honour my *Divine Nature*, which yet receives nothing by it, and is adorable on a much higher reason without it. And yet there is no just doubt but that the same *Subject* is intended to be honour'd, which is invested with Authority from God, *viz.* the Son of Man, *Ver. 27.* Nor can a Gift or Dignity confer'd on the *Human Nature* be a ground of worshipping the *Divine* at all; for as in *Naturals* Water ascends not higher than the Fountain; so in *Morals*, our Actions ascend no higher in a regular Estimation than the Grounds and Principles of 'em. He who pretends to worship the *Divine Nature* for a reason not in it, and which only reaches to the *Human*, does not worship the *Divine* at all, but only the *Human Nature*.

There-

Of the Worship of Jesus Christ,

Therefore to avoid these Absurdities, Mr. B. runs, if possible, into a greater. He cannot deny but that the Worship due to Jesus Christ, is founded upon the Father's Gift, in committing *all Judgment to him*: but then he would fain have this Gift to belong to his Divine Nature; and because that must needs have all Power eternally inherent in it self, he says, 'tis a Gift of no Power but what did *originally* belong to it before. And lest one should not be able to see the mighty Bounty of the *Father*, in giving his Son nothing new, but only what he had without that Gift, he says, the *Gift* lies in this, *That the Father did devolve for a time the sole Exercise of this original Power on his Son*, which originally was common to both, (and I suppose to the Holy Spirit also;) and, he says, that this is what Christ means, when he says, *All Power in Heaven and Earth is given me of the Father*.

Let us a little consider the Absurdity of these Notions in some Particulars.

1. Is it not strange, that in this *Gift* of the Father to the *Son*, of *all Power*, &c. which the Scripture speaks so pompously of, there should be *nothing at all* given him more than he had before? For Mr. B. expressly says, *The Son acquires hereby no Authority that did not belong originally to his Divine Nature*. A Gift of no new Authority, seems to be a Gift of nothing. Is Christ rewarded with nothing, or with no addition of Glory? Must he hold that by Gift, which he held by a better Tenure before?

2. Is it not absurd to say, that God can have a Gift, or that *God* can be rewarded? Yet Mr. B. makes this Gift to be the Reward of the *Son of God*, i. e. the *Divine Nature*, for *becoming the Son of Man*; and says, it terminates on the whole Person, both *God and Man*. And shall

shall it ever be said, that the Supreme Possessor of all Perfection can be rewarded with a Gift of Authority, or receive any Commission? And tho Mr. B. would avoid this by the former Paradox, saying, that nothing is given but what he had originally, yet herein he is not very consistent, either with Reason or himself; for since he calls the *Son's sole Trust* and Administration a *Privilege*, beyond his ruling in common with the *Father*, I would fain know whether he had that *Privilege originally*, or whether this was not a new Acquisition. He grants it to be *new*; so that it seems that as *God Supreme*, he can receive new *Privilege*, and become *better* and *greater* than he was before. Is this the Trinitarian Faith of God?

3. This is inconsistent with the Divine *Unity*, for one to resign, and another to receive the Administration; one to be voluntarily excluded, and the other *solely* entrusted. It agrees well enough with *two* Beings and two Wills, and with his Instance of King *William* and Queen *Mary*; which is nothing to his purpose, unless he will make God and his Son to be a *pair* of Infinite Beings, which he denies, but yet his Reasonings do plainly insinuate it. The same single *Will* cannot resign and take; cannot both quit, and exercise the Administration of all. This implies two Parties and two Wills, as the different Subjects of that Power and mutual Consent, and Managers of those various Administrations.

4. It seems inconsistent with Mr. B. himself, who had said often that the *Father sustains the* p. 24.
place of Supreme Lawgiver, and intimates that the
Son leaves the Rights of his Sovereignty on the Fa- p. 25.
ther's Hands, and takes on him the Office of a
Mediator. If then Jesus Christ have not finish'd

his *Mediation*, as he has not, how can he be entrusted, or solely entrusted with the Supreme Authority, while at the same time he has left the *Rights of the Sovereignty* with the Father? Or how has the *Father* devolv'd the sole Exercise upon the *Son*, if himself sustain the place of Supreme *Rector*? Mr. B. says, that Jesus Christ has this *Sovereign Dominion* over all, in the Capacity of *Mediator*. And yet it seems in that Capacity he had left his Sovereignty in the *Father's Hands*. So that the Father is suppos'd to have the *Rights* of Sovereignty devolv'd upon himself, at the same time as he is pretended to have devolv'd 'em on his Son; and that while he is in the place of Supreme Ruler, he has quitted the Rule to the *Son*. These things seem most repugnant to each other, as well as to Reason. And this is contrary to what the *Trinitarians* determine in their Systems; for there the Question, *An Christus solus jam dominetur in Ecclesia, non vero Pater?* is answer'd with a *negatur contra Socinianos*.

P. 25.

Turret.
Compend.
p. 124.

5. 'Tis evident that this Authority, as given, is made the reason of the *Son's* Honour. Now if the Father's devolving the *sole* Exercise on the *Son* be the ground of Divine Worship or Honour, then while the Father has not this *sole* Exercise, nay has devolv'd his whole Right on another, hath he not quitted this ground of Divine Honour? And to say the truth, Mr. B. makes the Father's Gift to lie in divesting himself of his Glory, so that he has *less* Rule than he had, and yet the *Son* has no more than before. This is to honour the *Son*, and not the *Father*, by supposing he has laid by the *Grounds* of Divine Worship, and conferred it only on his *Son*, himself quitting the Exercise of original Power.

6. This

6. This suppos'd Oeconomy of Mr. B. carries in it many injurious Reflections upon the Honour and Perfections of the blessed God.

It supposes that 'tis a Happiness for one Person to have all the Government in his hands, and to get the whole from the other *two*; so that it seems 'tis not so well for that *one* Person, when the *Father* has his part again: for this *sole* Exercise Mr. B. calls a Privilege, and therefore when the *Son* gives up his Kingdom, he resigns a great Privilege of his *Divine* Nature, for to that Mr. B. supposes the Gift belongs.

We have sometimes been told, by one of Mr. B's Brethren, that *Society* in the Divine Nature is *delicious*, and a great Happiness; and therefore there are necessary *Emanations* of several Persons. But then how comes it to pass, that *Society* in Government is so grievous, that it should be such a *Privilege* for one of 'em to have the other's Rights confer'd on him?

Sure that *Society* should be as pleasing in Government, as in any thing else. And it should be best for the three Persons to rule alike, as they did before Christ's Reward, and must do hereafter; when Mr. B. says, *All will revert to the natural Order, and then Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, shall be jointly concern'd in the Administration of Government.* If this be their *natural* Order, methinks this should never be alter'd by a *voluntary Dispensation*, since the Divine Persons must be suppos'd to have all Advantages and Excellencies *naturally*, in the most perfect manner. It is unreasonable to suppose that Jesus Christ can have this *Power* by any voluntary Gift, in a better manner than he had it *originally*, and by Nature; so as that it should

be any Privilege to have their natural Order inverted.

Besides that 'tis no Privilege to the Son, who, Mr. B. says, *has all Power originally*, to have it now as a *Trust* for which he must be accountable. Nay, it seems no *Privilege* any way to him, that the *Father* leaves the Administration to *him*, who had all before; any more than 'tis any Privilege to me, that another withdraws, and leaves me to have all the *Sunshine* to my self, who had it all before, as much as I can have by his retiring.

Upon the whole, I cannot but lament to see how wofully the holy Christian Religion is, by such *invented* Absurdities as these, expos'd to the grievous Scorn of Infidels, while they see such *Schemes* as this of Mr. B. (which indeed is the Ground of his whole Argument) representing *God*, his *Son*, and *Spirit*, not only as three several Men for Distinction, but also as to their Temper and way of Management; making 'em to parcel out the Divine *Regimen*, and one to devolve his part on the other, (as the Son at first leaves his Rights with the Father, say the *Trinitarians*) and then to receive in his turn the others part for a Reward and Gift; and then to give it back again, as at the last Day the Son must. As if, like ambitious Mortals, who furiously scramble for Dominion, and labour to undermine each other, it were so among the three *Persons* of the Godhead, that one should count himself raised to Honour and *Privilege*, by the other's divesting himself, and leaving all to him. So that according to Mr. B's Scheme, one may plainly see that it were more for the Divine Glory and Happiness, that there were but one Person in God; since he would have all the Privilege of ruling without a Sharer

or Competitor, (which no doubt is the real Truth of all.) To such sad Derision do some bold *Disposers* of God Almighty expose him, as if they thought him (and had a mind to teach it to others that he is) like to themselves! Are these the venerable Mysteries of Christianity? Of which I find not one word in Holy Writ; and therefore they must answer for the Shame done to *Christianity* hereby, who have dared by such strain'd Artifices to distort and abuse Holy Scripture, that they may impose those violent Absurdities upon the Gospel.

I conclude then, that the *Son* of God being an inferior Being, is dignify'd by the *Father* as his *Deputy*, and so is honour'd subordinately by us; and then all Absurdities are avoided. Another, and an inferior Being, may easily receive from God, and have a dignifying Gift of Government: for the Exercise of which, I allow the *Fulness of the Godhead in him* does greatly enable him. And thus it appears, that the *Authority given* for the Foundation of his Honour, is a *subordinate* Power vested in him as an inferior dependent Being, and subject to the *Father*; and consequently that the Worship resulting from it cannot be *Divine*, but inferior, whatever strain'd Evasions Mr. B. so unhappily advances.

Let me only add under this *Head*, that it will plainly appear to be only an *inferior* Worship that Jesus Christ claims by that Text, *John* 5. 22, 23. from Mr. B's own Argument, which he brings to prove that the *Devil* claim'd no more than inferior Worship from him on the Mountain, *Mat.* 4. *Luke* 4. 6. he says, The Devil only claim'd *such inferior Respect as was* P. 134.
due to one constituted a God over this lower World, or as one who had a Power over all the King-

doms of it *delivered to him*; so that he could give it to whom he would. But how does he prove this? Why, 'tis merely from the Devil's saying, *All this Power is delivered to me*. Now if the Words will prove that the Devil did not demand more than inferior Worship, then I am pretty sure that our Lord Jesus's Words must prove the same of him, that he intended to claim only such *inferior Honour*, when he goes upon the same reason, *viz. because all Judgment was committed to him*, or delivered to him; and withal he tells us from whom, *viz. from the Father*, which the Devil does not there own. One may challenge Mr. *B.* to make his Argument good here, without being forc'd to grant that it will afford a good Argument, to prove that the Worship spoken of by Jesus Christ in that Text, is only inferior Worship; since his Words do more fully express that, which Mr. *B.* in the Devil's case says, can only imply inferior Respect. Only whereas the Devil not only pretended to more Power than he had right to, but had Impudence and Malice enough to demand what was unreasonable, even on that pretended Reason; our Lord Jesus on the contrary had a just Claim to his Dominion, and would seek no more Respect than is due to the Grounds on which he claims it. So that tho' the Devil shou'd, and perhaps really did, require an unjust thing, and even vie with *God* himself; yet the Holy Jesus would never be gailty of it.

Having thus prov'd and clear'd *this Point, viz.* That Jesus Christ is an Object of *inferior* Worship, and consequently that his being worshipp'd does not prove him to be the most High God, I proceed to vindicate it from Mr. *B.*'s Exceptions:
tho

tho as to what he objects against giving truly *Divine* Worship to him on the *Unitarian* Grounds, I need not take notice, because they deny such Worship; yet that on their Principles he may have inferior religious Worship, I think I may easily justify against all his Objections, which may be reduc'd to Two.

1. He says, That it entrenches on the peculiar Honour of God, to pay any kind of religious Worship to any Inhabitant of the invisible World, but himself: Which is in effect to say, it is idolatrous to worship the Man Jesus Christ, tho with inferior religious Homage.

2. That on the *Unitarian* Principles, both *Papists* and *Pagans* may justify their Worship of Creatures, from any Charge of Idolatry. These two Objections I hope fully to silence, as going upon mistaken Grounds.

First, he says, It entrenches upon the incommunicable Honour of God, to worship any one else (even Jesus Christ, if not the Supreme God) with any religious Worship, tho inferior. This I deny. And here he gives us a very lame Notion of *Religious Worship*, as oppos'd to *Civil*: By *Religious Worship*, says he, I understand such Worship as the Religion we profess directs us to pay to some Inhabitant of the invisible World. But why does he say, to some Inhabitant of the Invisible World, when he denies that our Religion directs us to pay Worship to any other of those Inhabitants, but God alone? He might more clearly have said, he means such Worship as our Religion directs us to pay unto God. And if this be his Notion of *Religious Worship*, 'tis nothing to the purpose to say, that this is all appropriated to God; for Mr. E. never pretended any such *Divine* Worship to be given to any other, but only a different kind of subordinate Respect. But if Mr. B's

Meaning be, that there must be nothing of any external Semblance or Likeness in our very bodily Postures or Words, when we shew our Respects to Men, to what we use in our Worship of God; 'tis a very weak Assertion, contradicted by the allow'd Examples of good Men, who have bowed their Bodies to Angels and Men too, much lower than now is used in the Worship of God. No difference may be perceiv'd in the outward Act, tho there be enough manifest from the known difference of the Object, as Mr. B. himself confesses, p. 125.

Mr. E. had shewn, that some such Worship (that is, such in the general Sound and Sense of the Letter) is ascrib'd to the Lamb slain, *i. e.* the Human Nature of Christ, as to God. The Words are the same, *Blessing, Honour, Glory to the Lamb, and to him that sits on the Throne*: And yet the *Lamb standing among the Elders* before the midst of the Throne, and God represented as *sitting on the Throne* of Majesty, made a sensible difference of the two Objects, enough to distinguish the Nature of the Worship or Praise; as Mr. B. supposes in the Instance of the Peoples *bowing their Heads, and worshipping God and the King (David)*. Mr. B. supposes the People first bow'd to God, and then faced about, and made another Bow to the King; but the Text takes no such Care to make that Distinction. And it may be another will think it as reasonable to say, The Angels first made their Acknowledgments to God on the Throne, and then did it again distinctly to the Lamb. However, here was no danger of mistaking this latter for more than a subordinate Worship. And for his demanding *what Instances the Author can give of such Doxologies being ever apply'd to ordinary Men or the highest Angel*; 'tis a poor and vain Flourish, when he knows the

Unitarians give Honour to Jesus Christ on Grounds proper to him only, who alone is exalted to be Mediator and Head.

I come now directly to oppose his Assertion, by shewing that all *Religious Worship* is not appropriated to *God* alone, as his Peculiar. He affirms it to be so, both in the Nature of the Worship, and by the Testimony of the Scriptures. I deny both.

First, 'Tis not so in the *Nature* of the thing it self; for all Religious Worship is not Divine Worship (as Mr. B. asserts) nor does it suppose *Infinite* Perfections in its Object. Then indeed all Religious Worship of any but God, would be Idolatry, or Supreme Worship given to an undue Object: whereas his great Friend Dr. *Whitby* Ib. p. 230. allows that there is *inferior* Worship, which is not *Idolatry*, but Superstition only; because tho' it be Religious Worship, yet it is not in its Nature truly Divine. And indeed if there be such a thing as *inferior* Worship in its very Nature, it is so far from being appropriate to God, that it agrees not to him at all. He would be affronted by such mean Respects. But with Mr. B. there can be no such thing as *Inferior*, no Religious Worship, which is not Supreme and *Divine*. Let us examine his Reasons.

All such Worship, says he, *supposes the Being to whom we pay it, to have such unlimited Perfections of Knowledge, Power, Presence, &c. as belong to none but God.* This I justly deny; for Jesus Christ may have Knowledge and Power enough to answer my Occasions, without being infinite therein. And Mr. B. can never make it out that this should be the Reason, on which St. *John's* Worship was refus'd by the Angel, *as injurious to God, to whom alone it was due*, as he speaks, p. 140. Nor could this be the Reason why Jesus Christ refus'd

P. 133.

refus'd to worship the *Devil*, when talking with him visibly, *Luke 4.* (which yet is the Text from which Mr. *B.* endeavours to prove his Point.) Will he pretend that the *Angel* could not hear *St. John*, nor do him any Office of Favour; nor the *Devil* know of Christ's Worship, without being suppos'd to have unlimited Perfections? Would not less than Omniscience and Omnipresence serve the turn? since it required no more in them, than is in an ordinary Man to whom we speak or bow. Is this Divine Worship in the Nature of it? or any of that Idolatry, which, he says, is *founded in the Nature of things*, and not only on the Command? So that he must find out some other Reason, than from the Nature of the thing, before he can *condemn* all Religious Worship given to another besides God, as idolatrous or sinful, from such Instances of Scripture: for on what reason soever the Angel discouraged *John*, and Jesus Christ the *Devil*, 'tis certain 'tis not on Mr. *B.*'s Ground as tho it suppos'd the Object to be of *infinite* Perfections; for his Instances make all against him and the Reason he goes on, because they all relate to Persons present, which supposes no such Perfections in them to receive Worship, as might be suppos'd in the Worship of one absent.

P. 129.

Nay, I truly think, from *St. John's* Worship of the Angel, that it appears, there may be a Religious Worship of an Inhabitant of Heaven, which is not *Divine* in its Nature, nor Idolatrous: Else if all such Worship be so, it makes *St. John* the *Divine* to be a grievous Idolater, and that *twice*: for Mr. *B.* supposes that he offered to the *Angel* what was appropriate to *God*, and to his Injury, which he judges to be Idolatry. So then I don't see but *St. John* fell as grievously as *Peter*, who deny'd his Lord thrice, and the other committed

P. 126,
140.

mitted Idolatry twice (if it was real Matter of Fact, but however it shews *John's* Inclination.) This is strange, that so long after he had receiv'd the *Holy Ghost*, and been a confirm'd antient *Apostle*, he should not know what was *Idolatry* in the *Nature* of the Thing, or by God's Command; nor yet perceive it, after he had been once warn'd by the *Angel*: I believe rather that he sinn'd not at all, as Mr. *B.* supposes, and that the *Angel* refus'd the Honour on another score; an *Apostle* being not much inferior or unlike in Office to an *Angel*. The *Angel's* Reason is, *I am thy Fellow-Servant, and of thy Brethren, that have the Testimony of Jesus.* Just so *St. Peter* refus'd the Honour from *Cornelius*, not because it was *Divine*, but, says Mr. *Baxter*, it was unmeet for *Paraphr.*
an humble Man to own it. Had *St. John* thought *on Acts 10.*
the *Angel* refus'd it from the Sinfulness of the *Act*, he had never offer'd it so soon again, as *Rev. 22.*

And I may add, That if this *Apostle* did, after the writing his *Epistles*, thus think that some Religious Worship might be given to an *Angel* when present, then he never intended to forbid such Worship (consequently not all Worship of others besides God) in his Caution, *Keep your selves from Idols*: tho' to worship *Angels*, when not present, may yet be inexcusable.

The like I argue from the Worship, which our Lord *Jesus* received when on Earth, as a Prophet. Mr. *B.* brings this as a Proof of his Deity: If, says he, he were not truly *God*, he should in all *P. 126.*
reason have been as tender (as the *Angel*) of the *Divine Honour*, in refusing all external *Acts* that looked like religious *Homage*.

Now Mr. *B.* must by this intend, that *Christ* receiv'd this on the account of his being *God*, and so as *Divine Worship*; else it cannot prove him

to be *God*, by receiving it. I would then ask him whether this Worship was given by the Worshippers with any such Intent : I believe he will not say they intended it otherwise than to worship him as a Prophet, and so as holy Messengers of God us'd to be reverenc'd : If not so, then it must have been Idolatry in them, to give *God's* Honour, or what in the Nature of the thing was Divine Worship, to one whom they judg'd not to be God. And would the *Blessed Jesus* have been so little tender of the Divine Honour, as quietly to receive idolatrous Worship, and not reprove 'em? We are told, that he rebuked the

Matth. 19. young Man, who gave him only the *Title* of *Good Master*, while he did not judge him to be the most High God, (tho the *Trinitarians* say he was really so *incognito*.) If it were really so, then it is most strange that he could from time to time suffer Men to worship him (nay even the *same* young Man) and yet shew no dislike. Was not giving him Religious Worship (according to Mr. B.) a more direct and undoubted Proclamation of his Deity? And did it not more apparently carry with it an Ascription of Divine Glory to him, than barely to say *Good Master*? Would he then have borne it, to be made an *Idol* by them, by undue Worship? Be sure he that refused the *Semblance* of a Divine Title, would much more have done the same by *Divine* Worship; tho the Offerers no more intended it for *such*, than he who gave that *Title* did intend it for a Divine Attribute.

No, no, our Lord Jesus took it as the Worshippers gave it, *viz.* for an *inferior* Religious Worship, or *moral* Reverence due to him, without any regard to his (suppos'd) Deity. Nay, if either Jesus Christ or the *Angel* looked on it as *Divine* Worship in its very *Nature*, how come they

they

they to be so calm? We find how such a Business rais'd the Indignation of *Paul and Silas*; They rent Acts 14. *their Clothes, &c.* Had not Jesus Christ nor the 13, 14, 15. Angel any of this *Tenderness* for the Divine Honour? Or rather they had not such a Provocation.

Thus I conceive Mr. *B's* Notion appears most false, in asserting all Religious Worship given to any Inhabitant of the invisible World, or to any other but God, to be Divine in its own Nature. And tho his Definition of Religious Worship limits it to any other Inhabitant of the *Invisible World*, yet 'tis plain in his Proofs, he extends the Case to all Religious Worship of others also.

To bring the matter nearer, let us inquire, whether his Argument will hold in reference to the Worship of such Inhabitants of the *invisible World*, as are absent from us; whether all Worship of any such, besides God, does in the Nature of it ascribe infinite Perfection to its Object. This also I deny, because it is possible another besides God may know and do as much as such Worship may imply, tho his Perfections be not equal to those of the *supreme Being*. And this is what is really suppos'd in Jesus Christ. It does not necessarily suppose *Infinite Omniscience* to know (some way or other) all that passes in this little Spot of Earth.

It must be granted that Jesus Christ, as a *Mediator* of Worship, is as really supposed to know our Prayers and Wants, as when he is an Object of it, (and I hope, that as *Man* he does mediate and intercede, and is our Agent.) Dr. *Whitby* tells us, what is imply'd in being our *Advocate* with God: Speaking of the *Romish* Practice of praying to *Angels and Saints*, as *Advocates* for Men, he says, 'tis built on this Supposition, That they
know

Idol. c. c.
p. 180. know our Prayers and Hopes; for, says he, *who knows not that to be our Advocate, is to commend our Cause to God, and to intreat that our Desires be granted? And who knows not that our Cause cannot be commended, nor our Desires represented, till they be first understood?* Since then Jesus Christ is our Advocate with the *Father*, and intreats for us, it must be said, that he knows our Case some way; and sure 'tis not in his Divine Nature he prays to the *Father*, (supposing such an one.) Does the supreme Divine Nature pray to any? Or does God Almighty in one *Mode* intercede with himself in another? If then the Man Jesus Christ does intreat for us, if he be our Advocate, and that for this end he is enter'd into Heaven, (which only can belong to his Human Nature; for if he had a *Divine* one, that was as much there before) then in all reason, this *Man* Jesus Christ must know our Case before he plead it, and in that same Nature which pleads it. God, who has exalted him to that Office, has some way or other capacitated him for it: and this is a sufficient Ground for worshipping him as *Mediator*, tho it be far from implying him to be equal in Perfections to that God with whom he intercedes, and consequently is no Ground for *truly Divine* Worship.

John 16.
25.
Heb. 7.25.
Heb. 9.24.
P. 90. To this forcible Argument, Mr. B. seems at a loss what to answer, by his saying, *That 'tis sufficient that his Divine Nature discerns our Distresses; and the Remembrance of his own Sufferings in our Nature, renders him a compassionate Intercessor.* But what is this to the purpose? The Question is, how his Human Nature can sympathize with, or intercede for us, without knowing all our Cases? To this he says, 'Tis sufficient the *Divine Nature* knows. What! is this sufficient to make the Human Nature know? Does not he say, that

this was ignorant of what the *Divine Nature* knew, in the matter of the *Judgment Day*? So that 'tis no way sufficient, to say the *Divine Nature* knows all our Distresses, unless the *Human* know it also (which does not follow from the *Divine Nature's* knowing it) because to intercede is an Act of the *Human Nature* and Understanding. Or does he mean, that 'tis sufficient to render the *Human Nature* capable of Intercession, that the *Divine Nature* knows our Cases, tho it self that must act in it, knows 'em not? This is to say, that the Man *Jesus Christ* intercedes for he knows not *what*, nor *whom*; and is a compassionate Advocate in a Case he never heard of; and asks for he knows not what of his Father on their behalf, as not knowing what they need. Is this the encouraging Account, which the Scripture gives us of our compassionate *High Priest*? An Angel or Saint can intercede thus in general.

Therefore in the next words he is forc'd to suppose the *Divine Nature may communicate to the Human the Knowledge of our particular Cases*. And hopes to get off by adding, That *tho we should allow such Knowledge to be communicated to his Human Nature, by Revelation from his Divine, yet I don't see that this would prove an universal Knowledge, &c.* Now the allowing this Supposition, will serve Mr. *E's* purpose: for not to dispute, whether this Knowledge of *all Christians* particular Cases, may be call'd universal, since it extends to *all*, and even implies the Knowledge of their *Hearts*, else little or nothing of their Case is truly known at all; nor whether this be not as much as the Scripture ascribes to *Jesus Christ*; yet I hope Mr. *B.* may see that this Knowledge by Revelation of our Cases in particular, is however enough for us
to

to ground our Worship and Addressees upon, tho we do not suppose him *omniscient* or *omnipresent*, as God is. For what greater Knowledge, I wonder, does *Prayer* to him as Mediator suppose, than that he knows our Cases and our Prayers? And if the *Human Nature* may know this by *Revelation*, then the making him an *Object of Worship* does not imply him to be the *Supreme* and *Infinite God*, as Mr. B. pretends. Thus his Reason is utterly lost, by which he would prove the Religious Worship of Jesus Christ to be in its *Nature* truly Divine, as implying Infinite Divine Perfections; since without *such Perfections*, here is a way suppos'd by *himself*, in which he may be qualify'd to know our Addressees, as much as is needful for justifying us in offering them to him.

And whereas he refers us to Dr. *Whitby* for proof that the antient Fathers, in the purest Ages, did disclaim all Religious Worship of any but God alone; I can make it appear, from that very Learned Doctor's own Words (with what Consistency I heed not) that the chief of them, whom he instances in, did expressly deny at the same time, that ever they gave equal Honour to Jesus Christ, and to God his Father; and also that the Worship of Christ depended plainly on the Father's Grant of Honour to him: which because the *Pagan Demons* could not justly pretend to, their Worship was for that very reason condemn'd by Christians.

*Idolat. of
the Rom.
Church,
P. 223.*

2. Let us in the next place see if he can prove by *Scripture Testimony*, that all religious Worship is appropriate to God, so as that no other can be capable of so much as inferior Worship. If Mr. B. can maintain this (tho he has certainly mistaken the ground on which such Worship is limited to God only, it not being so in
its

its Nature, yet) this shall be enough to decide the Cause with me, who desire to walk exactly by the Scripture-Rule, and only reject those *Trinitarian* Opinions, which I think the Gospel never asserts; but magisterial Men would shew their *Dominion over our Faith*, in imposing 'em upon us.

The Proof from Scripture (besides such Instances of *Peter's* refusing the Worship of *Cornelius*, and the Angel that of *John*, the Vanity and Weakness of which I have already shewn) that he insists on, is our Lord's Reply to *Satan*, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.* Luk. 4. 10. Whence Mr. B. concludes, that our Saviour has determin'd it, that no religious Worship is to be given to any but God; and he adds, 'That the Devil did not claim Divine P. 134.
'Worship, but such an inferior Respect which
'was due to one constituted a God over this
'lower World; yea, a relative Worship, which
'ultimately refer'd to the Honour of the Giver,
'*Luke 4. 6.*' But adds he, 'Our Saviour rejects
'his Demand, not by denying the Devil's pre-
'tence to such Power, but by telling him he
'demanded what was God's incommunicable
'Right, and what he could not claim, had his
'Pretensions been never so true. And that
'Jesus Christ gave a weak Answer, and the
'Devil was a weaker Disputant to take it, if
'that Text only denied *Supreme Worship* to be
'given to any other than God, and not *all*
'Worship.'

Here he thinks he has gain'd the Victory, and is ready to triumph; but may receive some check, if he consider how weak the Foundations of his Arguments are. For,

1. It cannot be deny'd, that the *Precept* related by Christ is to be taken under some Li-
H
mitation;

mitation; and that it does not forbid *all manner of Worship* or Homage whatever, to other than God. For then no Homage might be paid to any *Prince* or *Parent*, which is *Civil* Worship, yea and *religious* too, as 'tis given on a religious Account, from Conscience toward God, and Reverence to his *Image* and Authority, which Magistrates bear. Nor would Jesus Christ have receiv'd this Worship of *Prostration* (for that was all that was in dispute) from such as respected him only as a Prophet, if it was not lawful to give to any but God such religious Homage. Besides, 'tis plain, the *Jews* never thought Prostration to a Man, nor to an *Angel*, to be against this Law: and since the Devil requires, and Christ pleads against bare Prostration, or only falling down before him, it follows that if it be lawful to bow or fall prostrate before any other than God, *viz.* Man or Angel, then it is **certain** Jesus Christ did not mean, by repeating this Command, to forbid this very Act of Worship to all others but God; which yet he did forbid to the Devil. It was a reason against worshipping *him*, on some special Ground, which might not reach to all others, to whom it may be allowed to fall down, and *do homage*, as to superior Powers in Subordination to God: or else it must relate only to supreme *Divine* Homage and Adoration, and not to all inferior Worship.

2. Well then, since Mr. *B.* cannot say, that all *Prostration* to another but God is here forbidden, it is requisite that we inquire what sort of Worship the Devil might intend by it, and which our Lord intimates to have been forbidden in that Law which he cites; that so we may see what Limitations are to be given to it.

Mr. B. says, that we are to understand it of all *Religious Worship*, which is only to be given to God: but I say that we may as well limit it to *Supreme* or ultimate Religious Worship; and that on due Consideration it will be found, that either the Devil requir'd *Divine*, or at least absolute ultimate Worship, or else but civil Worship; and consequently that Christ in shewing the Unlawfulness of that Worship, which he required, did only prohibit such Worship. For 'tis plain to me, that the Devil did not claim an inferior subordinate Worship, as Mr. B. pretends; since by such Religious Worship is always, I think, understood a serious reverential Respect to Persons for their *moral* Excellencies, or their Sanctity, and near *Relation* to God. Now I wonder, what pretence Mr. B. thinks the Devil had to this *moral* Religious Reverence. Did he set up for a Saint or a Prophet of God, or pretend to any sacred Spiritual Office in the Church, or in Heaven under God; or demand Worship that might be ultimately refer'd to God? No, he never pretends any such Thing. Therefore,

3. It was either a sort of *Civil Homage*, or ultimate inferior Respect, or *supreme* Divine Worship, that he sought. Let it not seem strange, that I say it might be *Civil Homage*; for do but observe how the Devil states his Claim. He represents himself as a mighty *puissant* Prince of spacious Dominions, who had great Offices, Preferments, and Kingdoms to bestow on his *Favourites*; and on this account he demands Homage of Christ, by falling down to worship him, as the *Eastern* People used to worship their Kings. This seems plainly to be a doing Homage to him, as a secular Prince, or *God of this World*. Had the Devil sought to be

Of the Worship of Jesus Christ,

worship'd when absent, or in some *Idol Temple*; it might have lookt more like *Religious Worship*; but he only seeks *Worship* when present, and making a pompous shew of his *Grandeur*: I think this looks very like *Civil Worship*.

But if Mr. B. will have it to be inferior *Religious Worship*, then I say it was at least *ultimate Worship*, such as no way was in *Subordination* or *Reference* to God, on whom all *Worship* ought to terminate ultimately, or 'tis sinful. For the Devil sets up in opposition, not in *subordination* to God, and was so consider'd by our Lord Jesus; and I utterly deny that he ever pretended to such *Worship* as *should ultimately refer to God as the Giver*. For he never says one word, that *God was the Giver* of his *Dominion*, or had *constituted him a God over the World*, as Mr. B. pretends. Much less do I believe, (supposing Jesus Christ had so understood him) that our Lord did not in his Answer intend to deny such a false Pretence. To suppose the Devil has a subordinate *Dominion* under God, relative to him as the Giver, is to suppose an orderly Agreement between God and the Devil. But *what Communion has Light with Darkness? What Fellowship hath Righteousness with Unrighteousness?* Our Lord must never be suppos'd not to have deny'd this, in his Answer. Nor does he any way insinuate, that had this Pretence of a just subordinate Authority been true; yet no Homage could be given him in *Subordination* to God, without intrenching on God's incommunicable Right. All this is unwarrantably feign'd by Mr. B. and not express'd or imply'd in Christ's Words. His Answer was, *Thou shalt worship God: q. d.* I am bound by this Law to do Homage to the God of *Israel*, and therefore must not do it to thee his avowed
Enemy,

Enemy, which would be a Breach of my Allegiance to God. And *only him shalt thou serve*; *i. e.* I must be under no Government but his, and therefore I will not own thine, which would be a Revolt from him whose Subject I am. I think this is a very fair and natural Sense of his Words; or *Thus, q. d.* All Worship must ultimately relate to God, who is the only Fountain of Honour and Power, and he only must be the End of all Worship. Therefore I'll give no Homage of which he cannot be the End, and in which he is not acknowledg'd nor honour'd.

Now supposing this to be the Case, then the Words, *Thou shalt worship the Lord, and him only shalt serve*, are only spoken in opposition to Enemies, and will only exclude from Worship, or all sort of Homage, any Usurper and Opposer of God, that has no Authority from him, and whose Worship can have no relation to him at all: so that there is good Consequence in this, *Thou shalt worship God only*, as the ultimate Object of all Worship and Honour; and therefore thou shalt not do Homage to his Enemy and *Rival*, because tho in other subordinate Worship, God is *relatively* and ultimately worship'd in the Worship of his authoriz'd *Substitute*, yet this Worship of a declar'd Enemy has no relation to him, and can no way be reduc'd to this *Head* of worshipping God, as the other may. He that *honours* the *Son* or *Servant*, honours him who sent him; but so does not he, who does honour to an open Foe: And therefore Christ rejects it, by proving that we *must worship and serve God*, which is all that the Text cited by him says, (tho the *Septuagint* Deut. 6. 13. had added the word *only* afterwards, which the Evangelist in gross repeats) for the Obligation

Of the Worship of Jesus Christ,

to serve God, as his *Subjects*, is reason enough upon which to refuse doing Homage to an Enemy. And indeed our Lord does not say, him only shalt thou worship, but *him only shalt thou serve*; teaching us that there the stress of the *Contest* lay, and that what the Devil requir'd was not so much a sacred *devout Adoration*, as a doing *Service* to him as a Subject, or owning his Government and Dominion, as *God of the World*, by a Token of Subjection that was common in the World: whereas we must *only serve* God, *i. e. ultimately*, whether immediately or relatively; and therefore may not perform Homage to his Adversary, as Christ teaches us. Since there is no just Power, but that which is from God, not what is opposite to him.

4. Yet I must confess, that when I look into *Deut. 6. 13, 14.* whence the Words of Christ are said to be taken, the Context seems to intimate, that the Precept refers to *Divine* Worship, because the words following are, *Ye shall not go after other Gods, the Gods of the People.* And then 'tis no wonder if Christ refus'd the Devil *Divine* Worship, upon the Warrant of this Text, teaching us to do the same, when yet some inferior Worship may be due to himself as one under God. Nor do I see any weight in Mr. B's Objection, *viz.* That the Devil could not demand such *Supreme* Worship; since we know he has always proudly and wickedly aspired to *rival* God, and to be in the place of the most High: and tho his saying, *All this is delivered to me,* may seem to imply his owning a Superior Power, which makes his Claim to *Supreme* Honour very unreasonable; yet who need wonder if the Devil desires an unreasonable thing? Mr. B. seems to rely too much upon the *Devil's Modesty* in this matter, which I am very prone to call in question;

question; and I doubt it will puzzle Mr. B. to vindicate it in another respect, in this very Affair of Christ's *Temptation*: for since the Gospel tells us, the Devils *knew who Jesus Christ was*, what an unaccountable thing was it in them to go about to tempt Jesus Christ to sin, if indeed they knew him to be their *Infinite* God? Could they be so foolish as to think to overcome and baffle God? Nay, could they be so foolish as to hope to entice *God* to worship the Devil, tho' with inferior Worship? This Mr. B. supposes without difficulty; and cannot he then suppose the Devil to be so unreasonable as to demand more than his real due? Nay, let me say, that to tempt *God* to sin, was a foolish impossible Attempt, that could no way gratify the Devil: and therefore some will conclude, that tho' they *knew him indeed*, yet they knew him not to be God, else they had not done so foolish a thing. But as to such an unreasonable Demand of Supreme Worship, tho' it was unjust (and not at all the more unlikely for that) yet it might be deem'd possible, and very gratifying to his Pride, and therefore 'tis not strange if he sought it without Reason or Modesty.

As for the Phrase of *all being delivered to him*, it may possibly denote only the Effect, that he had it in possession, rather than the manner of his gaining it; for he mentions no Author or *Giver*, nor takes the least notice of receiving it from God: so that he rather intends by that Expression, that the Kingdoms of the World had delivered or yielded themselves into his hand as their Ruler; of which he pretends an absolute independent Power to dispose, as he pleases, to *whom he will*.

So that Mr. B. grounds his Argument against the Devil's claiming Divine Worship from Christ,

Mark i.
24. comp.
with v. 34

on a weak surmise; for the Devil seems far from intending a *relative* Worship, that should ultimately refer to God the Giver, as he pretends. And (as was already hinted) I say again, that if the Devil's owning that all was deliver'd to him from God (supposing that) will prove that he could not justly (tho he might nevertheless unreasonably) claim *Divine* Worship; then it is very evident on the same ground, that when Jesus Christ owns all his Authority was given him, (and that by *his Father* expressly) neither could he claim such Worship on that ground, *John* 5. 22, 23. But if Jesus Christ might yet require *Divine* Worship, notwithstanding *such* Expressions, then Mr. B. has no reason to suppose it inconsistent with the Devil's Claim to the same. This seems unanswerable by Mr. B. who supposes *Divine* Adoration to be requir'd for Jesus Christ in that Text, tho against Reason.

If it be said, how could the Devil pretend to supreme Worship, if not to subordinate Religious Worship? I answer, both are unreasonable, but yet he does certainly aspire to that Supreme or Absolute Dominion, which is a Foundation of the former, but never to that *Sanctity* of Person or Office, which is the Ground of the latter.

So then if the Devil did aspire at Supreme or Absolute Worship, then our Lord's denying that to him, or any but God, is no Argument against the Lawfulness of *inferior* religious Worship to another than God; and the Reason which he went on, imply'd in the Command, will not relate necessarily to any Worship, but that which he applies it to there. Therefore we may rest content with Mr. *Baxter's* judicious and *wary* Comment on the Text, who says, that the words

him [only] thou shalt serve, exclude other Gods, and all Competitors and Opposites, but not others subordinate to God. To worship the Devil in competition with God, if he sought Divine Worship; or in opposition to, or independently on him (as all Homage done to an open Enemy is) tho it were by inferior Homage; is against the Text and Precept, which makes God alone the Object of Supreme, and the ultimate Object of all Worship whatever.

And thus Dr. Owen himself against Mr. Biddle, p. 140. says, *Where it is said, God only is to be worship'd, tho it do not exclude all others from any kind of Worship, but that they may have what is due to them by God's Appointment, from their Excellence and Preheminence; yet it does absolutely exclude any from being worship'd with Divine Worship.*

5. After all the rest, I might answer in short, that if the words cited by our Lord were pretended to prohibit all religious Worship whatsoever of any besides God, yet it was a mere positive Command, and might be necessary, when God had not as yet exalted a Mediator. For this was before he had given Jesus Christ a Name above every Name, to which all are to bow, as a Reward of his Sufferings. But now that God has made him both Lord and Christ, he has by a new Law requir'd, that we honour and do Homage not only to God, but to his only beloved Son also; for every new Dominion and Authority requires a suitable Homage and Honour from all under it. Acts 2. 36.

And yet here is nothing contradictory to the first Command in all this; for this is not to set up another Infinite God, or to make any other Person God, but the one Self-existent *He*; 'tis only an acknowledgment of his Minister and Son, for we have one God, and one Lord besides. The Unitari- Eph. 4.

ans are so far from denying the *Morality* of that first Command, that they are zealously tenacious of it, and think it the very Basis of their Cause, and a standing Reproach to their Adversaries. And indeed till the *Trinitarians* have clearly prov'd the *Repeal* of that Command, 'tis judg'd they will never reconcile their setting up *three distinct Persons*, as Objects of Divine Worship (one an unoriginate God, and two other dependent derivative) with the Command of having *no other God but* (one single) *me*: while the *Unitarians* read this, that only one single Person is to be accounted for their God. They can never hearken to them, who instead of *no other God but me*, would interpret the Command thus, *Thou shalt have no other God but us Three*, or none but *Me, Me, and Me*, including three *Me's* in the one.

Thus it appears, that the *Unitarians* are far from *robbing Jesus Christ* of his due, if no *Divine* Worship was ever claim'd by him; and as far from *entrenching on the Divine Honour*, by giving God's Peculiar to one who is not God; since they give him that inferior Worship only, which does not belong to the Supreme, but is allow'd by him to his commission'd Son. But they seem to rob God of his Glory, who give *Divine* Worship to another than him, and rob Jesus Christ too, forbidding that subordinate Worship of him, which is granted to him of the Father. What he requires they deny, and what he never claims they pretend to bestow upon him.

However, I think it may be undeniably prov'd, that the *Trinitarians* have incurr'd this Guilt of *giving God's Glory to another*, which the *Unitarians* can vindicate themselves from, in another respect, and that is, in worshipping the *Human Nature*

Nature of Christ, which is as much a Creature as any other Man, let what Union you will be pretended. And yet those antient Christian *Fathers*, who are oft cited as pleading for the Worship of God only (whence some infer they held Christ for that God, because they worship'd him) did nevertheless admit this other Object of Worship. And he who can reconcile their Worship of the Human Nature of Christ with that *Maxim*, That God only is to be worship'd (with any sort of Religious Worship, as Dr. *Whitby* and Mr. *B.* take it to mean) may easily believe that the *Unitarians* can reconcile their Worship of Jesus Christ with the same *Maxim*. If the *Trinitarians* could worship the Humanity because related to the *Divinity*, why may not others also worship a Man inhabited by it, tho not by personal Union? It is as much a Creature in the one case as the other.

Several learned Men have shewn the common Judgment of the *Fathers* to be for worshipping the *Humanity*, as united to the *Divinity* (among whom I find *Athanasius* for one) and this was particularly manifested in their Exposition of that Text, *Psal.* 99. 5. which they read thus, *Worship ye his Footstool*, (meaning, probably, the Ark.) Those *Trinitarian Fathers* were puzzled at this, because they judg'd it absurd to worship such an Object as the Letter of the Text contain'd. To avoid this, they ran into this figurative Interpretation of the words, saying, that by this *Footstool* was to be understood the Human Nature of Christ, and this they thought might be ador'd. Their Agreement in this point may be seen, in *Forbesii Instruct. Theol.* and Dr. L.7. c. 37. *Stillingfleet's Defence against Godden.* The former Par. 2. of these two learned Men scruples not to say p. 714. of Jesus Christ, *Adorandus, inquam, sine exclusione carnis,*

carnis, ab objecto seu termino adorationis. And he ends the Chapter with this Conclusion drawn from the Opinion and Judgment of the *Fathers*: *Unica & sola ratio, propter quam humanitas Christi, latria, soli Deo debita, absq; Idololatriæ crimine a nobis colitur, est unio hypostatica; i. e. The only reason why we worship the Human Nature of Christ, with that Worship which is due to God alone (and yet without Idolatry) is the personal Union to the Divinity.* Thus it appears, Christ's Human Nature has been us'd to be worship'd without any Outcry against the Idolatry of it. The like is

Person. of asserted by Dr. Owen: *The Human Nature, says Christ, p. he, in the Person of the Divine, and together with 308, 322. it, is the Object of all Divine Adoration, and no other Creature.*

I ask Mr. B. whether these Men be not *Idolaters*, as all the *Lutherans* also? And whether this has not been the common Doctrine of the *Trinitarians*, whatever the straits to which they are now driven, may make them profess or turn to?

See *Turretine* on the Question, *An Christus quæ Mediator sit adorandus?* who owns that the affirmative (*i. e.* the Worship of Christ as Mediator) had been admitted as a Problem among the *Orthodox*; but now seeing the advantage the *Socinians* made of that, he gravely intimates, they should be very cautious in allowing it. *Licet hæc quæstio prout inter Orthodoxos agitatur problematica sit, tamen alicujus momenti esse, post detectas Socinianorum Insidias, proclive est intelligere.* Fain they would throw off the Worship of Christ as Mediator, rather than the *Unitarians* should pinch them so hard with it: for they who worship him as Mediator, worship the created *Humanity* along with the Divinity, according to them.

Now is not this, even according to the *Trinitarian* Principles about Idolatry, more manifest Idolatry, than any that can be pretended to be charg'd on the *Socinians*? For these profess to give only an inferior Worship, as to an inferior Being, which they think the Gospel warrants: but the *Trinitarians* profess Christ's Human Nature to be but a *Creature*, and yet at the same time they profess to give it *Divine* Worship designedly; whilst they deny any religious inferior Worship it self may be paid to any thing but God, and accuse it of Idolatry. Can any thing be more absurd than this?

I wonder much if *Arius* found any difficulty to be quit with such *Fathers* as *Athanasius*, who charg'd him with Idolatry for worshipping Jesus Christ with inferior Worship (for it could be no more in their Design) whom they judg'd to be but a *Creature*; when themselves could stretch their Devotion, so as to extend *Divine* Worship to the *same Creature* (of which they had much meaner Thoughts) in the *same Act* with which they ador'd the Divine Nature. I wonder with what shew of Reason this can be vindicated from the Crime of the grossest Idolatry, to worship a profess'd *Creature* with *Divine* Worship. It is a vain thing to think to excuse themselves, by saying, they do not worship the Humanity for *it self*, but *as and because it is united to the Divinity*: Since as that Union does not change the *Human* Nature into a *Divine* Nature; so neither does it hinder their Worship from being *Creature-Worship*. And if it be Idolatry to give *Divine* Worship to a *Creature*, then for any to offer a reason why they do so, is only to offer a reason why they commit Idolatry, instead of a Proof that 'tis not such. Thus they worship a *Creature* and a *Man*
(that

(that is, according to them, they commit Idolatry) because it is united to the Divinity.

Thus I have vindicated the giving inferior Religious Worship to Jesus Christ on *Unitarian* Principles, from being any way injurious to the Honour of God, either from the *Nature* of the thing, or from any positive Law against it reveal'd in Scripture. Nay, 'tis to the Glory of the *Father*, to have his Son honour'd in a Subordination to him. There are two other Texts which Mr. *B.* mentions, to prove it to be Idolatry to pay any Religious Worship to any other besides God, *viz.* *Rom.* 1. 25. and *Gal.* 4. 8. But to these I shall have a proper Occasion to speak in answer to Mr. *B.*'s

Second Argument against giving Religious Worship to Jesus Christ on the *Unitarian* Principles, *viz.* That this would clear Pagans and Papists from the Charge of Idolatry.

In answer to which, I shall shew that the Worship of Jesus Christ, as *Mediator*, on the *Unitarian* Grounds, does no way excuse the Pagans from the Guilt of Idolatry charg'd on them in the Scriptures; nor yet the *Papists* so far as they agree with them. Mr. *B.* supposes that the Heathens could no way be guilty of Idolatry, by their worshipping Creatures, unless all Religious Worship to any besides God be so. To make out this, he supposes two things, both of them very false.

First, That all Idolatry is founded not on the bare Command of God, but on the Nature of the thing.

Secondly, That the *Pagans* did not intend to worship any of their Idols with *divine* Worship, but only with inferior Worship; and seems to think that if they are clear'd from Idolatry in their

their giving inferior Worship, they are wholly freed, since they gave no other. But,

1. I deny that all Idolatry is (tho some may be) founded on the *Nature* of the *Act*, or that it ascribes infinite Perfections to the *Object*, and so respects it as *God*: for in some Instances it depends on the mere *positive* Will of God.

To prove this, I shall shew from some Instances in Scripture, that there has been Idolatry, which in the bare *Nature* of the thing did not ascribe infinite or *divine* Perfections to its *Object*. I am satisfy'd that a great part of the Idolatry of the World has been, not about the *last* *Object*, but about the *Medium* of Worship; and that when they never ascrib'd any thing to it, which in the *Nature* of it was *truly divine*, or God's incommunicable *Right*, which Mr. B. supposes all Idolatry does.

The second Command is esteem'd by *Protestants* to be the great Bar to Idolatry in the Worship of *Images*; and they have fully shown, that in Scripture the Worship of an Image is arraign'd as Idolatry. Now Mr. B. will not allow the *Pagans* to be so senseless, as to take their Images for *real* Gods, or to worship 'em as such; much less did the *Jews* so. 'Tis evident, the *Jews* did not worship the *Golden Calf*, but as a Symbol of the Divine Presence, even that of the true *Jehovah*, *Exod.* 32. 4, 5. and yet it was gross Idolatry, and so call'd, *Acts* 7. 41. *They made a Calf, and sacrific'd to the Idol.* Yet I am persuaded here was nothing in this, that appears to be Idolatry in the *Nature* of the thing, as *that* imports the ascribing Divine Perfections to another than *God*: for to make an Image, and set it up as a Symbolical Pledge of the Divine Presence, for God to dwell and operate in it, is not to ascribe any infinite Perfection to it; because any *material* thing

thing may be put to such an Use if God please; and the Sacrifices offered thereto, or rather at them, are not offered to them designedly, but to God suppos'd to reside in them. And indeed the Mercy-Seat and Ark, under the Jewish Law, was a material Symbol of God's Presence, before which the Sacrifice was presented, and the Blood was sprinkled upon it for Atonement, and Incense burnt before it; and yet this was not Idolatry in the nature of the thing, for then it had ever been sinful: Tho, I doubt, it had been Idolatry for the Jews to put the Golden Calf, or any Symbol of their own Appointment, to that sacred Use; and to determine the Divine Presence and Operations to it, and to present their Services at it, to burn Incense before it, and sprinkle it with the Blood of a Sacrifice: Not but that the Golden Calf, in its own nature, had been as capable of the Shechina as the other; but because God himself appointed the one, and not the other: so that it could only be Idolatry, from the mere positive Will of God, which could make it to be so, or not, at his arbitrary Pleasure; but in no case did it suppose infinite Perfections to be ascrib'd to the Symbol or Image; since the same thing was done, whether it was an appointed Symbol, as was the Mercy-Seat, or a forbidden one, as was the Calf.

Nor is the Reason of its being Idolatry to offer Worship to such a Medium or Symbol, to be taken hence, viz. because there was no Deity did reside there, and so the Worship rested on the Symbol or Image, which was intended for the Deity suppos'd to be in it. For he who truly intends to worship the true God, as did the Israelites, are sure to find him every where, and that as an Object of Worship, whether there be Symbol used or not; so that it can never fall beside

side him, unless he reject it, which depends on his Pleasure, and not on the Nature of the thing always.

Again, supposing God to set up an inferior Being (and that Jesus Christ be He) as the common Mediator, to be the Advocate, or the great *Master of Requests* in the Heavenly Court, to appear for us there; would not it be as manifest Idolatry to pay the Respect due to *his* Office alone, to another of our own setting up, as to set up of our own head a *symbolical Medium* of Divine Worship, or a graven *Image*? As he who sets up a *Vice-Roy* in any Province, and applies to and acts under his Authority as such, when the Sovereign Prince has made another so by his Commission, may be as truly guilty of *Treason*, as he who sets up another *Sovereign*: tho the Viceroy be far below his Sovereign Prince, and also the Honour paid *him* be far below what is due to his chief Lord, and is peculiar to him. For tho the Honour paid to an usurping Deputy or *Viceroy* be not what the chief Sovereign ever appropriated to *himself* as incommunicable; yet it is his incommunicable Right and Prerogative to appoint who shall be so honour'd. Even so, tho it be not God's incommunicable Due to be worship'd with inferior Worship; yet it is his Due to appoint who shall be his *Mediator*, and have that Respect: And therefore to give that Honour to another of our own establishing, is to intrench, tho not directly on his Worship, yet on his Authority in appointing the Object of subordinate Worship; and this is either Idolatry or Rebellion, or both, in misapplying Religious Worship, peculiar to the *Mediator*, to another self-devis'd Object. And of this the *Pagans* were guilty, even while the *Unitarians* are excus'd, by respecting only the Holy Jesus
1
whom

whom the *Father* hath seal'd, and set apart for that high and principal Office, in which none must rival him.

Further, I think Mr. *B.* cannot deny in some Instances, that *Idolatry* is merely from the positive Command of God; for since he accounts all Religious Worship of *Angels* to be *Idolatry*, or a Giving God's *incommunicable Due* to them, I demand, what there can be in the Nature of the Act, that looks like the giving God's Due to them in this Instance, (something like to which Mr. *Baxter* supposes in his *Directory*.) Suppose any Christian Assembly (in which we learn, that the *Angels* are present) should pray indefinitely and generally to *such* *Angels* as are there to hear 'em, for what is in their power to afford; is here any more ascrib'd to them, than we ascribe to an ordinary Man, of whom we ask an Alms? If it be *Idolatry*, 'tis not so from the Nature of the thing. Had God bid me pray to *Angels*, I would take it for my Honour, says Mr. *Baxter*. It seems he did not take it to be *Idolatry* in the Nature of the thing.

1 Cor. 11.
10.

Dying
Thoughts,
p. 155.

2. I deny that the *Pagans* did only give inferior Worship to their Idols or *Demons*: for as they worship'd other Idols besides their *Demons*, viz. the visible Creatures, the *Sun*, *Moon*, and *Host of Heaven*, and several others, whom they plac'd in the room of the *True* and Supreme God (which is the *Idolatry* so often charg'd upon them in Scripture, and not always *Demon-Worship*) so the Worship which they did give to their *Demons*, was as great as any they gave to the Supreme, viz. all manner of Sacrifices. Nor do I doubt but the vulgar People were wholly taken up with them, and minded no other Gods but the *Demons* that inhabited their Images, as they suppos'd; they worship'd the *Creature*, passing by

Josh. 24.
14, 15, 16.

Rom. 1.
25.

by the Creator, as *Beza* renders it. They terminated all their Worship in the *Demons*, and so gave truly divine or absolute Worship to them, for which they were charg'd with Idolatry. Nor is it of any force to tell us, that some of their subtle Philosophers reputed them only for *Dei inferioris notæ*, or subordinate Gods, constituted by the Supreme, and worship'd on the account of the Power he had invested them with, &c. For we know the Vulgar do not refine, as a few speculative Students may do (as is apparent among the *Papists*, the Vulgar of whom have gross Thoughts of Images, &c. which the nice Scholars quite disown.) This is plain in the Case of their *Image-Worship*. Mr. *B.* tells us, that the *Pagans* were not so senseless as to take the *Stocks and Stones* for true Gods, and that they did not worship them, but the imaginary Deity dwelling in them: for this is what some of their learned Apologists tell us, as we find in *Arnobius* and others. But yet 'tis plain, that the Prophets charge the People even with the Worship of the Idols or Images themselves; and tho' it was a sottish absurd thing, yet that is the very Argument they use in their Reproofs, and reproach 'em for being so brutish: *They that make them are like unto them, and so is every one who trusts in them.* *Psal.* 115; *Hab.* 2. 19. He saith to the dumb Stone, *Arise.* See but how the Prophet derides them, *Isa.* 44. v. 11. to the 20th, That they should be so stupid, as to think by hammering and hewing it, to make a God of one part of the same Tree as they had burnt in the Fire, and roasted their Meat with; and that they should worship and pray to it. And he says, *They could not see, they had no Understanding, not so much Sense left as to say, I have burnt part in the Fire, and shall I make of the residue a God, shall I fall down to the Stock of a Tree?* The more

monstrous and brutish a thing this was, the more likely it is to be what they are charg'd with; for the Prophet expressly says of 'em, they were brutish herein. If they had such fine Speculations and Evasions, they could easily have wiped off all this Reproach, and it had not been just to impute such ridiculous things to them, but to have answer'd their plausible Pretences as to an indwelling Deity. Thus *Origen* says, *The Multitude can't bear to hear any one deny those to be Gods, whom they have been wont to worship.*

Jer. 10. 14.
Cont. Celf.
p. 375.

Much more were they like to terminate their chief Worship in those *Demons* or Spirits, which they suppos'd to preside over those Images, (tho the Learned took them for no more than inferior Ministers of God;) and thus there was Idolatry in their *Demon-Worship*, in that they gave *supreme* Worship to them; which has nothing parallel to the *Unitarians* Case.

Nay, tho the Scripture takes no notice of their making any such *Distinction* in their Practice, as to this inferior relative Worship, which Mr. B. supposes was all the Pagans gave; yet allowing that they did so, and that this Worship was condemn'd too (as it must be) yet it may be it was so, as it intrench'd on God's Honour, and peculiar Right to appoint Mediators. He can never shew that there was any thing in that subordinate Worship, which, in its own Nature, ascrib'd infinite Perfections to those *Demons*. And then since Jesus Christ is authoriz'd to be our Mediator, the *Unitarians* are free from such Injury to God's Honour, as the Pagans were guilty of, in setting up Mediators of their own.

P. 137.

But, says Mr. B. If this was the reason of the Heathens Crime, that they worship'd uncommission'd *Hero's*, then the *Apostle* should have fix'd his Charge here, on their doing it without Command

mand and Warrant from God, and not have made it their Crime to worship the Creature beside the Creator, and to serve such as by Nature are no Gods; since the Heathens might have retorted on the Apostles, that they also worship'd a Creature, and a God by Office, &c.

To this I answer, That it is a vain Supposition in Mr. B. that the Apostles should answer all the particular Cavils and Evasions of a few learned Adversaries among the *Pagans*, when they were reprovng the current vulgar Errors only. The sacred Writers are never wont to do thus, but content themselves with condemning the vulgar Errors, without considering the nice Apologies of some that refin'd their Notions by subtle Speculations, while the common People ran into grosser Notions; against whom the sacred Censures are utter'd, rather than against the subtle *few*, who durst neither profess their more refin'd Thoughts, nor yet go about to hinder the common Worship of their Idols; but join'd with them in it, tho they saw *them* worship'd with the highest Worship by the People, whom they judg'd to be but *inferior* Gods, (as is now among the Papists.) So that if the common People generally worship'd their Images and Dæmons as *Gods*, this was ground enough for the Apostles to condemn them, whatever a few undiscover'd Philosophers might think to say for their own particular Excuse.

That I say not this without Reason, may appear from a clear Instance: 'Tis evident, as was said, that the Prophets very often reproach the *Heathens* for worshipping *Stocks and Stones*, their Idols or Images, and even scoff at them for a Company of Fools; yet Mr. B. knows that the *Pagan* Writers reply to this Charge, in their Defence against Christians, *That they were no such*

Of the Worship of Jesus Christ,

Fools as to take the Images for Gods, or to pay their Worship to Wood and Stones: no, it was only to the indwelling Deities, who took up their Habitation and operated in those Images, &c. with many more fine things of this kind, which are so well known to the Learned, that they will not require particular Testimonies: See Lactant. l. 2. c. 2. Arnob. l. 6. Euseb. Præp. l. 4. Aug. de Civit. l. 8. c. 23, 24. Now according to Mr. B's arguing, one must say, The Prophets cannot be justify'd in their Charge against these *Pagans*, because they take no notice of *these Replies* and *Evasions*, which plainly overturn a great deal of the Grounds of that Charge. *They should have fixt their Charge* on this, that there were no such Spirits or Dæmons that did indeed dwell there, or that could claim any such Worship if they did; *and not have made it their Crime to worship Wood and Stone*, which it seems they did not do only as *Mediums* of Worship, or as the *Seats* of their Gods. Nay, they might have retorted on the Prophets, How come you to reproach us as Fools for worshipping Wood and Stones? Do we do more than you *Jems*? Have not you an Habitation of Wood and Stones for your *God*, towards which you pray and worship? Have not you a *Symbol* of his Presence in the *Oracle*, where you offer *Incense* and Blood to your *Mercy-Seat* of Gold, as much as we to our Images? So that it seems this may be very lawful when we have God's Command for it. And as for those *Excuses*, that the *Pagans* ador'd their Images themselves, and the like, I have shew'd from the *Patrons* of *Image-Worship* among the *Gentiles*, that they disown'd all this. Now will this make us doubt, whether the *Prophets* did argue justly, because they answer not to these *Apologies* of a few wiser Men than the *Commonalty* were? No, nor did the *Apostles* argue

amiss,

amiss, tho they take no notice of the Apologies some made for *Dæmon-Worship*; while the Vulgar had grosser Notions among them of their *Images* and *Dæmons*, and minded none of these *fine artificial Apologies*. And to these the Prophets and Apostles mainly address'd themselves, while the other wise Men did not produce their Exceptions, and so they were not regarded; but the Charge was rightly fix'd still, according to the common Sentiments and Practice of them they argu'd with.

But indeed there is yet a further Reason, besides what has been said, why the Pagans Worship was Idolatry, and from which, all that Mr. B. objects in this Matter, may, in few Words, be fully answer'd; leaving the Charge of Idolatry in full force against the *Pagans*, upon such a Ground as will wholly clear the *Unitarians* from any share in that Crime. And 'tis upon this Reason, *viz.* because the *Pagans* did terminate their Worship ultimately not in God, but in the Creature, after all they said, even when they paid but an *inferior* or relative Worship to their Dæmons (as Mr. B. says they did, and no more.) They did not serve 'em in subordination to *God*, but to *Idols* or Creatures, to whom it was all refer'd: which I take to be clear from Scripture, which often assures us that the *Gentiles*, before they receiv'd the Gospel, had no knowledge of the *one true God*: They are describ'd thus, *At that time ye were without God in the World*, Eph. 2. 12. Again, *Ye then knew not God*, says St. Paul, Gal. 4. 8. *i. e.* They knew not so much of him, as to direct their Worship to him, as is plainly intended there. They had *Gods many*, *i. e.* superior *Deities*; and *Lords many*, *i. e.* inferior Powers, 1 Cor. 8. 5. Some held one for chief God, others another, *Micah* 4. 5. or rather the same People held several supreme *Deities*, *viz.* each in his

several *Province* and *District*; and none of them was accounted to be universally and absolutely Supreme over all by *Nature*, tho' comparatively some were greater in Power than the rest; which is all that can be said of their mighty *Jupiter* himself, * at least in the *vulgar* Estimate it was no more: however the true God they had not among them. Hence it was, that in the *first* Command, God requires that we *have no other God but him*; i. e. not only that we have but *one* glorious Supreme God, but that it be only *Him* we take for such; even He who was the God of *Israel*, and brought them out of *Egypt*, as the *Preface* shews: else a Man may hold but one God, and yet be the grossest *Idolater*, if with some he take the *Sun*, or *Moon*, or created *Nature* (either part or whole) to be that one God. Thus it was with most of the *Pagans*, either some famous *Ancestor*, or some part of the *Heavenly Host*, was what they intended by their *Jupiter*, as learned Men have shown; or if they worship'd some invisible Spirit, which was represented by their Images and Symbols, and which gave out his Oracles, &c. still this was not the true God of *Israel*, but he was the *Devil* indeed, whom they counted the true God. Thus we read, that the *Gentiles sacrific'd to Devils, and not to God* (as they perhaps thought.) And hence it may be that the Devil is call'd *the God of the Infidel World*, 2 Cor. 4. 4. however the true one God they knew not.

Now since they had not Knowledge of the true one God, their *Supreme* Worship must needs terminate in something else, and that must be a Creature or a Fiction. So then in all their *Demon-Worship* (which Mr. B. says was but subordinate and inferior Worship) either they ultimately

* See Juri-
riou's Crit.
Hill. Par.
4. c. 5.

1 Cor. 10.
25.
Deut. 32.
17.

timately refer'd it higher, or not; if not, then it was not inferior but supreme Worship, and so was rank Idolatry: but if they did so refer it to a Superior Object, whom they held to be the Supreme God, then that Object not being *really* the true God, but a Creature, and often the very *Devil*, it follows still that they terminated all in the Creature; and so 'twas still the *same* Idolatry, as if they had terminated all in the *Demon*, or in the Image; the first Object was as good as their *ultimate*, and so they were not at all help'd by distinguishing their Worship into subordinate and ultimate. Nor does Mr. B. gain any thing by this Apology for them, since all their *Demon-Worship* was Idolatry still, in being offer'd up ultimately to the Creature, and in no subordination to God; either they terminated their Worship on the *visible* Symbol, or refer'd it to an *invisible* Spirit, which was the Devil, (says the Text) both which were Creatures. And on these accounts 'tis that the Scripture constantly charges them with Idolatry, and not for serving any allow'd mediate Object of God's own setting up, and in subordination to himself. But what is this to the *Unitarians* Worship of Jesus Christ? Are they guilty of any *such* thing? I mean, of any religious Worship that is not refer'd ultimately to the true *Jehovah*? or of worshipping any not subordinate to him? no, far from that. There is then no reasonable pretence of paralleling their Worship to that of the *Pagans*; against *these* the charge of Idolatry lies in full force, while the *Unitarians* are fully justified and free.

The truth is, when Christianity had bore hard on the *Heathen-Worship* a while, then they began to refine, and their Philosophers spake more freely against the gross Notions of the Vulgar,

in their Defence against Christians, than before: and therefore the Christian *Fathers* had more occasion than the Apostles to answer to such *Pleas*, when the *Pagans* came to retort on the Christians, as Mr. B. says they might; if the Christians worship'd Jesus Christ as a subordinate constituted God, with the *Unitarians*. Accordingly we find it really came to pass so as he says; the *Pagans* did retort on Christians that very Argument which Mr. B. thinks the Apostles might be assaulted with, if they held with the *Unitarians*: for so *Celsus* pleads, that they did no more in worshipping *Dæmons*, than the Christians in worshipping *Christ*: If *Christ* was worshipp'd, the Christians worship'd nothing else but *God*; they might seem reasonable in their contempt of others; but when they do abundantly worship Him, who was of late original, and yet believe they offend not God in reverencing his Minister, they are unreasonable. So that it seems the *Pagans* did so understand the Christian Doctrine, as to spy a place for their Objection (of recriminating on Christians the Worship of an inferior Lord) which in the *Unitarian* Scheme there is room for (as Mr. B. observes) but not in his; and therefore the former seems to be the Primitive Doctrine.

L. I. c. 20. So we find in *Arnobius*, that it was usual to object against the Primitive Christians, that they worship'd a *Man* in the Worship of Jesus Christ. Not only the *Gentiles*, but the *Jews* also had such Apprehensions, as appears in the Case of *Polycarp* the Martyr, whom they suppos'd the Christians might worship on the same score as they worship'd *Christ*. But had they known that the Christians reputed Jesus Christ for the Supreme God by Nature, they could scarcely have imagin'd, that they would leave off worshipping him, to worship a mere *Man*. And tho' the

Church

Euseb.
Hist. l. 4.
c. 15.

Church of *Smyrna* do disown the Worship of any other Person but Jesus Christ, they plainly intend it of any *other Man*, or of any other who is not the Supreme God; him they worship'd as *God's Son*, but to no other except God himself they gave this Honour. They can't mean that Christ was the *only Object* of Worship (for that would exclude the Father) but the *only Man*. And *as such*, the *Jews* charge them with worshipping him, which the learned *Daille* acknowledges *. When I consider this Passage and others of *Celsus*, I am satisfy'd, that the *Jews* did very early begin to accuse the Christians of worshipping a Man; and I wonder any should alledge their Silence in not accusing Christians of Idolatry, as an Argument that the *Christians* did not worship a Creature: for since they charg'd them with worshipping a Man as God's Minister, they either judg'd that Worship to be against the first Command, and so must count it Idolatry; or did not reckon all inferior Worship (supposing a divine Command which the Christians pleaded) to be Idolatry, and so had no reason to charge them with it: but that they did impute to them the Worship of another beside the great God, is very apparent.

The Apostle (says Mr. B.) should have fix'd his Charge against the Heathens on this, that they worshipp'd their inferiour Gods, *without a Warrant* from the true God. Why, just so the Primitive Christians did: for when the *Pagans* produc'd such Apologies for them-

* *Clare* significant se nullum alium hominem a Christianis religiose cultum scivisse, prater unum Christum. *Daille de Cult. Relig. object.* p. 509.

elves as Mr. B. mentions, viz. that they did but as Christians did in the Worship of Christ, the Christians make that very Answer which Mr. B. dislikes in the Unitarians, viz. *That we Christians have the true God's Command for worshipping Jesus Christ, which the Heathens had not for worshipping their Demons*: for thus it was that Origen answer'd to Celsus. He asks him, whence he could prove that God has granted to them (i. e. the Dæmons) to be honour'd; and then he proceeds to shew, that to Jesus Christ he had granted this Honour, from *John 5. 23.*

L.8.p.384.

This Mr. B. may find in Dr. *Whitby* himself, in his *Idol. of the Rom. Ch. &c.* so hard is it to write against the *Papists* and *Unitarians* with Consistency.

Therefore, by the way, I wonder with what Ingenuity that learned Doctor could pretend to prove Jesus Christ to be esteem'd the true and supreme God by *Origen*, from his Worship of him, *Tract. de Christi Deit.* p. 12, 14, 117. when yet himself owns that *Origen* gave him only inferior Worship, and deny'd him to be the God who is Lord over all, in that former Book, *Idol. Ch. Rom.* p. 223, 224, 356. Nay, he lately cites him again as denying Jesus Christ to be the Object of proper Prayer, in his *Paraphrase* on *John 16. 23.*

But because Mr. B. sends his Reader to this Doctor for full Proof in this Dispute, I'll recite his Words. *It is evident that Origen, by that Expression, I and my Father are one, did not intend to argue the Unity of Essence, but of Affection only betwixt God and Christ; nor yet to say our Saviour was that God who is Lord of all; for this expressly he denies.* In the other place the Doctor's Words are, *When Origen discourses of this Subject, he usually*

usually says, that we must put up our Petitions to God by Christ; and having once confess'd that we must pray directly to Christ, whom he conceiv'd to be inferior to the Father, he makes this distinction, that Prayer may be taken properly, or in an improper and abusive Sense: and in this Sense alone he doth approve of Prayer made to Christ. And by this time one may judge, whether the learned Doctor had any great reason to send us to *Origen* among others; or Mr. B. to send his learned Reader to the Doctor to know *Origen's* Judgment in this matter: who, after all the Worship of Jesus Christ which he pleads for, does (by the Doctor's own Representation, when out of this Controversy) design no such Worship as might declare him to be the Infinite God, but contrarily such inferior Worship as might shew that he thought him to be not such.

Now I suppose his other Testimonies have the same force; and if *Origen* could say the Christians worship'd none but one God, and yet was for their worshipping Jesus Christ with other inferior Worship, why might not the other Fathers do the same? 'Tis plain they mean that none but God was worship'd with *Divine* Worship, nor any but his Son with any inferior Religious Worship, which yet in a sense was one and the same Worship; of which presently.

Thus we see the first Christians could vindicate the Worship of Jesus Christ as *Mediator*, without ceasing to condemn the *Demon-Worship* of the *Pagans*, on this very ground, that Jesus was authoriz'd by the Supreme God to have the Honour which those had not; and this agree exactly with the *Unitarian* Principles.

And then, says Mr. B. why does the Apostle rebuke the *Pagans* with this, That they worship'd him as if he besides (more than) the Creator, and with

with *serv'g them who by Nature were not Gods?* Since the Christians did the like in the Worship of Jesus Christ, if he was not by *Nature* the Supreme God. I *answer* in general, 'tis probable the Apostle speaks there of their serving the Creatures as *Gods*, when they were not Gods, with Supreme Worship; for they serv'd 'em *beyond the Creator*, says the Text, (which the Christians did not do) and this the Apostle censures absolutely: for whether they had a Warrant to worship any inferior *Lords* or not, it was nothing to the Business here, since that could be no ground for worshipping any Creature as the *true God*. No, nothing but a truly *Divine Nature* could be a ground for such Divine Worship; and therefore the Apostle grounded the Charge on a right bottom, in blaming 'em for *serv'g Creatures as Gods, that by Nature were not Gods*, and so no Objects of such high Honour, which did not depend on a Command of God, but on the Nature of the Object, the like to which Christians did not in their subordinate Worship of Jesus Christ, nor do the *Unitarians*.

But let me consider those two Texts more particularly; to begin with *Rom. 1. 25. They worship'd and serv'd the Creature more than the Creator*. What says this against them who worship none but the Creator with Supreme Worship? Not that under the Notion of Creatures, they could designedly respect them above God (as Mr. *B.* seems to think we mean, when he accuses it as *Nonsense*) but in their blind Mistake, they fix'd their Devotions on what truly were but Creatures, and pass'd by the Creator; as they who believ'd one God, but worship'd the *Sun*, or *Fire*, &c. for him, did really serve the Creature, and pass by the Creator: or tho
they

they own'd one God, yet they might do more service to the Creature, to their Images and Dæmons, than to the Supreme. It is possible a Papist may worship the Virgin *Mary* more than God, and yet hold her to be but a Creature; and the sensual Sinner may serve the *World* or his *Belly* more than the Creator, tho he knows the other are but Creatures. So that here is no such *Nonsense*, in supposing Men to serve the Creature beyond God.

Mr. *B.* is so sensible that this Text will do him no service against the *Unitarians*, as our Bibles have it, that he is forc'd to give it a corrupt, or at best an ambiguous *Turn*: He had rather have it thus, *They serv'd the Creature besides the Creator.* But I dare appeal to any *Trinitarian* Critick, if the Word *ἄνω* set thus between two Nouns, does not in the New Testament note Comparison, and be not render'd *above* or *beyond*; as in this very Epistle, *Ch. 14. 5. One esteems one Day above another.* *Hieb. 1. 9. Above thy Fellows.* And tho sometimes it may be render'd *præter*, or beside, yet that may be, as *Beza* and *Turretine* render it here, *præter:to Creatore, passing beside, or by, the Creator*; i. e. they serv'd the Creature, and not the Creator. But Mr. *B.* would have the word *besides* to signify a Conjunction, as if it were thus, *besides the Creator* they also serv'd the Creature; which is not the fair Sense of the Original, nor so natural and genuine a Version, as that which we have, viz. *more than the Creator*; which is not the *Unitarians* Case, who worship none beyond God, nay worship none besides God, with ultimate or Supreme Respect.

The other Text is *Gal. 4. 8.* where *St. Paul* describing their former Gentile State, says, *When ye knew not God, ye did service to them that by*
Nature

Nature are not Gods. Whence Mr. B. would infer, that to worship what has not the *Infinite Nature* of the Supreme God, is Idolatry, like to that of the *Heathens*, and the formal reason of their Sin. And this he thinks the *Unitarians* do, in worshipping Jesus Christ, while they deny him to be the Infinite God by Nature. To this I answer, 1. That the Apostle speaks plainly of their worshipping those false Gods in the place of the *Supreme God*, and not in subordination to him; which no doubt was Idolatry. And this appears by his opposition of *those Gods* to the one true God, implying that they worship'd *them in lieu of him, whom they now knew, i. e.* as supreme; and not in any subordination to him. For whatever Thoughts Mr. B. may have of those *Pagans*, the Apostle plainly says they had no knowledge of the true and infinite God. *Ye knew not God*; and therefore what they worship'd in chief, must needs be what by nature was not *this God*, but some part of the Creation, whether a Man, or the Sun, &c. nor was their mighty *Jupiter* or *Jove* any more. And in all their inferior Worship of *Heroes* or *Demons*, if they ultimately refer'd their Worship to any superior God, yet it was not to the only true Supreme Being; and consequently they must terminate all their Worship in some Creature, as has been said. But what is this to the *Unitarians*, who do not worship Jesus Christ with supreme and ultimate Worship; and whose Religious Worship of him ultimately rests in the Infinite God alone? The *Pagans* might say they terminated their Worship in the one true God, and that they worship'd him in chief; but St. Paul says, *They knew him not*, and upon this condemns them. They cou'd not make out these Pretensions, which

Mr. B. and some of their Apologists make for 'em, to excuse 'em from idolizing Creatures or Fictions, by their Supreme Worship. Nor do I doubt, but that what some accounted *inferior Demons*, the Vulgar ador'd as Supreme.

2. Let it be how it will, 'tis nothing against the *Unitarians*, who hold Jesus Christ to be a subordinate Lord, or God by *Nature*. The ancient Fathers (says Dr. *Whitby* on *Eph. 2. 3.*) constantly interpret *ἐν φύσει* by *truly* or *really*: Now we say, that Jesus Christ is truly such a God as we hold him to be, and as our Worship implies. *He is truly Partaker of a Divine Nature*, not only in moral Graces, but in glorious Dominion and Authority, with sutable Strength and Wisdom. Those *Dæmons were no Gods at all*, as Mr. *Baxter* says truly; they cou'd not make out their *Nature* or real Qualifications, which we can in Jesus Christ. The Apostle might not mean, *they were not infinite Gods by Nature*, but not truly any sort of Gods. Either way it touches not the *Unitarians* at all.

Yet I doubt not but the words may very justly and naturally be read something otherwise: *Ἐδουλεύσατε τοῖς μὴ φύσει ὄντι θεοῖς*; *You were in bondage to Gods that in Nature had no being*, or by Nature *were not*. Mere *Chimæra's*, and artificial Fictions; the *Vanities* of the Heathen, and indeed but *Nullities*: for so were many of their pretended Deities. They never existed in Nature, much less had they ever the Power or Office pretended to; so that as *Gods* or *Lords* they had *no being*. And this is just parallel to what the same Apostle says, that *an Idol is nothing*. ^{1 Cor. 8. 4.} There are no such things in nature, as the Heathen *Gods many* and *Lords many*. There may be *Images* and *Dæmons*, but no *Gods*, nor *Lords*:

But we Christians have one real Supreme God, *viz.* the *Father* ; and one real subordinate Lord, *viz.* Jesus Christ. There is such a Lord in Nature, and he has the real Nature and Abilities of such an anointed God, as well as the Character and Commission ; and so he cannot be rank'd among the *Pagan* Idols who *were not*, or were nothing, sometimes as to their Being, but always as to their Power and Dignity.

I am not sensible of any thing like *Violence* done to the Text by this *Sense* and Reading ; but rather that it seems most natural and easy to the Words, and most suitable to the Context. For the Apostle is setting forth the noble Liberty of these *Galatians* by the Gospel, in comparison of their former servile State. They were as *Servants*, but now as *Sons* at age, *v.* 7. But what were they Slaves to ? why says he in this Verse, *When ye knew not God, ye were in slavery to such Gods as in Nature were nothing.* For what we render, *Ye did Service*, signifies *ye were Slaves*, or *in bondage*, as appears thro the whole Context ; so the Word is render'd, *ver.* 3, 9, 25. Nothing could more emphatically describe their base Degeneracy, while *Pagans*, than this, that they were under a superstitious slavish Subjection to what had no Being ; and were terrify'd with *Fictions*, and did Homage to a Nullity. Therefore nothing seems more for the Apostle's purpose, than this fair Sense of the words, which are not against the *Unitarians*, who knew Jesus Christ to be such a real God, or Lord by Nature, as those of the *Pagans* were not. Their *superior* Gods were not such, nor their *subordinate* Gods such in nature and reality, as they accounted 'em to be ; but our supreme God the Father is such, and our subordinate Lord Jesus his Son, is really and *in nature* such as we pretend

tend 'em to be, and as answers to their Characters. So that we can boast their Gods are not like ours, nor their *Lords* like ours.

Nor does the Apostle reproach 'em with Idolatry in doing this, but with the base and ignoble Degeneracy of their Condition; so that it appears not that he speaks so much of Worship, as of the Slavery and Subjection they were under to these *Fictions*. But will Mr. B. say that we owe no Subjection to the Man Jesus Christ, whose Nature is not Divine? Sure since the *Human* Nature is invested with Dominion, as Mr. B. owns, and acts its part of *Royal Authority*, as he speaks, p. 89. it will claim Subjection answerable to that Share of Dominion it is invested with. And if there be any Service due to the *Man* Christ, then the Text does not condemn all Service to what is not by *Nature* the infinite God; since the Human Nature, tho' united, is not a Divine Nature: and yet sure some Service is due to the exalted *Manhood*, which is made a Lord and *Prince* over Men and Angels by God's Reward (but the Divine Nature must be so without it) and has therefore a far greater *Title* to the Character of a subordinate *God* than those Angels, and which *Pagan* Idols had not.

Now it is easy to apply much of what has been said about the *Pagans*, to them of the *Roman* Church, whose Practices seem to have too near an Affinity with the others. If the *Papists* worship any Creature with *Divine* ultimate Worship, as they seem to do the *Cross* and the *Host*; if they worship *Images*, or erect unwarranted Symbols of the *Divine Presence* and Grace; or if the common People esteem these as *God*, or

Of the Worship of Jesus Christ,

give to them as high Worship as to *him*; or *lastly*, if they set up other *Mediators* in the place of Jesus Christ, to invade his Office (which things they are charg'd with) then are they still as much *Idolaters* as ever; tho' the *Unitarians* are clear of it, in their Worship of the Lord Jesus Christ, as a subordinate Lord and Mediator, with subordinate Worship.

Mr. *B.* says, they assign the *like* grounds of the religious Worship of the *Saints*: But what then? Can they make 'em good? The *Pagans* might assign the same grounds for Divine Worship of the *Sun*, or some other Creature (which they took to be the supreme God) as Mr. *B.* does for worshipping the true God; but they did not assign them truly, and so they were *Idolaters* still. This is our Case, compar'd with the *Papists*. Does Mr. *B.* think they can give as good proofs of God's investing the *Saints* or *Angels* with universal Power in Heaven and Earth, or of their Commission to be our *Mediators* and our Judges, as the *Unitarians* bring for the Lord Jesus's Claim to all this? If not, it was unrighteously said of him, *That they assign the like grounds of their religious Worship of Saints and Angels; That their Cause is the same, and that they may defend it on the same Principles.* Should I judge justly, if I said a *Pagan* (that should mistake the Devil or other Creature for God) assign'd the like grounds of his Divine Worship with Christians, and *that his Cause was the same, and he might as well defend it?* God forbid I should so reproach my Maker, or slander his Servants! Sure 'tis enough that the one are mistaken in their Object, and the other are right; and so the grounds they go upon are very different, the one being Truth, and the other a false pretence: For *we think there is*
some

some little difference to be made between what is commanded and what is forbidden, says Dr. Stillingfleet in his *Idolat. of the Church of Rome*, p. 97.

But says Mr. B. we are not inquiring, whether the *Popish Invocation of Saints, &c. be commanded or uncommanded, but whether in it self it be injurious to God.* But by his leave this ought to be the Inquiry; since herein the *Injury* will lie, if it be an Invasion on God's Honour and Authority to set up unqualify'd unallow'd Mediators in his Heavenly Court. And I dare say, that if he will approve of all that Religious Worship of *Angels, Saints, and Demons*, which does not attribute to *them* any infinite Divine Perfections in its very Nature, then he may be a much greater Friend to the *Popish* and *Pagan* Worship, than Mr. E. appears to be.

Thus we see, that the *Unitarians* Practice and Principles plainly destroy the *Creature-Worship*, which was practis'd among the Pagans; while they so carefully reserve intire to *God* all Divine Worship, and all subordinate Religious Worship to that *one* Mediator the Lord Jesus, whom the great God has rais'd to this Honour, and this it self ultimately, *to the Glory of the Father.* Phil. 2. 10, 11.
Amen.

The Sum of what is argu'd on this Head, from the *Fathers*, is, That they profess to worship *one God, and him only*; and yet they worship Jesus Christ: Ergo, they held Jesus Christ to be *essentially* the Supreme God. But when all is consider'd, I believe this Conclusion will not follow from the *Premises*, as they are found in the *Fathers*: For,

1. 'Tis most certain they profess to worship *God and his Son*: Here then is something besides

Of the Worship of Jesus Christ,

God *alone* that is worship'd. This is frequent in *Origen, Justin Martyr, &c.* And that they meant another Being by the Son, will appear from what shall be presently observ'd.

2. Their current and most usual Form was to worship the *Father by his Son, or in his Name.* So *Clemens Romanus* ends his Epistle. Thus *Justin Martyr* says, that at the Communion the Minister, or *President*, pronounces Praises to the *Father of all, in the Name of the Son, and by the Holy Spirit.* By which 'tis plain, that the Father and Son were worship'd with a very different Respect; which not only must follow from the unequal Esteem they had for them, but is most expressly own'd by *Origen*, the most Learned of 'em all, and who had best study'd the deep Points of our Religion: who in answer to *Celsus* (who charg'd the Christians with worshipping others beside God, in their Worship of Jesus Christ) gives an account how far they worship'd *him*, and how the Father: *Offerentes Deo universorum Domino preces, per suum unigenitum; cui prius eas adhibemus rogantes, ut ipse dignetur tanquam Pontifex, preces nostras offerre Deo optimo maximo: i. e. We offer up our Prayers to God, the Lord over all things, by his only Son; to whom we first bring them, praying, that he as our High Priest would vouchsafe to present our Prayers to God most High.* This, he says, was the *quantum possumus*, the utmost Worship they could give. Now is this to worship him as Supreme God, *viz.* to pray to him to officiate for us with God as *Intercessor*? Again, speaking of praying to God by him, he adds, *We will pray to the Word, provided we may distinguish between doing it in a strict or proper Sense, and in an abusive one.* So that he will not allow Prayer to him properly taken, only *in a sort*, as thro him it is put up to God. Is this possible for one to say, who worship'd

P. 386.

P. 233.

ship'd him as Supreme God? No, they held the *Father* and *Son* for *two* Objects, and distinguish'd the *Worship* into *two* sorts, as you see here.

3. The Account which they give of their worshipping the *Father* and *Son* as one, and in some sort with *one* *Worship*, is not such as speaks them to be *one* in the same *numerical* Essence, or one and the same infinite Spirit or Substance. 'Tis most evident that they could not mean such a *Worship* as implies this, with any Consistency with their Expressions elsewhere. *Lac-* L. 4. c. 6.
tantius expressly says, That God the *Father*, before he set about the *Creation*, *sanctum & incorruptibilem genuit Spiritum, quem filium nuncuparet: He begot a Spirit whom he call'd his Son, which Title he did not give to any other of the Spirits whom he afterwards created.* So then when he had begotten a *Spirit*, there must be two *Spirits*. And even when *Origen* is treating about their *Unity*, and labouring to make 'em one Object of *Worship*, in answer to *Celsus*, who said they were two, he sticks not to say, *We religiously worship the Father of Truth, and the Son who is the Truth; duos quidem Substantia (* Hypostasi) unum vero Concordia, &c. Two indeed in Substance, but one by Agreement and Concord.* So then here are two Substances worship'd: Tho at another time perhaps they may be called one, in regard to their mutual *Concord* and *Unity of Will*, as Christians are one. * Which in that time signify'd Substance, as its true Sense. Socr. Schol. 1. 3.

But how is it then that they could pretend to worship none but God, when they worship'd both the *Father* and his *Son*? As far as I can see, it was grounded upon a near *Union* of the *Objects*, which they still maintain'd, and the *Unity* of the external *Acts* of *Worship*. c. 7.

1. They reckon'd that still the *Father* and *Son* might be deem'd as *one Object* in a political

Sense, tho' *two Spirits*, one subordinate to the other: Because their Dominion (which is the ground of Worship) was politically but *one*, as that of a *King* and his Son, or his Viceroy, or Ambassador: the Homage also done them was in a sense but *one*. Thus *Origen*, when treating upon this very Matter, says, *Celsus would never think we worship another besides God, if he understood those Words, The Father and I are one.* But what *Unity* does *Origen* interpret it of? Why, says he, that none may be startled at this, let him mind that *Text*; And the Multitude of them that believ'd, were of *one Heart, and one Soul*; and this may help him to understand the other, *The Father and I are one.* And then adds, That tho' they are *two* in *Substance*, yet they are one in *Consent of Will.* And *Lactantius* more fully opens the matter by this near Resemblance, *viz. of one who has an only beloved Son, who is in his Father's House, and in his Power: Tho,* says he, *he grants him the Name and Power of Lord and Master, yet Civili Jure it is call'd one House, and one Lord.* So the *Father and the Son* being unanimous in the *World*, it is *one God*, because *one is as two, and two as one*; the *Son* always obeying the *Father's Will*, as he adds. And again, he that acknowledges the *Son*, says he, *worships the Father together with the Son, because the Son is the Ambassador of the most High Father.* Here is a *Political Unity* between them, that occasions the calling it *one Worship of one God.* I deny not but they held also a natural *Conjunction* between the two, so near that they were not separated asunder, nor held as divers divided Beings, but yet without one Thought of an *Equality* (which serves my Purpose) whenever they were compar'd together.

2. This might be further grounded upon the *Unity of the Act of Worship*, which at once respects

spects both these Objects. As the *Respect* done to an Ambassador is at the same time a *Respect* to his *Prince*; and yet both are not equally honoured, tho' it be in the same Act: so when a Son is honoured merely for his Relation to his Father, both are honoured together, tho' not equally. Thus 'tis the same Prayer that we present to the Father, which we offer to Christ, that it may be presented by him; as the same *Sacrifice* was presented to the High Priest, which was by him to God: We always join the *Father* and the *Mediator* in the same Devotion, but the same Physical Act may be *morally* two. And this is just according to the abovesaid Account of true Christian Worship from *Origen*, who truly says, that a Christian does *ἀμεσίστως, undividedly and inseparably worship the God of Gods, thro' Jesus Christ*. If I pray to the Father, it implies that it be thro' the *Mediator*; if to *Jesus Christ*, 'tis that he may present it to God, where all Worship terminates. This seems to be their most natural Meaning, when they say, they only worship one God, tho' they worship him thro' his Son Jesus Christ; which is also a sort of Worship of the *Son*. If it be not so, I doubt they will not be very consistent with themselves. However, I fetch not the grounds of my Faith from any, but the truly *Primitive Fathers*; I mean the *Apostles*; who I think appear on my side, without the Obscurity that is in the others, who soon began to be corrupted, as was foretold.

But what Mr. B. says, *That those of the third P. 114. Age insist on the universal Practice of giving Divine Worship to Jesus Christ, as one great Argument to prove that the Deity of Christ was the Belief of the two foregoing; is a mere Boast and Flourish, of which he gives no proof. I desire him to shew who of that Age ever prov'd that Jesus Christ had been held to be the Supreme God*

God (which is the Question) by the two first Ages, from their Practice of *Divine* Worship. No, they neither so believ'd, nor so practis'd, that appears: And the *Trinitarians* themselves cannot but own that the *Arians* offer'd to appeal to the preceding Ages and Fathers, for a Testimony to their Opinion; and that it was declin'd, as, besides others, Bishop *Taylor* confesses. It might be found that they call him *God* indeed, and that he was worship'd as Mediator; but never, as I find, that he was God equal to the Father, nor worship'd with equal or supreme Worship. 'Tis plain that *Deus super quem non est alius, a God that has none above him*, was their Character of the *Father*, in distinction from the Son, of whom they denied it, as Dr. *Whitby* cannot but confess. And if a God that has another above him, can be equal to a God that has none above him; or if *two* who are unequal in Excellency, can be both alike *Infinite*, that is, can have both of 'em all the same Excellencies in perfection: I think there is an end of all rational Discourse on the point, when Writings and Words must not be taken with Simplicity, in their obvious Meaning, but be made to signify quite contrary to the common Sense of Mankind, merely to serve an *Hypothesis* at a pinch.

Let me only by the by take notice of one Passage more from Mr. *B.* p. 157. where he pretends that the *Unitarians* lay as great a stumbling in the way of the Mahometans, by giving religious Worship to one who is God by Office, as the *Trinitarians* do by their Doctrine of the Incarnation; and that the Mahometans worship not Mahomet himself. To which I must reply, that 'tis not merely the Incarnation of a God in general, that is pretended to be such a Stumbling-Block, but that *one* who is God should be incarnate, and yet

two other Persons be God too, who are not so. This is a terrible scandal to the *Jews* and *Mahometans*. Tho' to the ordinary *Pagans* this may be pleasing enough, as agreeing with *Polytheism*: But as to the *Mahometans*, I may safely say, the giving *Divine* Worship to Jesus Christ as a Supreme God, is a fatal Stumbling-block which they are not able to get over. Whereas the Worship of him with inferior Worship, as a great Prophet and *Lord*, would be none, if other Difficulties were remov'd. For Mr. *B.* is much mistaken in saying they worship not *Mahomet*; for in reading the *Turkish* History I find the contrary, and meet with three sorts of Worship paid by them to that *false* Prophet. First, They swear by him. Secondly, They bow their Bodies in Adoration at the mention of his Name, as they do at *God's*, but only they bow not their Heads so low. And Thirdly, They pray to him. And therefore Mr. *B.* goes on a false ground. *All Praise to God, and to Mahomet our Master,* is their Worship.

See Pitts's
Account of
Mahome-
tans, p. 41.

And now having finish'd my Argument, upon the review I have said what I really believe is the Truth of the Gospel, and to the true Honour of my *Blessed* Saviour. If any think otherwise, I can however profess from my very Heart, that I have not done it from any Inclination to lessen the Honour of the *Lord of Glory*. I thank God I am much rather dispos'd to congratulate than to envy his highest Glory, were it ever so great, if real and just; but I dare not accept his Person, nor talk wickedly, even for God. I am jealous for the peerless Majesty of the Lord of Hosts, the God of all Gods.

After all, tho I am not conscious of any wrong Interpretation of the Sacred Scripture, yet I dare not speak in the ranting Stile of a late furious Writer, who on supposition that Jesus Christ be not the Supreme God, of the same Essence with the Father, sticks not to say, that *Mahomet* was far the *honestest Person of the two*, since Jesus Christ has written in such an ensnaring dangerous manner to insinuate the contrary into Mens Minds. I say, I dare not so boldly and scornfully accuse my Saviour, as to say on the contrary, That if he be the same God, and the self-same Being with the Father (which I am still satisfy'd the Scripture never says) he then betrays Men into Infidelity, into Blasphemy, and Atheism; and that Christianity is but a *Farce*, a Trick, &c. (which is that Author's Stile) because he has said so much that looks the contrary way, as if he would deceive Men. No, I doubt not but what he has done in this matter, is wisely done: tho he may have left many things difficult and dubious, 'tis not for one side to say he means thus, or he is a Deceiver; and the other, that he means the contrary, or he is so. What scorn must be done to the *Holy Jesus* before Infidels, when all sides shall take this liberty? Sure that Gentleman never considers that the *Unitarians* think he has spoken as much to countenance their Sentiments, as he can imagine he has said in the Gospel to uphold his: and that at this rate the *Papists* may say, he is a Deceiver like *Mahomet*, if the *Host* be not his proper true *Body*, since he said it; and the *Anthropomorphites*, that God is a Lyar if he have not proper bodily Parts, which he so oft professes. Thus it may go round to *Remonstrants* and *Contra-Remonstrants*, *Lutherans* and *Calvinists*; and where shall it stop? Thus by the Majority

of Christians themselves, their common Lord shall be cast for an Impostor, and the *Jews* justified in crucifying him. What then mult *Jews* and *Mahometans* think of Christ and his Religion, when Christians give him so little Credit, that they profess to renounce him, if their particular Sense of some Sayings be not what he intended? I am griev'd that so many *Trinitarians* should discover so little Reverence for the Holy Jesus, and breathe forth so much Rashness and Rage, Malignity and Uncharitableness; and while they plead for *his Deity*, seem to put off their *own Humanity*, save that they manage all with the *Wrath of Man*, which shall never work the Righteousness of God. I pray God quench this intemperate Zeal, which comes not from above; for that is *gentle and peaceable*. Whilst I heartily pray, that what I have written may never prosper nor prevail, unless it be the Cause of God and Truth, which I have pleaded: *Let my Tongue cleave to the Roof of my Mouth, and my Right Hand* (that writes this) *forget her Cunning*, if I prefer not the Truth and Honour of God and his Christ, before any By-Interest or Reputation in this World. I sometimes desire to believe higher things of the Son of God: but when I look into the Scriptures, I cannot find Encouragement to regard him higher than as my Mediator with the most High, whose *Ability to save to the utmost* is laid mainly or wholly on this, *because he ever lives to make Intercession for us* Heb. 7.25. with God. But sure none will say, that the Supreme God is mighty to save, because he can intercede with another for Help and Salvation.

To conclude, I will only add, that supposing the matter of Dispute were equally evident on both sides (which I don't think, nor do my Adversaries) yet I judge there is much more Safety in this

this point of the Worship of Jesus Christ on my side, than on the other. For supposing (as Mr. B. and the Modal *Trinitarians* say) that Jesus Christ were the very same Being with the *Father*; yet in worshipping one God the *Father*, we give Worship to the Divine Being: and he who worships one Infinite God, surely worships all that is adorable with Divine Worship. I desire to know what I leave out *unworship'd*, when I worship God the *Father* of all, and of Jesus Christ. If they tell me I pay no Honour to the three *Modes* or *Personalities*, which they suppose to be in God; I must ask them, if there be any divine adorable Perfections in the other *two Modes* or *Personalities*, which are not in the *Father*? If not, then I leave nothing *unworship'd* that is to be worship'd in God, more than they. If there be, then the *God and Father of Jesus Christ* has not all Perfections in him, nor is the Object of all Divine Adoration, but here is some Divine Worship which he cannot challenge; which I think is a very reproachful Affront to him, to whom not only some, but *all Honour and Glory, all Blessing and Praise is due.*

Nay, supposing there were such *personal Modes*, yet since they are not the grounds of Worship (for we don't worship the *Father* for having a *Son*, nor the *Son* for having the Holy Spirit) but God is only worship'd for his essential Perfections and Dominion, for his infinite Power, Wisdom, and Goodness, &c. which are common to all the suppos'd *Three*: it follows there can be no such fault in worshipping *God* without regard to these distinct *Modes*, which are not properly adorable, only the *Essence* under them. I adore not the *Paternity*, or *Filiation*, or *Procession*; but I adore infinite Power and Goodness, &c. in worshipping God, even the *Father*.

But

But now on the other hand, supposing Jesus Christ to be another *Being*, next, but inferior to the Father; the *Trinitarians*, who worship no other Being, but what is the Father's, or the Supreme Being, must needs be found to give no Worship at all to Jesus Christ, according to Mr. B. Tho they hold to the *two* Names of God and his *Son*, yet they leave out the last in reality, and cast off one Object of Worship; for they worship not the Son, while they honour the *Father's* Being only. The *Unitarians* leave not out *their* Christ, who is suppos'd to be in the Supreme Being; but the *Trinitarians* leave out *ours*, and disown him, not the Name, but the Being or Thing; unless they worship the human Nature or Creature. At most it can but be pretended against me, that I give too much to Jesus Christ, according to my Notion of him (which yet I judge I have vindicated) whereas if they err, they not only give him too little, but no Worship at all; crying in effect, that the *Lamb* (or sacrific'd Man Jesus Christ) *is not worthy to receive Honour and Worship*. Tho 'tis plain in *Rev. 5. 13.* that he is worship'd as distinct from God in his Dignity; not as *sitting on the Throne*, which is God's peculiar Royalty, but as *standing* before the midst of it among the Angels or Saints, *ver. 6.* and so is honour'd subordinately to the great enthron'd God.

So that 'tis a Value for the Honour of Jesus Christ, against those who degrade him as unworthy, that makes me plead his Cause against the modal *Trinitarians*; who, amidst the abundance of magnificent Flourishes, and pompous Strains about his Glory, do really represent him as *too mean* for our subordinate Worship and Homage; denying him that deriv'd Glory, which the Father in reward of his Obedience has bestowed upon

upon him: and so deprive him of his great Glory. Nor does it make any amends to him, to hear them talk of his Divine Worship, while under the name of Christ's or God's Anointed, they mean God himself; and so give that Worship not to Christ himself, but to another, *viz.* to the Father, whose Being is not the *Son's*, but his own.

With this kind of *inferior* Worship our Lord has been honour'd from the beginning; and tho' there has been a great Defection from this pure Religion, yet as I believe the generality of honest plain Christians have intended no other Worship of Jesus Christ, than as Mediator (amidst all the unintelligible Phrases of another import, that their Teachers put into their Mouths) so a considerable Body of the Christian Church has all along so worship'd him; I mean all the numerous Churches of the *Nestorians*, who have in this point preserv'd the Truth from the Times of *Arianism*: *Nestoriani non adorabant Christum ut Deum, & a Patribus Idololatriæ accusantur.* Now the *Nestorians* are acknowledg'd to be a Branch of the *Arians* or *Photinians*, or very near a-kin to them. See *Jurieu's Pastor. Let.* Vol. I. p. 157. *Sandii Nucl.* p. 118, 119. And these Churches in the *East* are so numerous, that, if *Sandius* compute right, they are far more than the Members of the Church of *Rome*, and have all along continu'd for so many Ages, that for ought I know the *Unitarians* may pretend in them to as good a Succession and Visibility, as any other Churches, if that was needful, especially in this Point of Worship.

Thus I think I have taken in all that Mr. *B.* has offer'd on the Head of *Worship*, which I judg'd most proper to be answer'd; both because he seems to be especially confident of the Strength
of

of his Argument here, and also because, while other Arguments contain only Matter of Speculation *immediately*, this does immediately concern our daily Practice, in our Addresses to Heaven, in which a serious Christian will earnestly require Satisfaction, and I think cannot have true Peace, till he has used serious Endeavours to know his Duty : In which thou, O Father of Lights, be merciful to us and guide us. *I am a Stranger on this Earth : Hide not thy Commandments from me.*

Laus Deo, & Christo Mediatori



L


T H E



THE
SUPREME DEITY
OF
GOD the Father
DEMONSTRATED.

Being a Short, but Full Answer to
Dr. *Sherlock's* Proofs of our Saviour's
Divinity, or whatever can be urg'd
against the Supremacy of the First
Person of the HOLY TRINITY.





The Supreme Deity of God the Father demonstrated, &c.



IF false Accusations and uncharitable Censures, if torturing some Texts and trifling with others, and all this set off with a magisterial Arrogance and tragical Exclamations, overlooking the mysterious *Nonsense* of his own Opinions, such as a *deriv'd Self-existent*, or a *begotten First Cause*, &c. and misrepresenting those of his Adversaries, that they may deserve such a Charge; I say, if this be a wise or solid way of confuting the *Unitarians*, the Doctor has shown himself a brave Champion against them, in his late Book *of the Deity of Jesus Christ*, in which there is scarce any thing new, but what is either extravagant or trivial.

The *Unitarians* cannot but think it very hard to be so virulently insulted by every *Trisbeist*, who stands condemn'd not only of *Heresy*, but *Paganism*. And with relation to the Doctor himself, it has been openly declar'd by divers Dignitaries of the Church, that the Opinion of a *Trinity of infinite Minds* is much worse than *Socinianism*; nay, as much as *Paganism* is worse than *Judaism*, say some. Nor do I take up such an

P. 10.

Accusation against so great an *Elder* in the Church, without two Witnesses: The one is Dr. South, in the Preface to *Tritheism charg'd upon Dr. Sherlock, &c.* who declares the abovesaid Opinion to be *Paganism*. The other the Bishop of *Glocester*, in his late *Reflections on Dr. Sherlock's Examination, &c.* where he tells us, his *Examiner* lies under a *greater Scandal* than that of a *Socinian*, even that of a *Tritheist*: Tho, to do the Doctor Justice, he is even with the *Nominal Trinitarians* or *Moralists*, charging them to be worse than the *Socinians*, on the other hand; because tho he judges their *Heresy* to be the same, yet in the others 'tis join'd with *Nonsense*, which is something worse than *Heresy* alone. And so both sides declare the *Socinians* to be better than themselves are in the account of each other.

Upon this occasion, one can hardly forbear inquiring how it comes to pass, that Men of the *Tritheistick Notions* have been and are so warmly cherish'd both in the Bosom of the *Church*, and also among the *Dissenters*; when at the same time there is so much Fury and uncharitable Severity among them both, towards the more harmless *Unitarians*. It can be no great Proof either of the *Honesty* or *Justice* of those Churches, who deal so partially, as to persecute the less *Erroneous*, and to dignify them that are more grossly so. *Unitarians*, it seems, must not speak for themselves; while the others have leave to slander and insult them, as appears by the Doctor's Book.

It is evident his Expositions of the Scripture have been often baffled, which yet he repeats without taking notice of what has been offer'd to overthrow 'em. It were very easy to shew the *Vanity* of his new Interpretations, which it seems he could not advance without bespatter-

ing

ing the learned Commentators of his own side (I mean not of the *Tritheist* side, but of the *Trinitarian*, if there be a difference) and therefore he lets fly at the Generality of our celebrated Annotators. One while they are with him Men of *Levity* and *Wantonness*, p. 24. another while they assert *downright Heresy*, p. 167. and all because they can see nothing against the *Socinians*, in such Texts as he makes the great Support of his Arguments, without one good Reason for it.

The fundamental Text. he begins with, is *Rom. 1. 3, 4. Made of the Seed of David, according to the Flesh, and declar'd to be the Son of God with Power, according to the Spirit of Holiness, by the Resurrection from the Dead.* This he calls an *express Declaration of two distinct Natures in the Son of God*: And so there is in every Man, *Flesh* and *Spirit*; what then? But says he, *according to the Flesh*, is, according to Human Nature, and consequently it implies he had another Nature. Tho' this be nothing to the *Arians*, yet, tis not true. The Phrase *κατὰ σάρκα* never signifies according to Human Nature: The Doctor knew it well enough, that in *Rom. 4. 1. c. 9. 3. 1 Cor. 10. 18.* where we read, *Abraham our Father after the Flesh, my Kinsmen after the Flesh, Israel after the Flesh*; I say, in all these places it could not be so taken, as if *Israel* and *Abraham* had two Natures, or another beside the Human. But because the mention of such Texts had baffled his Argument, he had the Honesty not to take notice of 'em, tho' one of 'em was the Verse but one before that which he argues from. Will such childish *Craft* ever uphold his Cause long? 'Tis plain, that the Phrase, *according to the Flesh*, signifies according to Carnal Descent; and if there be any Opposition in the other Phrase, *according to the Spirit*,

it notes his Spiritual Descent. Not that Jesus Christ was constituted of these two, but he had his Origination both ways; he was of his Mother's Substance, by the Power of the Spirit. So that *after the Flesh*, or by the Mother's side, he was the Son of *David*; but by the other side, as from the Spirit, he was the *Son of God*, tho' the same Man still: And then what does all his straining come to? Is not here a goodly Foundation for his Proof of Christ's Deity?

Another weak Observation he makes on *John* 1. 14. The *Unitarians* say, it should be render'd, *the Word was* (not *was made*) *Flesh*; because the common reading justifies *Eutychianism*. For one thing is not properly *made* another by mere Union to it; but by a natural Change, as the *Water was made Wine*. No personal Union can justify the saying *God was made Man*: We cannot say, the *Soul is made Body or Bones*, because united thereto. So that to say the *Word*, meaning God, *was made Flesh*, is far beyond a personal Union; and implies, that the infinite Divine Nature was really chang'd into a corruptible thing. I challenge the Doctor, or any Man, to shew me that ever *ἐγένετο* signifies *was united*; and if not, then the Trinitarian Sense of that Text is certainly false, except they allow the *Eutychian* Heretical Sense. And therefore the *Unitarians* say the *Word was Flesh*, or Christ the Word and Messenger of God was a *frail mortal Man* like us, in whom nevertheless God's Glory shone forth.

Now, says our great Critick Dr. *Sherlock*, this cannot be, that *ἐγένετο* should be render'd *was Flesh*. Why not? Is it not so *ver. 6*. *There was a Man sent*? But, says he, 'tis never to be render'd *was*, when 'tis a *Copula* between a *Subject* and a *Predicate*: and yet the good Doctor could not perceive that in that very Text which he speaks of, the

Word

Word ἐγένετο is certainly (tho he did not understand it) a *Copula* between ἀνθρώπου and ἀπεσαλμένον, which last Word is the Predicate, and no part of the Subject. I don't think the Doctor has any good luck either at Criticisms in *Greek*, or Speculations in Divinity, to encourage him to go on, after so many Stumbles.

But because 'tis endless to be *capping Texts*, while we fix not a Rule of interpreting them, but each expounds 'em according to his *pre-conceiv'd Hypothesis*; therefore, to come to some Issue of the Controversy, 'tis necessary to fix on some Principles agreed on both sides, and by them to take our Measures, in interpreting *Texts* that are of *variable Accommodation*, unless the Sense be determin'd by *the Nature of the Subject*. And this is the best way to find in what Sense the Name of *God* is intended, whether for a *Supreme* or *Secondary Power* (for naturally 'tis no more one than the other, as the Term *Lord* among us) and what *Creation* is intended, Old or New, and what *Worship*, &c. when attributed to *Jesus Christ*.

To this end I will lay down the Doctor's *own Rule* for expounding Scripture, and observe it with his own Limitations.

His Rule for expounding Scripture, when we appeal to it for Decision of any Question, is this; viz. *To confine our selves to the plain and natural Signification of the Words*. And tho he says, *his Adversarys will oppose this with all their Might*; and if this be once admitted, *there is an end of Socinianism*: Yet he is much mistaken, they'll freely give him this imaginary Advantage, because they judge the fair obvious Sense of Scripture is for the *Unitarians*, and against their Opposers. I'll seek no more Liberty in going off from the natural Sense of a Text, than the Doctor himself allows in his Explication of his Rule. For,

P. 65.

He grants, we may recede from the obvious literal Sense, when *the Nature of the thing will not allow a proper literal Sense*; That it would be absurd to understand some things literally; and that the way to know what is a Metaphor, and what not, is from a previous Knowledge of the Nature of the things to which they are apply'd. So that if the Unitarians can shew, that the Nature of a deriv'd Being will not admit the Title of Supreme God, or First Cause, then they have his leave to deny the Title of Supreme God to Jesus Christ from a previous Knowledge of his Nature, that will not admit it. And indeed to argue from the Nature of the Subject, is better than to argue from a thousand dubious Texts; because they must all be determin'd in their Sense, from *That* at last.

P. 66.

Nay, I will not only close with his Rule, but I will approve his Example too, by which he illustrates it: *When we read of the Face, Eyes, Ears, Hands of God*, says he, *we know all this must be expounded to a metaphorical Sense, because Reason and Scripture assure us God has no Body*. So then, if it can be made appear, that the Unitarians have as good reason to reject what the Doctor accounts the literal Sense of the Scripture, as to the *Trinity* and *Deity of Jesus Christ*, as he or his Party have for rejecting the Opinion of the *Anthropomorphites*, or of *God's having a Body*; then it must be granted that they act justly, and offer no more Violence than the Doctor himself, and other *Trinitarians*. And upon this Point I will join issue with him, and leave it to impartial Men to judge whether the Unitarians have not better Reasons for denying the Supreme Deity of Jesus Christ than the Doctor, or the *Trinitarians* can pretend for denying God to *have a Body*, upon their Principles.

First,

First, I am afraid, tho the Doctor rejects the Opinion of *God's having a Body*, with great Disdain and positive Assurance; yet upon his *Trinitarian* Principles, he has no reason at all for so doing: but is bound to hold that gross Notion along with the Opinion of the *Incarnation of the Supreme God the Son, by a personal Union to a Body*; because this last justifies the other. Where one Text is alledg'd for the Incarnation of *God the Son*, I suppose a thousand may be brought to prove bodily Members to belong to *God the Father*, of old. The Doctor owns, there is full Testimony; only he says, *Reason and Scripture* warrant his quitting the literal Sense, and assure us that *God has no external Shape and Body*. But I deny the Scripture says any such thing directly; and as to Reason, by his Principles, it cannot be against that Opinion neither.

1. Where does the Scripture say God had *no Body*? Does it not say he had *Face and Eyes, &c.* but never says he had none? It says indeed, *God is a Spirit* (tho but once, *John 4. 24.* where the Sense is doubtful too:) But what then? may he not be an *embod'y'd Spirit* for all that, as Man is? Sure the *Anthropomorphites* may allow God to have a Spirit to animate his Body, as well as Men have. So that the Doctor seems but to pretend to join Scripture with *Reason*, that he might not be thought to rely on *Reason alone*, in thwarting the literal Sense of so many thousand Texts.

So that I doubt Reason must take the matter wholly upon *it self*, to maintain that the Deity (tho said to have almost all the bodily Members under the Old Testament) was not an *incarnate embod'y'd Spirit*, or personally united to *Flesh*. But shall proud Reason so correct Revelation? And that not in one single Text, but in the cur-

rent Strain of Scripture: And these Texts so plain (may some say, after the *Trinitarian* Dialect) that God must needs intend to be understood in that obvious Sense, or to deceive us in a very great Point, by speaking contrary to the known Use of Words. What! cannot the *Trinitarians* humble their Reason to so many clear Texts? What tho it seems harsh, has not God said it, and is not that enough? How know they how far he can separate all Imperfection from a Body, tho their *shallow Reason* cannot comprehend it? This is just such *Pride of Reason* as they charge on *Unitarians*, but yet damn and persecute 'em for it; while on their own side 'tis no Crime at all.

But the worst of it is, I don't see how Reason it self can help the Doctor in this case neither: I mean, according to his *Notion* of a personal Union of the *Divine Nature* in Jesus Christ to a *Human Body*; because this Opinion has exactly *all the Absurdities* (at least as great as any) which he can charge upon the *Anthropomorphites*. And if his Reason can admit 'em all in the one case, why should it be affrighted with them in the other? This is but mere *Humour*, not Justice nor Reason. Therefore,

2. How can Reason assure the Doctor, or any of his *Party*, that God has not had a *Body* all along from the first? If nothing but utter *Impossibility* must drive us to a figurative Sense of the Text, how can they pretend it impossible for God to have bodily Members? For they can never demonstrate any *Impossibility* in it; but contrariwise do declare it to be *possible*: nay more, that the *Divine Nature actually is incarnate, is made Flesh, and had Blood* to shed in the second Person, and why not in the *first Person* before? Is it more impossible for God the Father to have a *Body* all along, than for *God the Son* to have one for ever, when

when both are said to be the *same Divine Nature*? Either 'tis an eternal Contradiction to *true Reason* for God to *have a Body*, or 'tis none at all; for true Reason is ever the same. And therefore,

The *Trinitarians* Mouths must be for ever stopt here; they must not talk of the Imperfections that attend a Body, or the like: for since they say there is no Imperfection in it, that hinders the *Divine Nature* in the Son from being *incarnate*, by a personal Union to a Body; why should it hinder the Incarnation of the *same Nature* in the Father? None need plead for more in the case, than that God the Father, under the Old Testament, has all along been *personally united to a Body*, as nearly as *God the Son* is said to be so under the Gospel, by the *Trinitarians*.

One Opinion is as defensible at the Bar of *Reason* as the other, as well as by Scripture. So then either let the Doctor confess he has no Reason for denying the *Incarnation of the Father*, at least under the Old Testament; or let him justify the *Socinians* in denying the Incarnation of any *Divine Nature in the Son* under the New; since they must needs have as good Reason on their side, as the Doctor on his. Renounce *both*, or hold *both Opinions* together, since they are so much alike; and for shame cease clamouring against the *Unitarians*, and reproaching them with straining the Scriptures, while you imitate 'em to the utmost; and but for the very same Practice (*viz. putting the most easy and rational Sense upon the Scriptures*) you cannot avoid turning *Anthropomorphite* and *Muggletonian*.

Here the *Unitarians* might rest, as having said enough to justify their Procedure, by an Argument *ad hominem*; but *ex abundanti*, they can shew more solid and direct Reason still, why they re-
nounce

nounce the Doctor's Notion of the Trinity and Supreme Deity of Jesus Christ, and much greater than he can shew, upon his Principles, for refusing to be an *Anthropomorphite*. I'll tell him some of their Reasons, even such as he must own to be pertinent, if made out.

First, they judge it very hard to suppose a *deriv'd Being* to be the most High God. The Doctor owns Jesus Christ to be a *begotten Being*, a *distinct substantial Person*: and when he tells us, that *whatever Difficulty there is in conceiving a Trinity in Unity, yet there is none in the Notion of God's having an Eternal Son*; he must mean a *distinct substantial Son*, tho of the same *specifick Nature*: for else it is as great a Difficulty as that of the *Trinity in Unity*, if I must conceive the *same single Substance* to be an *underiv'd Father*, and yet a *begotten Son*. Two such Persons in the single *Unity of Substance*, is as hard to conceive as *Three*, or more such: But if he meant that the *Son is a distinct Substance*, begotten of the *Father*, then 'tis not indeed hard to conceive *God's having a Son*; but 'tis very hard still, to believe this *begotten Son* to be the very *God*, whose *Son* he is; or to be the *Supreme God*, or *First Cause*, when his *Being* is *deriv'd* from a *Father*.

For whether *Modern and Nominal* or *Real Trinitarians*, they generally own, that our *Lord Jesus Christ* derives his *Divine Nature* from the *Father*. The *Notion of a Son* implies it; the *Primitive Fathers* declare the *Father* to be the *Fountain* of the *Son's Deity*, and some of 'em expressly say he was the *Cause*. The *Doctor* grants this, and *Dr. Whitby* abundantly discovers it, in his *Comment on John 14. 28.* that the *Son receives his Divine Nature dependently from the Father*: And *Mr. Boyse*, in his *Vindicat.* says, *his Divine Nature is deriv'd*. In short, 'tis the *Catholick Faith*

Faith of the *Trinitarians* in the *Nicene Creed*, which is the Standard of *their* Orthodoxy, and a part of the constant publick Worship, and subscrib'd to by *Dissenters*, That he is God of God; not Son of the Father, to denote the Relation, but *God of God*, to denote the Divine Essence or Nature to be deriv'd, as *God*; i. e. *his Divine Nature* of the Divine Nature of the Father: So that who so denies the Son's *Deity* to be deriv'd, declines from the common *Nicene* Faith (and sets up a novel Doctrine) as much as the *Unitarians*.

Now here the *Unitarians* find matter of Objection: They think, as the Doctor in his sober moods says, That *the most natural Notion of God* ^{P. 128.} *is, that he is the First Cause.* But then how can he be the *First Cause*, who (as all Sides grant) is a *caused* deriv'd Being from another Cause? Can *He* be possibly more than a second *Cause*, who has a Cause of himself? The universally receiv'd Notion of a God among Men, is, that he is absolutely the *First Unoriginate Cause*; and 'tis only by demonstrating *such* a Being, that I can prove a *Deity*. We must trace remote Effects up to a *First Cause* that is self-existent: and should we argue with an *Atheist* to prove a God, 'tis this we must drive him to. But if we tell him only of one whom we confess to be but a *begotten Son*, deriv'd of his Father; he would justly reply, that this is not to the purpose, for Proof of what Mankind mean by a God. There may be still an eternal Succession of Causes, if the highest Being I can pretend to, be but a *begotten Being* (and if Christ's Being be the highest Essence, then the highest Essence that we acknowledge is but a derived one) and so the *Atheist* can never be confuted this way. No, I must find another Being who has the *Self-existence* and *Independence*, which Jesus Christ is not pretended to have by the Doctor himself,

or I am still to seek for my ultimate End, in whom to rest my Mind.

So that there is no good Proof of the Deity, without *Unoriginate Self-existence*: and then how shall I prove Jesus Christ to be that Deity, if he has not that Perfection? To prove him to have *all Power and Wisdom*, &c. does not do it, if it be such only as a deriv'd Being may receive; and also if it come from a higher Fountain and Cause. *Self-existence* then being the most peculiar, and most *indisputably Divine* Perfection, and essential to the Deity, I would fain know, whether *he* be the most absolutely perfect Being, who wants this most *certainly Divine* and noblest Perfection? Nay, the Doctor has told us, That *an infinite Being signifies a Being that has all possible Perfections— and that is a finite imperfect Being, that wants any Perfections*. So that he must either shew, that *Self-existence*, and prime Causality, and absolute Independency is *no Perfection*; or else must grant that the *Son*, who is not self-existent and independent, does want a glorious Divine Perfection— and then by his own Confession, *That is but a finite Being which wants any Perfections*.

To say the *Son* is equal in other things, but not in this, is to give up the Cause: 'tis the same as to say, that he is not the *same Nature*, but *espeecially different*, not having all the same essential Perfections as the *Father*; not so Honourable or *Amiable*; being inferior to him upon the whole, but yet as like him as *another inferior Being can be*, which is plain *Arianism*. For every Exception of a Perfection is a *Limitation*, and a limited Being is not the most *High*. Men may talk and write against the *Unitarians* to the World's end, and to no purpose, till they answer this Objection; for 'tis here the matter sticks, and in this they triumph, as unanswerable.

And

And this I rather urge, because 'tis according to the Doctor's own Rule, who tells us, *That from the previous Knowledge of the Nature of the Subject*, we must learn what Sense to give to Expressions and Characters that are apply'd to it. Here then we have a *deriv'd dependent Being* under Consideration; the Question now is, In what Sense the *Title of God*, and other Characters, can be apply'd to him? Whether the Title of *Supreme God*, or of *Subordinate*, be intended? If it be not therefore consistent with a *derivative dependent Being* to be the Supreme God, or the *First Cause* (which the Doctor says is our most natural Notion of God) then the *Unitarians* act most wisely, in not applying that Character of God to *him* who is a *deriv'd Being*, in such a high Sense as the *Nature* of the Subject will not admit; and therefore it must be in a subordinate Sense.

Both sides agree in it, that the Son is a derivative Being: So that all the Titles of *God*, *Lord*, &c. and the Attributes of Power and Knowledge, Worship, and Works of Creation, &c. must be so understood as they are capable of belonging to such a *deriv'd Being*. We must not, from uncertain *Titles* and *Names*, think to determine what the Subject is (which is to come in at the Back-door, a more obscure way) when we can *a priori* prove that the Subject is not capable of such Names and Titles in the pretended Sense: 'tis but reason that the known Nature of the Subject should rule and limit the Sense of uncertain Names and Characters, &c. rather than equivocal Names and Words should rule the Subject, or be brought to force upon it what 'tis well known it cannot bear. Such Worship, such Power, &c. as a dependent deriv'd Being is capable of, is all that the Scripture ascribes to him. 'Tis much easier to suppose a *subordinate Being* to

have subordinate Power and Worship, and the Names of God in a subordinate Sense, than to suppose a derivative begotten Being to be the Supreme God: The Unitarians think the first, and the Trinitarians the latter, and more absurd.

'Tis therefore a pleasant Fancy in the Doctor, to challenge us to prove, That *the one God is but one Person, any otherwise than as the Father, who is the Fountain of the Deity, who begat a Son in his own Likeness* [not in his own Sameness, but it seems as *Adam* did, *Gen. 5. 3.*] *is call'd the only true God.* That is, we may not prove there is but *one Person that is God*, from this prime essential Perfection of Self-existence, which 'tis granted belongs but to *one Person*: which is just the same as to say, we must not prove it by that which is the most *evident*, and perhaps the only way to find out what Person is most High God. But why should he think us such Fools to let go our best Arguments, and then to try if we can prove our Cause without 'em? No, Sir, first do you shew us, that this is no necessary essential Perfection of the Supreme God, to be *self-existent* or *uncaused*, and then we will hearken to you; but till then, you seem to own that we have an Argument of Force enough to baffle all you say, and therefore you'd craftily persuade us to quit it. I'm sure he is a noble and glorious Being, who is so necessary and excellent as to *be* without an Author or *Cause*: for being of *none*, he has none to limit his Being; and therefore must have Fulness of infinite unbounded Perfection. Whereas a deriv'd Being *may possibly* and easily be limited by his Cause or Author: and unless God can cause and produce or beget (for there is no great difference which) another infinite Being, who also is God, it must needs be so limited.

In short, the Great *Jehovah* disdains that any should be thought or said to have given to him; *Who has given to him?* Will our Lord *Jesus* make that absolute Challenge, who says, that his *Father had given him all?* Or will he equal his deriv'd Being and Perfections to the Father's, who gave it? when himself used that Maxim, *That 'tis more blessed to give, i. e. more excellent and worthy, than to receive.*

Nay, I find the Apostle arguing this Point with great Authority and Evidence: *What hast thou which thou hast not receiv'd; and if thou hast receiv'd it, why dost thou glory, as if thou hadst not received it?* What if some one (tho with great Veneration for the only-begotten Son of God) should apply this to the Blessed *Jesus*, who is *worthy of the Glory and Honour* he is exalted to; and say, What is or hath he, which he hath not receiv'd? And if he hath received it, why should any boast as if he had not received it? or as if he did not owe Respect and Duty to him who gave him all? How would this be answer'd?

Here is no straining of Scriptures, or the natural Notions we have of things; no artificial Subtilties in these Reasonings; 'tis plain, serious, honest and cogent Argument, which the Doctor, or any other, is desired with like Plainness and Fairness to give an Answer to, as soon as he can. Till this be done, we shall think we have much greater Reason for denying his strain'd Interpretation of some Texts for the Deity of Christ, than he has for denying God to have *bodily Members.*

The Sum of all is; 'Tis *essential* to the Divine Nature to be *Unoriginate.* The Question then will be, How he can have that Divine Nature, who being a deriv'd *Being*, wants what is essential to the Divine Nature? Or how can he have

the *Essence* who wants what is essential to it? For to want what is essential to it, is the same as to want the *Essence*, and he who wants it has it not. I dare not say, Almighty God is a *deriv'd* Being; but if Jesus Christ be the Almighty God, and his Divine Nature be his *Father's* Nature, will it not follow, that the *Almighty Father's Nature* is deriv'd, because it is the deriv'd Nature of the Son *that is the Father's*? And so being but one Divine Nature, *and this deriv'd*, there will be no unoriginate Divine Nature, unless we speak Contradictions, and say the same is unoriginate, and yet is caus'd and deriv'd.

Secondly, the *Unitarians* judge it to be very clear, that *God Almighty is but one Person*, or He. The Doctor challenges 'em to prove from Scripture, That *the one God is one single Person*. Now it must be known, that by a *Person* he fairly means a distinct *substantial Person*, or *infinite Mind*, (as all the World, I believe, out of this Dispute do, and the antient Church did) and by *three Persons*, three infinite Minds, as he has declar'd in his *Vindic. of the Trin.* to which he refers us in this Book. He is rightly sensible, that to make a Trinity of *Modes* is but a Juggle, and Blind for *Sabellianism*, &c. since neither *Sabellius*, nor *Arius*, nor *Socinus*, would ever deny such three Modes, or God's *Self-Knowledge* or *Self-Complacence* with *Original Mind*; nor had they been ever the nearer to the Church's Communion for owning it. And since all the common Arguments from Scripture, *viz.* from *personal Notes*, *I, Thou, He*, &c. do prove three Persons in the vulgar Sense, or prove none at all; because they were never in this world us'd to be put for *Modes* of one Person, and therefore could never be design'd by God in such a strange Sense: I say, he is just in his Notion of such a *Person*.

But

But it seems the easiest thing of many, to prove there cannot be *two Infinite Minds* or Beings, or that God, is but *one such Person*; else there is no Supreme Mind or Spirit that can say truly, *I am, and there is none besides me*. Sure no more is God than what is necessary Being; but if one Infinite Mind be all Perfection (else 'tis not infinite) then no more is necessary. Again, if there be but one *Person* that is *First Cause*, or that has the Divine Essential Perfection of Independent Self-existence, then there can be but one Person who is God; since the Doctor grants, that our most *natural Notion of God* is, that he is the *First Cause*.

I know his Expression of *one solitary Person* seems to imply, that Plurality is requisite for *delicious Society*, lest it be not good for God to be *alone*; as if that *Glorious Ineffable Being* were indigent like one of us, who need social Help, or as if he was not to himself instead of a *Thousand*; and if there must be Provision against his *Solitude*, why not three hundred rather than three Persons? What do Men think of the Great God, who argue at this rate? No wonder, if they think not *one such Person* enough for their Happiness, who is thought not sufficient for his *own*.

The Doctor tells us, *each Person in the Trinity has the Perfection of the whole Trinity*. Then I think one is as good as all three, and the rest seem to be made by him utterly unnecessary; and what is so, is not essential to God. And if all Perfections are common to the three, then how can they be distinguish'd by any Perfections? And if not distinguish'd by some Perfections, how are they at all distinguish'd? If no way distinguish'd, how are they *three distinct Persons*? But if they are distinguish'd each by some Perfection, then *one alone* has not all Perfections, and so has not

the Perfections of the *whole Trinity*; nay, is but a *Finite Being*, according to the Doctor.

But perhaps he likes not that we should reason upon the matter, but only bring *Scripture-Proof*: to that therefore I come, and shall see whether the Scripture does not warrant us to say that God is but one *single Person*. Do we not find God represented to us here, constantly under personal Notes of the *singular Number*? When he speaks to Men, 'tis *I* and *Me*; *Thou shalt have no Gods before me, not before us three; I am thy God, not we are thy God*. When spoken unto, is it not always *O Thou*, is it ever *O Ye*? When spoken of, 'tis said *He*, never *They*. Now the Doctor tells us, that *I* signifies a *Person*; so then compleat God is but one singular Person or *I*.

P. 222.

Gal. 3. 20.

Jan. 2. 15.

And thus we read, that *God is one*, θεὸς εἷς ἕστι. God is not said to be εἷς, *one thing*, in the Neuter Gender, but *one* in the Masculine; *i. e.* one Person, *Unus*, not *Unum*: which is quite against the common Dialect of the *Trinitarians*, that say God is *alius & alius*, but not *aliud & aliud*; for if he be but one, or *unus*, then he is not *unus & alius*, or divers Persons. Now, how dare any say, that God is *Three* in the Plural, when the Scripture declares him to be but *One* in the Singular Number? And when it speaks but of *one God*, it limits it expressly to the *Father*, as the *one Lord* (or subordinate intermediate Agent, as 'tis there intended plainly) is limited to Jesus Christ. So *John* 17. 3. *Thee* (Father) *the only true God*, as distinct from *Jesus Christ, sent by him*.

1 Cor. 8. 5.

Perhaps some will run to the old trifling Remarks upon *Gen. 1. 26. Let Us make Man*, to prove a Plurality. But as that is frequent for one Person to use the *Plural*, which has an Air of Authority in it, and I doubt not but it might be so us'd then, as well as now: So if *Elohim* be of plural

Meaning

Meaning at all, it must signify a *Plurality of Gods*; if the Singular be *one God*, then the Plural must be more than one God. And if a Plurality of Persons will not warrant us to say *Gods* in the Plural, then neither was that the reason of saying *Elohim*, or *Gods*, in the *Hebrew*.

But 'tis very apparent that was not the Intent of such Expressions (viz. *to teach us a Plurality of Persons in God*) because they are only us'd, and but rarely neither, in the Old Testament, where 'tis confess'd the Doctrine of the *Trinity* was not explicitly reveal'd; but they are never *once* us'd in the *New Testament*, of which 'tis pretended that Doctrine is the Fundamental Article. To us *Christians* he never speaks so; and sure he would have done it as fully as to the *Jews*, if he intended we should *believe* it more explicitly and fully than they, who understood it not. Sure 'tis in the Gospel we should find God using this Language, *We* and *Us*, and others in their Addresses saying *Ye*, &c. if ever that had been design'd to express a *Trinity*: for no Proof had been more clear, nor any Style more *natural* than this current way of Speech, supposing God to be *Three Persons*. So that 'tis evident it was but an *Idiom* of Language, and has no Argument in it, since the *New Testament* shuns all such Style, where yet it had been most proper for that purpose.

Nay, the using the singular Notes *Thou* and *He*, quite overturns the other; because, tho some single Persons may assume an Air of Majesty sometimes, and say *We*, and yet none suspects more than one to speak it; yet never was it heard that three Persons in proper speaking should affect a *diminishing Form* of Speech, or say *I*: for by that none will ever suppose more than one Person intended. So that 'tis as evident as can be, that the Scripture, especially the *Christian*

Revelation, speaks God to be one singular Person: whereas *Three Persons in one Being* had been so strange a matter, that the most particular Care and Accuracy of Expression, had been necessary to be us'd, if that had been to be reveal'd to our *Faith*.

So that all that is in God, is intended and comprehended in one single *He*, and one single *He* cannot be *three He's* or *They*. 'Tis not *Ye* or *They* are God, but *Thou art God*. The Unity of Essence had been secure in saying *God* in the singular Number, but the Personal Notes must have been plural, if a Trinity of Persons had been design'd.

It signifies nothing to say there are *Three Persons* or *He's* that have the *Name of God* given 'em, (tho of one 'tis never prov'd at all) for that may be in different Senses of the *Character, God*. And since the Supreme God is but *one He*, the other *He's* must not be *that God*, whatever Character they have. 'Tis easier to suppose there may be *Gods* that are not the most High God, but in another Sense, than that there should be *Three He's* or *Persons* in a God who expressly says, he is but *one He* or *Me*; but one *Spirit*, John 4. 24. not three *Spirits*: The one is possible or obvious from Scripture, the *other* seems not possible, nor is it asserted.

But because the Doctor requires that we produce a Text which teaches that Jesus Christ *is but a mere Man, and a God by Office*, we shall proceed to this; tho there is no necessity we should do it: For why should any suspect that a mortal Man should be the Supreme God, that we need prove *this Negative*? Where is there a Text that teaches us, that *Moses* was but a Man? 'Tis enough that he was a Man. So that *Jesus* was a Man is plain, and that he was *anointed God* is plain,

plain, *Heb.* 1. 8, 9. But what need is there to have it said he was no more, if none then suppos'd that an anointed God was the same as the *Supreme God by Nature*? For then why need he, or how could he be anointed or commission'd by another? However, to gratify him, let us try if the sacred Text does not declare Jesus Christ not to be God by Nature, by denying absolutely that he has Omniscience, and ascribing some Ignorance to him as the *Son of God*, which will appear under the next Argument. For,

Thirdly, the *Unitarians* offer another Reason from *Mark* 13. 32. *Of that Day knows none* ('tis not *Man* in the Original, as the Doctor implies) *not the Angels, nor the Son, but the Father, or my Father only*, as 'tis *Mat.* 24. 36. for both Expressions are the same in Sense; and *none but my Father*, is as much a Limitation, as *none but my Father only*. Hence the Doctor forms a good Argument: *To be ignorant of any one thing, cannot be reconcil'd with a perfect Knowledge* — and were he true and perfect God of the same Substance with his Father, he could be ignorant of nothing. Very true! but how does he answer the Text that says, *The Son knows not of that Day, but the Father only*? Why, truly, he gives but the common Answer, *viz.* That he knew it not in his *Human Nature*, but yet supposes that he knew it in his *Divine*. Not that he likes that Answer neither; for he confesses, 'tis very hard that the Son, who is but one Person, tho he have two Natures, should be said not to know what he did know, whether he knew it as God or as Man. But says he, in great Distress, *this must be the true Answer*; why so? or, says he, *I know not how we shall find a better*: that is, we must use this very hard shift, or the Cause is utterly lost; and that must be maintain'd, whatever the Text says: and therefore, tho we don't offer

offer a good Reason, yet we must stand by what we have : A hard case indeed !

Then he falls on to blame his Ignorance of the *personal Union*, as the reason of this Nonplus ; but why does he take up such a Notion of the *personal Union*, as the Scripture never asserts, and which he cannot reconcile with it ? Does he not often declare, that what belongs but to one Nature, is to be attributed to the Person ? But now that it will not hold good upon due Examination, but is turn'd against his Cause, he would pretend he does not know what the Union is. Is this fair ? And if he knows not what it is, how can he tell it would serve his purpose, if he knew it better ? This is a poor Come-off. Why may not the *Eutychians* as well set up an unintelligible Mixture, as others an unintelligible Union ?

Therefore the Doctor must try again, how to make good the old Answer, as well as he can. He tells us, *Jesus Christ* has two Understandings : How appears that ? or what is it to the purpose, if he understands the *Day of Judgment* with neither ? or how is either of them a Divine Understanding ? Again, says he, *Jesus Christ opposes the Knowledge of Creatures only to that of the Father*. Who denies it ? But then the *Unitarians* say, the *Son of God the Father* is among them, who are oppos'd to the Father, and whom the Doctor accounts Creatures. For the Text says not Creatures at all, but mentions Angels and the *Son* ; and if the Son was more than a Creature, then the Father was not oppos'd to Creatures only, when oppos'd to the Person of the Son, and I hope the Person of the Son is all that he is.

However, if the Son be not the *Father*, then where the *Father only* knows, and that as distinct from the Son, there the Son does not know ; because he is no way, the Father in distinction

tion from the Son, to whom alone as so distinct, that Knowledge is appropriated: And 'tis in this the Argument lies, and not only in the Son's being said not to know it.

'Tis a vain Pretence of some, that the *Son and Spirit are not excluded here*, while yet they are forc'd to own, that by the Father is not meant *all three Persons*, but the *First of the Sacred Three*; and yet he only is said to know. Thus weakly and desperately I find a late Author argue, *viz.* Mr. J. Boyse, in his pretended *Vindication of Christ's Deity*. To confute all this, let us but put his Comment in the place of the Text, and 'tis thus; *None, no not the Son, knows of that Day, but only the First of the Sacred Three.* Now one would think; that where the *First of the Three* only is excepted from being ignorant, the other two were not excepted; for then it could not be said, *none but the First*, if the second and third also were excepted. So that this wholly gives up the Cause, as not to be vindicated; since it leaves the Son of God ignorant of something, which the Father knew.

As frivolous 'tis to say, that because he was call'd the *Son of Man*, Mat. 24. 30. therefore *only* the Son of Man, or his Human Nature, was intended in *ver.* 36. tho he had a Divine. What, are there two Sons? Is not the Son of Man the Son of God also? If so, then 'tis the same Son under both Names: Or, supposing another *Son of God*, yet was there ever a *Divine Son* that was the Father, or *First of the Three*? If not, then is he excluded, let him be what Son he will; because all but the Father is excepted, whether Son of Man, or *Son of God*. So that this poor Distinction and Evasion will not afford any Shelter. Nay, does not *Christ* say, *my Father only*? and if the *Father* be God, I hope then *his Son* means

†

God's

God's Son, or *the Son of God*. So that 'tis as express as if he had said, *of that Day knows not the Son of God*, &c. for the Son of the Father was the *Son of God the Father*. So trifling a Defence only could the *Vindicator* make against so shining an Argument from the Sacred Text; but it was because he was in the Doctor's Distress, *not knowing how to find a better*: and so they must speak Contradictions, rather than quit a weak Defence.

Well then they must go to the old Refuge:

P. 201.

For, says the Doctor, *the incarnate Word being but one Person, whatever belongs to either Nature, may truly be affirm'd of his Person, tho it be not true with respect to more than one Nature*. Thus he

P. 263.

says, *the Eternal Word was born and dy'd, &c.* But then if we may affirm of the Person what belongs to one Nature only, why should it not rather be said, that the *Son also knew of that Day*, if he knew it in one Nature? This is quite against him. In like manner, says he, *if Christ, as Man, was ignorant of any thing he yet knew as God, he might truly be said not to know what he did not know as Man*. But let him hold a little here: He laid the Rule down thus; *That we may affirm of the Person what was true of any one Nature*, and now instances in a Point that implies a *Denial to the Person of what was true in one Nature*. This is just contrary to his Rule; for there is a vast difference between affirming and denying in this case: and for the same reason that I can affirm a thing of the Person that respects one Nature, for that very reason I cannot deny the same thing of that Person, because to deny, is to say, I cannot affirm it; and if I can affirm that *Jesus Christ knew that Day*, then I cannot deny it without shameful Contradictions. Besides, if I may, in absolute Terms, deny of the Person what he is in one Nature, I doubt this would warrant Men

to

to say, in absolute Terms, that Jesus Christ is *not God*, nor better than a Creature, because in one Nature 'tis certain he is no more. So that this Shift won't do after all.

Now if it appear, that the *Son of God* knew not all that the Father knew, then where is his infinite *Omniscience*? And if after all the large Expressions of his *knowing all things, and searching the Heart, &c.* it yet be found, that he has but a limited Knowledge, then I doubt all other Perfections ascrib'd to him in Scripture, will also be suspected to be in a limited Sense; since nothing is more largely ascrib'd to him than *Knowledge*: and if there be no Infinite Knowledge, &c. how is there an infinite Divine Nature?

I must not give over, without observing what the Doctor says at the end of this Argument; *viz.* That now the *Lamb, whole Christ, not as God* P. 205. *only, but as Man, opens the Seals, and discovers all those secret Counsels of God, with all the Variety of Events to the end of the World.* Again, says he, *his Human Nature is perfected with the Knowledge of all the Divine Mysteries of Grace and Providence, &c.* Now I ask the Doctor, if this do not ascribe as much Knowledge to the *Man Christ*, as the *Unitarians* Opinion? And if so, with what face could he represent them for such ridiculous Monsters, in giving Divine Attributes to a Creature, when they say no more than the Doctor here does? Why did he censure it as a piece of *mysterious* P. 6. *Nonsense* in them to pray to one who cannot hear us, nor know what we pray for, unless God reveal it to him? Surely if his Human Nature know *all the Counsels of God* relating to the *Government, Instruction and Support of the Church, and all the Variety of Events to the World's end, and be instructed in all the Secrets of Government*; he may then very well know our Prayers, else he knows

knows not *all Events*: And if the Doct̄or don't think the way of his knowing things by Revelation, or other way, to be *ridiculous*, I see not why it should be ridiculous in his Eye, for a Man to pray to, or trust in him, as one who knows his Affairs so well, be it which way it will. If it be no *mysterious Nonsense* for the Lord *Jesus* to govern, as Man, by reveal'd Knowledge; how is it Nonsense to apply to such a Governor, as so qualify'd? Is he a Ruler of the Church by his Knowledge reveal'd to him, and may not a *Subject* of his trust in him, or pray to him on that ground, without *mysterious Nonsense*? Verily, this is *mysterious Confidence*, or Ignorance!

Thus I have consider'd the Nature of the *Subject*, viz. *Jesus Christ*, that he is a *deriv'd* Being; and of God Almighty, that he is but *one Person*; and of the Perfections of *Jesus Christ*, that they are limited. Now it follows, that we must interpret the Texts of Scripture accordingly, which indeed fall in as naturally with the *Unitarian* Scheme, as with any, and with less Violence than the Doct̄or offers, as appears by his hard straining with so little Success.





A B R I E F

V I N D I C A T I O N

O F T H E

Bishop of *Glocester's*

D I S C O U R S E

C O N C E R N I N G


*The Descent of the Man Christ
Jesus from Heaven, &c.*

From the Dean of *St. Paul's* Charge
of *Heresy*.

With a Confutation of his new Notion in
his late Book of *The Scripture-Proofs of
our Saviour's Divinity*.







A Vindication of the Bishop of Gloucester against Dr. Sherlock.



THE Venerable Prelate, whose Discourse of the *Descent of the Man Christ Jesus*, the Doctor so severely reflects on, is at least the second of our Right Reverend Fathers, who with-

in a short time have been publicly accus'd of writing *Heresy* in the Article of the *Deity of our Blessed Saviour*. Alas! that this Point should be so dubious, as to be debated among our very Dignitaries to this day; and that our Reverend Fathers and Doctors can come no nearer in Agreement here than *Heresy* and *Truth*!

'Tis not long since the Reverend Dean proclaim'd all those guilty of *Heresy* and *Nonsense*, who believe not a Trinity of *three distinct Infinite Minds and Substances, each of them a God*: which other Reverend Doctors say is *Paganism*, and much worse than *Socinianism*. And tho' that Opinion was censur'd as Heretical at *Oxford*, yet the Doctor thinks he can find *Divines* enough to do the like by the Opinion of his Condemners.

Now again he charges a Reverend Father's Book, with asserting what *may shake the Founda-*

tions of all Religion, as well as of Christianity; and with advancing an Hypothesis that overthrows the whole Doctrine of our Salvation, and all our Hopes of Immortality by the Incarnation and Death of Jesus Christ—— and yet corrupts not the Christian Faith, more than it does the Christian Worship. And to render these Reproaches the more cutting, he tells us what an *old Friendship* and particular Respect he has for the Bishop, which restrain'd him from some *Remarks* that else the Subject might bear. So that these are represented as the most favourable Remarks a Mind full of Respect for the Author could in Justice make upon his Book.

P. 273.

P. 245.

How far Respect moderated the *Dean*, I shall not pretend to determine; but I find his Aggravations are far beyond his Proofs.

The Sum of the matter I take to be this: 'Tis a great Objection of some against the common Doctrine of the *Trinitarians*, that 'tis inconsistent with the Scripture-Account of *Christ's* Humiliation. The Gospel magnifies his Love to us in this matter as most transcendent, not only for the Sufferings he underwent, but also on account of the great Benefits and Glory which he laid aside in order thereto. *He emptied himself; and being rich, he became poor.* Hereupon they inquire, how any Man can rationally account for these things according to the common Notion of the Person of Christ? *viz.* That only his Divine Nature was before his Conception in the blessed Virgin, and that *then* the whole Human Nature, Soul and Body, began to be.

Now, says the *Arian*, perhaps, how could the Lord Jesus by this Account, *of rich become poor, or empty himself, or come down from Heaven*, and that by such a Descent as answers to his local Ascension? His Divine Nature could not descend, could not be stript of any uncreated Glory,

John 16.
28.

Eph. 4.9.

ry, for God cannot suffer Diminution; *he cannot deny himself*, being immutably perfect. And the Human Nature could not be made poor, that never had been richer, being born in Poverty, *in a Manger*; nor could it empty itself of Glory it never had. And if nothing was parted with upon our Lord's coming into the World, upon what ground do we extol the Love of our Blessed Lord in *coming from Heaven*, and parting with his Glory, and emptying himself to become Man, &c.?

Nay, how could he possibly *come down from Heaven* answerably to his local Ascent, to which 'tis oppos'd so often? I find the Difficulty rather increas'd than remov'd by some that handle this Subject: among the rest, a very ingenious Person (tho a very sour Writer in these Controversies, and therefore ought to have been more wary) seems horribly confounded; I mean Dr. South, (with whom the common Writers agree) who, in his 3d Volume of Sermons treats of this Subject.

Speaking of Christ's coming into the World, he says, *That it is impossible for his Divine Nature to come, because Coming is a Motion from the place where one is, to a place in which he was not before; whereas Infinity (the Property of the Divine Nature) implies a Presence to all Places.* Well then, one would think if Jesus Christ came down at all, it must be in his *Human Nature*, for he has no other left to come. No, says he, *That which did not exist before it was in the World, cannot possibly be said to come into the World, any more than the Fruit that grows on the Tree, can be said to come to the Tree; which would suppose it were somewhere else before.* So then neither did the Human Nature come down, for he confesses it did not exist before the Conception in the Virgin.

But what way then did he come down from Heaven? The *Socinian* Sense of coming forth from God by virtue of his Commission, is ridicul'd as *forc'd*. Besides, then we should lose all those Texts, from whence Christ's Pre-existence was wont to be prov'd; and this would anger Mr. *Dean*, who says they are the *principal Proofs* of Christ's Divinity. But what then must be said in the case? Dr. *S—h* says, he came not down in the *Divine Nature*, nor in the *Human*, and gives seeming Reasons for it: and if neither Nature came down, I see not how he can pretend it of the whole Person. For tho we are sometimes told by the *Dean* and others, that by virtue of the personal Union, what belongs to one Nature only, may be attributed to the Person; yet I never can believe such a *Communication of Properties*, as that what belongs to neither Nature should be attributed to the Person. This is a dark State of the Case!

But I must not forget to do this Ingenious Doctor this Justice, that between those Pages which contain these harsh inconsistent Matters, he has very conveniently placed a needful Caution, *viz.* that this Doctrine, *i. e.* of the personal Union of two Natures in Jesus Christ, *brings both ends of the Contradiction together*, and so he is safe; and no doubt with that fine knack he may explain any Mystery in the World, and need not fear to undertake *Transubstantiation*. But if this be the real case, that I must reconcile Contradictions, before I can have any rational account of the Love of Jesus Christ in coming down into this World, I think Christianity will not gain much Credit by such Explanations and *Solutions*, any more than by such Assertions as that remarkable one; p. 316. (in which no doubt the *Socinians* will cordially join with

with him) *viz.* that his Faith, in relation to the Person of Jesus Christ, is such, *That*, as he says, *were it not to be ador'd as a Mystery, it would be exploded as a Contradiction.* A fine Issue of the Controversy!

The *Arian* thinks he gives a more intelligible and rational Account of the matter by his Principles: That *Jesus Christ* did truly leave his former created Glory, and came down to live in Poverty on Earth; and that herein was great Love, because it was a very sensible and evident Loss and Humiliation. And this gives a plain Account of his *leaving Heaven* and his *Father's Throne*, and the like: which are Phrases continually in the Mouths and Writings of our Divines; but with what Sense, according to the common Principles, appears not yet.

Now, I suppose, his Lordship thought to give us some Ease in these Matters, by *another* Account of *Christ's* Humiliation and Descent, that might more clearly answer to the Scripture, and raise a nobler Idea of *his* Love to Men, than the common *diminutive* one; which swells high in Words, but being examin'd into, seems to dwindle into little or nothing of real *self-emptying* Love. This might be his *Lordship's* Design, and the *Occasion* of his Discourse.

Next, let us see what Reason the *Dean* had to quarrel with it, or how he has mended the matter by his new Scheme or *Fancy*.

The Bishop asserts the Pre-existence of *Christ's Human Spirit*, which he supposes was first in Heaven, and left it and its Glory there for a while, to live in a Body on this Earth; and some Texts at their first and most obvious View do certainly favour such a Pre-existence, if no subtle Strain be used to evade it; as *John 3. 13. The Son of Man was in Heaven.* Why should he name

the Person by the Title from his Human Nature, if he intended to speak of what belonged to a Divine Nature, which perhaps none to whom he spake knew any thing of? So *John* 17. 5. *Give me the Glory I had with thee before the World was.*

Nor had the Dean any reason to quarrel with the Bishop for rendring $\delta \omega \nu \epsilon \nu \tau \omega \delta \iota \epsilon \gamma \nu \omega \varsigma$, *who was in Heaven*, rather than *is in Heaven*; for as this leaves no Difficulty in the Sense, so 'tis agreeable to the Scripture-Use of the Word. Is it not necessarily so render'd, *John* 9. 25. *I was blind, but now see?* *ωρ*, not *am* so. Does not *Beza* himself turn it, *Qui erat, who was in Heaven?* But forsooth, *This is no great Mystery*, says the Doctor; as if we must have nothing of Sense and rational Notions in Scripture, but Mysteries. And because he would not lose one of the number of his Texts in his common places for the Deity of Jesus Christ, therefore right or wrong the Doctor will be for the other Sense, and hopes by standing stiffly for it, he may do some Service to such as mind the Number of Texts more than their Force. But it is well known the *Socinians* would not yield the Doctor's reading, if the Bishop had; and what had it signify'd to argue from a reading of the Text, which could not be prov'd to be certainly true?

Thus he finds fault with reading another Text, *John* 8. 58. *Before Abraham was, I was*; and is so warm as to pretend that $\epsilon \gamma \omega \epsilon \dot{\iota} \mu \iota$ must needs be *I am*, and that *I am* must be the peculiar Name of *Jehovah*. This he presses so far as to say, that to change *I am* for *I was*, is certainly to part with the most express Proof of our Saviour's Divinity. I am amaz'd that a great Dignitary should tell the World, That this is the most express Proof he has for Christ's Divinity, viz. that he speaks thus of himself, *I am*; which is the ready way

to expose a Cause by catching at Shadows instead of solid Arguments. Would it prove the blind Man to be the *I am*, because he says the same Words, *John 9. 9. I am he?* And is it not used for the Preterperfect Tense, *I have been*, *John 14. 9?* And is the best Argument for Christ's Divinity gone with this slender Proof? This straining for Arguments never betters a Cause, nor does fair receding from an abused or doubtful Text weaken it. So that the Bishop has done no such harm to the Cause in these things as the Doctor himself.

The Bishop indeed has given up some Texts that used to be alledg'd for Christ's Deity, by proving his Pre-existence, and these the Doctor calls *most of the principal Proofs*. But what would those Texts avail against the *Arians*, who own a Pre-existence (which is all that such Texts prove) and yet deny his *Deity*? Let the Doctor shew, that they prove a Pre-existence of a *Divine Nature*, else they are not the *principal*, nor any sort of Proofs to the purpose. This should have been the Doctor's work, if he had done any thing to the purpose? the rest is but Clamour, to say they are good Proofs, when others deny it, whether the Bishop had given them up or not. The Doctor only shews, they may be consistent with a Divine Nature pre-existing, and so they may be with the want of it, or with another pre-existing Nature for ought he shews. Ibid.

Next, he runs into Clamour against the Bishop's *Nestorianism*, but how does he make it out? Tho it be the Sum of all his Charge and Re-proaches, yet his Lordship never said, the Human Soul was a *Person* of it self, without the *Logos* (whatever another accused Prelate has suggested) but that the *Logos is personally united to the Human Soul, and by it to the Body*. And where is the

P. 241. Nestorianism of this? Why, says the Doctor, *he always speaks in the Language of a personal Distinction*; for this he instances in his calling him the *Man Jesus*, and attributing so much to the *Man Jesus*, calling him *Lord and Saviour*, but never calling him the *Eternal Word*, &c.

P. 232. But does the not calling *Jesus* *Eternal Word* amount to a Denial that he is so? Or, does his calling him *Man Christ* deny him to be a Divine Person? Or does he say more of, or attribute more to the *Man Christ* than the Apostle? *One Mediator, the Man Christ*, 1 Tim. 2. 5. And, *God shall judge the World by the Man Christ Jesus*, Acts 17. 31. Either the Apostle does hereby exclude the *Word* from being our *Saviour* and *Mediator*, when he attributes such things to the *Man Christ*, or else the Bishop does not exclude him in saying the same. Nay, does not the Doctor himself say, that the Title of *Son of Man* must signify the *Eternal Word made Man*, and notes the whole Person? And why then may not the Bishop call *Jesus* the *Man*, and speak of the *Merit of the Man Jesus*, and call the *Man Saviour*, and yet be allow'd to mean the same, viz. the *Eternal Word made Man*? especially when he had asserted the *Personal Union* of the *Man* to the *Word*: So that there could be no Person (with him) but the *Word* united to the *Man*, and the *Man* could be no Person, if the one Person consist of the two Natures. Where did *Nestorius* allow any *Personal Union*, as the Bishop? The making the *Human Soul* a Person as united to the *Word*, is far from making it another Person of it self, as the *Dean* poorly argues. May not the *Man* say *I*, and the *Word* say *I*, and yet it be the same Person, according to the *Doctor's* Notion of the *Union*? Again, does it follow, that because the *Word* is only incarnate in the *Incarnation* of the

pre-existent Soul, that it is not *incarnate* at all? yet so weakly he argues.

And what a ridiculous Remark is that, tho' odious enough! where he says, *The only difference between the Arians and the Bishop is this, that they own no Word, or Son of God, but this excellent Creature, and the Bishop unites this Creature to the Eternal Word*: That is, the Bishop only differs from them in what was deem'd their *Error*. A sad Charge! just as if I should say, the only difference between the *Doctor* and the *Socinians* in this Point, is, that they hold no other Son of God, but the anointed *Man* Jesus Christ; and the *Doctor* unites this Man personally to the second Person of the Trinity. What would a captious Mind have!

I confess he gives a wonderful Argument against *Nestorianism*, that will charm any Man who is fond of *Fargon*. *This Nestorian Union*, says he, *is not the Union of the Human Nature to the Eternal Word*. He reckons if the Man Christ be a Person, he can be but a *single Person*; but if it be *Human Nature*, that is, *no subsistent Person of it self*, that is united to the Word, then it will be *Human Nature in general will die and suffer, and be redeemed*, i. e. *the Nature of all Mankind*; whereas, if the Man Christ was a *single Human Person*, only that particular Man might be redeem'd, but not *Human Nature, or all Mankind*. This I give as the Sum of what he says.

One would have thought any Man of Sense should have been asham'd to meddle with the imaginary Notion of *Universal Human Nature*, since so great a Man as the Bishop of *Worcester* was gravel'd with it in his Debate with Mr. *Locke*. Would there have been less of Human Nature in our Lord for being a Person, as every Man else in the World is, and ever was? Had *Jesus Christ*

Christ any more than his own particular Human Essence, as every Man has his own particular, like indeed to others, but not theirs at all? Did every Man's Human Nature die when Jesus Christ died? Or why might not his *Human Person* have been every Man's Person, as well as his *Nature* every Man's Nature? For my Nature is as particular as my Person. There is no such thing in the World as *Universal Human Nature*, abstract from Particulars, 'tis but an abstracted Notion; all Human Nature is in Particulars. I conceive Christ's Human Nature was not the Doctor's, nor is the Doctor's Nature which he has here personally united to the Divine *Logos* in Heaven. Some Human Nature is to be *damned*, I hope Christ's Nature is not to be so. What Trifles does he put upon the World!

Besides, then Christ could not die *instead of all*, or any of Mankind, if he was all Human Nature or Mankind: but then it follows, that Human Nature dy'd and aton'd for it self, without a Substitute: and why should Human Nature perish at all, if all Human Nature has made ample Atonement?

These are terrible Arguments against *Nestorianism*; and unless the Doctor's Human Nature be all Human Nature too, I believe few of that Nature will be of his mind. What strange Notions are these to serve an *Hypothesis*! Men may talk big, and lay their Salvation on what odd Notions they will, but this never moves a wise Man to imitate their Ravings. But I'll say no more of this, because I hear his *Lordship* intends to vindicate himself from a Charge of Heresy.

Let us then go on, to see whether the *Doctor* has at all mended the matter, or given a better account of the Son's *coming down*, and *emptying himself*,

himself, so as to take off the abovesaid Objection of the *Arians*. For Answer to this, he owns, that 'tis a *Mystery* to him, how an *Infinite Being* that fills all places can be said locally to ascend or descend. But yet for all the Text speaks it, he will venture to affirm, that properly it cannot be (where by the way observe, that what he calls a *great Mystery* in one place, he says is a thing that properly cannot be in another; there is his Explication of a *Mystery*) but then how does the Son of God descend, if not the *Divine* nor the *Human Nature* can come down properly?

To this he says, *When the Eternal Word, who appeared in a visible Glory in Heaven before the Foundation of the World, came down, he put off for a time his visible Glory in Heaven, and left his Father's Throne, and made his personal Appearance on Earth.* — He put off, not the essential *Glory* of his *Nature*, but the visible *Manifestation* of his *personal Glory* in *Heaven*. His *Riches* were the *eternal Glory* he was possess'd of in *Heaven*, and therefore his becoming *poor*, was his putting off the *visible Glory* of the *Son of God*, &c. — Now when the *Eternal Word* translated his *personal Presence* from *Heaven* to *Earth*, he might properly be said to descend from *Heaven*.

Thus, besides the essential *Glory* of the *Divine Nature*, he asserts a *personal visible eternal Glory*, and *Manifestation* before the *World* was, and that not by way of possible *Supposition*, but with *peremptory Assertion*, as if he personally had seen it. This is no presumptuous prying, I warrant you, into hidden *Mysteries*, as long as 'tis done on his own side! but as the *Hypothesis* is as precarious wholly as that of *Socinus* about the *Translation* of *Jesus* to *Heaven* before his publick *Ministry* (for *John* 3. 13. is as good a *Proof* for his purpose as *John* 17. 5. is for the *Doctor's*; I mean, for

for 'Proof of a *visible eternal* Glory of a Divine Infinite Person) so 'tis weak and absurd on many accounts. For,

1. Was that visible Glory a Creature, or uncreated Glory? 'Tis hard to suppose he takes it for *uncreated*, since 'twas neither essential, nor necessary to the *Divine* Nature, for he grants it might be put off: and he makes it a finite or limited thing, that may be confin'd to a place, and translated from one place to another. Sure God cannot lay by any *uncreated* Excellency; or can any finite, visible, sensible Object be uncreated? If so, then to prove the Lord *Jesus* an uncreated Being, would not prove him to be Infinite, or of the Nature of God, because something *not created* would be finite and visible. I will suppose then that there is no uncreated Being but God; and that what is visible, finite, and mutable, is not God; and consequently that the Doctor will not suppose this limited unconstant Glory to be uncreated.

Why then it must be a *Creature-Glory*: But was there any Creature before the World was? Nay, since he calls it *eternal* Glory, will he assert an *eternal Creature*? This will give up a stronger Proof for Christ's *Divinity*, than any the Bishop has 'given us, *viz.* from his Eternity: for when his Eternity is prov'd, what avails it in Proof of his Deity, if there be eternal Creatures?

2. I ask, Was this Glory personally united to the *Eternal Word*, or not? If not, it was none of his Person. Then, as the *Doctor* argues against the *Nestorian Union*, or the Human Person not united to the *Word*, it follows, that 'twas not *Jesus*, or the *Eternal Word* that came down, not *Jesus* that ascended again where he was before, but another Being, a Creature; and then his own Conclusion is, *The Foundation of our Hope is lost.*

For

For 'tis the Union of the two Natures in one Person, that he makes to be the only Ground of ascribing to the *Person* what belongs to *either* P. 255.
Nature; as I could not ascribe to the *Man*, what belongs to the Body, if the Body was not in personal Union to the Soul. So that his visible Glory is no more the Eternal Word, than the *Nestorian's* Man is, if it be not in personal Union with it.

But if it was personally united to the Word, then it follows, that the Eternal Word was in personal Union with a Creature from Eternity, and long before he was Man; and that the Word was made *Light* or Glory before he was *made Flesh*: and so there will be *two* personal Unions and *three* Natures in one Person; two Creatures, *viz.* visible Glory and Flesh, and a Divine Nature. Who will not say that the Dean has far outdone the Bishop?

3. I ask, how, or upon what occasion should there be such a *visible Eternal Glory and Manifestation*, when there were none to make this Manifestation unto, and to see this visible Glory? It was, I hope, no Manifestation to God, or the Divine Nature; God knew his own essential Glory without a Manifestation, and the Dean will at least allow the *three* Divine Persons to know their own personal Excellencies by a *mutual Consciousness*: so that this visible Glory seems of no use to them, and yet there were no others from Eternity that the Dean tells us of to see this visible Glory, or to receive this Manifestation; therefore there is no reason to suppose such an unnecessary thing.

4. How could Jesus Christ put off this visible Glory for a time, so that he should not appear in it, as he did before the World was? Was this Glory utterly extinguish'd and annihilated, or did it vanish and disperse into Obscurity? This

indeed will shew it to have been a created Glory; but what ground is there to assert this, and to suppose a new one to be created when our Lord ascended? And how then was it *eternal*? or did it only move by *Translation* from place to place? Then it will follow, that Jesus Christ had not *put it off*, nor emptied himself of the rich Manifestation he had before the World was, because wherever this visible Glory settled, it was manifest to as many as it had been formerly manifested to *before the World was*, that is, to the three Divine Persons: and if it could not be hid from these, then he made the same glorious Appearance still that he had done from Eternity, and so need not have said, Give me the *Glory I had with thee*, but the *Glory which I have now with thee*, and never *parted with*.

Or did it return to Heaven again after such a transient Appearance as at the Transfiguration? If it return'd, then Jesus Christ had as truly ascended before his Death as he had ever descended, *viz.* by a Translation of this *personal* Glory; and if it dwelt on Earth, being visible, it had been openly seen where he went, and it had not been his Humiliation neither, but his Riches and Grandure, to have so come down in Pomp.

Nay, I doubt the Doctor must ascribe the like Descent and Humiliation to God the *Father*; for he says, that *God translated his personal Presence from Heaven to Earth, when he descended on the Mount, and he remov'd it again; and that when he does so, he may be said to ascend and descend in respect of us*: and he makes this an Illustration of the Descent of the *Eternal Word*.

Then we have, it seems, the *Father's* Descent and Ascent as well as the *Son's*: and if it was a *leaving the Father's Throne* in the Son, and a *putting off his Glory* and Riches, when he thus came
down;

down; then I doubt not we must account the like to be his putting off *his* Glory too: and then there will be the *Humiliation of God the Father* as great as of the Son, according to the Doctor's Notion. And will not the like follow in relation to the Holy Spirit, that once descended in his visible Glory on the Day of *Pentecost*? And so Acts 2. after this rate all three will have come down and been humbled for us.

What a poor *scanty* narrow Creed is the *Athanasian*, if it wants all these Articles? If the Doctor had but the mending of it in the points of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation*, according to his present *Hypothesis*, what a noble spacious thing might he make of it?

I am seriously ashamed to see such raw Notions from an ingenious *Dignitary* of the Church, urged with so much Positiveness and severe Reflections on others, not sparing his Reverend *Father*. This tempts one to use more Freedom in the case than one might otherwise be disposed to.

And after all, allowing this wild fanciful *Hypothesis* to be good, how has he mended the matter? Or, has he not run into the *same* Faults in the main which he so hardly censures in the Bishop? He is for a *pre-existent Creature too to come down from Heaven for us*, as well as the Bishop; and the *Eternal Word* no otherwise comes down, according to the Dean, than in the Descent of the visible Glory. And he says as little of a *personal Union* of this pre-existent Creature to the *Eternal Word*, as the Bishop, nay much less; only the Bishop makes *his* pre-existent Creature to be a *rational Agent*: And if the Doctor's visible Glory be but supposed rational (which would not render it less noble) then they come much to one and the same thing. At least, where was the need of all this Fierceness and Noise, where

no more is done to set matters in a better light?

So that still it will be inquir'd, how will the *Dean* solve the *Arian's* Objection abovesaid, without such or the like Concessions as his Lordship saw a necessity of making? And tho the *Dean* says, 'tis by giving away the *principal* Proofs of Christ's Divinity, and thinks he comes too near the *Arians*, &c. yet our Question ought to be, not what Opinions are farthest from the *Arians and Nestorians*? but what are nearest to the Truth, and best explain the great Love of the Holy *Jesus* in the Gospel? and whether the Doctor's Notion of a bright Appearance, or *visible Glory's* removing from one place to another, be such a mighty matter as to fill up the *Emphasis* of such Texts, he *became poor*, and emptied himself? A Prince may lay by his *Robes*, and be never the poorer, or emptier; if he don't lose withal some real Authority, or some of his Dominions, he endures no very grievous Change by not always wearing his glittering Crown.

In short, I don't find that the Doctor has added any Clearness to the *Scripture-Proofs of our Saviour's Godhead*, by his Examination of the Bishop's Discourse, but rather confounded the business of the Incarnation, as if he was resolv'd upon that score at least to shake hands once with his Brother *Dr. South*; for they *both*, by unintelligible Explications, have expos'd the Cause to the *Arians*, and made sport for Infidels; who, God knows, need no more Stumbling-blocks in their way: and happy were it they would believe the *naked Gospel of Truth*, without regarding the distracting Explications of subtle Doctors, who have more Curiosity than solid Judgment, and are not near so impartial in searching after Truths themselves, as they are forward to cast the Reproach of Error upon others.



R E M A R K S


O N


Mr. *Charles Leslie's* First
D I A L O G U E

O N T H E

Socinian Controversy.







Remarks on Mr. Charles Leslie's First Dialogue, &c.

S I R,



W H O am a true Scriptural Trinitarian, am far from rejecting, as a Contradiction, any Doctrine that bears the genuine Stamp of Divine Revelation, merely because it has some Difficulties attending it which I cannot solve, or because I cannot frame an adequate Notion of it ; nay, I firmly believe there is no Contradiction in the Scripture-Account of the Holy Trinity, to the Divine *Unity* : But yet I must freely tell you, that I am no way assisted to answer the common Objections of that kind, from what you offer towards clearing the vulgar Notions of a Trinity, from some Mens Imputation of Contradiction and Inconsistency.

There may be Contradiction enough in the common Explications of that Doctrine, for ought you have said in the Matter. Nor have I ever met with less rational Satisfaction in the Point, than in your late uncharitable Dialogue. If such poor Philosophy, such shallow Reasoning, and such gross Divinity, must baffle the *Socinians* ; I

confess they ought to be the last who pretend to the Character of *Men of Reason*.

To *their Charge* of a Contradiction upon the Explication of the Trinity, you offer these things in your Defence.

P. 7.

1. Say you, That *may not be a Contradiction in one Nature, which is so in another*. But here you greatly err; for a Contradiction always consists of two inconsistent Parts or Terms; and wherever those two Terms are united in any Proposition, 'tis always a Contradiction, let it be apply'd to what Nature you will. Indeed there may be something attributed to one Nature, where there is nothing inconsistent or contradictory to it; while, if attributed to another, it might meet with something inconsistent, whence a Contradiction will arise in the one and not the other: but as one of the Terms alone is not the Contradiction in any case, so where both the Parts are join'd (which is the Contradiction) 'tis always a Contradiction, and of the same size, in any Nature. I should indeed suppose you might mean thus, were it not for those ridiculous Instances you bring for the Illustration of your Meaning; where you intimate, that tho' 'tis a Contradiction, for *our Legs to move two Yards as soon as one*; yet 'tis none for *the Eyes to reach a Star as soon as the top of a Chimney*; or for *the Thoughts to go to Rome, as soon as the next Street*: and gravely conclude, *Thus you see that what is a Contradiction to Legs, is none to Eyes nor to Thought*; and oft speak of the *Motion of Sight and Thought*: adding, that all the Philosophy in the World cannot reconcile *its going two Yards as soon as one, from downright Contradiction*, (for so you express it). But are you indeed so very weak as to think you move all the way to *Rome*, and are got thither as soon as you think of it? No, Sir, whatever haste you may
be

P. 8, 9.

be in thither, you go no faster than your Legs can carry you. And should you challenge all the Philosophy in the World, who have so little as not to know, that when you think of *Rome*, or any other Place, 'tis only the *Idea* of it in your Imagination which you contemplate, and not a Leap or local Motion of your Thoughts to it? In like manner, when we see the Stars, our Eyes move not up to them, but their extended Rays strike upon the Eye. I see you have a Head much fitter for entertaining and coining Mysteries, than for explaining or defending 'em. It's a wonder you did not think rather, that *Rome* and *Constantinople* shift and come into your Head: and then since in other cases a lesser Vessel cannot contain a greater, nor a Nutshell hold an House, you might wonder how your little Head should hold such great Cities; and with the same Philosophy infer, that what is a Contradiction to *Nutshells* is none to *Heads*, and challenge all Philosophy to reconcile it.

2. You say, *No Contradiction can be charg'd in any Nature we don't understand*: For which reason you say, *We must not object Contradictions in the* ^{P. 7.} *Incomprehensible Nature of God, from comparing it with our own.* I should grant this, in an Object of which we have no Knowledge at all: but surely if I have some, tho a partial Knowledge of the Infinite God, I may discern what is contradictory to that little Knowledge of him. Nor is any thing more usual or just, than to deny such or such a Doctrine, because incompatible to the Divine Attributes, to his Spirituality, Eternity, Goodness, &c. tho perhaps some of these are not plainer nor better known than the Divine Unity. So that one may as well perceive some things to be contradictory to the Divine Unity, as we do others to be so to his Purity, and Spirituality.

ty, &c. for why should this *Unity* be thought the only obscure Attribute among Christians? And therefore there is no more Caution due here than in all other Reasonings from other Divine Perfections known but in part.

P. 6.

Nay, you your self frankly grant, that we may perceive some things to be a Contradiction when affirm'd of God: for you say, That 'tis a *Contradiction to say, three Persons are but one Person*; and you are not ignorant (or if you be, you are not most fit to write in this Controversy) that the Unitarians take this to be the very case, *viz.* that you make *three Persons of one Person*, whatever you say; for they imagine, that God Almighty, in the compleat Notion of God, is but one Person, expressed by single personal Notes, *I, Thou, or He*. They fancy you pray to him as one Person, when you address thus, *O Thou Lord, &c.* They don't observe any to cry, *O ye bear us, &c.* But if that be your Meaning, pray consider if you do well, by using the single Pronoun, to give 'em occasion to suspect, that you take God for one single Person, when you may so easily amend it, by saying always, *O Ye* in the Plural. *They* are ready to say, that when you prove the *Son* or *Spirit* to be a Person, you do it from such personal Notes as shew each of 'em to be one *He*: and that if under one *He, Me, Thou, &c.* (by which God Almighty is perpetually express'd in Scripture) three *He's* are included, (for instance, if the Words, *no Gods before me*, mean *none before us three*) then how shall they be sure, that under the Person of *Son, or Spirit*, tho' spoken of as one *He* each, there may not be many Persons intended by you? Now you'll do well to shew, that God is not one *He* or Person, or that there are not three Persons in him in a proper Sense, such as the Proofs some bring for the three Persons do mean,

if they prove any thing. Without this, you did not well in making so liberal a Concession, *viz.* that 'tis a Contradiction for three Persons to be but one Person, if you hold both.

3. You advance this odd Paradox, That if the Doctrine of the Trinity *be a Contradiction, it could not be an Invention*; annexing this shrewd Reason for it, *For who could invent a Contradiction?* P. 24. As if no Error (which ever implies a Contradiction to some Truth) can be an Invention: whereas all Errors are nothing else but Inventions; and a *Socinian* will say, as you represent him, that you run into these Contradictions, by mistaking the holy Text. Whether you do mistake it or not, or whether you get by the Mistake, or not, I meddle not; but 'tis a fair Account, how 'tis possible and easy for Contradictions to be invented: and your saying, you don't mistake the Text, be it ever so truly said, is not to the purpose, since they, believing you do mistake, can satisfy themselves how it might arise, and are no way tempted to think it better than an Invention, merely for its seeming to them a Contradiction.

But tho you have said so little to the purpose against the Objection of a Contradiction in the point; yet, as I said, I argue not upon that head, and therefore leave it,

To consider what Notion you'll give of the Trinity: for indeed till Men know *what Trinity* in God you mean, 'tis in vain to prove any more than a Trinity *in general*, which is not deny'd. You offer us some Parallels and *Images* to help our Conceptions, but very inconsistent ones. One while 'tis a Trinity like *three Faculties* of one Mind, and another while 'tis like a Trinity of three Men or *Minds*; which two are just as opposite as three Persons, and one Person, which

you say is a Contradiction : so that both cannot be true Images of the same thing.

1. You resemble it often by three Faculties (that is, three Operations) of the one Soul, where you say, *The Understanding is the Father Faculty*; the Memory is begotten by it, and the Will proceeds from both. This, you say, is an *Image of the several Persons of the Deity*. Now, tho you are out in your Account of the Nature and Pedegree of the Faculties, when you make the *Memory* another Faculty, which is but an Act of the Understanding, and so is no Image of a second Person; and when, supposing it another essential Faculty, you say, 'tis begotten by the *Understanding Faculty*, whereas 'tis only the Exercise of the Memory that the Understanding can occasion, and not the *Principle*, which is before any Act of the Understanding: yet when you have pleas'd your Fancy ever so much, with these pretty Jingles; this is nothing to the *Socinians*, it only shews, how three Operations of a Mind may be in but one Person, not how three Persons may be in one Mind; unless the divine Persons are but so many Operations or Thoughts. Besides, they will ask such *Allegorical Trinitarians* (for I assure you in this Case, you are not charg'd with keeping *too much to the Letter of the Text*, as you pretend, but *too little*, in making three such distinct Agents, as Father, Son, and Spirit, to dwindle into a thin Figure or *Prosopopœia*) whether *Arius*, or *Socinus*, or any *Unitarians*, ever deny'd such a Trinity? Were they such Fools as not to believe, God knows and loves himself? (And can't he do this without being three Persons, which is done by every single finite Person?) If this be eternal *Generation* and *Procession*, they are for it; and they have been barbarously us'd if this was all the Charge against 'em, which all know they were clear

P. 14.

P. 30.

P. 25.

clear

clear of, and that they believ'd God has somewhat answering to our three Faculties.

You pretend, That notwithstanding the Un-^{P. 17.}likeness of three Faculties to three Persons, you must yet use the term *Persons*, because we must not alter the Phrase of Scripture; and yet the Scripture has no such Phrase at all as three Persons in one God. Your alledging the Words, *the Image of his Father's Person*, is here impertinent for proof of three Persons in God; it only proves God the Father to be a Person, which none deny: Tho the Word $\upsilon\pi\acute{o}\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma$ signify'd, then, *Substance*,^{Heb. 11. 1.} not *Person*. You of all ought to give a better Reason than this for using the Terms, *three Persons*, of God; because (if I mistake not) at the end of Mr. G's *Deists Manual*, you have said, that the Word *Person*, apply'd to God, is us'd in a Sense infinitely different from what it means when us'd of Men. Now if it be infinitely different, 'tis at the widest distance possible; and nothing can be more unfitly made use of than such Terms as express all the Unlikeness possible to the thing intended. 'Tis a ready way to deceive Men, to use Terms that are the farthest off, of any we can devise, from expressing the true Meaning: 'tis better saying nothing of God, than what begets corrupt *Ideas* of him.

However, will this sort of Trinity, like to three Operations of Man's Mind, accord with the Scripture-Trinity of the Father, Son, and Spirit? who have such distinct Parts and Agencies assign'd 'em, as cannot be so much as shadow'd out by our three Faculties. You grant the *Father* was not incarnate, but the *Son*. Can the Understanding be incarnate, and sent, and humbled, &c. and not the *Will*? Are not the three Faculties always in the same Human Mind, which is incarnate without Division? Do you teach

teach us, that the Divine Nature is incarnate, without its Understanding, or *Father Faculty*? No, there must be more Distinction than this between the *not-incarnate* Father, and the incarnate Son.

Besides, don't you think the *Son of God* knows himself, and retains that Knowledge, and loves himself? And if so, then, according to you, he is the *Person knowing*, and the *Person known*, loving and lov'd, as you learnedly distinguish. And this will make three such Persons in each Person, by reflecting on himself: for this seems to be your Argument, A Man knows himself, *ergo* he and himself are two Persons. And at this rate a good Wit may allegorize all the Absurdities of the *Alcoran* into fair Meanings, and silence all your Objections against it, tho' the vulgar People be still left to their own gross Conceptions, while they take the literal and obvious Meaning: nor do you build upon such a Trinity, like that of three Faculties; for you have another Scheme which fits your Notions better. Therefore,

2. You resemble the Trinity by three *human* Persons in the same Human Nature; but then lest the *Socinians* infer, that three divine Persons will in like manner be three Gods, as three human Persons are three Men, you will not allow it to be *strictly true to say*, *Two or three Men*, when so many human Persons are spoken of, but think there may be many human Persons in the *same one Nature*. And yet in short, you tell the *Socinian*, That if he would allow that *several Persons might partake of one divine Nature*, as he does allow they do of one human Nature, the *Dispute was at an end, as to the Substance of it*. But, Sir, the *Unitarians* do not allow one and the same Nature to have many Persons in it; they judge every Man has a particular Nature and Substance of his own,
in

in which none partakes, only that others have such another like Nature to his: they cry, human Nature in general is a mere *Ens Rationis*, a Notion of the Mind arising from the comparing one Man's Nature with another.

However, if three divine Persons be like three human Persons as to their Unity of Nature; then I doubt they will, in consequence hereof, be deem'd to be *three infinite divine Minds*, as three human Persons have three finite Minds, let 'em be ever so much one in their *Nature*, or Kind. And if three divine Persons should as properly be accounted three Gods, as three human Persons can (in strict Speech) be accounted three Men, and are as truly three infinite Minds or Spirits, as three Men are three finite Minds, *there is a sad end of the Dispute* indeed. But on the other hand, if three Men (or human Persons) in the same *one single Nature or Mind*, be a Contradiction, then you give the Unitarians too much occasion to think the like of your Notions of the Trinity, by making this Parallel.

Moreover, If God teach us to number Men by *two, ten, &c.* and yet in opposition to such Plurality, tells us, there is but one God, or rather that *God is but one, unus, or éis*, it warns us that his Unity is inconsistent with such a Plurality of Persons as is in your human Nature. You add, *If p. 17. we say, there is not more than one human Nature, we cannot say, there is more than one divine Nature, tho several Persons partake of it.* Now this shews your Notion of the Unity, which you sacrifice to that of a Trinity: and upon this Notion of several *infinite Minds*, your Scheme is built; as your Arguments for the eternal Generation of the *Son*, and Procession of the Holy Ghost, do manifest: for you tell us, God must needs *generate* and produce other Persons on these accounts.

1. Because 'tis a *Perfection in Man* to propagate: *We see Trees spring from Trees, Beasts, Fish, Fowl, and Man propagate their Kind; and shall God be barren?* say you, and hook in a figurative Text, *Isa. 66. 9.* according to the *vulgar Translation*, to back you; and truly you wanted a better Authority for such a Paradox. For you ought to know, that Man's Propagation is so far from being an absolute Perfection, that 'tis founded in his Infirmity; he need not be multiply'd, but for want of others to succeed him when dead, or to aid and assist him while living. And as Angels, who are more perfect, do not propagate, I suppose; so neither will Men, when they come to a more perfect State: this will cease with their present Imperfections. It seems then the nearer to God, the less there is of *this* Propagation.

But why must God be barren, for not propagating? Are not Angels and Men his Offspring? and he the Father of the whole Creation? Would you have the Almighty propagate as thick as the Trees? I doubt you'll think him else, to be comparatively barren. The Reason you give for not multiplying Persons and *Productions*, or Communications in God, [*viz. If it be infinite, it can be no more than one; and to infinite Productions nothing can be added; but human Productions may be repeated, because finite*] should be consider'd, as it seems to lie against any infinite Production in him at all. For it may be objected, that many infinite Productions are no more absurd than many infinite Persons; and that if infinite Person may be repeated, and can have an Addition, why not other Infinities?

2. Because *God would be stinted in his Happiness, if there were not a Person (you must mean another Person) to communicate all his Thoughts to; and this must be an infinite Person, for, say you, nothing but*

but infinite can contain infinite. See more to this purpose, p. 32. And a little before, you argue for your Point, from Man's want of some to converse with; else his Life is a Burden, say you. *Who would be content to live, if there was never a Man in the World but himself?* Such a solitary indigent Being you suppose the great *Jehovah* to be, that without Company he cannot be happy. What a base ignoble Notion is this of that perfect Being? as if infinite Wisdom and all Perfection could want any thing more! and can't be happy, unless it be multiply'd into two Minds. Thus you make him *barren* indeed, while you talk of the divine *Facundity*; and tempt the *Unitarians* to think, that three such Persons as you would make 'em, are not so great as their One, *Self-sufficient*, Eternal Mind.

By these things you discover your Mind plainly, that you are for three *infinite Minds* or Spirits; and that by the divine *Generation* of a Son, you don't mean only his *Self-Reflection*, but a Production of another infinite Mind: for otherwise you talk inconsistently; nor is there any shadow of Resemblance between Man and God in the case which you argue upon. For you can't mean, that Man is solitary and miserable for want of conversing with his *own* Mind, but for want of another Man to discourse with: and accordingly must mean, that God could not be happy neither, without another infinite *Mind*. Nor does any deny him to contemplate himself, that you need argue for that against the *Socinians*; so that your Meaning is plain. You do well to have two Schemes in readiness, one a Trinity of *Faculties*, which serves to explain the *Unity*; the other of three *Minds* (each with those three *Faculties*) which makes out a sufficient Trinity. This *latter* you and others make use of when you explain the

Incar-

Incarnation; because 'tis hard shewing the *Son's Nature* or *Mind* to be incarnate, and not the *Father's*, if it be the same particular individual *Mind* that is both *Father* and *Son*; the former is us'd in explaining the *Trinity* in general, and in *Thesi*. Now if these two happen to be inconsistent taken together, you cannot help that, because to be *three Minds* and yet but *one*, is hard to reconcile.

In my mind you needed not to insist on the *Authority* of the *Heathenish Philosophers* about the divine *Fecundity*, and a *Trinity* in *God*; since your *Adversaries* have been so willing to own you to be *Paganish* enough in your *Notions*. And as you own there is some *Corruption* in the *Pagan Notions* of these *Matters*, so they imagine there is *more* than you apprehend. Vid. *Platonism unveiled*.

Let me only remark one thing more, *viz.* That when you illustrate the *Union* of the *Divine Nature* to the *Human* in *Jesus Christ*, by the *Union* of *Man's Soul* to his *Body*, p. 51. you don't account well for the *Communication* of the *Properties* of the two *Natures*. You (tho contrary to the *Alexandrian* and best *Copies*) read that *Text*, *Acts* 20. 28. of *God's Blood*, and think what was done in the *Man*, may be said as truly of the united *God*; as *Man is said to eat*, &c. when it *belongs only to the Body*. Whereas in *this last Speech* the *Properties* of the *Body* are not at all attributed to the *Soul*, as those of the *Human* are by you to the *Divine Nature*. To say, *God shed his Blood*, or *was Flesh*, or *made Flesh*, is answerable to such *Expressions*, as *the Soul drinks*, the *Soul is made Body*, &c. And if we never speak so, notwithstanding the *personal Union* in *Man*, then it may seem hard to justify such *Expressions*, as *God's Blood and dying*, &c. by any such

such personal Union of the two Natures, as never is a ground for such Communication of Properties, in the Instance you parallel it by.

You say nothing for the *Procession* of the Holy Spirit (as distinct from Generation, which is a great Article of Faith) from Scripture, only that he *proceeded from the Father, or goes forth*. So all Gifts do, and Christ *proceeded from the Father* too, and he *proceeded* (the very word us'd of the Spirit) *from Jericho*. Is that all the ground you would shew for such a distinct Article? John 15.
26.
Ch. 8. 42.
14. 28.
Mark 10.
46.

To conclude, Unless you state your Notion more clearly, what Trinity you will maintain, 'tis in vain to cap Texts about you know not what. 'Tis easy to bend a Phrase divers ways. Unless you fix your Notion of a Trinity more distinctly, had you not better leave Men to believe only some Trinity in general, tho they can't well tell what? And tho you may think there is no such vast difference between believing and not believing, one knows not what in particular, as that Men should damn and hereticate each other for it; yet certainly 'tis better to be content with this *little implicate* Faith, than to go about explaining what you cannot. For when all's done, a Man's *Faith* is not his Words, but his Sense and *Meaning*; and he who says a large *Creed*, but *means nothing*, believes no more, nor makes any more use of it, than he who denies it all, let him boast never so of his Faith.

And when you have brought a Text or two for Christ's being call'd *God*; and suppose it to be the Supreme God that is united to the Man Christ Jesus, yet if the *Unitarians* say, 'tis God the *Father*, (as they gather from *John 14. 10.*) who was *manifest in that Flesh*, and so the *Father and he be one*, in as near Union as you imagine of a Second Person; and that therefore he is call'd, as you say,

16a. 9. 6. say, the *Everlasting Father* ; which *they think* gave great virtue to his Performances ; what are you the nearer ?

You'll do great Service indeed, if you satisfy the *Unitarians* Scruples ; but, not by corporeal Resemblances of the Trinity, from three (or four) Dimensions or Postures of a Body ; or of the eternal *Generation*, by the *Light* (which you call an *Effect* of the Sun, but is indeed the very Sun it self, and so may well be as old) nor by vain Boasts of the early *Fathers* (so often yielded up to the *Arians*) nor by concealing their strongest Objections. Shew 'em that they have no ground to imagine two or three Gods (or *Infinite Minds*) to be imply'd in your Scheme of the Trinity, as they have fancy'd, not so much from the Expressions *God of God*, and *one equal to God* (and so far not the very same) in divine Perfections ; as from the *Nature of your Scheme* it self ; as when you hold the divine Nature to be personally united to Man, but yet not the *Father* : as if, say *they*, he was not in that divine Nature that is incarnate, but another. Also, that the Divine Nature and the Three Persons, are the same [else, say your own side, there will be a Quaternity, viz. Three Persons, and one Nature besides ;] yet the three Persons are not incarnate, tho the Divine Nature (which is the same thing) be: That tho there be three Persons in the Divine Nature alone, yet when that Nature is join'd to another intelligent Nature, 'tis all but *one* Person. Indeed *two or three Infinite Minds* would easily solve all this ; but then the *Oxford Decree* 1695. has declar'd that impious and heretical. No doubt you'll do it another way : and having also made it appear, that there is no such Difficulty in supposing a begotten Being to be *self-existent* and independent ; or else that he should be Supreme

God,

See Le
Blanc
Thes. de
Dei sim-
plicit.
p. 100.

God and the *first Cause*, tho not self-existent, but dependent; and may have all the Perfections of God, tho he have not that of unbegotten Self-existence: Then I say, you'll go on smoothly with your Texts. But if you silently grant 'em, that *these* are really Contradictions, and really chargeable on your Opinions, you'll not wonder if they conclude, all those Human Comments of God's Word, which support 'em, to be erroneous. That you therefore, Sir, may not lose your Labour, nor they the Benefit of it; pray be so kind as to take this Advice, from one who truly wishes to see the Unitarians Errors detected, and that you may write to better purpose for the *Church*, than you are said to have written for the *State*.






A
VINDICATION
OF THE
REMARKS
ON
Mr. *Charles Leslie's* First
DIALOGUE
ON THE
Socinian Controversy.







*A Vindication of the Remarks
upon Mr. Charles Leslie's
First Dialogue, &c.*

S I R,



SHALL hasten over your Preamble, in which you represent me for a *Socinian*, as if every one, who has not so good an Opinion of the Truth of Contradictions as you have, must needs be such; and also your feigning me to be in a *Passion*, for only censuring your weak Arguments, that you might poorly infer thence, I was a *Lofer by my Talking*; while a whole Torrent of personal Reflections on the Dead, by whole mouthfuls of Reproach, *viz.* That *pragmatical Heretick, ignorant Pedant Biddle*, witnesses Dial. 2. the Candor and Tenderness of your *meek inoffensive* p. 60. Spirit: All this I wave as little to the purpose, and proceed upon the Argument.

I perceive, by your Answer to the *Remarks*, that you are resolv'd to found your Scheme of a Trinity on *Mystery and Ignorance*, and to cover your self from the *Unitarians* by impenetrable Darkness, which you make your Defence. You seem to admit, that as far as Human Reason can

judge, there are irreconcilable Contradictions in *your* Scheme of Faith : and therefore, in order to support your Notions, you endeavour to support the Credit of plain Contradictions ; intimating, That we conceive of God no otherwise than as a blind Man of *Sight*, *i. e.* with a Mind full of Contradictions. To this end

You asserted, That what *is a Contradiction in one Nature, may be none in another.* I affirm the contrary, that a Contradiction, consisting of two repugnant Propositions, is ever the same, apply it to what Nature you will ; because the same thing cannot both be, and not be at once, whether it be said of God or Man.

You attempted to prove your Paradox by the Motion of the Thoughts to *Rome*, &c. and of the *Eyes to the Stars as soon as to the Chimney-Top* ; which, you say, implies the going *two Yards as soon as one* ; which is a Contradiction in walking, you grant, but not in the Motion of *Thoughts* and *Eyes*. Now, tho I had shown, that there was really no such Motion in the Thoughts or Eyes, and you seem to be ashamed of it, and therefore shift off one *Part* on your Man, *without Thought*, which is a contradictory Supposition (which it was time for you to quit, and therefore I shall not expose you on it) and another upon some poor blind Man, that your self might not bear the Shame of such Folly ; yet you are again trumping up your old Instances, and argue from 'em as if they were true ; especially from the Motion of *Sight*, and the Impossibility of a *Born-blind Man's* Conception of *Sight*, any otherwise than by allowing the aforesaid Contradiction (as 'tis in the Motion of the Legs) to take place here in the Eyes. You ask, *How can you explain to him, how the Eye can reach a Star as soon as the Chimney? He feels his Eye with his Hand*

F. 2.

ibid.

that 'tis fix'd in his Head; how then can he imagine it gets a thousand Miles off, while he feels it does not stir? Did ever any Man trifle worse? I tell you, and you seem to admit it, that there is no such thing as the Eyes moving a thousand Miles; and yet you suppose your blind Man must be falsely told, and must believe it. I don't wonder if the poor abus'd Man conceive that to be a flat *Contradiction*, which in truth is so even to a seeing Man, and which he ought not to believe. But does this prove that 'tis no *Contradiction* to move a thousand Yards as soon as one, because you falsely told him, and he foolishly believ'd you, that your Eyes did move so, when they never could do it, because 'tis a *Contradiction*? I thought you were to prove a real *Contradiction* in one Case to be none in another; and now you suppose a *Contradiction* which is not, and conclude from it as if it truly were. So that

This is in effect your Argument; Supposing the Eyes did move to the Stars as soon as to the Chimney, or your Thoughts to *Rome* in an instant, (as they do not) then here would be an Instance of that being a *Contradiction* in one Case, *viz.* in *Legs*, which is none in another, *viz.* *Eyes*: but tho there is no such thing in the Premises, yet the Conclusion is true, because it would have been true if the Premises had been so. No doubt, Sir, you argue very desperately! How does this prove, a *Contradiction* in one Case may be none in another?

But, say you, 'Tis impossible to explain to him what Sight is, so as to reconcile it from being a *Contradiction* to him. I answer, That a true and just Explication of it will not contain any real *Contradiction* in it: and if to him it appears a *Contradiction*, 'tis from his Mistake alone; and you are not to shew that a *seeming* *Contradiction* may be none (for who doubts that?) but that a real

p. 6.

Contradiction may, in some Cases, be none. And I pray what Contradiction will appear to him, according to what was said, *That the Eye moves not up, but the Star strikes on the Eye?* To this you say, *The blind Man does not feel this, nor knows what you mean by it, or by seeing.* But is this any Contradiction to him, that he should not feel every *subtile Particle* that touches on him? or that he should have no Idea of Sight? You add, *He can't think of any other way, but that the Eye must get up to the Star, or the Star come down to the Eye.* I expected he could only imagine his Eye went up to the Star, as you had suggested before, to represent the Contradiction of moving so far in an instant; and now you allow him another Conception of Sight, *viz. That the Star may extend to his Eye.* But this is quite another matter from your Instance of the Eye's *going up* so many thousand Miles, and has no such Appearance of a Contradiction. Nor will it serve your turn for an Example of a *Contradiction's becoming no Contradiction*: So that, it seems, he may be convinc'd *another way*, than by persuading him, that what is a Contradiction in one Nature, is *none in another*, which you say is the only way, and I that 'tis no way at all; and if he be to be convinc'd this way, he must be suppos'd to have a worse Blemish than want of Eye-sight.

The most you can reasonably pretend to here, is, That I can't, by my Words, help him to form a just Idea of Sight (which is thro his want of necessary Organs) but it does not thence follow, that he ought to take up with a Conception that implies plain Contradictions, which he knows must be wrong, and ought to be rejected: For tho he may not conceive what Sight is (nor is it made his Duty, as in the other Case, to which you parallel it) yet he may be sure 'tis not made up

up of Contradictions. A Man may not understand a thing, and yet understand very well that Contradictions about it are false; and this is all the *Stress I laid upon this Instance*. So that this is no Argument against objecting Contradictions to some Mens Notions of the Divine Nature; since in no Case whatever are the blindest Creatures oblig'd to believe direct Contradictions, nor would they become no Contradictions, if they should believe 'em erroneously.

To what purpose then was that faint Triumph? *I will join Issue with him upon it, if he can find* P. 3. *Words proper to express the Nature of Sight to a Man born blind, and will give him leave to infer Contradictions from such Words, according as he understands 'em; then I will undertake to solve all the Contradictions in the Terms, by which we express the Holy Trinity.* To explain it so as to enable him to form a clear *Idea* of it in his Imagination, I neither undertook, nor is it his Duty to have such an *Idea*, much less to take up with any that are false. But still I say, that a true Explication of the Operation of Sight will never lead him to *infer Contradictions*. If he imagine any in it, which is a certain Contradiction (in other Cases) he as certainly does not rightly take in the true Explication of *this*, and ought to conclude he is in an Error, and to set himself against it; and must either bring his Thoughts to a Consistency, or explicitly believe nothing in the Matter: for no Man, pretend what he will, does believe apparent Contradictions to be none, or (which is the same) to be possibly true; he must, at least, suspend his Assent.

And yet, I believe, as to Matter of Fact, that many such blind Persons, tho they have no distinct *Idea* of Sight, are very far from entertaining Contradictions about it; at least they would be
so,

so, if they had understanding Instructors that did not err, as is suppos'd in your Case; where God is reputed the Teacher of *your Notions* of the Holy Trinity, who will hardly be thought to leave any Doctrine upon us, to be believ'd under the unavoidable Notion of a Contradiction.

Therefore, if there were no difference between the two Cases you think to be so like, *viz.* of a blind Man's conceiving such a thing as *Sight*, and your Conception of the Trinity; yet there is no reason from thence for taking up with Contradictions in the latter, since 'tis not requisite nor fit to do so in the former.

Besides, who can easily believe such a Case to be really true in the Christian Dispensation, *viz.* That the All-wise and Good God should impose upon a Generation of Men, *born blind*, a long *Creed*, of the Nature of *Light, and Refractions*, and Colours, or a *System of Opticks*; of which they could have no manner of Conception, nor make any Use, only it might set 'em together by the Ears in ignorant Contention? Or that ever he would be pleas'd with such of themselves, as should presume to be paraphrasing: on *Light and Colours*, &c. in their own *novel devis'd Terms*, which they think more proper and clear, and say, are equivalent to *his* (but being wholly ignorant of the Subject, cannot know what Terms are more or less proper) nay to anathematize and persecute all that assent not thereto? Verily, you insinuate no Honour to your Cause by such an untoward Representation! You own your self blind, and yet you force your Neighbours to take you for their Guide: Therefore, I conclude, Man is not so incapable of God's Revelations, as a blind Man of knowing and using the Sun's Light; and I'll suppose you pretend greater Incapacity in Men, and less Benefit from
Revela-

Revelation thereupon, than is true or fit, merely to cover your own Errors; and feign your self blind, that you may be excus'd in holding Contradictions. Tho' Blindness it self, as I have shewn, does not constrain us to take that for no Contradiction in one Nature, which is evidently and truly so in another, as you pretend.

After this Absurdity of yours had been expos'd as ridiculous, you would fain hook me into your Company to take share, calling Spectators to see me confessing what I had ridicul'd. But why p. 4. so? Did I say a Contradiction may sometimes be no Contradiction? No. I had granted, say you, there may be something attributed to one Nature, where there is nothing inconsistent or contradictory to it; while, if attributed to another, it might meet with something inconsistent; whence a Contradiction will arise in the one, and not in the other: And so I say still; only I added what you omit, that one of the two Terms of a Contradiction is not the Contradiction, but both together are, and are so in any Nature. And now let as many as you will see, if I say what you had said. Is this all one, to say, that a Contradiction (which is two inconsistent Propositions) is sometimes no Contradiction, which is what You said; and that one of the Propositions alone is no Contradiction, which is what I said? Do I, that say, Dependance and Derivation of Being is no Contradiction, when said of a Creature, where is nothing repugnant, say the same as he, that says such Dependance and Derivation may be no Contradiction, when said of the Independent Self-existent God, and First Cause, where the other repugnant Term is found? As mutual Blows make the Fight, so two repugnant Terms make the Contradiction; and this I say still, on sure Grounds, is always absurd, say it of what Nature you will.

Well,

Well, but if I did not say what you said (because you are resolv'd we shall agree) you say you meant the same as I say: That *this is all you contend for, and you desire no more.* But this is not all you contended for, you *said more*, in saying, *a Contradiction in one Nature may be none in another*: nay, you *meant more*, if Words can shew your Meaning, by your Instance of going *two Yards* as soon as *one*; *i. e.* to go but one Yard, and yet *more than one* at once. This is your Resemblance, how a Contradiction in one Case may be none in another; that is, *two* contradictory Propositions may become not contradictory, as if the Verity of Propositions could be chang'd. Nay, I must add, that this is not *all you desire*, for your Argument *needs more* to defend it against the *Unitarians*.

You know they don't deny that some things may be Contradictions, if affirm'd of Men, which are none when said of God; as to be Eternal, or *Infinite*, is not, with *them*, a Contradiction when said of God, because 'twere so if said of Man. You were not so weak to argue for what they always asserted; contrariwise, you did suppose the *Socinian* to charge you with holding two opposite repugnant Propositions, *viz.* That God is *Unoriginate*, and yet a *deriv'd Nature*, is the *first Cause*, and yet has a Father and a *Cause* (as the *Greek Fathers* express of the Son) That he is but *one He*, and yet *three He's*, &c. Now that such sort of Contradictions, if real, can ever be true, you affirm'd, but I never said; and therefore pray don't call me any more to be your Voucher in such a Case; for you certainly intended more than I said or you pretend: and 'tis incumbent on you, either to shew that these are no Contradictions which they object for such, or that they are not chargeable on your *Faith*; or if they

they be real Contradictions, that cleave fast to you, yet there is no Absurdity in them, because Contradictions (*i. e.* two opposite Propositions) may sometimes be none, or not opposite; and that *to be*, and *not be*, may sometimes be the same. And then you'll do more towards the reconciling the *Gallican* and *English* Churches, than if their *two Synods had sat at the same time*, or than is done by the Author of the *Regale*, &c. Transubstantiation will then be a credible Mystery!

And now since I said nothing that has any Likeness to what I expos'd in yours, you need not pretend to wonder, *How I can deny, that what is a Contradiction in one Nature, may yet be none in another.* I should wonder more, if I did not deny such an Absurdity.

Your other Instance, which you complain was not taken notice of, *viz.* That 'tis no Contradiction for all things to be present with God, tho it be a Contradiction to Men that the past or future things should be present, is to the same purpose as the rest: for in one sense 'tis no Contradiction to either, *i. e.* for a past thing to be *objectively present* in the Idea, and so it may be with Man; and in another sense 'tis a Contradiction in both, *i. e.* to behold that as *actually doing now* which is past; for so God himself does not behold the original *Chaos*, as now actually existing void of Form; nor does he judge *Adam* and *Eve* to be now in their first Innocency. I doubt some are fond of making abundance of needless Contradictions, on purpose to keep some *darling Absurdities* of their own in countenance. But tho I am not so vain as to pretend to reconcile all Difficulties, or to say which side is wrong, much less to fathom the *boundless Perfections* of my glorious Creator; yet I think it is no Arrogance to say, that I am sure both sides of a Problem, or real Contradiction,

tion, cannot be true, about any Object; or if they may be both true, and a Contradiction in one Case be none in another, why will you not have a little Charity, and allow that the *Unitarians* and you don't contradict each other? But tho, in some Cases, 'twould be a Contradiction to affirm and deny the same thing; yet of the *Divine Nature* to do thus, may possibly be none; and so we are good Friends.

P. 4. Your next Refuge is, That *the Nature of God being incomprehensible, we must not object Contradictions in it, from comparing it with our own, because we understand not his Nature.* To this I said, it might have some fair Pretence, if we had no Knowledge at all about it; but that we have so much Knowledge, tho partial, as warrants us to deny what is contradictory to it: hence we justly deny many things for being incompatible to the Divine Attributes, to his Spirituality, Goodness, &c. And why may we not as well discern what is contradictory to the Divine *Unity*, which is as manifest as the others? You reply, That *the Attributes and Nature are different; and this is a Dispute not about God's Attributes, but his Nature, of which we are totally ignorant; that 'tis utter Darknes to us, &c.*

I might answer you; That *Essential Attributes, or Perfections, are the very Essence* under so many various inadequate Conceptions; that God is not compounded of Essence and Perfections, as of different things, but that his very Nature is Goodness, Power, Wisdom, &c. But I will not obscure my Argument, by entring on *metaphysical Niceties*. I have enough to say without this: for supposing what you crave, there may be good ground to object Contradictions in this Case; for, 1. The Divine *Unity* is one of his Attributes by Consent of all, and so may be argu'd about,
and

and Contradictions may be discerned and objected here as well as in other Attributes. And,

2. Were it otherwise, yet may Contradictions safely be discerned and started about the Divine Nature, on these Accounts.

1. 'Tis sufficient for this, if I but know what God *is not* in any respect. All allow one way of knowing God is *per viam Negationis*, by denying of his Nature every thing that argues Imperfection. Now if I do but know what God certainly *is not*, I may then object against any thing, that in contradiction thereto, does affirm him to be what I know he is not. Thus, if I know that *Derivation of Being* from any other Cause, is what cannot belong to the first Supreme Nature, I may justly object Contradiction to those who shall affirm this unoriginate Nature to have a *Cause*. If I know his *Nature can be but one*, I object soberly against them that shall say, there are many supreme Divine Natures. I will object against all Imperfection, as a Contradiction to that *ever-glorious Jehovah*: and I must know, in some Instances, what is Imperfection, else I shall not know but God may be *mutable* and *mortal in his Nature*, if I cannot know that these are Imperfections.

2. If I know but any Property or Perfection of his Nature, I may know that to be a Contradiction to his Nature, which denies that Perfection or Property. If I know he is a *necessary eternal Being*, I know well that he is of a Nature that *cannot die*. If I know from Reason or Scripture that he is *all-knowing*, I know 'tis a Contradiction to say of him, who *is that Nature*, that he is ignorant of any one thing. Nay,

3. If I knew neither what he *is not*, nor what any Perfection of his Nature *is*; yet if I knew but what is a Contradiction in the Nature of the thing, and to it self, I may safely say, 'tis a Contradiction

tradiction when apply'd to God, because 'tis so in it self. Thus *to be* and *not be* at once, to be but *one single Person*, and yet three such Persons, being repugnant, may safely be objected for a Contradiction, without any regard to the Nature 'tis apply'd to, because of the mutual Repugnancy of the two Propositions, which always destroy one another, and cannot be said of the same thing. So that I don't, in this Case, object a Contradiction in God, from a Supposition that his Nature is resembled by mine, but from the bare Nature of a Contradiction. I may doubt whether God be a pure Spirit, or be only a gross Body; whether my Soul be material or immaterial: but leaving this still in doubt, I am sure 'tis not both *material and immaterial*. And if any one shall say, There are both *many Gods, and but one such God* in Nature; that once he was not in being, but yet eternally was and is to come; I hope, in these Cases (like to which Contradictions the *Socinians* pretend) one needs not stay till he knows perfectly what the Nature of God is, before he pronounces 'em to be Contradictions. And therefore 'twas not rightly said

Dial. I. p. 7. of you, *That no Contradiction can be charg'd in any Nature we don't understand*; especially when your self had granted to the *Socinian*, *That it is a Contradiction to say, Three Persons (in God) are but one Person*; which, I represented to you, was what the *Socinians* charg'd your Scheme with: and therefore you were bound (but wou'd not attempt it) to shew, that this Contradiction is not chargeable upon you; instead of which you cry, a Contradiction in Man may be no Contradiction in God, when 'twas granted 'em, that this were a Contradiction even in God.

Having made it appear, that our Ignorance of the incomprehensible God, does not render us wholly

wholly

wholly incapable of discovering certain Contradictions in Men's Notions of him, I may conclude you have not taken an effectual Course to convince the *Unitarians*, by saying they must not argue from Contradictions. So that the Matter rests as at the end of the *Remarks*, viz. that it will be expected you shall shew that those and the like Difficulties, objected by *them*, are either not Contradictions, or not truly charg'd on *your* Faith of a Trinity in God. If you go on to appear so willing to allow 'em those two Points, I dare say you'll gain no Ground.

Besides, let me add these Remarks:

1. That you have laid a fair Foundation for *Scepticism*: for nothing can be said of God, tho' most absurd, which on your Principles can be confuted; because not knowing his Nature, we must not say any thing is a Contradiction to it. Nay, since you say we know not the *Nature of Man* (perhaps he may be three Persons and one Man) *nor of Trees, or a Pile of Grass*, we cannot then urge Contradictions about them, and so cannot argue about the Nature of any thing; since all Arguments tend to shew a Contradiction in what we argue against, and so we can prove and be certain of nothing.

Nay, we cannot confute *Transubstantiation*, for we know not the *Nature* of Bread and Flesh (for Sense cannot reach that) and so may not object Contradictions in the Case.

Nay, you can't confute a *Socinian* this way; for you can't tell whether a Denial of a Trinity be not consistent with a Trinity, according to you, because this is about the *Nature of God*: and not understanding that, we must not object Contradictions here. How know you that God is not *three Essences* and *one Person*? The Scrip-

ture says not expressly, either this or the contrary.

2. You can never justify any long *Creeeds* or Explications of the Trinity, &c. in other Words than Scriptural: for how shall Men believe your Pretences of Humility, that you can't comprehend God, when at the same time you are for explaining his Nature in unintelligible Terms, *novel*, and more obscure than the Scripture? If you don't know the Divine Nature, then be silent about it. How dare you say this or that is equivalent to the Scripture-Terms, or *more proper*, when that is to be judg'd of by the Nature of the (unknown) Subject? But you are for explaining the Text, and urging that it must have *this and that* Sense; sometimes it must be *figurative*, and sometimes literal; and are for skrewing Reason as long as you can hold it, and then run to Mystery, when Reason and scholastick Wit are spent; and tell your Adversary, he must not argue about the incomprehensible God: as if you meant, that you may reason, but only 'tis not fit for a *Socinian's* Reason to meddle; it must be, because their Reason is of a lesser Size.

Nay, is it any great Sign of *Humility of Reason*, to be so confident of your *Deductions*, as to oppress or anathematize such as testify their Dissent from them; tho they assent to the Text whence you pretend to infer 'em? And how know you whether their Sense and Inferences or yours be truest, since the Terms you say are all but *Al-lusions*, and that about a Nature you know nothing of? Of all Men such may seem the proudest Exalters of human Reason, in matters of Faith, even while they decry and reproach it in their more peaceable Adversaries.

3. You could not confute the Pagan Notions of the Divine Nature your way: supposing they held

held many Gods, or that there is but one Divine Nature, and all the thousands of particular Gods but a *multitude of Persons* in that one Nature (as you suppose many Men in but one human Nature) you could not confute 'em by the Light of Reason at least, because you allow not Contradictions to be an Argument here.

For the Honour of Christianity, I beseech you, never insist on it, that to be a *Christian* is to believe, that a *Contradiction may sometimes be none at all*, and that this is the only way to persuade a Man to be such. I thank God I am convinc'd without it.

I shall do you no Injury if I pass by your wonderful Proofs for the Memory's being *another Faculty* from that by which we understand, *viz. P. 5.* That the Understanding is only conversant about what is *present before it*: as if we cou'd not understand any thing that is past, and knew not formerly; or as if the Idea of what is past may not become present to the Understanding, which yet in the next Line you own. You ask, *If the Understanding forgets?* I answer, as much as the Memory. But I have shew'd, that three Faculties in one Mind is no Parallel for your Trinity. 'Tis neither a Mystery, nor will it resemble (what the *Unitarians* object to you) how three Persons can be but one Person; unless instead of three Faculties making but one Soul, you had shown that three Faculties make but one Faculty, or *three Minds* but one Mind. Nay, you are so tenacious, that whether there be really three Faculties in the Soul or not, you say it does as well for you if it be *but thought so*. Right or wrong, 'tis all one to you. You will hold to the Conclusion, let what will become of the Premises. This is true Courage!

You find fault, that I will argue strictly from the word *Person*, as 'tis us'd among Men; when I only shew it does not answer the Parallel in that Point (of three being but one in the same Sense) for which you bring it. And since you use the word *Persons* for explaining better the Scripture-Language, you must suppose it to be more proper and less ambiguous; and till you give another Sense, I must understand it after the known use of it. You add, *If he wou'd apply the word Father so, and the words Repent and Grieve, that are said of God, what Work wou'd he make? &c.* As to the first Term, I see nothing absurd in it. For the other Terms of *Repent*, &c. the nature of the Subject bids me give 'em a figurative Sense, and I shou'd not dare use 'em of God, if the Scripture had not done it, which is not your Case; much less wou'd I put 'em into my *explicatory Creeds*. But if at the same time the *Athanasians* wou'd publicly declare, they no more believe *three Persons to be in God, than that God can repent or grieve properly*; and wou'd give us another fair and open Sense of the Terms, as of the other, that may comport with the Scripture-Account of God, of his Son Jesus Christ and his Holy Spirit, and with the rest of their *Scheme*, then you might have some Pretence for talking thus. But if you assign to the *Sacred Three* all the various Parts and Distinctions of Persons in a proper Sense, and for that reason do give 'em these Characters; how can considering Men think, you don't design by it, to give 'em an Idea of three proper Persons in one eternal *He*? And you your self deny the *Expressions are figurative*, speaking of such Texts as are alledg'd for a *Trinity of Persons*.

P. 25.
Dial. I.

P. 6. You are mistaken, in saying, *I raise Difficulties how a begotten Being can be God, from gross Conceptions*

ceptions of begetting after the manner of Men. I never had a Thought of more than of a *Being deriv'd from another*, which I think is the allow'd Sense of *Begotten*, as apply'd to the Lord Jesus, *who receives his Nature dependently on the Father*, says Dr. *Whitby* on *John* 14. 28. speaking also the Sense of the antient Fathers: So that the Difficulty is no other, than how a *deriv'd dependent Being can be God*; which the *Unitarians* insist on much.

You having illustrated the Co-eternity of the *Son with the Father* by this, that the Light is as old as the Sun, tho' the *Effect* of it; I reply'd, That the *Light is really the Sun it self*. Upon which you set up a hideous Cry, as if I were bringing the whole Sun upon your Head, and fetching it out of the Firmament; even all that huge Sun, that is *so many times bigger than the whole Earth*: For, say you, *By which we see the very Sun, so many times bigger than the whole Earth, can creep thro' a Cranny, and be all of it in this Room, and in a thousand other Places at once. This will help Transubstantiation.* Again, *If the Light be the Star, then the very Star strikes on the Eye*; and then you crow merrily. *Let him consider on whose side the poor Philosophy and shallow Reasoning lies.* It seems, you imagine, the Sun is not made of Parts; and that if the Sun shines into a Room, it must quit the Firmament, and must come down, all or none. I can't breathe in *the Air*, I warrant you, without being so unmerciful as to sup it all up; nor say, I stand on the Earth, unless I cover it all over, from East to West. You cannot believe any subtile Streams, or *Effluvia* of Light, that are a part of that huge luminous Mass which penetrate small Pores of Bodies. I did not say every Stream of Light was the *whole Sun*, or that the Parts that are above are beneath. But I fancy you hop'd to find an Instance from me,

how a Contradiction in one Case, may be none in another: the *whole huge Sun in a little Cranny!* Ah *this subtle Socinian!* as you call me. Thus you deride me to your Cost, as *Lactantius* did the *Antipodes*, for going with their Heels upmost.

I heartily wish, Sir, you wou'd entertain the *Coffee-Houses* for one Year with a *Course of your Philosophy*, I dare promise you many Admirers; and when that has prevail'd, no doubt but your Divinity will go off.

All the Answer you give to the Objection against three Persons in God, from his being spoken of singularly, as *I, Thou, He*; is, that in the first of *Genesis*, &c. God is spoken of plurally; for instead of *God created*, you say, 'tis *Gods he created*: That three Persons are mention'd, the *Father, Word* (because God spake, and Speech contains Words) and *Spirit, and these Gods made*, &c. So that if Plurality be express'd, as you say well, 'tis a *Plurality of Gods*; if the Singular be *God*, the Plural is certainly *Gods*. Pray stick to that. 'Tis an obvious Reply to this, that 'tis an usual *Hebraism* to put the *Plural* for the *Singular*; and so Princes and others say *We*, when 'tis but *one*. You say, indeed, that, in the Royal Language, *We* notes the King and *his Council*; as if *Our Royal Pleasure*, and *We command*, did relate to any but himself. But to silence you once for all in this matter: Know that this Plural Term *Gods, Elohim*, is said of one of the Persons alone; *Psalm. 45. 7. Thy Throne, O Gods, is for ever and ever*: And, *Heb. 1. 9. O Gods, thy Gods have anointed thee*, which the Apostle applies to Christ. Now unless the *Son* have another Trinity in him, the *Plural Word* can't intend three Persons, but one, only it is more *Majestick*.

But what must we say to this, that in the New Testament (the proper Place for this Article) there is not so much as one such Expression, but always *He* in the Singular? It had been meet to shew where many Persons ever use the diminutive Language *I* and *Me*; which you aim at, in telling us, That 'tis said of a King, *He marched*, &c. when it means *all his Army*: but tho it supposes all the Army, it does express the King alone, and his Authority, and therefore is singular; for if three Princes together have the Command, it wou'd no longer be, *He march'd*, but *They*, which shews you are out: So that the Objection (with the greatest part of the Remarks) lies on your Hands still.

As for your Comments on other Texts, they are Arrows shot at *no Mark*, till you state your Notion, whether *three infinite Minds*, or but *one*. Your Expositions are precarious, or go no higher than *Arianism*, or are obviated oft in the *Sacrian* Comments; and in answering *their* Texts you are as modest (on *John* 17. 3. *1 Cor.* 8. 5.) as if you said nothing. Pray, Sir, tell us whereabout your Answer is to the Text, *of that Day knows my Father only*, which some cannot find among your answer'd Texts; and yet it was in that *little Book*, which is all that you venture to attack, and no Text is more urg'd by the *Unitarians*. Pardon this Freedom, Sir, in pursuance of your *Desire to hear from me again*; who, I assure you, am acted herein by no Passion, except it be a passionate Desire of seeing our Holy Christian Religion rescu'd from the Burden of Contradictions.



A N
EXAMINATION
O F

Mr. *Leslie's* Last Dialogue,

Relating to the

Satisfaction of Jesus Christ.

Together with

Some Remarks on Dr. *Stillingfleet's*
True Reasons of Christ's Sufferings.




1. The first part of the document
describes the general situation
of the country.

2. The second part of the document
describes the situation in the
different regions.

3. The third part of the document
describes the situation in the
different provinces.
4. The fourth part of the document
describes the situation in the
different districts.

5. The fifth part of the document
describes the situation in the
different counties.



An Examination of Mr. Leslie's last Dialogue, &c.

S I R,

I MAKE bold to present you with my Thoughts on your last Dialogue, relating to the *Satisfaction of our Lord Jesus Christ*, in opposition to the *Unitarians*; and shall examine what pretence you have from thence to infer his Supreme Deity: For as to the rest, the *Unitarians* are no more concern'd in the Dispute than the *Arminians*, who give the like Account with them of Christ's Sufferings. They can bear with any Notions here, which don't subvert the Justice of God, or sully the Glory of his Free Grace in the Pardon of Sin: But they stiffly deny any just Inference to be made from the true Account of the Atonement of Sin by Jesus Christ, for his Supreme Deity, which is what you and others drive at: you telling us, That *the Doctrine of the Satisfaction is built upon the Trinity, and Divinity of Christ*; that *if he were not God as well as Man, he could not satisfy*, &c. This is the common Plea, but of what weight 'tis, will be seen by what follows.

As

As to your Management of the Argument, I doubt whether any that was hearty in the Cause ever prosecuted it, either more feebly or more unfairly; for what no *Socinian* would ever say, nay what he expressly denies, you put into your *Socinian's* Mouth, and make him speak what you found in *Trinitarians* Books, because you judg'd it might be odious. The most pinching and obvious Argument which the *Unitarians* insist on, *viz.* the Inconsistency of a strict equivalent meritorious Satisfaction, with free *gratuitous Pardon*, you are so ignorant or disingenuous, as never once to mention; and yet you have the Vanity to tell the World, you have consider'd the chief of the *Socinian Treatises*, when you have only attack'd one very little one, which for your own Glory you must call *that most celebrated Book with them*. To me it appears, that you have but just dip'd into the Controversy, and don't so much as understand the true *State* of it. In order to shew your Defects,

I shall *First* state the Matter in Dispute; and then shew how short you are of proving your Point against the *Unitarians*.

1. As to the Matter in Dispute, I will not lay weight upon Words and Phrases, that may have various and uncertain Meanings. The Term *Satisfaction*, in a legal sense, is wholly unscriptural. I think you are not quite so happy as ridiculous, in pretending to discover it in *Isa. 53. 11.* which I think none before did; and I fancy none after you will interpret of a Satisfaction to Justice, when it plainly speaks of a complacential Delight the *Servant of God* should have in the Issue of his Undertaking. But any Jingle of Words serves some Men, let the Sense be ever so foreign to their purpose; however, neither the unscriptural Term *Satisfaction*, nor the scriptural Terms

Redemption, Propitiation, Atonement, Sacrifice, &c. is the Matter of this Dispute: the Unitarians can allow all these, and the very *Racovian Catechism*, which you say is *their Standard*, expressly allows *Jesus Christ* to be our *expiatory Sacrifice*, Chap. 8. and that *in the same Sense as, nay, in a fuller than the Sacrifices under the Law were such.* So that they have said what is false, who tell the World, that the *Socinians* in general deny *Christ dy'd a proper Sacrifice for Sin*: much less do the *Arian Unitarians* decline the Expression. Nor shall the Phrase of *nostro loco*, or his dying in *our stead*, make any Difference, so that the *Antinomian Sense of his sustaining our legal Person* be excluded. The *Racovian Catechism* asserts it, that *Christ dy'd as Victimam succedanea.* And I think he that suffers with a Design to prevent our Suffering (which is granted) truly suffers in our stead.

But the true State of the Question is about the Meaning of the aforesaid Expressions, *viz. Whether or not our Lord Jesus Christ endur'd such infinite Punishment at the hands of God, as was a full equivalent Compensation to vindictive Justice for the Sins of Men, and strictly meritorious of their Pardon.* It must not only be Punishment, but equivalent to all that a world of Sinners had deserv'd at the hands of severe Justice for ever: and in order to this, it must be *Infinite in Value*; for no other Notion of *Christ's Satisfaction* can afford you so much as a Pretence of an Argument for his *Infinite Deity*. Therefore you call it *Infinite Satisfaction*, p. 2. as do *Dr. Edwards* and others. If it was proper Punishment laid on *Christ*, yet if that was not a full *Equivalent* in strict Justice; nay, if 'twas an *Equivalent*, yet if that *Equivalent* did not amount to *Infinite*, then not being *Infinite Satisfaction*, it needed no *Infinite Person* to make it;

it; and so your Argument for Christ's Deity will fail here.

E. 308.

The *Unitarian Sense* I take to be this, That the Lord Jesus, not so much by any *physical* Virtue of his Blood, or by the natural Pain and Torments of his Sufferings, but by his *Obedience to the Death of the Cross*, by his great Patience, Humility, Submission towards God, and transcendent Charity to Men, express'd chiefly in his Sufferings (which were the great Trial of those Virtues) did make so acceptable and *rewardable an Oblation to God*, that in consideration hereof he is exalted to be a Princely Advocate with a merciful God for Sinners; and in the acceptable Virtue of this Obedience to Death, his Intercession is prevalent with the Divine Mercy for *Pardon*, which he is authoriz'd to grant. *The ground of Pardon being granted in his Name*, is his Obedience, which is better than a bare external Sacrifice: 'Tis not merely a Condition, as Dr. *Stillington* pretends, in his *Reasons of Christ's Sufferings*, but a rewardable Consideration in the case of Pardon; as a perfectly holy Life would be a meet Consideration for God's gracious Recompence of eternal Happiness. *The way of its Application* is by his Intercession, not challeng'd of rigorous Justice as a thing strictly merited, and which God, having had the full Worth of, is bound in Justice to grant as a Debt he owes to the Purchaser; but sought of the Divine Favour and Mercy, with which Christ's Obedience has given him so great a Prevalency. And herein they see the Wisdom of God highly manifested, in putting this Honour on Jesus Christ for his consummate Virtue, that Pardon and Salvation shall, thro his Mediation, be given to them, who by him (by his Law and Example) are brought to turn from their Sins unto God; and also in making it serve as an

hum-

humbling Memorial of our own Unworthiness and Distance, in being admitted to Favour by the interposal of one of the highest Virtue and Worth, and this try'd to the utmost by the most difficult Exercises. And in order to such Atonement and Pardon by Jesus Christ, they see no need of his being Supreme God.

2. Having thus stated the Case, I am next to shew how short you are of proving your Point against the *Unitarians*, viz. of an *equivalent infinite Satisfaction* to God's vindictive Justice, in order to Pardon. The Method of your (and others) Argument takes in these four things: (1.) That Divine Justice necessarily requires *such Satisfaction* in order to pardon Sin. (2.) That Christ has made it, by suffering such equivalent Punishment. (3.) That this Equivalent can be no less than *infinite Punishment and Satisfaction*. (4.) That hence it follows he must be an *infinite God*. Let's examine them singly.

(1.) You assert, that the Justice of God obliges him to *exact the utmost Farthing*; i. e. to punish to the utmost what every Sin strictly deserves, and that God cannot pardon Sin till he has executed his Vengeance *somewhere* or other to the full. And on this 'tis that your Party build the Necessity of *infinite Satisfaction* in order to Pardon. You ask, *Does Justice require full Satisfaction?* P. 5. and are so disingenuous as to make your *Socinian* answer, *Yes*; when no *Socinian* will ever say it in the Sense your Question intends, but on the contrary they would always say, *No*. You say, P. 47. *Justice can no more remit the least Farthing, than it can cease to be: That Justice not being satisfy'd,* P. 31. *Justice is not done, and that is Injustice.* This you assert, but don't prove. But so far is this from belonging to the Nature of Divine Justice, that I dare say no just and good Man ever acts thus,
always

always to demand inexorably the utmost of his strict Right. This *Summum Jus* is ever blam'd, as is he who is righteous overmuch.

'Tis granted by the *Unitarians*, that punishing Justice belongs to the great Governor of the World, and that 'tis requisite it should be exerted, tho' not always answerably to the strict Demerit of Sin, yet answerably to the Ends of Government; and so 'tis in all regular human Governments. Accordingly God does exert this *punishing Justice* in many temporal Punishments, and more fully in the final Condemnation of the Incurable, in the *Day of the Revelation of the righteous Judgment of God*.

But Justice does not demand the same Punishment of the *Penitent*, who do Honour to it by their Repentance, and their humble earnest Deprecation of deserv'd Wrath: But, by your Principle, God is bound to punish the Sins of the most Penitent, as much as those of the most haughty obstinate Transgressors. He must not remit a Farthing in one Case, and he can have no more than every Farthing in the other. In short, I say, God always hates Sin, but is not bound always to punish it, only when in his Wisdom he sees it requisite. And in this Dr. *Stillingfleet* consents, *Preface to the Sufferings of Christ*, p. 8. where he argues against your Notion of Divine Justice as very absurd.

Your only Argument, *viz.* That *Justice not being satisfy'd, supposes Justice not to be done*, and that *not to do Justice is Injustice*, arises from your confounding two different Notions of Justice. For a thing is said to be just in two Senses: either 'tis *quod fieri potest*, what lawfully may be done; or, *quod fieri debet*, what ought to be done. Now not to do the last, that is, what *ought to be done*, is Injustice; but to omit the *former*, *viz.* what I may *without Injustice* do, is no wrong.

wrong. And of this kind is God's Right to punish the penitent upright Servant for his hated Defects and forsaken Faults: this is not *quod fieri debet*. But you suppose that whatever *may* be done justly, *ought* in Justice to be done, which is very monstrous. For I pray what is Justice? Is it not *to give every one his Due*? 'Tis in *giving*, not *taking*, what is strictly due, giving others their Right, not exacting from 'em my own; of my own I am Master, but not of another's. And tho' we say Punishment is *due* to an Offender, the meaning is not that he has a Right to it, which in Justice we must not deny him, but that the injur'd Person has a *Right over him* to take it if he pleases: the injur'd Person does not come under these Bonds, but the Offender only; so that the Injur'd is free in point of Justice, if something else don't require him to use his Power over the Injurious. If a Man can't part with his just Right in any Case, without coming *short of Justice*; then he is unjust in not prosecuting every Trespasser to the utmost lawful Rigor: for here Justice is not exerted. Whereas even Princes, who are trusted by the Community, and shou'd not give up their *Rights*, are yet endow'd with a Prerogative to remit Punishment, where it may safely be; and this without any Injustice, tho' *Justice be not done*. And dares any Man say, that the absolute Sovereign Lord of all shall not sometimes forbear to use his Right to punish his Creatures? *May he not do with his own as he lists*? Mat. 20. 15.

But if God must do all that with Justice he can do, then I doubt he must needs refuse Christ's Substitution; because in Justice he might either not have contriv'd, or not accepted it: and *not to do Justice is, say you, Injustice*. And

it seems strange, that in order to magnify God's pardoning Mercy, you shou'd lay your Foundation in such a Notion of him, as represents him incapable of shewing any Mercy, and under a necessity to do all the hurt he can within the Limits of rigorous Justice. Nay, if God cannot part with the *Exercise of his just Right in any Point* (for with his *Right it self* in general, I grant it) then it will follow that he must pardon penitent Sinners *absolutely*, because it is his *just Right* to suspend and remit Punishment when he pleases, as much as 'tis his Right to inflict it when he sees that to be best. And if he must do *Justice to the utmost*, i. e. whatever is just; then must he do this Justice, of exercising his Prerogative and just Right in absolute Pardon, else here is some *Justice not done*: So that both ways, either in punishing, or not punishing, God exercises his just Right, and acts as justly in the one as in the other, if we only respect the nature of mere Justice.

P. 4.

You ask, If Forgiveness without Satisfaction be called Justice? and you make your *Socinian answer*, No; when he would say, Yes, if he might speak for himself: But he is in your hands, and you make him speak what you would have him, to make you Sport; which is the great Privilege of them who write Controversy by way of *Dialogue*. I say then, that free Pardon is Justice, as our Alms is call'd *Righteousness* in Scripture; for this reason, among others, say some, because they must be given of such things as we have a *Right* to: So God's pardoning Mercy is Righteousness, as much as his Bounty is so, as being the Exercise of his *just Right*. Punishing is one Act of Justice, and Pardoning another; either way God uses his own Right with equal Justice. So that you give no manner of Proof of its being

ing essential to Justice, that it must always punish to the utmost Desert. And indeed since *Forbearance* is a real Remission of all that Punishment which the Sinner might have suffer'd in that time, you may as well say, that *Justice is not done* in God's long Forbearance of the Wicked, as in his absolute Pardon of the Penitent; nay, in his *Forbearance of Devils too*, on whom Justice is not fully executed yet, but they are forgiven a great part of their Torment till the last Day: and yet this is without any Satisfaction, unless you suppose Christ satisfy'd so far for Devils too.

And as *your Ground* for the Necessity of full Satisfaction fails, *viz.* from the *Nature of God*, and his Justice; so I suppose will *theirs*, who found the Necessity of full *penal Satisfaction* upon the Threatnings of the Law, as *some*; or upon a Regard to the Ends of Government, and the common Good, as *others*.

1. I find even some rigid *Calvinists* will not go so far as you, to lay this Necessity so boldly on the *Nature of God*, but only on his voluntary Determination. *The Injustice of not punishing any Sin* (says Dr. Owen) *arises not from any natural Obligation, but from a positive Act of God's Will.* Treat. of Redemp. p. 93, 144. This positive Will being suppos'd to be declar'd in the Threatnings of his Law, before Man sinned, let us examine what Necessity of full Penal Satisfaction is manifest from the *Threatnings of the Law*. Tho, I think, this founds the Satisfaction originally on *mere Will and Dominion*, which made a Necessity that did not arise from any *natural Obligation*; and therefore 'twill be a great Presumption against this Opinion, that 'tis not likely a most gracious God shou'd exert such a positive Act of mere Will; yet I find no such thing in the *Law* it self. The Threatning was,

Gen. 2. 17. *Thou shalt die*; and the Sentence pass'd upon him
 Chap. 3. 19. in pursuance of that Law was, *Thou shalt return
 to the Dust*. And this is fully executed on Men
 themselves; so that there is no need for a *Sub-
 stitution* or Satisfaction, to take it off: and 'twill
 be very hard for Men to suppose a secret Mean-
 ing of that Threatning, *viz.* that it includes
 eternal Torments, and then upon that Suppo-
 sition to suppose a Necessity of a full Execu-
 tion of that Meaning of the Threatning on every
 Sinner.

But as I will not deny, that the Continuance
 under Death was imply'd in that Sentence; so
 I judge, that whatever *future Miseries* might be
 imply'd in that Threatning (as I grant they
 are in others) yet that Threatnings, consider'd
 barely in themselves, do not bind the Lawgiver,
 in strict Justice, to inflict 'em on every Sinner
 who repents. For even the Sentence of *return-
 ing to Dust* was not executed on *Enoch* nor *Elias*;
 1 Cor. 15. nor will it be on those *who shall not sleep*, but
 51. *shall be chang'd*. Who knows but the Threat-
 nings of the first Covenant were as conditional
 as to future Miseries (supposing them intended
 in *Gen. 2. 17.*) as the Threatnings in the Gospel?
 1 Cor. 3. 17. *Gal. 5. 21. Rev. 21. 8.* These are
 deliver'd in as absolute Terms as the *first Threat-
 ning* was, and yet we say they are not intended
 to be executed, if there be Repentance; only
 temporal Miseries, *viz.* Death, &c. are peremp-
 torily determined. Perhaps God, whose merci-
 ful Nature was the same at first, never dealt
 with *frail Man* (as the History shews him to be
 easily ensnar'd) on other Terms than these: he
 might threaten future Miseries; but we have no
 reason, that I see, to say his Threatnings were
 not conditional, and left no reserve for Repen-
 tance,

tance, as now. I know a thousand precarious things are said of the *first Covenant*, and *Covenant of Works* with Man in Innocency, requiring perfect Obedience, as the *Condition of Life Eternal*, and admitting *no Repentance*; of which things I find not the Holy Scriptures say a word: and I doubt whether *such* a Covenant be either suitable to the Nature of a gracious wise God, or the *Nature of Man*, in his unexperienc'd *feeble Innocency*. Our common Systems do most pitifully suppose, and then build all on this, which shou'd be well prov'd, before it be laid for a Foundation. Now if the Threatnings were conditional, then on Repentance they were to be suspended of course, without any Execution due.

But if eternal Miseries were threatned, and absolutely denounc'd against the Sinner, yet considering what has been said of the *Nature of Justice*, and that *Non-execution* wrongs none in their Rights (for even God's Right to punish remains, tho he forbear to exercise it) I can't see any thing can be pretended for the Injustice of not executing the Threatning but this, That 'tis *against Truth*, a Wrong to the Veracity of God, and a Wrong to Men, as 'tis a sort of Justice due to them not to deceive 'em.

To which I answer, That whatever the certain *natural Consequence* of Sin may be, to render an incorrigible Sinner miserable; and whatever Engagements may be on the *Wisdom and Holiness of God*, as Rector of the World; nay, whatever Engagement may be upon his Truth on *other accounts*, to exact the threatned Punishment on the irreclaimable Sinner; yet the bare Threatning does not, I conceive, *engage his Truth*, because Threatnings are not like Predictions, nor are wont to be understood to signify what shall

certainly be, but what *may be* expected : they are not given for a Pledge of the Divine Veracity. Death was threatned to the Murderer, and yet God said to *David*, without being *false*, *Thou shalt not die*.

If the Divine *Truth* were at stake in every Threatning, I don't see but the *same Injustice*, i. e. the same *Untruth*, might be charg'd on God still, even tho' Jesus Christ had suffer'd the Equivalent ; because the Law or Threatning did never say, that Christ, or *some Substitute*, shou'd die, but the Sinner. And there seems to be as little punctual *Truth* observ'd in Christ's suffering the Punishment instead of the Sinner, as in God's pardoning him absolutely ; for when Christ suffer'd, it was neither the same Person, nor the same kind of Punishment that the Threatning spake of. And if it be a right Notion of Dr. *Owen*, that *Personal Guilt* differs from Debts in this, that the *Person himself is principally intended, and aimed at*, and not the Debt ; then it will follow, that the Threatning was not accomplish'd in its principal Intention, when Christ suffer'd : and then where is the *Truth* of the Threatning accomplish'd ? Justice may admit an Exchange, but *Truth* lies in a point. Thus if I tell my Creditor I am worth a thousand Pounds in Land, and it be found, that I am worth it only in Cattel, or Shipping, I may seem *just enough*, and my Credit is altogether as good, but I shall be counted a Lyar : So that the Equivalent does not answer the *Truth*. Yet I suppose the *Divine Truth* is as exact as *his Justice*. Wherefore I conclude, that there is no Necessity, either upon the *Justice* or *Truth* of the most Holy God, that he must always execute the utmost of his Threatnings on all Sinners, even the most penitent. 'Tis enough that he uses his Right or not, as in his

his infinite Wisdom, Goodness, and Sovereignty he judges best.

2. I find most of our considerate late Writers do lay the Necessity of Christ's Satisfaction on the Regard that is due to the *Ends of Government*, and the common Good of Men, by deterring Men from Sin, by this Instance of Punishment. Thus Dr. *Stillingsfleet* in his *Reasons of Christ's Suffering*, p. 47, 59. *Preface*, p. 39. For tho' this *Doctor* avoids saying 'twas necessary, yet he says, 'twas agreeable to Justice to admit of Christ's Satisfaction on behalf of the Penitent, on this account.

But since the *Ends of Government*, and the Means to serve those Ends, consist not in a point, but admit of great Latitude, I think this will devolve the matter upon the Dominion and Wisdom of God at last, who may chuse what way he shall take in this Affair; and if he can but maintain, or has provided for the Honour of his Law, without an *equivalent penal Satisfaction*, then there is no Necessity for it.

Now the *Unitarians* judge, that the Honour of God, and a Regard to his Laws, are abundantly provided for without it, *viz.* by his limiting the *Conditions* of free Pardon and Salvation; so as that none can partake hereof but those who repent, and forsake their Wickedness, and sincerely submit to his Laws, while the rest are doom'd to perish. In this are contain'd all reasonable Motives to Obedience, as absolutely necessary, and all possible Arguments to deter us from wicked Acts. *Here* is no more Encouragement given Men to go on in Sin, than if Christ had satisfy'd for 'em; which wou'd certainly give as much Hope to the most daring and dilatory Sinner: and I am confident Sinners wou'd presume as much on the Satisfaction of Christ,

as they do, or wou'd do, on the free Mercy of God, even while they go on in Sin. And here is as much to *deter Men* from Sin, as if Christ had been punish'd for 'em; for I can't suppose the World will ever be made to think the Sufferings of Christ for a few Hours, to be *more terrifying*, or to give 'em a more dreadful Sense of Divine Wrath, than the endless Horrors of Hell-Torments in *unquenchable Fire*. If this will not deter 'em from Sin, the other will not; and they have already the same Grounds to believe Hell-Torments, as are pretended for Christ's *infinite Sufferings*: nay, if they don't first believe the *Wrath to come*, on the Credit of the Text, they'll not believe Christ suffer'd to take it off. So that it seems neither to add to the Terror, nor the Assurance of it, to say Christ made such Satisfaction for the eternal Torments due.

To which, if we add the sad Abuses of the Doctrine of an equivalent Satisfaction by so many, to their Hardning and Security in Sin; and also how much this Doctrine seems to diminish of the Glory of God's *free Grace*, in unmerited Pardon of the Upright; it may perhaps appear, that the Honour of God's Government, and the Ends of Piety, are at least as well provided for by free Pardon, as by an *equivalent Satisfaction*. Certain it is, that Love to God is the noblest Root of all pious Endeavours; and as certain that the less free Grace we believe there is in God's Pardon, the less we shall love him: for *to whom little is forgiven, the same will love but little*.

Besides, 'tis not for us in dubious Matters to say, this or that is the wisest way, therefore God must take it; there being nothing we are less proper and certain Judges of, than these
Matters

Matters of Wisdom, which require a mighty Comprehension and Capacity. If we must judge that to be the wisest Method of Divine Government, which is back'd with the highest Severities, and most sensible Representations of God's Anger, we shou'd perhaps think, that to serve the Ends of Government it were necessary God shou'd smite upon every presumptuous Crime: for if on each wilful Crime he shou'd take away a Limb, or cause a Paroxysm of the Cholick or Gout to seize the Offender; and this became a certain fix'd Method, that a Man could not doubt of such a Mark of speedy Vengeance; probably this severe way might deter Men more from Sin than either Christ's Sufferings or future Torments. Yet we must not say, God uses this Method, or that 'tis necessary, when we see the contrary; no more must we fancy a Necessity of a Satisfaction without proof. Now since there is no Necessity of an *equivalent Satisfaction* to be made out *à priori*, either from the Nature of God's Justice, from his Law, or *Reasons* of Government (which last I confess you deride) I don't see but Pardon, or not punishing, is a matter of God's *Dominion*, but always under the Conduct of Wisdom, Holiness, and Goodness; and therefore is gratuitously exercis'd on an *humble Penitent*, where it may be so without any Prejudice to the Interest of true Piety, and I think without any absurd Consequence.

I wonder to find Dr. *Stillingsfleet* object so weakly against this Dominion in Pardon, which the *Unitarians* assert: *If, says he, the whole Right of Punishment depends on God's Dominion, then all Sins must have equal Punishments.* This is a very strange Inference, that because God may punish as he pleases, therefore he *must needs* punish all alike,

Christ's
Sufferings,
p. 28, 29.

and observe no proportion of Fault and Punishment. And yet in the same Breath he adds, *Then it were as liberty for God to punish a greater Sin with less Punishment, and a less with greater.* This is still more strange, that two such contradictory Consequences shou'd follow from the same Premises, *viz.* both that *all Punishments must be equal,* and yet that they *may be unequal.* He goes on; Punishment wou'd then be a *mere arbitrary Thing, depending on the mere Will of God.* No more I think than in his Preface he had made it to be; nor is it *mere Will,* but attended with Wisdom, Holiness, and Equity in all its Determinations. He adds, that then *God may punish whom he pleases* (he means any innocent Man) and wonders that the *Socinians,* who assert *the Right of Punishment to be merely in God's Dominion,* shou'd cry out of *the Injustice of punishing one Person (Christ) for the Faults of another.* And tho he produces this as their Reason, and I think a very good one too, *viz.* that *Punishment supposes Guilt,* and so restrains his Dominion in punishing to the Guilty only: yet the Doctor will have it, that they *contradict themselves to serve an Hypothesis,* in saying, that God may by his Dominion forbear to punish a guilty Man, and yet that he cannot extend his Dominion to the punishing an innocent Man; notwithstanding the *Socinians* never pretend God's Dominion gives him Right to punish all that are under it, but only *the Guilty;* and that among them his Dominion gives him a Right also not to punish where he sees that best.

I think if the *Unitarians* be rightly understood, the matter is very clear; they'll grant that *Right to punish* is founded on *Dominion,* but yet upon Justice too. I may not be punish'd by one, merely because he is *over me,* without any De-

fert

sert of mine; so that there must be *Justice* at the bottom: and yet I may not be punish'd for my Fault by every one that has no Authority over me, so that there must be Dominion also, as the Foundation of a *Right to punish*. But then this being only a *Right*, not an *Obligation* on God, 'tis no more than a Right to punish if he will; and consequently the *Exercise of this Right, or not Exercise*, is a point of mere Dominion. There must be inherent Guilt to found a *Right to punish*; but nothing but Choice and Wisdom is needful to use it, or to suspend its Exercise. So that the *Socinians* speak very consistently, when they assert God's Dominion in *free Remission* of the guilty Penitent, but deny it to extend to the Punishment of the innocent Jesus, or any other; *i. e.* he may part with his Right, and yet may not do wrong. So then if *not to punish* belong to the Divine Dominion, there will be no necessity of your full Satisfaction in order to Pardon. Nor can you argue that any such thing is at all design'd, until the Divine Pleasure to have it so be produc'd; because Pardon may be granted by absolute unmerited Remission, for ought that appears from the nature of God's Justice.

And 'tis plain, that in human Governments, thus to forgive *penal Debts*, to the humble relenting Offenders, making a difference between a modest and an impudent Transgressor, is so far from being a Defect in Government, that 'tis a *beautiful Royalty*, and one of the greatest *Graces* of Dominion. Much less is it any Defect in God's Government, who is absolute Lord of all, and who can't be impos'd on, as Men may, with *Shews of Mock-Repentance*; especially since there seem more ill Consequences to follow upon his long Forbearance of the obstinately Vicious, than from

from his free Pardon of the Penitent: and yet even that is not too destructive a Method to the ends of righteous Government, to be admitted by the wise and just God every day. The *Papists* don't prove to me, that there is an *universal visible Judge of Controversies*, by their bold saying, that else God would not be *wise*; no more do you prove there is an infinite Satisfaction made in order to Pardon, by saying, that else God would not be just. It only shews you are very bold with God's Attributes, as if you comprehended them well enough, tho the *Unitarian* must not pretend to fathom the Divine Unity.

But because you may say, that God has taken this Method of Choice, to forgive upon an infinite Satisfaction, and that this is enough for us to know, Whether he was bound to it by Justice, or not, is no great matter, if he have but determin'd upon this way; I therefore add under the

Second General, That the *Unitarians* deny that the Lord Jesus Christ is ever said, in the Gospel, to have made any such *infinite* Satisfaction or *equivalent* Compensation to vindictive Justice, by bearing the full Punishment due to the Sins of Men; or that any such thing is intended by his being our *Ransom*, or being a *Sacrifice for us*, &c. Here two things come under Consideration:

1. Whether Jesus Christ suffer'd *proper Punishment*?
2. Whether it was a full *Equivalent to strict Justice*?

'Tis upon the latter that the main stress of the Cause lies: for if only some smaller Punishment was inflicted than what all Sin deserv'd, it will follow that compleat Satisfaction to Justice is not made; and so 'tis only a merciful *Compensation* made for the Sinners Debts, by an *Acceptation* of less than an Equivalent.

1. As to Christ's *being punish'd* in a proper Sense, by divine vindictive Justice, the *Unitarians* are afraid it will imply him to be a Sinner, according to their Notion of Punishment; which is this, *That 'tis Misery inflicted by the Lawgiver or Ruler on a Malefactor for his Crime,* whereas the Holy *Jesus was without Sin.* And according to this common Notion the *Antinomians* do rightly argue, that if the Lord *Jesus* was punish'd, he must first have all our Wickednesses and our *Faults* imputed to him, and be as sinful as we, which we should abhor the Thoughts of: which yet their Adversaries cannot answer, but by going off from the obvious and most proper Notion of Punishment, when they say Christ was punish'd for our Sins, and by giving a more lax and mild Sense of the Term *Punishment*; in which the *Unitarians* and they are at no great odds. They both agree in this, that *vicarious Punishments* or Suffering are not so properly Punishments, as where there is personal Guilt. The judicious Mr. *Hotchkis* says, *Christ was not properly punish'd.* Mr. *Baxter* says, it was but *analogically* such, that is, was not truly Punishment, but had a resemblance of it. See Dr. *Stillingfleet's second Part of Christ's Satisfaction.* And this Doctor himself, after all his vain Labour to make Mr. *Baxter* differ from the *Socinians*, is forced to own, that Christ's Sufferings were *not a Punishment in the most proper and strict Sense.*

Christ's
Righteous-
ness, Par.I.
P. 77.

P. 171.

Now the very *Racovian Catechism* says, That Christ suffered the *quasi pœnam*, that is, the *analogical Punishment* of Mr. *Baxter*, &c. And since Dr. *Stillingfleet* himself, by Punishment, means only *what was appointed and accepted in order to Atonement for Sin*; and by Atonement, *That in consideration of which, God is willing to release the Sinner*

P. 151.

Part 1. *Sinner on the Terms of the Gospel*: I don't see any
 p. 307. mighty difference between him and the *Racovian*
Catechism, which says, Our Sins were the Cause
 Chap. 8. of Christ's Sufferings in order to their Pardon; *Eorum*
causa passus est, & quasi pœnam in se recepit, ut nos
vera eorum pœna exsolveret: and that he suffer'd
 for Sins in the same sense that the Sacrifices un-
 der the Law did. Now since the Doctor and the
Socinians agreed so well in their Meaning, what
 reason was there to quarrel with them about the
 Term *Punishment*, of which he grants the *Scripture*
speaks not a word? Indeed they observe nothing in
 Scripture of God's Appointment in the Case
 (which the Doctor supposes and affirms) which
 in all solemn Punishments is expected.

'Tis certain God never did appoint and order
 the *Jews* to shed Christ's Blood; but on the con-
 trary forbad 'em to kill him: when he sent him
 among 'em, 'twas to *turn 'em from their Sins*;
 and the End he propos'd was this, *Surely they will*
 Mat. 22. *reverence my Son*, and not kill him, as they did
 37. his Servants the Prophets. And therefore to
 shew how they acted against his Will, God cen-
 Acts 2.23. sures those *Hands as wicked* that kill'd him, and
 punish'd them with most dreadful but illustrious
 Vengeance. I grant God did foresee the *Jews*
 Malice, and *delivered his Son up, i. e.* he left him
 in their power; and it became his Duty to en-
 dure resolutely whatever besel him in doing his
 Father's Work: but still God did all, that by
 his Authority and Command he could, to save
 him from harm. And was this *exemplary Punish-*
ment, which the Law-giver, instead of inflicting
 on him, did by his Authority seek to cover him
 from? Certainly such a terrible solemn Exam-
 ple of Divine Vengeance, as this is pretended to
 be, for striking a Terror into the whole World;
 such a direful Instance of God's angry Justice
 flaming

flaming against the Sins of Men, to affright them beyond the far lesser Punishments of an *universal Deluge*, or a Storm of Fire and Brimstone, &c. I say, one would think such a solemn Execution as this, design'd for publick Warning, should have the plainest Marks of God's Hand in it. If it were just to inflict this as a Punishment on Jesus Christ, no doubt God might justly have commanded the Jews to slay him, and then it had look'd more like Punishment; whereas by a bare Permission or secret Will, it comes to pass that the most solemn Vindication of severe Justice was made to look like an *accidental thing*, and scarce to be distinguish'd from the ordinary Tryals of the Saints, as to the *Ground* of his Sufferings, and loses its true Use. What publick Declaration is here of Divine Justice, when 'tis so hard to shew that it had any hand in it? Was it ever heard that a wise Ruler punish'd one by a grievous Death, for a Demonstration of his severe Justice, which Death he forbids all his Subjects to inflict; and instead of that, commands 'em to reverence and obey him in all things? This would be to obscure and hide Justice, instead of declaring it, say the *Socinians*.

Indeed that Text, *Acts* 4. 27, 28. as translated, may mislead some to think that God determin'd the Rulers to crucify Christ; but if the *Nominative Case* be plac'd before the *Verb*, as is natural, the true Order of the Words will be thus; *Both Herod and Pontius Pilate were gathered together against this holy Child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed to do what thy Hand and Counsel determin'd to be done.* The last Words, *To do what thy Counsel determin'd*, may relate to Christ, (see *Acts* 10. 38.) not to the wicked Rulers; for God did not determine them to murder Christ, nor was he slain by the Wrath of God *his Father*, but by the

the unrighteous Wrath of Men. 'T would grieve
 Remains, one to hear such good Men as Mr. *Jos. Allen* tel-
 P. 193. ling us of God's *curfing his own Son*, faying to him,
Go thou Cursed, cursed in Body, cursed in Soul, &c.
 Gal. 3. 13. Methinks tho the Jews *made him a Curse*, Chri-
 ftians fhould not hold him *accurs'd* of God. The
 Prophet complains of the Injury done him by the
Jews, who *esteem'd him smitten of God and stricken,*
even when he was wounded for our Transgressions.

To conclude, I and God is often faid to declare
 his *Love* to Sinners, in giving his Son to die for
 them, but never that he did it to fhew his *Wrath*.
 Rom. 3. He declar'd indeed *his Righteousness*, (or Clemen-
 25. cy, as Dr. *Hammond* on the place) but how?
 not in punishing Sin, but in pardoning it: his
Righteousness in the Remiffion of Sin, which is not
 an Act of *vindictive* Juftice, but of rich Favour.
 Mat. 26. Thus *Christ shed his Blood for the Remiffion* (not
 28. Punifhment) *of Sin*. We are not fo much as once
 call'd to take notice of God's Severity in this
 Affair.

But call it what you will, Suffering or Punifh-
 ment, for our good, or in our ftcad; yet if it
 was not a compleat *equivalent* Punifhment, as
 much as the fevereft Juftice could demand, or the
 World's Sin could deserve, 'tis nothing to your
 purpofe of an *infinite Satisfaction*. Whether it
 was fuch, or not, is the next thing to be confi-
 dered.

For, 2. The *Unitarians* do absolutely deny, that
 Jesus Chrift suffer'd the *Tantumdem*, or an Equi-
 valent from vindictive Juftice; I fay, an Equi-
 valent in the fenfe of ftrict Juftice: for as for a
prudential Equivalent, or rather *Expedient*, fuch
 as Mr. *Baxter* and others are for, *viz.* which may
 anfwer the Ends of Government as much as if all
 Men had perifh'd, and which may preferve Reve-
 P. 30. rence for the Divine Law; this you call an *Intrigue*
 of

of *Politicks*, and rightly add, that this will infer no necessity of Satisfaction, i. e. adequate infinite Satisfaction: for 'tis only a Satisfaction to the Divine Will and Prudence, not to inexorable Justice. And the *Unitarians* will own, that God's merciful Terms of Pardon thro Christ's Intercession, with the Sinner's Repentance, is such an Equivalent, or an Expedient, that better answers the Ends of Government, and affords Arguments and Room for Obedience, more than if Sinners were left under Despair and Ruin.

But the Question is about an *adequate* Compensation to Justice for Sins past, not about a Security for the future; or whether to answer the Ends of Government, and the Honour of God's Law, it was necessary that the utmost Punishment due should be suffered without any Abatement? And whether our Lord Jesus made such a full Compensation, as was meritorious of our Discharge from the strictest Justice? For whatever is short of this, cannot be *infinite Satisfaction*, since 'tis not equal to the Deserts of *finite Merit*.

Here then is the Stress and *Heart* of the Controversy between the *Unitarians* and *Trinitarians* about Christ's Satisfaction; which the former complain is not understood, at least is never attended to by their Adversaries. And in this critical Point, on which the whole Cause depends, as Dr. *Outram* waves it wholly, so I think Dr. *Stillingfleet*, in his *Reasons of Christ's Sufferings*, has most egregiously fail'd: for after he had own'd that the *Unitarians* acknowledge Christ to have been an expiatory Sacrifice for Sin, and that they freely had told the World what were the main Points in Controversy, viz. 1. *Whether Jesus Christ made an adequate Payment to the Justice of God, or an Equivalent for what Men should have*

S

sus-

suffer'd? 2. Whether it was a Satisfaction offer'd to the Mercy of God, or to his Justice? I say, after this, he very subtilly and unfairly drops the first and principal part of the Question, saying, *The main Point then between us is, whether Christ's Death had respect to the Justice or Mercy of God*; and so runs away upon a wrong Scent, straining Metaphors and Allusions to the legal Sacrifices to little purpose, when he knew the *equivalent Payment to Justice*, and no other, was the main Business: for if another Man, or an *Angel* were appointed for a Victim, this might be an Oblation to Justice; but not being an Equivalent, you despise such Satisfaction. So that the Equivalent is *all in all*, in this Dispute; which finding probably a little too troublesome, he had the wit to lay it aside, even tho he cites a Complaint of the *Unitarians*, that *they were not rightly understood in this Point*; and of himself they renew the Complaint, that he would not, or did not at least, seem to understand them by his Answer. So that whatever Esteem some may have for his Book, I can truly say 'tis nothing to the *main Point* which he had once before him, in his *Pref.* p. 9, 10. but left it out of his Book, whether to spare his Adversaries or himself, you may judge. In short, if less than an *infinite* and equivalent Satisfaction might do, then one less than God might give it. I speak this over again, because Men are not very willing to attend to this main Point.

Now that our Lord Jesus has not made *such full Satisfaction as this*, the *Unitarians* think is prov'd from this, that it would exclude all *gratuitous* free Pardon from God; which beyond all denial, is so gloriously and expressly declar'd in the *New Testament*, *forgiving one another, as God for Christ's sake has forgiven you, ἵνα ἁποκαταστήσῃτε ἡμῶς δικαιοσύνην*. We are justify'd freely by his Grace, thro the *Redemption*,

tion, &c. not only by *Grace*, but *Δωρεάν*, without any *meritorious Cause*, as 'tis *John 15. 25*. Now how can God be said to *pardon Men gratis*, if it be purchas'd at full Price? What is left to be remitted, if what was worth ten thousand times as much more Pardon (even for a thousand Worlds) be paid for it? He forgives all, but abates not a Farthing, say you. Strange, that this should be call'd gratuitous Pardon! I know this Argument is old and common, but I never saw it yet answer'd.

'Tis oft said for answer, that tho' Christ paid all, yet *it cost the Sinner nothing*. But to whom owes he Thanks for this? Is it to God as freely forgiving him, or to Christ who paid the whole due, which otherwise had never been remitted by God? *But it comes freely to the Sinner*; but, I say, not freely from God, if he sold it at full worth; only from Christ. But the Text says, *God freely forgives in Christ*. Well, but you'll say, it was God the Father's Mercy that he found P. 5.
out this way of Satisfaction. This is generally said, I doubt, in compliment to the Father, after Men have dishonoured his Goodness: For indeed, 1. It is as much the *Son's* Contrivance as the *Father's*, according to your Scheme, nay more the *Son's* than the *Father's*; for we are told, the Son is the *Wisdom of God*; and you expressly say, *Wisdom is the second Person of the Blessed Trinity*. P. 5.
Now we know 'tis the part of Wisdom to find out deep Contrivances: so that the Son must be the immediate Contriver as well as Executor, and nothing is left for the Father but tremendous *inexorable Justice*. If you say, *Mercy* put the Son upon contriving, you tell us that *Mercy* is the *third Person*: so that all the rich Grace that is left for the Father to shew, is only to accept a sufficient *able Surety* in room of a *non-solvent Debtor*,

and to accept a full Payment at once of what else he must ever be receiving in Parts. Do you think such a thing would speak any great Goodness even in a Man?

2. But supposing God the Father finds out this Expedient, 'tis not an Expedient how he may *freely forgive*, but how he may be satisfied to a Farthing. If my Judge or Ruler finds and persuades another to pay him my penal Debt or Fine, I may be beholden to him for his Wisdom, and perhaps some Kindness; but I'll never say he *freely forgave my Debt*, which I saw paid him to the full: especially when I saw the poor Man, my Friend, toil and pinch, and grievously put to it to make up the Sum, with Tears, and Sighs, and Prayers that he might be spar'd. The same I would say in any other criminal Case, or wherever a Substitution can be admitted to give full Satisfaction: whatever Favour there may be, there is no gratuitous Forgiveness of *all the Debt*.

Dr. *Stillingfleet*, who kept as much out of the way of this Argument as he could, (unable, I judge, to look this Objection in the face in its full Strength) at last mentions it slightly and by halves, in the last Leaf of the *Reasons of Christ's Sufferings*. But tho he did by halves start it, I think he did not so much as half answer it. To the Objection of the *Inconsistency of the Freeness of God's Grace with Satisfaction*, he answers, that *Freeness of Grace is consistent with Conditions*; he means our *Repentance and Prayers*, and instances in *Abraham's Prayer for Abimelech's Pardon*, &c. I reply, Tho *all Conditions* be not inconsistent with Free Grace, yet all strictly *meritorious Conditions* are so; and therefore 'tis that in answer to the *Antinomians* Objections, they who assert Conditions of Pardon, do always deny them to be *meritorious*, such as Christ's Satisfaction is said to be.

Again,

Again, says he, *Remission is free when the Penalty is forgiven wholly, as we assert: but others say, True, 'tis free when 'tis forgiven freely, but that there is no Remission, whatever you assert, from him, by whom nothing is remitted, no free Forgiveness at all, where all that was due was paid. If among Enemies, Prisoners are on equal Terms exchange'd, none will say they were freely releas'd, or magnify the Generosity and Free Grace of the Enemy that let them go on such Terms, especially if Ten of the other side were given in exchange for One not so considerable.*

He adds, that *Men under Defamation must vindicate themselves, tho they freely forgive the Authors of the Slander: And shall not God? &c.* I answer, That Men may forgive, and yet seek to bring their offending Brother to an Acknowledgment and Repentance of their Fault, and to ask Pardon, because 'tis not strict Satisfaction; and this way God takes still to vindicate his Honour, and forgives none that don't humble themselves and repent. But that Men are bound to take the Rigour of the Law against their Brother, or that ever they can be truly said of *Free Grace* to forgive their Brother, when no Submission will be accepted without the severest Satisfaction to a Farthing, is utterly deny'd. 'Twas time for the Doctor to end his Book here, when he could not tell better what to say to this Objection, which if mention'd duly before as it ought, he might have given over sooner.

Only one thing more I find him pleading, viz. That *Pardon was not 'inconsistent with Sacrifices of Atonement, and why should it be more inconsistent with the Sacrifice of Christ?* I answer, 'Tis not said to be inconsistent with Christ's *Sacrifice*, but with his equivalent *meritorious Satisfaction*; and therefore Pardon agreed with the legal Atonements,

because they were not a meritorious infinite *Satisfaction*. And if *Jews or Gentiles had thought so*, and yet own'd a gratuitous *Remission*, they were as inconsistent as others now are.

Eph. 4. 32.
Mat. 6. 11.

Nor does your Notion of Satisfaction seem absurd in Speculation only, but also to have a very pernicious Aspect upon Practice: For since God's Forgiveness of us is propounded as a Pattern for our forgiving our offending Brethren, what will the Meaning of those Words, *Forgiving one another as God hath forgiven you*, amount to by your Interpretation, but this, *viz.* When you have had full Reparation, not abating one tittle of due rigorous Punishment, then forgive all the rest, when you can demand no more; only if you can procure another to satisfy you better for them, don't refuse to accept it, but else pursue them into Misery, Prisons, and Death, as God would deal by you, unless there had been an equivalent strict Satisfaction, without which, *say you*, he forgives none? It avails nothing to say that we are in a private Capacity, but God is a *Governor*, who must observe different Methods; for since God, who is our *Proprietor* as well as *Rector*, forgives no other way but one, he can be a Pattern to us of Forgiveness in no other way but this. And thus you'll give a fine Account of that great Christian Precept of forgiving our Brother: And instead of being *merciful as our Father in Heaven is merciful*, teach us to be rigorous and severe as he, who, besides Repentance, requires the utmost Punishment due before he forgives. Whatever becomes of your *Creed* in that Article, *the Remission of Sins*, you'll give a sad Exposition of the *Lord's Prayer*, and of those two Precepts that are the Sum of the *Ten Commandments*, weakning the Motives of our *Love to God*, by an horrid Misrepresentation of his Mercy; and of our *Love to*
our

our Neighbour, by teaching us not to forgive, tho' he turn, and say, *I repent*, unless he make full Satisfaction, Eye for Eye, or Life for Life. Whatever difference of Circumstances there may be in the Method of God's Forgiveness and ours, it must not be in any thing that subverts the Nature of free gratuitous Pardon.

The Text says, *Indeed you are bought with a Price*: but it means not any Price of their Pardon paid to God, but that he had bought them by his Mercies; or that the Favours God had expended upon them did merit and purchase their Service. So *Deut. 32. 6. Do ye thus requite the Lord, is he not thy Father that hath bought thee, hath he not made thee?* And thus Dr. *Whitby* rightly expounds *2 Pet. 2. 1. Denying the Lord that bought them*, of God the Father, not of Jesus Christ; (which some ignorantly apply to the Unitarians, as if they deny'd Christ to be Lord) and so *God hath purchas'd his Church with the Blood of his own Son* (as 'tis *Acts 20. 28.* after some Copies) or the Lord, i. e. *Christ, has purchased it with his own Blood*, (after others) i. e. he has obtain'd a Church, rescu'd them from Darkness and Sin, and merited that they should live to him who has died for them. I read of his *redeeming Men to God*, but not of *redeeming any from God*, by giving to him a full Price. Indeed the Terms *Redeeming* and *Ransom* are seldom us'd in Scripture, but in the metaphorical sense, for Deliverance out of Trouble, without regard to the paying of a Price for it. Hence *Israel* was redeem'd out of *Egypt*, and *Moses* was their Redeemer, *λυτρωτής*, their Ransomer, tho' he paid no Price. And even where a Ransom in the most proper sense is given, it does not suppose an Equivalent, but whatever shall be agreed on. *Thirty Shekels of Silver* was the Ransom of the most precious valuable Life, if it happen'd

1 Cor. 6.

20.

Deut. 7. 7.

Acts 7. 3.

Exod. 21.

30, 32.

to be forfeited by the Law there mention'd ; which was next to no Consideration, if Lives were as precious then as now.

Nor can any such Satisfaction be infer'd from Christ's being a *Sacrifice*, a *Propitiation*, or *Atonement*, tho taken in the most proper sense (tho indeed he was a Priest only of the *Order of Melchisedec*, who did not sacrifice, that we find, only officiated by Benediction and Intercession, and not of *Aaron*) for I am satisfy'd the *Jewish Victims* themselves, that are alluded to in this matter, were not design'd for a full Compensation to Divine Justice. 'Tis evident they were *Rites* of humble Deprecation, and a sort of *symbolical Signs* of Confession, that they deserv'd to be serv'd as the Beasts were, while they implor'd Mercy to spare them. Nor does it appear, that their Sacrifices so much as respected any Satisfaction to *Justice*. What tho they were to avert God's Wrath, which Dr. *Stillingfleet* insists on? I think Divine Wrath may be averted by an Address to Mercy, and Forgiveness will prevent it as certainly as Satisfaction : however, 'tis certain there was in them an Address to Mercy, by which the Atonement was made ; for if we look to that which was the most solemn *Atonement*, which gave that Name to the Day on which it was made (at which time only the High Priest was to officiate, or could be a Type herein of Christ)

Lev. 16.

we find that the Atonement was made with sprinkling the Blood seven times on the *Mercy-Seat*, within the Holy of Holies. This plainly taught, that 'twas by an Application to *Mercy* from Justice ; 'twas Mercy the High Priest fled to ; and this was not only to apply the Atonement made, but to *make it*. This plainly figures

Ex. 17.

out to us, that Jesus Christ obtains our Pardon within the Heavenly Veil, by seeking it at the *Throne*

Throne of Grace, or Seat of Mercy. Besides this, the High Priest took Incense with him, which is a Symbol of *Prayer*; and thus Jesus Christ still intercedes for Pardon as a Grant of Favour, and in Heaven offer'd himself, as Dr. *Whitby* shews clearly. Heb. 9. 24, 25.

Thus the Scripture is so far from appropriating Christ's Atonement to his Death, that it gives *more Virtue* to his Intercession: *Who is he that condemneth? it is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen again; who maketh Intercession for us.* His Resurrection being so requisite to his Intercession for Pardon, that the same Apostle says, *If Christ be not raised we are yet in our Sins,* I Cor. 15. 17. notwithstanding his Death: and the reason of it is, because *he rose again for our Justification,* Rom. 4. 25. not only for a Proof of his Acceptance with God, which was for his *own* Justification, but that he might justify *us*. And on this 'tis, that the Apostle lays the stress of a Christian's Hope of Salvation by Christ. Heb. 7. 25. How often do we hear poor honest meaning Persons object to the *Unitarians*, how can Christ be a Saviour if he be not Supreme God? Now the Apostle, without mentioning his being God, gives a full Answer to such, *He is able to save to the utmost,* says he: But how so? Wherein does his Ability, for being so compleat a Saviour, lie? *Because he ever lives to make Intercession for 'em.* None will say, that Intercession is an Act that none but God can perform; sure 'tis the part of an Inferior rather. Now if his *Intercession* does justify as well as his Death, nay rather than it (which makes me wonder how Dr. *Stillingfleet* cou'd ask the Question, *Why are not Men said to be justify'd much rather by Christ's Resurrection?* when the Apostle does so expressely say it, rather he is risen) then it follows, since Intercession is not P. 299.
penal

penal Satisfaction, that we are justify'd upon other terms.

2. Again, legal Atonements were sometimes made in such a manner as had no shadow of Punishment, much less of a full Compensation, viz. by *Inmolation*, or burning an *handful of Meal*, which suffer'd no Pain, and yet made as good an Atonement for the Poor, as shedding the Blood of a Beast did for the Rich. I know you speak contemptibly of a Sacrifice that had all its Virtue from God's Appointment: that God might as well have covenanted to pardon Man upon the turning of a Straw, or upon the paring of a Man's Nails, as Dr. *Stillingsfleet* speaks, p. 272. Now I pray consider what more worth there was in an handful of Meal: therefore what the Text says, that under the Law, *without shedding of Blood is no Remission*, must be taken, I conceive, with the Limitation that begins that Verse, *Almost all things*, &c. for here is a manifest Exception from that Rule. Nay, Atonement was made sometimes by burning a little *Incense*, Numb. 16. 47. a Figure of Prayer, *Psal.* 141. 2. And sometimes *Prayer it self* was used for making Atonement, *Exod.* 32. 30. Which shews us what 'tis to atone for Sin; 'tis not to satisfy for it, but with humble penitent Expressions to acknowledge Guilt, and to implore mere Mercy for averting deserv'd Punishment: And this answers to Christ's Intercession with God's Mercy, rather than to any treating with *vindictive Justice*.

3. Those legal bloody Sacrifices themselves appear to be rather *penitential* than satisfactory, and to have such sort of Influence upon Pardon as Repentance had, which is no Equivalent to Justice, but an Address to Mercy. This I gather from *Psal.* 51. 16, 17. *David* had committed

ted *Murder and Adultery*, he is anxiously distress'd for Pardon; he inquires after a Sacrifice for Atonement, but finds none appointed in that case by *Moses's Law*: What must he do? Shall he despair because he had no expiatory Sacrifice? Can nothing serve for Expiation but Blood? Yes, says he, *the Sacrifices of God are a broken Heart*, i. e. they are a Sacrifice of Expiation, even such as the Law appoints for atoning some Sins, but not such as mine. And thus the Fathers (and Unitarians) allow *Satisfaction to God* to be made by Repentance, *Deo satisfacere liceat fide & penitentia*, Lactan. l. 5. c. 13. So *Tertul. Basil*, see *Seller's Remarks on S. Cypr. Life*. And I think Repentance has all in it that Dr. *Stillingfleet* says of *Atonement*, Chr. Suff. p. 59. 'Tis Pain suffer'd for Sin, ordain'd of God, in order to Forgiveness, serves the Ends and Honour of Government; and is more strictly inflicted on us by God's Command, than Death was on Jesus Christ: but yet 'tis no equivalent Payment to Justice, while 'tis an atoning Sacrifice.

And I think you, Sir, make Christ's Satisfaction to lie in Christ's Repentance or Sorrow for our Sin, *viz.* in his Sense of Sin proportionable to the Offence, p. 21. which you call *the utmost that Justice requir'd*; tho a bare Sense of the Fault is no meritorious Compensation to *Justice* for an Injury, it only recommends one to Mercy. And you speak in this as if Christ's Atonement was made rather by shedding of *Tears*, than by shedding of *Blood*; for the former is the more proper Expression of a burden'd Spirit.

But to return to *David's* Sacrifice of a contrite Heart; I find Dr. *Stillingfleet* arguing against P. 273. *Crellius* (who asserted the Efficacy of the Sacrifice to depend on God's Appointment of it as a Condition) asks, *Why were not inward Sorrow for*

P. 274.

Sin, and Prayers and Thanks rather made the only Conditions of Expiation, than such a chargeable Service? Now in *David's Case*, under the highest Guilt, it was just so; no Sacrifice of Blood or Life was requir'd, only inward *Sorrow, Tears, and Prayers*. And therefore one might have ask'd the Doctor on the other hand; If the Design of the Legal Sacrifices was to teach the *Jews*, that no Pardon cou'd be had but upon Christ's *Satisfaction*, as he intimates; then, I pray, how came it to pass, that under the Guilt of the deepest Dye, where Pardon seems most unlikely to be obtain'd, there shou'd be no Sacrifice at all appointed, but *bare Repentance* was accepted, without any bloody Offering, or the help of any Type to lead the Thoughts to Christ's Satisfaction? What, must one despair of Pardon without Christ's Sacrifice for lighter Faults, and yet do well without it, under the damning Crimes of Murder and Adultery? Or wou'd God have Satisfaction for, and teach Men to dread, lesser Errors, but not gross Wickedness?

In vain do some pretend to flee to the *general National Atonement*, as if *these Crimes* were pardon'd by it, for which no Sacrifices were particularly appointed: for as great Crimes require a more special Repentance, so likewise a more particular solemn Expiation; and 'tis strange if *they* shou'd pass off slightly by a general Atonement. Moreover, the Sinner might die according to the Law before that Day came: nor cou'd *David* say, there was no Sacrifice appointed in his Case, if it had been so. And *St. Paul* tells us, there were Sins from which

Acts 13.39. Men cou'd not be justify'd any way by the Law of Moses. So that Repentance seems to be the only way left 'em for the Expiation of the greatest

Guilt;

Guilt; which was a Procedure, not on the *Law of Moses*, but on the Principles of natural Religion, common to others.

I take the matter to be thus, That the Sacrifices alone did not purge the Conscience, but only took away the *political Guilt*, in relation to their *Civil* and *Ecclesiastical Penalties*; and therefore when the Crime was such as must not be pardon'd, but the Sinner must be put to death, then there was no room for a *Sacrifice*, because no Pardon cou'd be granted of that nature. But yet, with reference to God, and a future State, his Pardon was still to be fought by true Repentance, but without any bloody Sacrifice, Isa. 1.18. as typical of Christ's Satisfaction. But when the Law allow'd Pardon, then Sacrifice was that *Rite* by which they fought it from God, as their *State-Ruler*: And therefore, even in the matter of *Adultery*, which was by the Law made *Capital*, and consequently admitted no Sacrifice, from *David*; we find, that when in one Case the *same Crime*, for some Reasons, was not by the Law made *Capital*, then a Sacrifice was appointed, see *Levit. 19. 21, 22.* compar'd with *Deut. 22. 24.* Which makes it plain, that *Sacrifices* were us'd or not, according as the Crimes were expiable or not, in relation to temporal and political Punishments, not in relation to future Punishments (which is the End of Christ's Sacrifice) for then they wou'd have been most useful under the most heinous capital Crimes, where we find 'em wholly excluded, because they cou'd have no effect upon their temporal Punishment; and Repentance was the only Refuge from future Punishment.

Whence I infer, That tho this way of political Pardon might be typical of the Gospel-way of *eternal Pardon*, by the Sacrifice of Christ's *Obedience to Death*, as their *Canaan* was of our
heavenly

P. 4. heavenly *Bliss*; yet I see no manner of Pretence for what you suggest, that the Jewish Sacrifices of Beasts derived their *Worth and Efficacy* for Atonement from the *Sacrifice of Christ*: for the great Virtue of his Death seems wholly appropriated to the future Salvation from the Punishments of the World to come. It purges the Conscience, it effects our *eternal Redemption*, and saves us from *Wrath to come*; but it does not take off the *temporal* Punishment of a Criminal, nor reverse the just Sentence of the *Civil Law* or *State*. This is not the Purpose of Christ's Death, to interfere with *State-Judicatories*, or to save a Murderer from *Execution*: But 'tis apparent that this was the Design of the *legal Sacrifices*; and therefore how could they derive their Efficacy from Christ's Death, for those Effects, which the Virtue of Christ's Death has no Influence upon? What! Did Christ die to procure *State-Pardons* for Criminals? If not, how could *those* Sacrifices, that were us'd for that end, have their Virtue from *his*, that has no such Virtue ascrib'd to it? Christ's Virtue was of one kind, theirs of another. I wonder to see with what Assurance Men tell the World, that all the Efficacy of the *legal Sacrifices* was from Christ's Death, when the Scripture says not such a word. If it had been so, I think it had not fail'd to have been mention'd in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, where is no such thing, but only some *Allusions* of Christ's Oblation to the *legal Offerings*; making the *latter* to be Resemblances, Types or Figures of the *other*. But that might be, and yet they not have from it the least Efficacy for eternal Pardon: only Christ's Death had the like Efficacy (and greater in Degree) for *eternal Pardon*, as the *legal Offerings* had for external and *temporal Pardon*; both of 'em did operate after the *nature of Sacrifices*,

Sacrifices, to the averting Wrath. But that the nature of a Sacrifice is not to make an equivalent Compensation for Crimes, is seen *both* from the small Value of the *Jewish* Sacrifices of *Beasts, Incense, Meal, &c.* which were not in themselves of *equal Value* to the Soul or Life of Man, nor did borrow Virtue from Christ's Death to raise them up to such an Equivalent; and *also* from the nature of *Repentance*, which is with as express Design declar'd by *David* to be an atoning Sacrifice, as ever Christ's Death is declar'd to be such in the *New-Testament*; and yet cannot be deem'd to operate, by way of full Compensation to strict vindictive Justice, for heinous Crimes. The Sum of the whole is, that if Repentance was as efficacious a *Sacrifice* in the worst Crimes, as Burnt-Offerings of Beasts were under smaller; and yet that Repentance imply'd no *equivalent Satisfaction* to rigorous Justice, any more than *now* it does; then it follows that the nature of an expiatory Sacrifice is not to make a full Satisfaction to *strict Justice*, even tho Mercy accept it for an *Atonement*, as it did a little Meal; and consequently Christ's being an atoning Sacrifice, does not prove he was so by such an equivalent Satisfaction.

3. Supposing still that such an *equivalent Punishment* had been requir'd and paid by Jesus Christ, yet the *Unitarians* say this will not suppose it to be *Infinite*, or the Person that paid it to be so; 1. Because the Sin to be expiated, tho *exceeding Evil*, does not appear to be of *infinite Demerit*. Nothing is pretended for this, but its being against an *infinite Object*; but if that makes it so, then all Sin must be so for the same reason, as being against the same infinite God. But if all Sins are of infinite Guilt, then all must be of *equal Guilt*; since no Guilt can be aggravated beyond

St. Gill's beyond Infinite, which belongs to the least Sin; and equal Guilt deserves equal Punishment: and so there must be no Difference of *Crimes*, greater or less, one or many, the Guilt will be the same; nor any Difference of *Punishments*, no *greater Condemnation*; which is certainly false. And therefore if no better reason can be given to prove Sin of infinite Demerit than this, there is no reason to say God requires infinite Punishment to expiate it.

2. They don't see it possible that there should be *infinite Satisfaction* by infinite Punishment; because nothing that is infinite can suffer. *God is impassible*, and cannot deny, or diminish himself; and suppose what Union you please of the Deity to the Humanity of Christ, yet as nothing but the *human Nature* suffer'd, so that Nature, with all its Acts and Passions, remains still but finite. He was not an *infinite Man*, or an immense Creature, by being united to God: And his Suffering can hardly be counted infinite, any more than his Eating and Drinking; since the Deity no more suffer'd than it eat or drank. You may call it what you will, relatively or figuratively infinite, or by a logical *Communication of Properties*; but severe jealous Justice is not to be cheated or blinded with *Names and Terms of Art*, while it sees nothing truly suffers but a frail finite Creature.

To talk of God's Suffering, and a God punish'd, or of one Person of the *Trinity* punish'd and curs'd by one of the other, and the third helping the *second* to bear the Vegeance of the *first*, is daring Boldness enough, but little to the Honour of God or Christianity. And at this rate the *Unitarians* Account makes his Sufferings as much infinite as yours; for they freely own a peculiar *singular Union* of God the Father to the Man
Christ,

Christ, who wrought his Works for him. *The* John 14.
Father in me he doth the Works, (tho I suppose he ^{10.}
 did not suffer his Pangs) and this seems as hon-
 ourable and as near a Relation as others pre-
 tend; and yet they don't think he is made God
by being united to God.

Besides, how can one infinite Sacrifice (if it
 be suppos'd) be an Equivalent for so many Mi-
 riads of infinite Sins? as a *great Prelate* of the
 Age has observ'd in one of *his four Discourses.* ^{D'burnt}
 Will not each Crime need an infinite Sacrifice?
 If you say one Infinite is as much as many of the
 same kind, because it can have no addition; then
 you must remember that one Infinite Divine Per-
 son is as much as *Three*, and by this Rule the
Unitarians have as compleat an Object of their
 Faith and Worship as you. Nay, it follows, if
 Sin be of infinite Guilt, and one and many are
 the same, that a whole Course of Debaucheries
 ought to sit as easy on the Conscience, as one single
 infinite Fault; and will not this be a fine way to
 make your Doctrine of *Satisfaction* a comfortable
 Doctrine!

You suppose there may be an infinite Suffer-
 ing, in which you place Christ's Satisfaction, *viz.*
 in his having *an infinite Sense of the infinite De-* P. 19, 20.
merit of Sin; because, say you, he had an *ade-*
quate Notion of God. But this is either false, or
 nothing to the purpose: 'Tis *false*, if you mean
 that he had an infinite Sense of Sin, in his *human*
Nature, as you suppose, p. 21. or an *adequate*
Notion of God; for that *finite Mind* was not
 capable of finding out the Almighty to perfec-
 tion: nay, 'tis false, if you mean it of a sorrow-
 ful Sense of Sin (such as your Argument implies)
 tho you suppose his *Divine Nature*; for that
 cannot be afflicted *penally*, or have any truly sor-
 rowful Sense. But if you mean that he had a

full Estimate of the Demerit of Sin in his *Divine Comprehension*, then 'tis to no purpose to call this Satisfaction; for so had *God the Father* as large and deep a Sense as Christ could have, and express'd as much Grief (figuratively) and so had the *Spirit* also. At this rate they made Satisfaction too. So then *as Man* he had no infinite Sense of Sin, *as God* the Father had the same.

The *Sum* of the Arguments thus far is this: If God did not require a strict *Equivalent*; if Christ did not pay such, nay, if an *Equivalent* itself would not amount to *Infinite*; then was there no need of an infinite Person to make a *finite* Satisfaction, much less to be a Mediator and Intercessor with Divine Mercy.

But perhaps 'twould be well if you could get off so; for the *Unitarians* turn the Tables upon you, and from *your* very Proof of Christ's Deity, think they raise an insuperable Objection against it, which runs thus: If, say they, Justice be, as you speak, of the *very Essence of God*, and 'tis of the *Nature of Justice*, and consequently of *God*, to require an *adequate Satisfaction*; then if Christ have Divine Justice, *i. e.* the *Divine Nature*, and be *God himself*, he must also require such Satisfaction; but if he do not require it, he wants what is *essential to God*. No doubt you will say he is God, whatever follows. Well then, say they, is he the same just God who was offended by *Mens Sins*? Or are there *two Gods*, one who was offended by our Sins, and the other not? If he be the *same God himself*, then being the offended Party he must receive infinite Satisfaction, that is, must be as just a Person as his Father. But yet since 'tis he only makes the Satisfaction, it follows that he is not satisfy'd, unless he satisfies himself, which is no very terrible Instance of *vindictive Justice*.

Here then is the Dilemma in which you are caught: Either *Jesus Christ*, as God, has given infinite Satisfaction to himself, which seems absurd; or he is not satisfy'd at all, and so is not God by *your own account*. Chuse whether of the *two* you'll take. I find you offer at *both*, because you dare not stand to either.

1. You would have it no Absurdity for God to satisfy himself, and alledge vainly the Apo-^{P. 2.}stle's Words, God was in Christ, *reconciling the World to himself* (i. e. by sending the Apostles to ^{2 Cor. 5.} persuade 'em to be so reconcil'd) when you should have prov'd that God was reconciling *himself to the World*, and this by paying himself the full Price of their Pardon. Then you bring for a Parallel, an Instance of a *Creditor who pays himself, by helping his Debtor to Stock, and Credit, and Preferment, &c. that he may be able to make Satisfaction for his Debt*. But because any one will see that the Debtor pays the Debt out of his own Improvements, not out of the Creditor's own Purse, therefore you recant your own Words; and having before suggested that the *Creditor paid himself*, you add, *That because 'twas paid by the Debtor, 'tis not strictly call'd satisfying himself*. But why then did you bring it for an Instance of that kind? 'Tis a strange way of illustrating a Point, by bringing an Instance for it, and then giving a good reason why it won't answer.

The like may be said of *David's giving to God*. 'Twas *David's Act*, to give what was in his own Power and Choice to have withheld. God did not give to himself, to make himself amends for any wrong *David* did him; which is your Case in hand, and seems very absurd. Wherefore,

2. In the next place, you would not have it thought that God satisfies himself. Therefore,

P. 3.

(1.) You say, *Man paid his Debt to God, enabled to it by God.* What! does God enable *finite* Man to do an infinite Thing? To pay infinite Satisfaction? It seems then that a mortal Man, with God's Help, can make sufficient Satisfaction for Sin. I thought that whatever is infinite, is in none but God alone; and consequently, that if any infinite Price be paid to God, 'tis paid by himself, to himself, and not by *Man*, as you say. No not by the *human Nature* of Christ, if that be your meaning; for *infinite* cannot come from *finite*, and *that Nature* is no more. If you say, the infinite Value comes from the *Divine Nature* united to it; then I say, his Divine Nature is satisfy'd by *Value* receiv'd from it self, and so we are again where we were at first; and he still pays himself, which is a sort of Payment we don't oft hear of, especially where severe *strict Justice* has to do. And yet 'tis somewhat more harsh in case of *Punishment*, to take strict Satisfaction for one Abuse, by suffering *another* from the same hand. If this be tremendous full Satisfaction, then I don't see but our Blessed Saviour, in bidding us, when smitten, to turn the other Cheek, might intend not so much to teach us a Lesson of Patience, as to put us upon seeking rigorous Satisfaction by a second Blow. Thus I see you also can learn the *Sophistry of not distinguishing between Debts and Punishments*. But this being too absurd, you add, as your last Refuge,

(2.) That 'twas God the Son paid the Satisfaction to his Father, one Person to another; and so, say you, the *Objection* is wholly over. I perceive 'tis troublesome to you; and therefore you are in

haste

haste to have it over. But 'tis not over yet: This may account for Satisfaction to the Father, but still here is no Satisfaction to God the *Son*, unless he has satisfy'd himself. The Question is, Did Jesus Christ satisfy the Father *only*; (else the Difficulty remans still how he could satisfy himself) then who satisfies the Son? Can the Son be God, and yet not have Divine Justice essential to God? Or can *his Divine Justice* admit Men to Favour without a Satisfaction? Will it not then follow that vindictive Justice is not necessary to *God's Nature*, but that he can forgive without a Satisfaction, since God the *Son* does forgive without any, tho he have that *same Nature*? Why then can't God the Father forgive the same way? But if on the other hand, Christ be that very God, who can *no more remit the least Furthing than* P. 47. *cease to be*; and withal, it be absurd for one to give *penal* Satisfaction to himself; which makes you say, *A Trinity is necessary to Christ's Satisfaction*, (for else the Father alone might satisfy himself:) then it follows we have *God the Son* to satisfy still, and so you have mended the Matter well. Are not we in as bad a Case as ever? For the *Son* has, according to you, as severe vindictive Justice as the Father.

And is not that a defective Expedient for our Redemption, that leaves us without Hope, unless we find another *Infinite Sacrifice* for the Son? Truly, Sir, I had much rather humbly trust in the rich Mercy of a gracious God, thro the Mediation and Intercession of the Lord *Jesus*, with a sincere Repentance and Obedience, without pretending to plead equivalent Merit and full Worth given him, for all the Favour or Good I want from him; than to offer a full Satisfaction to but *one* Divine Person, and nothing at all to the other *two*; who, according

to you, are as able to destroy me as *that other*, and having the same Justice must needs be as inexorable as *he*, without a Satisfaction, had certainly been.

But to tell you the Truth, I verily believe, after all, that you and others of the same Opinion do not think Jesus Christ has the *same* vindictive Justice which you attribute to his *Father*. You say he is God *equal* to the Father, but you represent him by your Scheme as much *more* gracious. And this I fear is the fatal tendency of your Notions, to derogate from the glorious Love and *Free Grace* of the Father of Mercies, and to exalt Jesus Christ above him, in the vulgar Esteem at least. The Father you call *Power*, and represent him inexorable, without full Satisfaction to *a Farthing*; but Jesus Christ so good and compassionate beyond him, that tho he be as much injur'd as his *Father*, and have as much Right to demand Satisfaction, yet he will remit all his Debt without any Compensation; a poor Penitent shall be welcome to his Favour, without any Price paid him: Nay, so good, that he will himself be at the Expence to satisfy all the Father's Demands too at full Price. How can poor People forbear, by this Rule, to think and speak more kindly of Jesus Christ, than of God? Is this one reason that makes so many bow at the *Name of Jesus*, who yet stand stiff at the Name of *his God and ours*? Or that teaches others to call a Sermon of loving *Christ*, &c. spiritual Preaching, while one of loving and obeying *God*, is relish'd as *dry* Morality?

I find Men are more willing to trust Christ than the *Father*: So that if Christ have not made an infinite Satisfaction to the Father, but they be directed to hope in the Father's free Mercy, thro Christ's Intercession, they cry out they are *undone* and lost. Why so? Can't we trust the
Father

Father of Mercy? May not we as well hope for the *Father's* Favour, without an *Equivalent*, as for the *Son's*, without any given to him? We must be beholden to some one for free *unmerited* Favour; and why must the Father be dishonour'd with our despondent Jealousy more than another? Cannot he, if he pleases, as well be at so much Expence of Goodness to give, as Christ be at the Expence to purchase Favour? Is not he as rich in Goodness as the Son, who receives all from him? Would Men be more undone, if left to *his* Pity, of whom our Lord said, there is *none good but one, that is God*; than when left to *his*, who said, *Why callest thou me good?* for you must be left to the *mere* Pity of either *God* or *Christ*, unless you can produce a full Satisfaction made to both of them, which your Scheme of infinite Satisfaction will not allow of. Mat. 19.
17.

I think 'twere better to desist from such Arguments for *Christ's* Deity, till you are able to defend them, and till you can so manage them, as not to have them turn'd against your self with so much Force. But there's no ruling a rash indiscreet Zeal! How many *Teachers* tell their People, that Christ could not be a sufficient Saviour as Mediator, except he were God Almighty, who never consider the *abovesaid* Consequences of making God a Mediator? And how many poor Creatures have I heard speaking scornfully of Christ for a Mediator or Saviour (to whom Christ crucify'd seems to be a Stumbling-Block) if he could not make *infinite Satisfaction* by suffering, who yet could not answer one of the Arguments against such Satisfaction? As if the Office and Love of the Redeemer were contemptible, unless they be enabled to claim Pardon and Salvation from God, as things he is sufficiently paid for; or as if it were nothing

T 4,

worth

worth to them, that the blessed *Jefus* has fo liv'd and died for them, as to obtain the higheft Acceptance with God, and the higheft Power at his Right Hand, and then uſes this Intereſt for them. I perceive they who ſo think, would

Heb. 7. 25. never believe that *Jefus Chriſt* is able to ſave them to the utmoſt, for the Apoſtle's reaſon, viz. *Because he ever makes Interceſſion for them.*

As for your wild *Antinomian* Suggestions ſcatter'd up and down, about Chriſt's Suretyſhip, his being the *Reconciler of Angels*, who never offended, *as well as of Men*; your pretty Metaphors about being cloth'd in the *Garments of our elder Brother* (a bold word to uſe of Almighty God; for as Chriſt was *Man*, you'l not ſay but there are elder Brethren than he) your Talk of *Darning and Gobling, Rubbing and Scrubbing, Patching and Scouring, the filthy Rags of our beſt Righteouſneſs*, which the poor *Differents* have been jeer'd out of, by them of the Church, as nauſeous *Cant*; your aſſerting *all our beſt Performances to be Provocations*: Theſe and many more ſuch I can paſs over, and impute them to a Weakneſs, which might conſiſt with an *honeſt* Mind. But I cannot be ſo favourable to *other* Inſtances, which bear the Marks of *deſign'd Diſhoneſty*, when you inſinuate that the *Socinians* deny Hell-Torments, and uſe ſuch a way to prove it.

P. 45.

P. 28.

The *Racovian Catechiſm* and other Writings expreſſy own *eternal Punishments*; and Dr. *Stillingfleet* cites them, as aſſerting, that *God's Veracity is concern'd in the Execution of thoſe Threatnings on the Impenitent*. But you make your *Socinian* deny this, and charge him with believing *no Hell at all*; and to make out your Reproach, you moſt unrighteouſly have put the very Words of one of your *Trinitarians* upon the *Socinian*. So that ſhould ſuch Men as you (and Mr. *Edwards*) hereafter

hereafter happen to be credited, such things will pass for *Socinian* Sayings, which either none of them did say, or at most did no more say than the *Trinitarians* themselves. Almost whole Pages of Dr. *Tillotson's* Sermon on *Hell Torments*, you have clapt slyly upon your *Socinian*, as if 'twas originally from a *Socinian*; and he, in distinction from others, must be charg'd with it. I know not but some, both of one Party and the other, may indeed approve that Sermon, (and yet not at all deny *Hell-Torments*, which is your Inference only.) But is the *Socinian* therefore to be upbraided by a *Trinitarian*, with what Words were originally the *Trinitarian's* own; and with a Doctrine that they have so publickly contradicted, as well as their Adversaries?

Thus again you make your abus'd *Socinian* to say, *He can't think it lawful to preach the Gospel a-* P. 29.
gainst the Command of the Civil Government, without such a Commission as the Apostles had; when they are the words of a Trinitarian, at the Head of a Trinitarian Church. And tho I will not justify their Practice, who after they have settled their Judgments in that Persuasion of the Divine Unity, and have a fair Opportunity given them, do yet want the Zeal and Courage of a Christian, to confess with their Mouth what they believe in their Hearts, nay, dare practise contrary to their Faith; who, in Matters of Moment, and in which the Honour of Christianity is so highly concern'd, are for having their Faith to themselves, in a Sense the Apostle (tho speaking of minute Points only) Rom. 14.
never seems to have intended; which only means, we should not uncharitably urge our Opinions and little Practices on others, not that we should not own, or practise, nor impart our Faith to the World: Yet I may truly say this is no Socinian Principle, witness the severe Sufferings they

they have oft endur'd under *Trinitarians*, and sometimes at the *Stake*, which with great *Constancy* they have embrac'd, long since the *Reformation*. But how do you prove this to be a *Socinian* Tenet? Is it any other way than this, *viz.* because you find a *Trinitarian* professing it? And not liking it in him, you unrighteously father it on the *Socinian*, tho none *such* appears ever to have been of that Mind.

These are your *pious Frauds*: because you could not raise *Odium* enough from their own Writings, you pick up any odious thing even out of the Writings of their very Opposers, and then make your *Socinian* to speak it, and this without naming the Author from whom you took the Passage; (*Tillotson's Sermon on Josh. 24. 15.*) that it might look as if it were taken out of some *Unitarian* Tract which you pretend to be confuting. You might with the same *Honesty*, and from the same Authority, have told the World, that the *Socinians* own *three Persons in the one God*, and the *Supreme Deity of a derived Son*. This, Sir, may pass for your *Method with the Socinians*.

Whether you intended to slur that illustrious Archbishop (whose noble Parts, great Integrity, and sweet Temper render'd him one of the brightest Ornaments of the Church and Age) by telling the World he was a *Socinian*, tho himself wrote against them; or intended rather to load the *Socinians* with others Faults, it matters not: for either way 'tis such an unrighteous deliberate *Slander* of your Neighbour, such *false Witness* borne against him, that I hope for your own sake, you will not rely on Christ's Satisfaction for your Pardon without Repentance. I find indeed you profess not to *stand or fall by your Sincerity at the Great Day*. But whatever this Error may be in Speculation, I beseech you let's have no more *prac-*

tical Instances of renouncing *Sincerity*, because the World generally has some *Kindness* left still for that *Virtue*.

And I think this is enough to sink the Credit of any reproachful Stories which you don't vouch by others. This would lead me to reply, in the next place, to your angry Reproaches and Censures of the *Unitarians*: which I might attempt, by inquiring whether to be like the *Mahometans* or *Jews*, in their Belief of the *Unity of God*; or like to *Pagans*, in their multiplicity of *Divine Persons*, be most criminal? Whether you do well in representing the *Socinian*, as being at a greater distance from the rest of the Christian Church, than the *Mahometans*? While these deny the *Apostles Creed* in the very Letter, deny that Christ is the *Son of God*, on which the *Socinians* build their strongest Arguments; deny that ever Christ was crucify'd, dead or bury'd, and that ever he rose from the Dead; who supersede his *Laws* (in subjection to which the very Essence of a *Christian* lies, more than in right Systems of Faith) and receive another *Rule*, another *Lord*, another and a carnal *Hope*; whereas the *Unitarians* agree with other Christians in all these and many other great Points.

As to your Rarity of the Address to the *Morocco* Ambassador, I see not what it amounts to, more than a Complaint of the Corruption of the Christian Faith in the Article of one God, which the *Mahometans* have kept by Consent of all Sides. Yet forasmuch as I can learn nothing from any *Unitarians* of any such Address from them, nor do you produce any Subscribers Names, I conclude no such Address was ever made by any *deputed* from them, whatever any single Person might do: I suppose you conclude from the Matter of it, that it must be from some *Unitarian*, and perhaps so; yet you may remember, that

so you concluded from the Matter of Dr. Tillotson's Sermons, that they were a *Socinian's*. Again,

Can you justify your Rashness in saying, that *Unitarians* are not *Christians*? when to be a Christian, is to own the Authority and receive the Doctrine of Christ, according to their best Judgment (which one would think, a Charity as little as yours, might readily grant they do, who in their Belief go against all temporal Motives, and bear the heavy Wrath of their Persecutors.) Do they not worship the God of *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*? the same God that the Apostles worship'd, *who bow'd their Knees to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*. Nay, don't they worship the same God that our Lord *Christ* himself, our great Pattern, worship'd? And are they not *Christians* in their Worship, who worship as *Christ himself* did? I pray who are Christians, if not these? Did he not say, *my God and yours*? q. d. You must have and own the same God with me; or, you and I have the same Object of our Faith and Joy. Do you pretend to shew that ever Jesus Christ worship'd a *Son* or *Holy Ghost*? Shew it, and they will imitate him. In the mean time, if having just the same God and Object of Supreme Worship as the Man *Christ Jesus* had, must make them *not Christians*, they envy not any who claim the Name of the *only Christians*, upon the contrary Ground.

Eph. 3. 14.

John 20.
17.

Again, Whether the *Unitarians* ever said, *Paganism is preferable to the Christian Doctrine*, as you assert in your *Preface*; and 'twill concern you to shew, that you make some Conscience of what you write, by making that heavy Charge good; if you cannot do it, I shall henceforth have no great Opinion of such *Monopolizers* of Christianity: I know they may have said, that the Doctrine of the *Trinity of real Persons* or Minds in the God-

Godhead, is like the *Pagan Plurality* of Gods; and I think you have shown something like it, in producing the Testimony of *Heathens* to a Trinity. But as this is not *Paganism* in general, only in one Article; neither is this *preferring Paganism* to Christianity in this very one Point; nor is it to *Christianity*, but to what they deem corrupt Impositions, that they liken *Paganism* in this Point; and yet they count such Trinitarians to be Christians, because they have the *same Rule* of Christ's Word, with themselves: and tho they judge them very much mistaken in these Points, yet they think they may hold Inconsistencies, and hope the right part of the Inconsistency prevails in their Practice and Worship of one *Eternal He*, &c. if they act but sincerely, according to the best of their Understandings, and really believe what they profess.

And I must tell you, that the so grievous Charge of *Paganism* and *Tritheism* upon *Trinitarians*, is own'd and made good by other hands than the *Socinians*. Some *Trinitarians* themselves have ingenuously own'd, that 'tis *Paganism* which some Dignitaries of the Church have maintain'd under their Doctrine of a *Trinity of Persons* (*Charge of Tritheism* against Dr. *Sherlock*) and yet there are not a few of that same Opinion, tho neither *Dis-senters*, nor the Church ever spew'd out any for this *Pagan Tritheism*; but the former have courted the Men of *three infinite Minds*, at the same time that they were violent against an *Unitarian*. So that *Pagan Tritheism* is not so strange a thing among them, who live and thrive either upon the *Indulgence*, or the *Establishment*, even in the Judgment of more wary *Trinitarians* themselves. And tho Dr. *Sherlock* thought they made *Nonsense* of their Creed, who did not hold the *three infinite Minds*; so that either they must be as much *Pagans*

gans as he, or not Trinitarians: yet I shall not now examine that, only desire that *Socinians* alone may not be blam'd for charging the Trinity of *some* with Paganism, and that it may not be taken worse at their hands than at others.

This will lead me naturally to enquire next, what Force there is in your Réproach of the *Unitarians* with their Differences among themselves, and what reason you have to boast of the sweet Harmony of the *Trinitarians*. I know not one Sect of Christians who have not some Differences among themselves. The *Unitarians* are some of them *Arians*, and some *Socinians*, in their Judgment concerning *Jesus Christ*; yet that hinders not their making the same Account of his present Dignity, whatever Beginning they attribute to him. All of 'em agree as unanimously in the *Negative*, what he is not, as *Lutherans* and *Calvinists* agree against *Popery*: and tho' they have spoken, I think confusedly, about Christ's *Divine* Worship; yet I am satisfy'd, *Socinus* himself, who was zealous for it, did not mean, that *Supreme* Worship was to be paid him as a distinct Person from the Father in him. See a late *Vindication of the Worship of Christ on Unitarian Principles*. But are not the *Trinitarians* in a much worse Case here? for surely a more notorious Untruth never dropt from your Pen, than what you conclude with, That *there are no Doctrines in which all Christian Churches are so much united as in the Trinity, Incarnation, and Satisfaction of Christ*. I am astonish'd at such Confidence! Are not all Christians as much agreed in the Doctrines of Christ's *Crucifixion, Resurrection, and Ascension*, in the Doctrines of his coming to *judge the World*, and that of *Eternal Life*, as they are in the Trinity and Incarnation? From the time Men pretended

tended to fettle their Creeds in *these* Points; I say, from *thenceforth* they had nothing but Wars, and to this day the *East* remain divided from the *West* on the point of the personal Union. And the *Nestorians* (who are granted to be of the same Mind with the *Socinians* or *Photinians*, by so many Trinitarians; see the *Examination of the Bishop of Sarum's Exposition of the 2d Article*) are said to be more numerous than all the Protestant Churches. The *Greek* remains divided from the *Western* Church upon the point of the *third Person's* proceeding from *Father* and *Son*: and they are anathematiz'd in the *Athanasian* Creed, in as much as they deny the Holy Spirit to proceed from the Son at all, by any *Eternal Procession*. See *Smith's State of the Greek Church*; and *Seller's Remarks on Athanasius*.

Among them of our *Two British established Churches*, how many sorts of Trinities have been observ'd? Let's see in one of them what sweet Harmony there is between *Dr. South's*, and *Dr. Sherlock's* Trinity. There are numerous Followers of both Schemes, and they own one another for *Christians*, so far forth, as little as any foreign *Socinians* will own some *English Unitarians*. Is this your Agreement, which you *adore God's Providence* for, when there is no Agreement, whether it be *one God*, or *Three*? or whether the three Persons be *three infinite Minds* (*i. e.* Gods) or *three Modes*? Each side has own'd the *Unitarians* to be more in the right than the other: One side says the three *Modes* is *Nonsense* as *we-as Heresy*; the other side says, they again are *Pagan Tritheists*: see *Preface to Life of Valent. Gentilis*. So that if one go to one Church, he'll join with a *nonsensical Heretick*, says one; if to another, he joins with a *Pagan Tritheist*, says the other. 'Tis not Words and Terms, but Sense
and

and Conception that is a Man's Faith : so that unless there be the same Meaning, as well as the same Terms, there is not the same Faith, tho they all profess a *Trinity* of Words. Different Explications make so many different *Creeds*; and if the Trinity be reveal'd in Scripture so plainly, then I pray tell us which Trinity is so: for 'tis so plain it seems, that one Party says 'tis not the Tritheists Trinity of three Minds; and the other says, 'tis not their Trinity of three Modes, that the Scripture reveals: and the *Unitarians* are so complaisant as to take both their Words; and yet each side is angry that they will not come over to their Party. If it be a *fundamental* Point, then one Party *errs fundamentally*, since they are so contrary to each other in their *Sense*, which you own is *the Faith*: so that there is no escaping Heresy at this rate. First, try to convert your *Brethren in Terms*, and then the *Unitarians* will not be distracted in their Choice what side to take. And in such a woful distracted Case (where no publick Decision could be gain'd, tho some have cry'd out for help till almost *hoarse*) were you over-wise to set up such a vain Boast of your Unity about the *Trinity*? If this be the Article in which Christians great Unity is to be boasted of, and the World call'd to *behold and see* their blessed Harmony herein, you did ill to tell it: but I know 'tis otherwise.

Then comes the *Catholick Church in all Ages* for your Opinion: this carries a brave Sound with it, and all Sides adorn their Discourses with this Flourish. It serves *Papists* and *Protestants*, *Greek* and *Latin*, Dr. *South* and *Sherlock*, and none more justly than the Deniers of the *Son's eternal Personality*, and his *Equality to the Father*, if you'll credit even their violent Adversary Mr. *Jurieu* (as far as concerns the most *primitive* Church-Writers,

or *Ante-Nicenes*) who fully demonstrates, that they expressly deny'd those two great Points, till After-Ages mended their Faith. This great and common Boast of the *Catholick Church*, tempts one to put the Question, once ask'd our Saviour, concerning the Woman that had seven Husbands, *Whose shall she be, for they all had her?* The *Catholick Church in all Ages* never agreed in any thing, if this be the chief Instance of their Agreement: I am sure they never agreed since these Controversies begun, tho' Violence and Art have not been wanting to make 'em unite. But here is the *Craft* on't, Men mean that those of their own Opinion only are *Catholicks*, and then all *Catholicks* be sure are of their Opinion: they have as narrow a Notion of *Catholick Church* as the *Papists* have. All the great *Arian* Councils, and *Arian* Writers, and numerous *Nestorian* Churches, and the *Age* when the whole Christian World was *Arian*, &c. must be thrown by as none of the *Catholick Church*; and then be sure the *Catholick Church* (*viz.* of the *Athanasians*) is against the *Unitarians*: as tho' any Party cannot make the like Sport with their *Catholick Church*; for I find it is a very uncertain thing, and that every side has their *several* *Catholick Church* when it comes to be examined. And how can it be otherwise? since I have seen with my own Eyes (saith the admirable *Chillingworth*) Councils against Councils, some *Fathers* against others, nay against themselves, the *Church* and *Consent* of one *Age* against the *Church* of another. Just as if the *Votaries* of *Episcopacy* and *Presbytery* should boast, the one, that the *Church* of *Great-Britain* is *Episcopal*, the other, that 'tis *Presbyterian*; when the truth is, 'tis partly one, partly t'other; one of the two *Semi-national* Churches being of one sort,

Let. Past.
Vol. 3.
Let. 6.

the other of the other sort. I am enough *Catholick* if I agree but with Christ and his *Apostles*; they were *Orthodox*, but warn'd us of a general *Apostacy*, and *Antichristian* Degeneracy coming in apace, and like to last long. Which Side are of that *Apostacy*, and which are *Catholicks*, is to be try'd by the Scripture, rationally and consistently to be understood. *Heresies must be*, and it is not meant, that it should be only among the fewest or *undermost*, as the People are made to believe.

In short, a Man may venture to talk big of the *Catholick* Universal Church's Consent, but then it should be only in the *Pulpit* (which is the safest place I know of to speak in, where none may contradict him;) but you are too bold to venture it from the *Press* at this time a day, when the State of the Christian World is too well understood, for Men to be cheated with Pretences to the *Catholick Church of all Ages*, on any one side.

You insinuate, that the *Unitarians* should not be tolerated, and cry out, *Yet there is no Prosecution*; when at the same time you know of an Instance of Severity towards him, whom you pretend to be their Preacher, tho' with many false Circumstances. You say, *He was spew'd out even by the Presbyterians*: as if he were the worse *Unitarian* for what he has suffer'd for his Principle, viz. for denying that God Almighty had ever a Father, or was any one's Son; or as if it was such a Wonder to be spew'd out by the *Presbyterians*. Don't you think they have as weak a Stomach as others, and that they have as *spewing* Principles in their Catechism, of tolerating no false Religion? Would you like your *Jure Divino* *Episcopacy* ever the worse, if any had been so unmannerly as to tell you, that it had been spew'd out,

out, even by the *Presbyterians*, in a Country you have heard of?

You say the *Arian Persecutions* witness, that the *Unitarians* would persecute when in their power; I see you can prove the *Unitarians* are no *upstart Sect* when you please, since you charge them with Crimes done 1300 Years ago. I own the *Arians* were guilty of *Unchristian Practices* of this kind, even tho History should be thought to have aggravated Matters. But must none be tolerated whose Opinions have been receiv'd by some Persecutors? What will you then say for your Party? Besides, who was it taught the *Arians* to persecute? Whatever *Athanasius* pretends, 'tis certain, the *First Severity used by Christians against one-another*, was in the banishing *Arius* and his Followers, says the *Preface to Lactan. Lives of Persecut.* 'Twas by an Edict made *Capital*, so much as to keep an *Arian Book*; than which I know not of a more cruel Edict by *Lewis XIV.* I know no *Unitarian* however but abhors that *Unchristian Retaliation*; for I truly think no better of a *Christian Persecutor* than I do of a *Christian Thief*, or *Christian Murderer*.

It is the inviolable unalienable Right of a reasonable Being to worship and profess, according to his Conscience, so long as nothing is done to the Injury of the Commonwealth in its proper Concernments. Have not the *Unitarians* a God and a Conscience, and an awful Eternity to be concern'd for? Would you have them abandon all publick Worship of God, or join in what they judge corrupt? Shall they thrust in upon those who reject 'em (like you) as no *Christians*, and solemnly pronounce them *everlastingly damn'd*? Must they be thrust out of the Churches, and yet not admitted to assemble themselves? Or shall they be provoked and arraigned of monstrous

Heresies, and yet not have liberty to defend themselves? Is any thing more *mean* and pitiful than for a Man to write against them with that licentious Strain that you have done, and then to exclaim against suffering *their* Books to appear in their own Defence, as if you were conscious of your very great need of such a Refuge?

I am sorry the Nakedness of Christians should be thus expos'd: but as 'tis not possible to be hid, so if one side will run down the other, and allow them no quarter, but defame, and persecute, and damn, it must be expected they will retort Arguments in their own Defence. I wish indeed more healing Methods were taken, than by enlarging *Creeds*, and contracting Charity; but I shall never expect Good from any who have not an high Esteem for those two *cardinal* Virtues, *Sincerity* and *Moderation*.

Luke 6. 22. *Blessed are ye when Men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their Company, and shall reproach you, and cast out your Name as evil, for the Son of Man's Sake. Rejoice in that Day, &c.*





A

L E T T E R

To the Reverend


Dr. *W I L L I S,*

Dean of L I N C O L N ;

B E I N G

Some Friendly Remarks on his Sermon
before the *Honourable House of Commons,*
November 5. 1705.





*A Letter to the Reverend
Dr. WILLIS, Dean of Lin-
coln, &c.*

Reverend S I R,



THE great and just Reputation you had gained for Charity and good Temper, by your late healing Sermon before Her Majesty, when you declared against *Judah's* vexing *Ephraim*, made it very unlikely that you shou'd so soon be reflected on for a deficiency in your Principles of Charity, in reference to Persecution for Matters of bare Religion.

Yet whether thro Inadvertency, or otherwise, there is something in your late Sermon before the Honourable *House of Commons*, that seems to have an unpleasant Aspect upon the Principles of true *Christian Liberty*; and the rather, because asserted before so many concerned in the *Legislature*, where its Influence may be most prejudicial, if not prevented.

I profess sincerely, I am an utter Abhorrer of *Popery*, and *French Tyranny*, and very much so, because of the persecuting Principles and Practices

that are to be found under them ; but I am a Patron of Liberty, at least an Advocate for it, and would fain have *Protestant* Churches pure from this frightful Deformity of the *Romish*.

The Fault I find with you, in short, is this, That when you come to justify the Penal Laws against the Papists, which you say are *many and severe*, you ground the Justice of 'em (and that in the first place) upon their Idolatrous Worship, and the Severity required by God against Idolaters among the *Jews*. You had very good Reasons, without this, by which to justify those Laws, upon a Political Ground, which you mention afterwards, *viz.* as they are against the Subjects of a Foreign Prince, who is our open and bitter Enemy, and who are bent upon the utter Extirpation of *Protestants*, where they can prevail: But you chuse to use an Argument which insinuates, that the *Legislators* of the Nation did not go purely on a Political Ground, or on Principles of Self-preservation, in enacting such severe Laws against them, but that they designed to afflict and vex them for their Religious Worship it self; which seems too much to confirm the Justice of their Complaints of our Cruelty, in persecuting them, which you pretend to silence.

I will entreat you to consider, whether these following Remarks be not just.

First, I think you are not consistent with your self in your former Sermon ; there you say *Judah* shou'd not vex *Ephraim*, *i. e.* the Tribes that separated, *to go to their Groves, or High Places* (and also to their *Calves*, for they went to *Dan* and *Bethel*.) You tell us, that suppose *Ephraim* will not be reclaimed, yet there shou'd not be *so much as any Attempts towards Persecution*. And now of a sudden, you tell us *Ephraim's* Idolatry

is unsufferable, and the Exercise of Religion ought to be prohibited those, whom you compare to the Idolatrous Tribes, and this merely for their Idolatrous Worship. If this be true, then you ought to have said formerly, That *Judah* ought to vex *Ephraim* grievously. And why were those to be such happy Days, when this Union shou'd be between *Ephraim* and *Judah*, if it were best when Violence and Severity was practis'd? This is backward and forward, and there appears no happy Union at least between the two Sermons, I wish the first may obtain.

Secondly, You ground your Argument on a weak Bottom, when you justify the Punishment of *Papists* with severe Laws, by the Precedents of Severity under the *Jewish* Dispensation.

1. You know God bore with that hard-hearted People in many things, and humoured their Frowardness; nay, he directed 'em to some Severities, which *Christianity* will not allow. A Disciple of Christ may not act with the Spirit of *Elias*: *Ye know not what Spirit ye are of.* Here Luke 9.55. your own Comment is, *You are now under a new Institution, which allows of no such fierce and cruel Proceedings; my Gospel is a Gospel of Peace, if Men will not receive it, the greatest harm is to themselves, and you have more reason to pity, than to be angry with them.*

2. Shew me where the *Judicial* Laws of the *Jews*, and that in particular of punishing Idolaters, are enjoined any Christian State; or where else there is that Political Reason for punishing Idolatry, as among them, who were a *Theocracy*, which by Idolatry was subverted, as by High-Treason, against the Ruler and Constitution of that State. But there is no such Influence on the

the State of *England*, in Image-Worship, or in the Adoration of the Host, &c.

3. The Calves of *Dan* and *Bethel* might be taken away, without severe Laws against the Lives, Liberties, or Estates of the People. 'Twas a mere Artifice of the Rulers, to keep up that Worship, that the Subjects might not revolt, and unite again with the Kingdom of *Judah*; hence 'tis so oft called the Sin of *Jeroboam*, who made Israel to sin. So that the Kings of *Israel* were justly reprov'd for it, since they need'd but have taken away the *Calves*, and discountenanced the Business, and no longer have made the People to sin, and the Work had been done without violence; where only Policy, not Conscience that I can find, was at the Bottom, or rather it was kept up by Authority.

4. Where any grievous Severity was enacted by the *Jewish* Law, against Idolaters, as *Deut.* 13. it was against such as went off knowingly from the express Letter of the Law, and so did directly cast off the Authority of God in that matter, by taking another Object of their Homage; not against any who differed only in the Interpretation and Sense of the Law, which they still revered, as in the Case of *Papists*, in relation to the Worship of the Host. And indeed the ten Tribes being so often warn'd of God concerning their Idolatry, seem'd directly to oppose God in continuing that Service. Now, there is a vast difference between these two Cases, between opposing God's Will directly, and mistaking or misunderstanding it.

The *Jewish* Law then it self was not so severe as this, to punish any with sore Afflictions, or Temporal Ruin, for a wrong Worship, which arose thro mere misunderstanding the Text. So that I see not how the Examples of Severity
against

against Idolaters under the Law, can justify any Persecution of those, that thro Ignorance do conscientiously dissent from each other about the Sense of the Rule, while both sides receive it (as they judge) rightly. Let Christians be no crueller than the *Jewish* Law it self required that hard-hearted People to be towards Idolaters, and there wou'd not be the Hundredth Part of that Persecution which there is among Christians: And 'tis a little strange, that our *Protestant* Clemency and Mercy shou'd not so much as equal that of the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*, which I doubt wou'd be found true upon your Principle, that Severities are to be used against the *Papists*, at least may be justify'd, on the pure score of their mistaken Idolatrous Worship.

5. I doubt this Principle wou'd set the *Church* and *Dissenters* together by the ears. The *Dissenters* are many of 'em so rigid, to my knowledge, as to accuse the *Church of England* of Idolatry, in kneeling before the Bread and Wine at the Sacrament; hence they would use your Principle against you, were they able, and make severe Laws against you, because they say your *Idolatrous Worship is dishonourable to God, and so not fit to be publickly suffered by any that believe it so to be*. They can upon Occasion, improve such an Argument to such a purpose as Persecution, as well as most Men.

On the *other hand*, if God's Reproof of the Kings of *Israel* for not taking away the Idolatry of the *Calves*, will justify Severity against Christian Idolaters, tho thro Ignorance and Mistake they are such; then I doubt his Reproof of ^{2 Chron.} the Kings of *Judah*, for not taking away the High ^{20. 33.} Places, (where some went to worship the true God, besides the Rule or Constitution of the *Jewish*

Jewish Church, which required Sacrifices to be only at *Jerusalem's* Temple) will also justify our Severity against such as do but equal this Fault; and where shall Persecution stop at this rate? Once open the Sluice to give a little entrance to the *Waters of Strife*, and the Inundation will soon be universal; either let all sides persecute, or no side, for Matters of mere Religion.

Thirdly, I doubt, that upon this Principle, you will justify and harden the *Papists* in their Persecution of *Protestants*. You are pleased to say, that tho' your Principle will justify you to prohibit the Exercise of their Religion, yet the *Papists* cannot so much as pretend Reason to prohibit you the Exercise of yours on that Ground; But do you think to escape so? Will not your Argument, from God's requiring the *Jews* to suppress *Idolatry*, give the *Papists* as fair an Handle to persecute *Protestants*, if not for *Idolatry*, yet for something else?

You know that by the *Jewish* Law, the Blasphemer, as well as Idolater, was to be stoned; and cannot the *Papists* pretend Reason to murder *Protestants* on this Ground, when once they have convicted you of Blasphemy against *Jesus Christ*, in calling him a poor Wafer, and treating his *real* Body (as say they, who will be Judges in the Case) with Contempt? And have they not the same Argument to offer, as you offer for persecuting them as *Idolaters*, in conformity to the Spirit of the *Law*? Tho' as I have said, all Persecution of well-meaning *Christians* is greater Barbarity than that very Law required, or warranted the cruel *Jews* themselves to exercise.

Will not your Contempt of the Images of God and Christ, &c. be interpreted a blasphemous Contempt of God in Effigy? And then try if you can protect your self against the Argument

you

you urge, from the Duty of the Kings of *Israel* in the Case: And I see not but the *French King* acts every whit as rationally in his Persecution of *Protestants* for being such, as *Protestants* in persecuting *Papists* upon the account of mere Religion, according to your Argument.

And thus you have laid a Ground (tho I confess 'tis not new) for Persecution to go round the World; which is profitable for none that I know of, but the *Hangman* and the *Jaylor*, who are always on the Orthodox side, and infallible Judges of Controversy, tho the *Pope* has as good a pretence for it as they.


I beseech you, Sir, reflect and judge, if you have done Justice to the meek and calm Religion of the holy and harmless *Jesus*, that aims at the hurt of no Man, especially not at his ruin, who observes it the best he can, tho he shou'd mistake.

Consider, whether you have done Justice to the *Legislators* of our Land, in making 'em to act upon so dangerous a Foundation; and whether if you had omitted your first *Reason* for our severe Laws against the *Papists*, you had not done more Honour to her Majesty, to the Nobility, and Commons of the Land, by making a more evident distinction between their Proceedings against the treacherous *Papists* here, and the *French King's* Proceedings against the Loyal *Protestants* of his own Kingdom. So you had silenced the Objections, you mention, from the *Papists*, and so you had left the Principles of Christian Liberty on a firm *Basis*, which I doubt are greatly narrowed by your Assertions: and thus you had better agreed with your self, and had given less Encouragement for *Ephraim* to envy *Judah*, or *Judah* to vex *Ephraim*.

To conclude, tho' some may, to cast an *Odium* upon this Attempt, call me herein a Friend to *Popery*, yet I declare solemnly, that I wish it were utterly extinguished in the World, but not by Violence and Persecution, *not by Sword nor Bow, but by the Spirit of the Lord*, by sober, rational and Christian Methods; else 'tis better the *Tares* shou'd be suffered to grow up with the *Wheat* till the Harvest, than that by plucking up the *Tares*, the *Wheat* shou'd in its turn be hurt too. *Lupus persequitur Oves, non Ovis Lupum.* Chrysoft.

I am, S I R,

Your very Humble Servant.





A FULL
I N Q U I R Y
I N T O T H E
Original Authority

O F

That T E X T, 1 JOHN V. 7. *There are
Three that bear Record in Heaven, &c.*

Containing an Account of Dr. Mill's Evi-
dences from Antiquity, for and against its
being Genuine. With an *Examination*
of his Judgment thereupon.

Humbly *address'd* to Both Houses of *Convocation*
now assembled.

With a Postscript in answer to the Excuses offer'd
to take off the Force of this *Address*.

Jerem. xxiii. 28. *He that hath my Word, let him speak my Word
faithfully : what is the Chaff to the Wheat ? saith the Lord.*



To the Most Reverend

W I L L I A M

Lord ABp of *Canterbury*,


P R E S I D E N T ;

And the Right Reverend the
B I S H O P S of the same Pro-
vince, his Grace's Suffra-
gans ;

And to the Reverend the C L E R G Y
of the Lower House of *Convocation*
now assembled ;

This *Inquiry* is Humbly Presented and Sub-
mitted, by

The A U T H O R.



*Some Considerations on that
Long-doubted Text, 1 John
C. 5. V. 7.*



IS possible the laborious Inquiries of many Learned *Criticks*, who, with great Diligence and Accuracy, have sifted and scann'd the *Classick* Authors, some of 'em of no great moment; may be esteem'd by others only as the ingenious Diversions of a dextrous and sagacious Mind: since, when they have presented their Authors a-new, with their Emendations and Corrections, in restoring their old, or giving 'em new Beauties; 'tis oft of so little Use or Consequence to the World, that 'tis well if their painful Studies escape the Censure of being a laborious Loss of Time.

But when learned and judicious Men do, with Seriousness and humble Reverence, apply their Industry and Sagacity to examine the far more important Writings that are to guide us in the way of Salvation; when they shall discover the Interpolations and Additions, the Errors or Defects, which *these*, as well as other Writings, by oft transcribing, may in so long a Tract of

X

Time

Time have been liable to ; when, by diligent comparing antient Manuscripts and Versions, and the frequent Citations of the *Text* in the primitive Christian Writers, they become able to inform us certainly what is *original* and genuine, and what not, in any part of the Bible, more especially where some matter of great moment is concern'd ; their learned Industry is then sure to be well employ'd, and will be recompens'd not only with the Applauses of the Curious, but the Thanks, and which is more, the real Edification and Satisfaction of the serious Inquirers after Truth ; who greatly desire to know what God would have 'em believe and do ; to have the *Chaff* separated from the *Wheat*, and the τὸ ἀλόγον γάλα, the *sincere* unadulterated *Milk* of the Word, for their spiritual Growth.

The peculiar Veneration due to the Sacred Writings, requires us to keep that precious *Depositum* as pure as possible, and free from all human spurious Additions. Why then should the learned Criticks exhaust all their Learning, Reading, and discerning Skill, upon the Trifles of a witty or wanton *Poet*, or a fabulous and remote *Historian* ; and wholly neglect to make as severe an Inquiry into the Holy Scripture, in which are the Words of eternal Life ; in order to discover what is the genuine Text, among the various Readings of different Copies ; that we may build our Faith upon it, with the greatest Certainty we can attain to ?

I know, a late ingenious Author of the *Difficulties and Discouragements which attend the Study of the Scriptures*, has pointed at the worldly Discouragements, which, he judges, have tempted our cautious Criticks to turn their Studies another way. I wish him Success in his Address

to have these Hindrances remov'd; that it may be as safe, where'tis more important, to do Justice to the Writings of the Apostles, as of any other Author.

The very Learned and Judicious Dr. *Mill* has done much for one Man, in his celebrated Labours on the New Testament; which, whatever may be wanting, will long stand, as a lasting Monument of his praise-worthy Zeal and well-employed Abilities. A *Specimen* of what he has done upon one single *Verse* I am now to produce: And if upon a full and impartial Consideration it shall appear to your unbiass'd Judgments, that there is abundant Evidence of a spurious Addition; may I not justly hope that the Rulers and Guides of the Church, who can better judge of such Evidences than the Unlearned can, will yield their conscientious Compliance, and not render such commendable Inquiries fruitless, by refusing to receive the Truth, and to rectify our Books, when the true Reading is found? Else to what purpose do Men inquire how it was *in the beginning*, if we resolve not to return to it? or to search after the right, if we will still adhere to what is wrong, and will rather maintain Custom than Truth?

This is what I shall have some right to insist upon, and for the sake of Truth to press upon your Lordships and the Clergy; when I shall have made it appear, from his *Dissertation* on 1 *John* 5. 7. that the Doctor himself has overthrown the Credit of *that* Text, by the Evidence he has given that it is not original and genuine, tho he has not acknowledg'd himself overcome by it.

In order to manifest this, I shall,

I. In the first place (for the sake of others, who need more information) lay down the Sum

of that Evidence which the Doctor has produc'd, to shew that these Words in the seventh Verse, *There are Three that bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit; and these Three are One*: or rather these Words in the seventh Verse, *In Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit; and these Three are One*: And (ver. 8.) *there are Three that bear witness in Earth*: were not in the original Text, but have been added in later times without just Authority.

II. I shall put down what he had to offer on the other side, for establishing the Authority of these Words, and upon which he has determin'd in favour of their being original and genuine.

III. I shall shew the Weakness of those Arguments by which he endeavours to support the Authority of this Text: that so it may be judg'd whether he had just Reason to make such a Determination, or we to abide by it.

I. I must lay down the Evidences produced against the Authority of *this Text*, as not having been originally in St. *John's* Epistle. Only let me *first* observe, that the Text it self, and Context, have no *internal* Evidence, to persuade us that the Words are genuine: for as these Words themselves are not to be match'd with any in the whole Bible, so the Context is compleat without 'em, and rather more smooth and easy. The *three* following Witnesses having been already distinctly spoken of, it was very natural to sum 'em up in one Conclusion; *There are Three that bear witness, the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood*. But the other *three* Witnesses had not been mention'd, to give occasion for the like to be said of them.

Nor was it likely the *Spirit* should be produc'd as another Witness *on Earth*, if it had been num-
bred

bred before among the Witnesses in Heaven. The Spirit was no more an Inhabitant of the Earth, than the Father and Word were; who also operated and gave their Testimony, not in Heaven, but on Earth. Nay, the Word Incarnate was more properly an Inhabitant of the Earth than the Spirit, and yet is not reckoned among the Witnesses on Earth. Is it likely the Spirit should be made twice a Witness in the matter, and so give two Testimonies for one of the Father and Word?

But since the Doctor's Inquiry was only after external Evidence from Authorities and Testimony, it shall be my present business to examine them.

And here it must be own'd, that Dr. Mill has done Justice; so that very little more can be said in the case. 'Tis a Subject which had been long and often examin'd, with Niceness, from the beginning of the Reformation, and very much illustrated by the great Sagacity of the late Learned and Laborious Critick, Father Simon, in his *Critical History of the New Testament*, Chap. 18. Dr. Mill's business was, not so much to search for Evidences, as to collect, with no small pains, what had been offer'd; and to present it in one view, and in good order.

These Evidences are taken, (1.) From antient Greek Manuscript Copies. (2.) The antient Versions. (3.) The Writings of the antient Christian Fathers. And indeed whither should we go to learn what was in the Apostles Writings, but to the oldest Copies of those Writings (which are lost or consum'd themselves) and the oldest Versions made from them, and to the old Christian Writers who have transcrib'd very much of them into their own Books?

(1.) Let us hear how many antient Manuscript Greek Copies are without this Text. The Doctor tells us, in his *Notes* on the Words, That 'tis certain all these Words, *in Heaven, the Father, Word, and Holy Spirit; and these Three are One: and there are Three that bear witness in Earth:* are wanting in most Copies. Then he enumerates them particularly, in his *Dissertation upon this Subject*; beginning with our famous *Alexandrian Copy*, which elsewhere he calls *Ingens The-saurus Orientalis*, and the most precious Treasure the Christian World ever saw for these twelve hundred Years, and by far the most antient Copy in the World, which most exactly expresses the Original.

Next comes the famous *Vatican Copy*, which he extols much after the same manner, as of very great Credit, and above twelve hundred Years old; by which, according to Pope *Leo's* Order, the *Complutensian* Edition was to be made. 'Tis enough to shake the Credit of this Text with all impartial Men, that 'tis wanting in these *two*, the most valuable and antient Copies we know of in the World. Yet besides this, the Doctor gives a long Roll of the other very valuable Manuscript *Greek Copies*, in the most famous Libraries of the Learned, and of our two Universities, and of the *French King* (where *Father Simon* made a diligent Search, and says, he found not one that had *these* Words, of all the seven which he view'd, nor of the five Manuscripts of *Mr. Colbert*, tho some of these be of later date) also *two* at *Basil*, one at *Venice*, and many more. All these want *this* Text, tho in some of the later Manuscripts there are in the Margin short Notes, by way of Gloss or Comment, over against *the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood*; applying *these* to the *Father, Word, and Spirit*, according to an antient mystical Interpretation,

Proleg.
p. 143,
144.

P. 108.

Crit. Hist.
ch. 18.

tation, of which hereafter. And from the Margin, Father *Simon* judges *these Words* did afterwards slide into the Text, which are in our *seventh Verse*. Which is a very natural and easy Account, and the only way by which Dr. *Mill* himself accounts for so many other Interpolations, in his Notes, and his *Prolegomena*.

And whereas Dr. *Mill* once thought *Robert Stephens* had found the *Words* in *eight Manuscripts* (because of *fifteen Copies* which he had, he mentions but *seven* as wanting this Verse; whence the Doctor slipt into the common Mistake, and took it for granted that the other *eight* had it) he found upon Examination that those *eight Copies* of *Stephens* had not *St. John's Epistle* in them: so that all which had the *Epistle*, want-
Proleg.
p. 117.

To these of Dr. *Mill*, the Learned Dr. *Kuster* adds one Authority more, from the *Codex Seidelianus*, brought out of *Greece*, and about 700 Years old*. So that I think I may say, in one word, all the *Greek Manuscripts*, which are found, do agree in rejecting the Text under Consideration.

(2.) He considers the antient *Versions* of the New Testament. These were made for the Use of such People, as in early Times were converted to the Christian Religion, but did not understand the *Greek Language*, in which the New Testament was written; for their Benefit it was translated into their own Language. The most antient of these *Versions* were the *Syriack*, *Coptick*, *Ethiopick*, *Arabick*, *Latin*; all which, with the *Russian*, have not the Text: so that when these

* In his Edition of Dr. Mill's Test. Rotterdam 1719. which is what I make use of.

Versions were made, there was no such Passage in the *Greek Copies* or Original, whence they were made. Of the *Latin Version* the Doctor says *, 'Tis certain this Verse was wanting in all the most antient *Latin Copies*, except some in *Africa*, in *Tertullian's* and *Cyprian's* time, &c. Which Exception is a mere Supposition grounded on his Mistake (as I shall shew) that *Tertullian*, and especially *Cyprian*, had cited these Words in their Books.

P. 141. The antient *Italick Version*, he says, was made near to the *Apostles* time, from the best Copies. Of P. 152. the *Coptick*, that it was from one of the best and P. 128. earliest. Of the *Syriack*, that the Learned agree it was made in the very next Age to the *Apostles*. He tells us moreover, that even the *Latin Manuscripts* at *Basil*, *Zurich*, *Strasbourg* (800 or 900 Years old) and two others, *Duo Donatiani*, want these Words: That the Words however are inserted in the bottom of the Page in one, by another Hand; and in the Margin, by the same Hand, in another.

Father *Simon* observes, that in these later Copies of *St. Jerom's Bible*, where these marginal Notes are found, the Order of the Words, and the *three Witnesses* are various and diverse; which he takes to be a good Proof that they were not in the first Copies: who adds also one very old Crit. Hist. *French Version*, of a thousand Years, which has *ib.* not the Words.

I need but mention the first Editions of the *New Testament*, corrected by the Manuscript Copies, about the beginning of the Reformation; viz. by *Erasmus*, *Aldus*, *Colinaus*, printed in di-

* Certum est hunc Versiculum abfuisse è vetustissimis Cod. Latinis omnibus, præter Africanos quosdam, &c. p. 140.

vers places, which he owns had not *this Verse*; nor the Versions of *Luther*; because these are of no Authority beyond the Manuscript Copies by which they might be directed: which, it appears, did then want *this Verse*, otherwise they durst not have left it out, in prejudice to a receiv'd Opinion of the Church, and in contradiction to the *vulgar Versions* at that time.

(3.) He examines the Writings of the primitive Christians or *Fathers*: forasmuch as these very frequently cite the Sacred Writings on all occasions, and had such frequent and great Occasions to speak of the *Trinity*, and of the *Holy Spirit*; it may well be concluded, such a *Text*, of singular Importance, and so exceeding pertinent to their Design, and where there is no *other Text*, to supply the want of it, fully or directly in the whole New Testament, could not be forgotten by all of them, and at all times, if it had been known by them. And here,

1st, He makes inquiry among the *Greek Fathers*, to see if he can hear of *this Text* among them, who were most likely to have seen the authentick *Originals* of the Apostles, and needed not a Version into another Language. Of these he gives this melancholy Account; *Neminem unum, &c. That not one Greek Writer from the beginning of Christianity to St. Jerom's time* (about 400 Years) *has ever cited this Verse*. And adds, 'Tis Dissert. p. 583, 584. certain it has been wanting in the *Greek Copies* very near from the *Apostle's writing this Epistle*. And therefore wonders at the Author of the *Preface to the Canonical Epistles*, in the *Latin Bibles*, which passes under the name of *St. Jerom*, for saying this Verse was in all the *Greek Copies*: whereas, says the Doctor *, *not one of the Antients had ever*

* De quo nemo Veterum quidquam inaudiverat.

heard a word of it. For which, and other Reasons, he justly concludes, as do other *Criticks*, that it is not *St. Jerom's*.

Not content with these *Generals*, he runs over the particular most eminent *Greek Fathers*, and those who were most likely to have produc'd *this Text*, if they had known of it, who yet never mention it.

1. Not *Ireneus*, l. 3. c. 18. who to prove the Deity of Christ, cites this *first Epistle of John* (more than once) nay, he cites this *fifth Chapter*, and yet says nothing of *this Verse* which had been so apposite to his Design.

2. Not *Clemens Alexandrinus*.

3. Not *Dionysius Alex.* or the *Epistle*, under his Name, to *Paul of Samosata*, almost wholly about the Trinity, and the Deity of Christ; in which the *eighth Verse* is cited, and the three other Witnesses, the *Spirit*, the *Water*, and the *Blood*, but not the Words in dispute.

4. Not *Athanasius* himself, who had his Wits about him, and as much at work in these Matters as any Man; in whose *genuine Works* (more to be regarded surely than the *spurious Books* falsely attributed to him for the other side) even *those* in which he labours to prove the Trinity, and Deity of Christ and the Holy Spirit, by all the Texts he could think proper, we find no mention of *this great Text*, as he must have deem'd it. So that the Doctor again confesses, he knows not of one *Greek Father*, before the time of the *Nicene Council*, who ever cited it.

5. Not the Fathers of the Council of *Sardica* in their Synodical Epistle; in which, for proof of a Trinity of Persons in one Essence, they alledge *John 10. 30.* but not these Words, *The Father, the Word, and the Spirit; and these Three are One*: which had been much more fit to their pur-

purpose. They needed not twice have cited, *My Father and I are One*, which yet did not include the *Spirit* at all: once urging this Passage, *These Three are One*, had been better for their purpose than a hundred Repetitions of that other Text.

Certainly all those Fathers, who came from so many several Quarters out of *Asia, Africa,* and *Europe*, as the Preamble of the Epistle shews, could not be ignorant of this Text which they so much wanted, if there had been any knowledge of it in any part of the Christian World.

6. Not *Epiphanius*, who among the many Texts, alledg'd against the *Arians* and *Pneumatomachi*, quite omits this.

7. Not *Basil*, in his Book of the *Holy Ghost*, whom he had a mind to join with the *Father* and *Son* in the Doxology, but was kept in awe by such as watched his Words.

8. Not *Alexander*, Bishop of *Alexandria*, among the many Texts for the Unity of the *Father* and *Son*, in his Epistle, *Theodor. l. 1. c. 4.*

9. Not *Nyssen*, in his thirteen Books against *Eunomius*, of the Trinity and Deity of the *Holy Spirit*.

10. Not *Nazianzen*, in his Oration against the *Arians*, or in his fifth Oration *de Theologia*; where, to prove the *Spirit* to be God, he alleges the next Words, but not these.

11. Not *Didymus*, in his Book of the *Holy Spirit*.

12. Not *Chrysostom*, on the same Subject.

13. Not *Cyrril* of *Alexandria*, tho he cites the Verses before and after, to prove the Deity of the *Spirit*; *Theauri Assert. 34.*

14. Not the *Author of the Exposition of the Faith*, among *Justin Martyr's* Works; who endeavours to prove the *Father, Son,* and *Spirit* to be of one
Essence,

Essence, from their being join'd together in *Mat.* 28. 19. but not from *this Text*, more directly for his purpose.

15. Not *Cæsarius*.

16. Not *Proclus*, tho both of 'em upon a Subject that gave occasion.

17. Not the *Nicene* Fathers themselves, according to *Gelasius*: for *Leontius* Bishop of *Capadocia* answering, in their name, the Arguments of a certain Philosopher who oppos'd the Deity of the Holy Spirit, among other Texts insisted on the Words immediately preceding, *viz. It is the Spirit that witnesseth, because the Spirit is Truth*; but omits *this Verse*.

Here let me add what *Du Pin* observes, That as no *Greek* Father, for *five hundred Years*, quoted this Passage, so two of them, *viz. Didymus* of *Alexandria* in the 4th Century, and *Oecumenius* in the 11th, have written Commentaries upon *this Epistle* of *St. John*, and yet mention not *this Verse*: which, says he, *proves that either they did not know it, or not believe it to be genuine* *.

Thus far then the way is clear thro the ancient *Greek* Writers for so many hundred Years; even to *an Age or two* after *Athanasius*, as the Doctor confesses †,

2dly. For the *Latin* Fathers; the Doctor grants, that neither the *Author of the Treatise of the Baptism of Hereticks*, among *Cyprian's* Works (tho he mentions the *Verses* both before and after)

* Hist. of the Canon, Vol. 2. p. 78.

† Quinimo nullum omnino Codicem Græcis Ecclesiis in usu fuisse credo, nisi qui ad mutilatos quos dicimus, descriptus sit, pene ab ipsius Archetypi Scriptura usque ad Seculum unum vel alterum post Athanasium.

nor *Novatian*, nor *Hilarius*, nor *Calaritanus*, nor *Phebadius*, have ever cited these Words. Nor *Ambrose*, who also has the *Verses* on both sides; nor *Ferom*, nor *Faufinus*, nor *Aufin*, who yet would have the *Father*, *Son*, and *Spirit*, to be mystically signify'd by the *Spirit*, the *Water*, and the *Blood*, in the next Verse. Nor *Eucherius*, who has the same Notes on the next Verse: nor *Leo Magnus*, nor *Facundus Hermiensis*, who also cites the eighth Verse. Nor *Junilius*, nor *Cerealis*, nor *Bede*, (in the eighth Century) who, in his Comment on this *Epistle*, expounds the three other *Witnesses*, but not this seventh Verse.

Tho soon after his time, the Doctor says, the *Western Bibles* began to have it common: which I shall not much dispute.

The Reader must note, that all these antient Writers are here produc'd, not merely for not mentioning *these words* (for then a much greater number might have been brought) but because they treated profess'dly of such Subjects as requir'd the Assistance of *this Text*, and many of 'em of the *Context*, and *next Verses*. And therefore tho others might omit it, as not having occasion to alledge it, yet *all these* cou'd never have omitted it on any other reason but this, That they had it not in their *Bibles* (as the Doctor justly argues) for *above 700 Years*.

Now methinks here is a pretty large stock of Evidence, and as much as one can well require for a Negative, to shew that *this Verse* was not *originally* any part of the New Testament: and one had need have very direct and peremptory Testimonies to the contrary, to make him so much as to hesitate in the matter. There must be great Weight, to cause an *Equilibrium*, and much greater to turn the Scales, and make him determine

determine for what seems hitherto irrecoverably lost. But I forbear, till I have consider'd,

II. What Dr. *Mill* has offer'd for *superiour* Evidence on the other side, to prove *this Verse* genuine, against all that has been said.

And now he has a *hard Task* indeed, to undo all that had hitherto been done, and to prove *this Text* authentick, against all these Manuscript *Greek Copies*, all the *old Versions*, all the before-mention'd *primitive Writers*, both *Greeks* and *Latins*, down to the eighth Century, who, all that while, knew nothing of it.

No doubt it would be a grateful Service to the Church, of which he was a worthy Member, if he could justify her putting it into her *Bible* as current Scripture, (tho that has been but of late) and cou'd support the Credit of a *Text*, on which principally some important Branches of her *Creed* and *publick Offices* seem to be founded. Here is a great deal to excite one to try what can be said, by a kind Friend, in the Case; who was unwilling to leave the Matter fairly stated on both sides, without giving it the Weight of his own Judgment on *one side*, which no doubt had otherwise been thought to be for the *contrary*. 'Tis well known how many are apt to regard a Learned Author's own Opinion, more than to examine his Premises, or weigh his Arguments. But what has he to say in *this Cause*?

In the *first* place I must shew what *Arguments* he refuses to make use of: especially *two*, which have been often urg'd by others, thro Mistake, or Want of Judgment, or popular Prejudice. As,

1. That the *Arians* have razed *this Text* out of the Bible, because it thwarted their Opinion. This passes for current among the People, and

is taught 'em by their Expositors, even by Dr. *Hammond*, and many other less judicious Commentators. But the Learned Dr. *Mill* rejects the Suspicion of this with Indignation and Scorn: for * *how shou'd the Arians, says he, put out the words, which were out already, 150 Years before Arius was born?* And he says, that *Ambrose*, who, alone of the Antients, objected this, in relation to another Text, John 3.6. (not the Text in dispute) was under a Mistake: as he shews in his Notes on that place.

Nor will the Doctor suspect any of the *Gnostick* Hereticks in former times; whom their Opposers accused indeed of making *new* Gospels, but not of corrupting the *old*: only *Marcion* was charg'd with interpolating the Gospels and St. *Paul's* Epistles, but not the *Catholick* Epistles. Nor cou'd they corrupt the Copies in *other* Christians Hands, nor yet those in their *own*, without being soon discover'd. Thus the Doctor clears the Hereticks, as being without just cause suspected in this matter: *I don't think any Heretick corrupted the Text in any part, much less in this famous Testimony of St. John* †.

2. He utterly rejects the Authority of the Preface to the Canonical Epistles, under the name of St. *Jerom*, in the first printed *Latin* Bibles; which pretends that all the *Greek* Copies had *this Verse*, and that the *Latin* Translators had done unfaithfully in omitting it. And tho even the *Latin* Bibles which had this Preface, wanted this Verse, after the Complaint made, (which shew'd that the Preface and the Version were

* Quid enim illis cum hac Pericope, subtrata è contextu Græco 150 annis antequam Arius nasceretur?

† Non puto quenkum hæreticorum S. Textum in aliquo, nedum in hoc nobilissimo Johannis testimonio, depravasse.

not by the same Author) yet this gave great trouble to *Erasmus* (and others) how to reconcile this to the plain Evidences of the contrary: *He* was well assured the *Verse* had not been in the *Greek Copies*, and therefore charges *Ferom* with Falshood and Forgery. And the Learned Bishop *Fell* was at the needless pains of vindicating *St. Ferom*, and justifying his Preface, in his *Notes on Cyprian*; when after all, our Learned Doctor, who acknowledges that himself once had a great regard for this *Preface*, before he had examin'd into it, is fully convinc'd (with *F. Simon* and *Du Pin*) that 'tis not *St. Ferom's*, nor is it found in the most antient Manuscript Copies of his Version; nor with *his Name*, in some other Copies where it is, as *F. Simon* tells us: but is the Work of some *silly Rhapsodist* after *Bede's* time, as the Doctor says, and then join'd to the *Bible*, which contradicted the *Preface*.

So that the Learned will no more be troubled with this pretended Authority of *St. Ferom's* Preface, nor get any aid from it, towards the Support of the Credit of *this Verse* we are inquiring after.

I am next to consider what Authorities the Doctor *does* insist on, on behalf of *this Text*.

As for Testimonies from the antient *Greek Writers*, he had left himself very little to say from them, having confess'd there is not one of these, before the Council of *Nice*, who takes any notice of this *Text*. And therefore, tho he puts down *Scriptores Graci* for one of his *Topicks*, he is hard put to it to find any, and is content to mention only *one* oblique Testimony, which he wou'd have pass for *probable*, from a spurious Work falsely ascrib'd to, but long after *Athanasius* †. And he is suspected to be a *Latin Author*

Crit. Hist.
c. 18.
Ineptien-
tis Rhapsodist.

† Auctor
Disputationis
in Concilio
Nicensi.

†

too;

too; who only says, Ἰωάννης φάσκει ὅτι τρεῖς τὸ ἓν εἶσιν, John says these Three are One. Which τὸ ἓν, with the Article, are neither exactly the words of the seventh nor eighth Verse: and F. Simon judges they refer to the latter, which was usually apply'd to the Father, Son, and Spirit at that time; as Dr. Mill owns it was in St. Austin's. Hence he leaps at once down to the Council of Lateran under Innocent the Third, in the 13th Century; and to Calecas, in the 14th, who was a Greek, and turn'd to the Latins. All which is to no purpose at all, but to increase the number of Testimonies.

The Greek Manuscripts he pretends (which will be found only suppos'd) are, 1. A Manuscript in Britain of which Erasmus speaks, and by which he was moved (against his own free Judgment) to put these Words into his last Editions of the New Testament, against the Evidence of all the other Manuscript Greek Copies. 2. Some Manuscripts which the Doctor supposes Robert Stephens to mention, as having most of the words; all, except ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, in Heaven. 3. The antient Vatican Copies, which the Editors of the Complutensian Bible say in general they were directed by, and the Doctor hopes they were so in this particular, which they have taken into this Edition.

I think it will appear that all these are but Suppositions of such Copies as never were seen, nor produc'd by any others to this day. To all which, Dr. Clarke has given a learned and full Answer, except to Stephens's Manuscripts, where he seems to have mistaken the Objection; of which hereafter.

In his Reply to Mr. Nelson, p. 207.

As to the Versions, Dr. Mill had none very antient to bring. The Vulgar, of which some Manuscripts have it, and others want it, as is

noted by the *Louvain* Editors; the *Italick* printed at *Venice* in 1532. (while the old *Italick*, and *St. Jerom's* Correction of it was otherwise) are not worth regarding in this matter: nor the *Apostolos*, or Collection of Sections out of the *Apostles* Books, with some Remarks. Only, whereas the Doctor mentions the *Armenian* Version for having this *Versè*, as he was inform'd; the very Learned *Sandius* testifies the contrary, having himself seen it, with the *Armenian* Bishop, at *Amsterdam*.

Printed at
Venice,
1602.

Append.
Paradox.
p. 376.

Lastly, The Doctor produces his *Latin* Fathers, which are indeed his main Strength and Confidence.

1. *Tertullian*, *contra Prax.* c. 25. his Words are: *The Paraclete shall take of mine, says Christ, as he did of the Father's. Thus the Connexion of the Father in the Son, and of the Son in the Paraclete, makes the Three closely united, which Three are One, but not one Person; as 'tis said, I and my Father are One **. Which the Doctor thinks, with *Bishop Bull* and *Dr. Hammond*, are an Allusion to our Text in dispute.

2. *Cyprian*, *de Unitate Ecclesiæ*, his words are: *'Tis written of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, these Three are One †; or Three are One, as some Copies have it: and, in his Epistle ad Jubaianum, Tres Unum sunt, Three are One; without any Reference to the Scripture express'd. And near 300 Years after, comes Fulgentius, a Bishop of*

* De meo sumet, inquit, sicut ipse de Patris, ita connexus Patris in Filio, & Filii in Paraceto, tres efficit coherentes, alterum ex altero. Qui tres unum sunt, non unus; quomodo dictum est, ego & Pater unum sumus.

† De Patre, Filio, & Spiritu Sancto scriptum est; & hi Tres Unum sunt.

Africa, and says that *Cyprian* in the former words had respect to St. *John's* Testimony.

3. *Victor Vitenfis*, who tells us of a Confession of Faith, presented by *Eugenius* Bishop of *Carthage*, and other Bishops, to *Hunnerick* King of the *Vandals*; in which *this Text* is cited as from St. *John*, in the manner we now have it, in the Year 484.

4. *Vigilius Tapsensis*, *Fulgentius*, and the Author of the *Explication of the Faith, ad Cyrillum*.

And thus you have the Whole of what must over-balance all the Evidence on the other side: which, whether it will do or not, is to be consider'd under my next *Head*. Therefore,

III. I shall shew the Insufficiency of *these Arguments* brought to support the Authority of *this Text*, against *those* produc'd to overthrow it.

I suppose no Man of Reason will desire me to give any answer to what the Doctor cou'd lay no stress upon: I mean, such modern Testimonies as *Calecas* and the Council of *Lateran*, our late Editions and *Versions*, or the vulgar *Latin Bibles* since *Bede's* time. Therefore I shall say no more to them; nor indeed to *Vigilius Tapsensis* and *Victor Vitenfis*, nor to any Writer so long after the Heats between the *Arians* and *Athanasians*, and when the Invasions of the barbarous Nations had thrown all into Confusion and Ignorance. Such modern Testimonies will only tell me, that *these Words* did at last appear. All this I know well enough; for I see they are brought into the *Latin Versions*, and since that into our *printed Greek Copies*; and into our *English Translations*, first in *little Characters* for distinction, and next with as good a *face* as the

rest of the *Text*. And if this began to be done in the fifth, or sixth, or seventh Century, what is that, any more than if it was in the fifteenth or sixteenth? But if the *Words* were not in St. *John's* Epistle for so many hundred Years, nor known to the Christian Church as such, I shall conclude that no Man can give a good reason for admitting 'em since.

And a thousand smboth Suppositions (which are, in like cases, found to be false by daily Experience) that such and such a Writer wou'd not, in later times, have used *the Words*, or put 'em into the Bible, if he had not good Evidence they were in the Original; are of no force against all the *Greek* Manuscripts and Fathers, which plainly shew they certainly were not *there*. If upon the whole matter there can be found not one *Greek* Manuscript, or one *Greek* Writer, who mentions it for a thousand Years; nor one *Latin* Writer to the fifth Century (if St. *Cyprian* be not the Man, which shall be inquired into) what signifies all the rest? Men may be fond of a spurious Issue, but that will not legitimate it.

Only with relation to *Victor Vitenfis*, because the Doctor lays such a stress upon it, as if the urging *these Words*, in a Confession of Faith, so publickly presented to *Hunnericus*, in midst of the *Arians*, in the Year 484. was a good proof that *they* had been well known and receiv'd; at least, *ante unum Seculum aut alterum, an Age or two before*; and so will carry the Evidence much higher than the Year 484. Therefore I shall take some notice of this, and shew that in fact it was not thus, as he plausibly imagines.

What the Credit of *Victor's* History, as we have it, is, I cannot well tell. I know it has found little

little with many, in relation of strange Miracles, not unlike those of *Monkish Legends*, viz. of many who cou'd speak freely and articulately, when their Tongues had been cut out by the Roots; and sending his Reader to *Constantinople*, for an Instance to prove it: with other Miracles. But let that be as it will, I take it for granted, that he says true, in the Matter before us; that in the Creed presented to *Hunnericus*, this *Text* was cited as from *St. John*. But that it had not been commonly and long receiv'd, and well known as such, I think is plain by what the Doctor cou'd not deny, viz. That *St. Augustine*, *Eucherius*, and *Cerealis*, of the same Country, and in the same Age, knew not of *this Text*. *Eucherius* lived within thirty Years of the time when this Creed was presented; and the Doctor tells us, he says it was common in his time to interpret the *Spirit*, the *Water* and the *Blood*, of the *Father*, *Word*, and *Spirit*; as did *Austin*. Now if *this Text* had been receiv'd then, what place had there been for such a mystical Interpretation of the *three Witnesses* on Earth? Nay, *Cerealis* was one of the *African Bishops* at the same time, probably; for he flourish'd in the time of the Persecution under *Hunnericus*; and who drew up a Confession of Faith also, at the Demand of the *Arian Bishop Maximinian*; and had the same reason to have made use of *this Text*, as *Eugenius*, if it had been current, as the Doctor insinuates. Where then is the *Seculum unum aut alterum*, the *Age or two before*, in which *this Text* had been admitted? I rather think it must only have been some private Composure, tho it might be in the name of the other Bishops, who were now scatter'd and banish'd. It is signed only à *Gasis Medianis Episcopis Numidia*; *Bonifacio Foratianensi*, & *Bonifacio Gatienensi*, *Episcopis Vizac-*

Biblioth.
Patrum.

nis. So that it carries the Evidence no higher, than to *that time*, and that at the *latter end* of the *fifth Century* some pretended *this* for *Text*, which had been only an *Interpretation*.

There remain then only *two* things of weight to be clear'd :

First, The pretended *Greek* Manuscripts.

Secondly, The Testimonies of *Tertullian*, but chiefly of *St. Cyprian*.

First, His *Greek* Manuscripts pretended: These are of three sorts.

(1.) The *British* Copy which *Erasmus* speaks of; who not finding one *Greek* Copy which had this Passage, wou'd not put it into his two first Editions of the New Testament: but upon information of a Copy in *England* which had it, did, against the *Faith* of all his Copies, afterwards insert it; * rather, as he confesses, to avoid the Reproach of others, than that he judg'd it to be of sufficient Authority. For which *F. Simon* thus rebukes him: *With what warrant cou'd he correct his Edition by one single Copy; which, as himself believ'd, had suffer'd some Alteration?*

Crit. Hist.
c. 18.

And it appears he had reason to suspect it: for who ever saw this *British* Copy since, or that wou'd produce it? *Dr. Mill* does not tell us where it was, or that ever he heard more of it. Such rare Discoveries, so useful and grateful to the Publick, are not wont to be lost again, in so critical an Age. What! cannot all the Learned Men of our two Universities, nor our

* Ex hoc Codice Anglicano reposuimus, quod in nostris dicebatur deesse, ne sit causa calumniandi, tamen suspicor Codicem illum ad nostros esse correctum,

numerous Clergy, give us some account of it? Surely either there was no such Copy, or it is not for the purpose: else it had probably, long before this time, been produc'd. I am apt to think it did the best service it ever cou'd do, in the Cause, in thus imposing upon the Great *Erasmus*. Strange! that a *British* Copy is only to be mention'd by one beyond the Seas, while all *Britain*, and such an inquisitive *British* Critick as *Dr. Mill*, can know nothing more of it. Foreigners will expect to hear of it from us, rather than we from them. *F. Simon* says *Erasmus* saw it: but where does *Erasmus* say so? He only says (in his *Annotations*) *There is found one Greek Manuscript among the English, which hath it* *. He needed not then have said, *Suspicion*, &c. he cou'd, I think, have made a clearer Judgment of it, if he had seen it. And if he was abus'd by *Misinformation* or otherwise, 'tis hard first to deceive him, and then to make his Mistake an Authority in the case.

(2.) The Doctor depends on the Manuscript Copies by which he supposes the *Complutensian* Edition was regulated; because *these words* are there, and the Editors say in general, they follow'd the best and most antient Manuscripts of the *Vatican*.

But as they don't say, that they were directed by *those* Manuscripts in putting in *this Verse*, so it appears they were not; because, by the Doctor's own Confession, the *most antient and most correct Copy* of the *Vatican*, which is so justly extol'd by him, (and comes at least very near to the famous *Alexandrian Manuscripts* in the *Royal*

* Repertus est apud Anglos Græcus Codex unus, in quo habetur.

Library here) *wants* these Words which *those* Editors have put in: And how then did they follow it so closely as is pretended? Nay, this excellent *Manuscript* was that which Pope *Leo* recommended to them, as the Ground-work and Standard of their Edition, to *which* they were to keep, and to note the Variations of *other* Copies in their Margin, and which for the most part they did; and yet in this they forsook it. And 'tis no wonder, if they did so by the *rest* of the *Vatican Manuscripts*, as appears.

Proleg.
p. 108.

For *Cariophilus* afterwards, having by Order of Pope *Urban VIII.* examin'd these *Vatican Manuscripts*, tells us plainly, that all of 'em which have *this Epistle* of *St. John*, want this *seventh Verse*: tho, out of respect to *St. Cyprian*, he was for keeping it in †. Of which, *Dr. Clarke* has given an account, in the place already refer'd to; together with an account of *sixteen Manuscripts* (*eight* of 'em in the *King of Spain's Library*) collated by the *Spanish Marquis*, *Peter Faxard* (as *F. Simon* names him) and publish'd by *La Cerda*, in his *Adversaria Sacra*, c. 19. from all which *Manuscripts* nothing is alledg'd to justify their *vulgar Version*, in keeping *this Verse*. How then cou'd *Dr. Mill* presume so strongly that the *Complutensian Editors* kept to their *Manuscripts* here? *F. Simon* saw the contrary, and says they follow'd the Reading of the *Latin Copies* here; and to vindicate it, have inserted a *Note* from *Aquinas*, in the Margin.

Crit. Hist.
par. 2. c. 9.

(3.) He pretends the *seven Manuscripts* of *Robert Stephens*, to warrant the Words to be genuine. *Stephens* tells us he made use of *fifteen Manuscripts* in his Edition of the *New Testament*,

* Ad finem Catene in Marcum.

only *seven* of which he has set down in the Margin, as wanting some, at least, of *the Words* in dispute: hence it was concluded formerly, even by Dr. *Mill* himself, as well as others, that the other *eight* wanted nothing, but had the whole, as we have it. To this, the Doctor's remarkable Words cited from his *Prolegomena*, by Dr. *Clarke*, are a compleat Answer; shewing that those *eight Manuscripts* did not include *this Epistle of St. John*, at all; and so were of no concern here. But Dr. *Mill* was sensible of this, in his *Dissertation* on the *Text*, where he says of these *eight Manuscripts*, *Reliqui has Epistolas non exhibent*. And therefore he urges but the *other seven*, which are noted as wanting only ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, in *Heaven*, and authorizing the rest; *The Father, the Word, and the Spirit, and these Three are One*.

But as Dr. *Mill* was too judicious not to see thro this Mistake, in placing a *little Mark*; so he fairly owns his Doubt about it, in his *Notes* on the Verse: *If indeed the little Hook be placed aright †*. For this depends wholly upon placing the *Semicircle*, which marks the Words that are wanting in such *Manuscripts*, as are noted in the *inward Margin*. In *Stephens's* fair *Folio Edition*, this Mark or *small Hook* falls after the words ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς; as if these only were wanting: whereas it shou'd have been placed after the *whole Verse*, as F. *Simon* observes (or rather, after the words in *Earth*, in the *eighth Verse*: which, the Doctor owns in his *Notes*, was the case of the *most* and *best* Copies; and *Simon* intimates the same in his Remarks upon the *Lou-*

† Si quidem Semicirculus suo loco sit collocatus; which Lucas Brugensis had said before.

vain Latin Bible by Hentenius, which had the like Error.) And I wonder the Doctor shou'd say upon it, *Nescio qua autoritate, neque dicit se istos libros consuluisse*; or that he had not consulted the Copies, when he expressly said, *he had consulted the Manuscripts of the King's Library*: and I think it was there Stephens found his *. It appears by Dr. Mill's Account in his *Prolegomena*, that four of these seven Manuscripts were in the French King's Library; and since F. Simon cou'd find none there, that wanted only the words in Heaven, nor any one else pretends to find such elsewhere, I may safely conclude 'twas a Mistake in placing the Mark in Stephens, which the Doctor was willing to take hold of. And the same Stephens, in his Latin Edition of the New Testament, (as F. Simon tells us, *Crit. Hist. part 2. c. 11.* and as I have seen) included the whole Passage within the Mark. So that I think the Case is plain, that all Stephens's Manuscripts wanted *this Verse*.

Crit. Hist.
part 2. c. 9.

Proleg.
p. 117.

'Tis probable he put it into his own Edition, from the *Complutensian*, and we from *his* into *ours*; (so one Error begets another, by presuming too well of the Care and Faithfulness of such as went before) for the Doctor tells us, Stephens govern'd himself by the *best* Manuscripts: but then he says, *He always judg'd those to be best which agreed with the Complutensian*. Else it would be very strange, that all Stephens's Manuscripts shou'd differ from all them of *Erasmus* and *Simon*, and *others*; as they must, if only *ἐν τοῦ ἁεὶ* were wanting.

And whereas the Doctor lays a stress on Stephens's saying *he departed not one Letter from*

* Regia Bibliotheca suppeditavit. *Proleg.* p. 117.

the best and most of his Copies †; I would ask then, how he came to put in the ἐν τοῖς ἑπτὰ, in *Heaven*, when every one of his *seven Manuscripts* wanted 'em? 'Tis plain *Criticks* are not always to be trusted in what they say of their own Fidelity: the Doctor was right, in inferring that it *ought* to have been as he said, but 'tis plain in fact it *was* not so.

Thus having examin'd all his Pretences to the *Greek Manuscripts*, I think it fully appears there is not so much as *one* found to authorize *this Passage*, nor one antient *Version*, made from the *Greek*; and for others, they are not of value in the case. Indeed the Doctor has dealt more fairly than our common unaccurate *Commentators*; who, without any Examination, talk roundly of *many*, the most antient and the best Copies, which have *these* Words, not knowing what they say: whereas he pretends but to *few*, and rather supposes and hopes, from some Hints in others, that they had such Copies, than knows of any himself.

Let me close *this Head* with the very pertinent Remark of the most Learned *Phileleutherus*, Part 1: against the *Discourse of Free-Thinking*: *The present Text was first settled almost 200 Years ago, out of several Manuscripts, by Robert Stephens, Printer and Bookseller at Paris; whose beautiful and generally speaking (it seems, not in all points) accurate Edition, has been ever since counted the Standard, and follow'd by all the rest. Now this specifick Text in your Doctor's (Whitby's) Notion, seems taken for the Sacred Original in every Word*

† Ne in una litera discesserit à meliorum & plurium codicum suffragio.

and Syllable ; and if the Conceit is but spread and propagated, within a few Years that Printer's Infalibility will be as zealously maintain'd, as an Evangelist's or Apostle's.

Dr. Mill, were he now alive, wou'd confess that this Text, fixed by a Printer, is sometimes by the various Readings render'd uncertain, nay, is prov'd certainly wrong ; but that the real Text lies not in any single Manuscript or Edition, but is dispersed in them all.

I now come to the *second Head* of his Arguments, viz. from antient Testimonies of the Latin Writers, Tertullian and Cyprian.

As for Tertullian, in the Words already set down, he had only said, speaking of the Father, Son, and Spirit, these Three are One ; and 'tis written, the Father and I are One. But the former of these he says from himself, not as any part of Scripture, as he says the next words are. And indeed he needed not to have cited these latter Words at all, if the former had been of the same Authority ; for they had been sufficient, whereas the latter Words were not to his purpose for proving the Holy Spirit's Unity with the Father and Son. Only not having a Text for the Unity of all the Three, he was willing to alledge these Words for the Two as a Step to the other.

Nor can it be thought, but that in so voluminous a Writer we must have had that Text many times over, on several proper Occasions, if he had known it as such. He repeats John 10. 30. I and the Father are one, very frequently, even five times in a few Pages in his Book contra Praxeram, and again contra Hermog. and de Oratione. Whereas this pretended Text, so much more for his purpose, he omits : which could hardly have been, if he had taken it to be of as good Authority

urity as the *other Text*. And therefore Dr. *Mill* had reason to urge it but softly, saying, Dr. *Bull* and Dr. *Hammond* putant se alluisse, suppose that he might allude to the Words of St. John: which is but a Conjecture, instead of a Proof.

So that St. *Cyprian* is left alone to bear the weight of all. And indeed 'tis easy to see the Doctor's chief Confidence is in his Testimony, (with a little help from *Tertullian*, whom he owes to be not so clear) infomuch that he says, *This is Evidence enough of the Words being authentick, tho none of the Greek Writers ever saw them, and tho they never appear'd in any Copy to this day*. It seems then 'tis to no purpose to withstand *this Evidence*; or rather it seems, having nothing else to trust to, the Doctor was resolv'd *this must* and shall do the business.

Cyprian's Words are, *Of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, it is written, These Three are One*; (the other Testimony, in *Epist. ad Jubaianum*, is but like *Tertullian's supposed Allusion* to the Text, and may have the same Answer.) Upon *these Words* the Question is, Whether *Cyprian* refers to the *seventh Verse* in dispute, or to the *eighth*, by a mystical Interpretation of the *Water*, the *Blood*, and the *Spirit*, as signifying the *Father*, the *Son*, and the *Spirit*? *Father Simon* is out of doubt for this latter, and brings a strong Proof of it from the Words of *Facundus*, who was of the same *African Church*, in the *fifth Century*; and who not only *himself* so interprets the Words of the *eighth Verse*, but expressly adds, that St. *Cyprian* so understood them too, in *this very place*. Says he, * *Of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, he (St. John) says*

De Unitate Ecclesix.

Crit. Hist. c. 18.

* De Patre, Filio, & Spiritu Sancto, dicit tres sunt qui testimonium dant in terra, Spiritus, Aqua, & Sanguis, & hi tres unum

says there are Three that bear witness on Earth, the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood; and these Three are One: by the Spirit, signifying the Father, by the Water, the Holy Ghost, and by the Blood, the Son. Which Words of John the Apostle, St. Cyprian the Martyr, in his Book of the Trinity, (Unity it should be, as Simon observes) conceives to be spoken of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. And tho Dr. Mill would make light of this Testimony, 'tis without all Reason, and from mere Necessity: since this will overturn all he had to say from the Latin Fathers.

What *Facundus* says, is so far from being improbable, that the Doctor himself owns St. *Austin*, who was of the same African Church, did make the same Interpretation afterwards; and after him, *Eucherius* declares it was a common Exposition of those Words: and then why might it not be *Cyprian's*? Does not *Facundus* expressly say it? Does he tell an unlikely Story? Why is it then *levis momenti*? Truly the Doctor thinks none, till St. *Austin*, made this mystical Interpretation, and therefore not St. *Cyprian*. But why might not *Cyprian* begin it as well as *Austin*? *Facundus* tells us, he did interpret so, and it does not appear that he had any other such Words to apply to the Trinity, but these. Is it not as good an Argument against the Doctor, to say that *Cyprian* did not cite the seventh Verse in dispute, because that Verse never appear'd in any Writer till the fifth Century, as his is, viz. That *Cyprian* did not

unum sunt; in Spiritu significans Patrem, in Aqua Spiritum Sanctum, in Sanguine vero Filium significans. — Quod Joannis Apostoli Testimonium beatus Cyprianus in Epistola sive libro quem de Trinitate (de Unitate rather) scripsit, de Patre, Filio, & Spiritu Sancto, dictum intelligit. *Facundus pro Defens. Trin. Cap. 1. l. c. 3.*

so interpret, because *that* Interpretation appears not till the *fifth Century*? Only I can prove my Assertion by a proper positive Testimony, that *Cyprian* did use *this* Interpretation; whereas he had *none* to prove that *St. Cyprian* met with a *special Copy* of *St. John's Epistle*, which had *that Verse*.

'Tis true indeed, *he* alledges for the other side *Fulgentius*, Contemporary with *Facundus*, saying, * *St. John testifies there are three that bear witness in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and Spirit; and these Three are One: which also St. Cyprian, in his Epistle of the Unity of the Church, confesses; alledging from the Scriptures, that of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, 'tis written, And Three are One.* But as *Facundus* is as good an Evidence as *he*, and more particular, so even *this* does not contradict *Facundus*. For *Fulgentius* and *he* both say the same thing, *viz.* that *Cyprian* confessed *St. John's Testimony of the Father, Son, and Spirit, these Three are One.* Only *Facundus* tells us, that he took this Testimony from the *eighth Verse*, and *Fulgentius* does not say it was *otherwise*; and therefore there is no reason to oppose *him* to *Facundus*. *Cyprian* might own the same thing as is now contain'd in the *seventh Verse*, tho he deduc'd it from the *eighth*: He that supposed the *Spirit, the Water, and the Blood*, in *St. John*, to mean the *Father, the Son, and the Spirit*, as much confessed this Doctrin, and from *St. John* too; as if he had found the very

* *Fulg. cont. Arianos, sub finem.* Beatus Joannes testatur, dicens, Tres sunt qui testimonium perhibent in cœlo, Pater, Verbum, & Spiritus; & tres unum sunt. Quod etiam B. M. Cyprianus in Epistola de Unitate Ecclesiæ confitetur, dicens—
—de Patre, Filio, & Spiritu Sancto scriptum est, & tres unum sunt.

Words *Father, Son, and Spirit*, in the *Text*. And this is all which *Fulgentius* himself says of him. Neither of *them* says that *Cyprian* found in *St. John*, the *Father, Son, and Spirit*, besides the *three* Witnesses in the *eighth Verse*. No, it was *there* he thought he might find the *Father, Son, and Spirit*, mystically represented. And I observe *two* things to confirm it.

1. *Fulgentius* speaks of it as a remarkable *Concession* in *St. Cyprian*, *Quod etiam B. Cyprianus confitetur, which also St. Cyprian confesses. Confesses what?* that *St. John* had those Words, the *Father, Word, and Spirit*, and *these Three are One?* Was that such an Acknowledgment, if he found it in *his Epistle?* No, but he acknowledg'd the *Father, Son, and Spirit* to be *one*, out of *St. John*, by a mystical Interpretation of the *Spirit, the Water, and the Blood, which are one*. This indeed was somewhat far-fetch'd, and not so clear a Point, but *St. Cyprian's* confessing it might give it some credit; but it could give none to an undoubted *Text* of *St. John*, to say *Cyprian* acknowledg'd it to be true. I will not say the Doctor had any Design in it, but I find in reciting *the words*, he has happen'd to change the *confitetur* into the more convenient Word, *contestatur*.

2. I observe *Cyprian's words* are not the exact Words pretended to be found in *St. John*; for *Cyprian* says, *Father, Son, (not the Word) and Spirit*. Now tho' the *same* Person may be intended by *both* words, yet 'tis plain there could be but *one* of them in the *Text*. And therefore, if our present *printed Text* be right, *Cyprian* had no *such* Copy, or else he did not keep strictly to it: and if he did not cite the words *exactly*, only the *Sense* of them as an Interpreter; then in such a loose way of speaking it might well be, as *Facundus* says it was, *viz. his Sense of the eighth Verse*.

So that the Doctor was too forward in saying that *Cyprian could not have cited the Words of St. John (as we have them) more exactly, if he had them before his eyes.*

Let the Interpretation be ever so forced, that is nothing, so it was; and there are enough as strange Interpretations of *Texts* in the *Fathers* and in *St. Cyprian* himself, to satisfy us *this is no good Evidence it was not his* *. And why may not *Cyprian* father a weak Interpretation as well as *St. Austin*? Nor was it unusual with *Cyprian* to cite Scripture more by *his Sense* of it, than by the strict *Letter of the Text*. Thus, instead of *Lead us not into Temptation*, he cites it, *Suffer us not to be led, &c.* Again, he cites *Rev. 19. 10. Worship thou the Lord Jesus*, instead of *worship thou God*. Will any say, upon this, that he found a particular Copy which had *these Readings*? No surely, but rather that it was *Cyprian's Exposition* of the true Reading in *all the Copies*. Even so, I doubt not, his words, *the Father, the Son, and Spirit, these Three are One*, was *his Sense* of the *eighth Verse* of *St. John's fifth Chapter*.

Cypr. de Orat. Dom. c. 4.

Cypr. de Bono Patientiæ, c. 15.

I shall conclude *this* with *Mr. Du Pin's Judgment* upon the Case: 'Tis not then, says he, *absolutely certain, that Cyprian hath quoted the seventh Verse of St. John's Epistle*. And *Father Simon's*; who says, 'tis out of doubt that he hath not. Tho' 'tis probable *this Mistake of Cyprian's words* led some following *African Writers* into the Opinion that *St. John* had said them expressly.

Hist. of the Canon, vol. 2. p. 78. Crit. Hist. N. T. part 1. c. 18.

And thus I have fairly accounted for *St. Cyprian's Words*, without the Supposition of his having a *special Copy to himself*. And then I think there is not *one tolerable Pretence* left of any an-

* See Dr. Whirby's Dissert. de S. Script. Interpretat.

tient Authority. Now it remains that we see how the Doctor accounts for the Difficulties that lie *against him*; from all the *Greek Copies* and *Fathers* before and after *Cyprian*, who knew nothing of *this Text*: how then had *Cyprian* such a particular Copy above all others? Does the Doctor clear himself *as fairly* of this, as we have of his Objection from *Cyprian's Words*?

He puts very proper Queries here: *If these Words were in St. John's Original, how comes it to pass that for three Ages following, the Greek Fathers had it not in their Copies? How came Cyprian, an African, to know it, when it was unknown to Irenæus, who was a very curious Inquirer into all Learning, (which is Tertullian's Character of him *) and who convers'd with Polycarp, the Disciple of St. John himself? But in Answer to these Queries, he is forced to frame many unreasonable Suppositions: he knows not which way it was, but he can imagine how possibly it might have been, and then seems to believe it was so. Let us hear his own Account.*

If we ask how came *these Words* to be out of all the known *Greek Copies*? he answers, *By mere Chance, and Carelessness of the Transcriber, who cast his eye upon the word μαρτυρῶντες, or Witness, in the eighth Verse, instead of the same Word in the seventh; and so went on, unawares omitting the one μαρτυρῶντες, or Witness, and all the words between them both. And then by reason of Persecution Christians were in haste, and staid not to revise the Transcript, nor to compare with one-another's Copies, which were but few, because of the Pains and Expences of transcribing: and the Original being at a distance*

* Curiosissimus omnium doctrinarum explorator, Irenæus. *Tertul. cont. Valent.*

from them when dispers'd, they could not examine by that.

I grant, Mistakes of *this kind* have happen'd to Transcribers, where *ὁμοιοτέλευτα*, Words of the same ending, or the same Words have often occur'd : but that it was not so here, is plain, because the Transcriber had then taken the next Words to the second *μαρτυρεῖντες*, which are, *ἐν τῇ γῆ*, in Earth : whereas the Doctor confesses these words were wanting also. This he was aware of, and therefore supposes once more, that the Words in Earth might be in the first Transcript, but that the next time it was transcrib'd, or soon after, it was thought those Words were superfluous, and so were left or dash'd out * : and then Copies were taken by other Churches, and so they spread abroad thro Greece, Egypt, &c. And this is the reason that the antient Versions and Writers knew nothing of this Text, because there were none but these maimed Copies among all the Greek Churches †. But in process of time, he thinks, some correct Copies which lay hid in Asia (where the Original was) or some other Parts, some way or other got into Africa, which Tertullian and Cyprian saw : And the Times being troublesome, few Copies only were taken for the use of the African Churches, where they seem to have continu'd ; and about 100 Years after they became common, else the African Bishops would not have alledged these Words in a Confession of Faith, if they had not been in their common Copies, and in the Body of St. John's Epistle, more than one or two Centuries. And about 250 Years after Cyprian,

* Curato hoc uno, ut verba *ἐν τῇ γῆ* tanquam *superflua* deleantur.

† Nullum omnino codicem Ecclesis Græcis in usu fuisse credo, nisi qui ad mutilatos, quos dicimus, descriptus sit.

the *spurious Author of the Disputation*, falsely ascrib'd to Athanasius, perhaps might meet with a perfect Greek Copy: And then all was set right. And so we have his Answer to another *Question*, viz. How the true Copy at last came to light again?

I believe *this Account* will satisfy very few: if any Man should trace his Pedegree after this manner, through such a train of wild *Suppositions*, and improbable Imaginations of this and the other *bare Possibility*, I fear he would still pass for a *spurious Pretender*. And yet *all this* the Judicious Dr. Mill could seem to believe, rather than this *one Supposition*, which is also well attested, That St. Cyprian's Words were his Interpretation of the *eighth Verse*: for allow but this, and there was no need of racking his Invention at this rate. And I'll appeal to Men of Candor, which of the *two* is more probable; that *all these Suppositions* should happen, or that *Facundus* should say true: especially when these few *Remarks* on the Doctor's imaginary Account, shall be duly considered.

1. Why should *he* suppose, they who were at the Pains or Expence, and had leisure of transcribing, would not be at a very *little more*, to review and examine their *Transcripts*? which is so natural and usual, in matters of much less moment than what concerns the Interests of another Life, which to the *primitive Christians* were very dear. While they had the *Original* in their hands, it was easy to be done. Surely they were not so careless as the *Doctor* makes them to be: it appears what Sense they had in early times, of the necessity of comparing *such Transcripts* with the *Originals*, by *Irenaeus*; to whose Writings this *solemn Adjuration* is annex'd: *Adjuro te per Dominum Jesum, ut conferas postquam transcripseris, &c. I adjure thee*

thee who shall transcribe this Book, by the Lord Jesus Christ, and by his glorious Appearance to judge the Quick and the Dead, that thou compare after thou hast transcrib'd, and amend it by the Original very carefully. To which purpose St. John's Words, Rev. 22. 18, 19. are probably to be understood, as a Terror to all negligent and deceitful Transcribers of his Books.

But the Doctor pretends the Persecution of the Christians, and their not daring to assemble but in the Night, might hinder them: So far were they from having leisure to review their Books, that they could not assemble but before day*. As if this hinder'd them from examining or comparing their Copies at home. Must they needs do it in a publick Assembly? Rather, was it not much better to be done in private? Therefore the Doctor has another Imagination to help it out; and that is, that Christians were in such eager haste to catch the sacred Copies, that they carry'd them off as they were †. As if, after so much Pains or Expence for a Copy, they would not take care to have it right. Besides, if the Desire was so great, then we may conclude the Transcripts were very many, of so short an Epistle. And since all the Transcribers could not make the same Mistake, nor many of them, I ask,

2. Why must only this one defective Copy be carry'd away into remote Countries, to become the fruitful Parent of all the Copies in the World that we can find; and all the others stay behind, or never be heard of more? Is this likely? Were not the Possessors of the other Copies (which

* Adeo non vacabant recensioni librorum, ut ne quidem convenire iis licuerit nisi ante lucem.

† Libri cum primum exarati, avidissimè à Christianis arrepti sint, & in varias regiones distracti.

he supposes there were) as much persecuted and scatter'd as the Possessor of *this one faulty Copy*? And if they brought away *theirs*, surely there would have been some *more* and *better* signs of them than what is pretended from *Cyprian*.

3. Had not the *Christians* of that time often heard *St. John's Epistle* read to them, before they had it transcrib'd, as well as after? *This* was the constant Practice of *their Assemblies*, to read some part of the *Gospels* and the *Apostles Writings*, as *Justin Martyr* and *Tertullian* tell us in their *Apolo- gies*: which the *Apostle Paul* expected, and sometimes requir'd to be done; *Col. 4. 16. 1 Thess. 5. 27.* Therefore if there had been an *Omission in the Transcript*, would not some or other easily have *miss'd* so memorable a Passage as *this Text* contains? 'Tis so singular and remarkable, that the *Omission* could scarcely be unobserv'd, when they came to *read it over again*.

4. Why should he suppose *again* (to back his *former hard Supposition*) that any *Christians* wou'd so *evilly treat* the Sacred Scriptures, as to *strike out* the Words in *Earth*, for *seeming to be superfluous*? Had they so little Reverence for these *Sacred Records*, as to dash out what they liked not? And yet with *those Words* the Sense and Context are *no way disturb'd*: there are an *hundred Texts* which contain Words *more* seemingly needless, and *more* hard to be accounted for, and which may as well be spared, if we make our own *Fancy* the Judge, as *these Words*, which have indeed no Difficulty at all in *them*; and yet I am well satisfy'd those *Christians* never would, nor did presume to dash them out of their Copies, upon this slight Pretence, That *they were superfluous*.

5. Doth *Cyprian*, after all, say *one word* of any *such thing*, as his having had a *better Copy* than the rest of the Churches had? **Not a word**; and yet

yet one would think he should not wholly forbear taking *some* notice of so happy an Event. Or do any after *him* say they found such a correct Copy, or that ever they understood he had one? And what became of this valuable *Traverse*, after it had got into these safe Hands? For,

6. How came it that St. *Austin*, so long after *him*, in a neighbouring Church, knew nothing of *this matter*? And that in *his* Disputes with the *Arians*, none should let him know what might have been so serviceable to *him*? In such times of eager Contests, it must have soon *flown about* into the Neighbourhood, when adjacent *Bishops* so frequently met and confer'd; and the *rather*, because *Cyprian*, and others after him, must know that *other Copies* were defective in *this place*, and therefore it concern'd them to send Intelligence to all round about them, how the *true Text* stood: and yet the Doctor grants that St. *Austin* knew *not of it*. And therefore I think it very apparent there was *no such thing* as *Cyprian's* having *such a Copy*, notwithstanding the Doctor could say *certissimum est*, upon no manner of Evidence but *his* using *those Expressions* which are already otherwise accounted for; and of *which* Mr. *Du Pin* says, 'tis not certain that St. *Cyprian* quoted St. *John's Words*; and Father *Simon*, that without doubt he did *not*.

By these things it appears, that Dr. *Mill* not only could not give any *true Account*, how it *really* came to pass that all the *Greek Manuscripts* and *Writers* should be ignorant of *this Verse*, and yet *Cyprian* recover it from the *Original*; but that setting *his Imagination* to work, he could not so much as *invent* or contrive a way, how it could *possibly* be done, with any tolerable *Shew* of Probability, or Consistency of Circumstances.

Since therefore *he* has made such a *surprizing Conclusion* in favour of *this Text*, so unsuitable to *his Premises*, and against *all the Rules of Criticism*; in preferring *one Copy* to *all the Copies besides*; *one Father* to *all the Fathers*: nay rather, without *one Copy*, rejecting all the *Manuscript Copies*; and setting *one supposed*, at best but *dubious*, Testimony of *one or two Fathers*, against *all the certain Evidences* from *all the Copies* and *all the Fathers* for near *500 Years*: I say, since 'tis thus, I cannot wonder at the *Remark* made by the famous *Le Clerc* upon the *Doctör's* great *Candor* and *Justice* in stating the Evidence, and his strange *Caution* in concluding against it; in the *Preface* to *Kuster's Edition*: * *If Dr. Mill* (says *he* in relation to *this Text*) *hath not concluded here like a judicious Critick*, yet certainly *he hath shown himself to be a candid and ingenuous Man*, in producing the *Arguments* which effectually overturn his own Opinion: nor would I impute this to his want of Judgment, in not yielding to the Force of such Arguments, so much as to the Prejudice of a sort of Men, who are wont spitefully to reproach those who freely own the Truth; as if they favour'd I know not what Heresies, merely because they will not argue against 'em from corrupted Texts. Truly the best Men are sometimes under a necessity of giving way to the froward, which we must forgive.

* Si acutum Criticum hic se minime præstitit Millius, at certe ingenuum & candidum virum se ostendit, in proferendis rationibus, quibus sententia, quam ipse amplexus est, evertitur. Nec tam ejus judicio ascripserim, quod rationum pondere se permoveri non passus sit, quam iis qui libere veritatem professos maligne infamare solent, quasi hæresibus nescio quibus faverent, quia nolunt eas depravatis locis oppugnari. Scilicet, optimi quique viri factiosus nonnihil concedere necesse saepe habent, quod facile ignoscimus. *Clerici Epist. de Editione Milliana.*

And yet at the same time I willingly consent, that *his* great *Learning*, *his* indefatigable *Labour*, *his* accurate *Judgment*, and worthy *Design*, in this noble Undertaking, shall not fail to perpetuate *his* high Esteem, and very honourable Remembrance to *remotest* Ages. Nor indeed is *his* Judgment given in *this* point, but with the Modesty of one ready, upon *better* Information, to alter it; which he seems to suspect there might be ground for, in the Close of *his* *Dissertation* *.

BUT whatever Restraints Dr. *Mill*, in *his* private Capacity, might lie under, from declaring his Mind more *openly*, they affect not *your Lordships* and the Reverend Clergy in Convocation; whom, with all the Respect due to so *Venerable* a Body, and with the Humility of a *Suppliant*, I beseech to consider of this matter, as *in the sight of God*; whether here be not sufficient Evidence that *this Text* either *certainly*, or at least very *probably*, never was *originally* in the *Holy Writings of St. John*, but unwarrantably *thrust in* in later times. And if so, whether from the conscientious Regards *you* bear to the sacred Scriptures, they ought not to be purg'd of all such *injurious Additions*. In order to which, permit me, I pray, without the least *Affectation* of being *your Monitor*, or the *Arrogance* of an assuming *Director*, humbly to bespeak your very serious Thoughts upon these following *Considerations*.

* Meliora, si quid melius certiusque dederit longior dies, dicere parato.

1. Whether *such* Evidence, as is brought against *this Verse* before us, wou'd not be judg'd by you sufficient against *any* Passage in *any* *Classick* Author whatever? Wou'd not *such* a Passage presently be pronounc'd *spurious*, and be brought under a *Deleatur* by the unanimous Voice of the *Criticks*, when they had no concern in it, but to judge what is true and genuine, and *what not*? Nay, would a *Court* of Judicature allow any *Paragraph* to be good, in a Writing of consequence, for which no more, and against which so much can be fairly said? And will not the *same* Sincerity and Impartiality well become us in *this*, which we can not only well justify, but commend in the Examination of *other* Writings? Shall we press Men to take that for Evidence *here*, which will pass *no where else*?

2. Whether an awful Regard to *that* dreadful *Anathema*, or Denunciation left on Record by *St. John*, Rev. 22. 18. against all who *add to*, or *diminish from his* Writings, will permit you to be unconcern'd in the matter before you? It cannot be suppos'd that *those* Words shou'd not, at least by Parity of Reason, concern *his other* Writings, as well as the *Revelation*; especially when we remember how *general* the Precept was, not to *add* nor to *diminish*, Deut. 4. 2. Prov. 30. 6. The Threatning is very *severe*: God shall add to him the *Plagues that are written in this Book*, are words of so much *terror*, as will sufficiently justify your *Lordships* and the *Reverend Clergy's* utmost Caution to avoid 'em; whatever more careless People may think or say. Whether the keeping in an unjust *Addition* to the Word of God, when 'tis *our part* and in our *power* to rectify it, comes, or not, within the *Prohibition*, none concern'd can think below their sober Consideration. It might perhaps *come in* with less
guilt

guilt thro Ignorance, than it can be kept in, when the Fault is discover'd.

The *Oracles of God* are a Sacred *Depositum* lodg'd with the Church; *Rom. 3. 2. To them are committed the Oracles of God; in this trust surely, that they be kept inviolable, and be transmitt'd to Posterity pure and clean from all known human Additions; whose Authority is so infinitely inferior to the Words of God, that they ought not knowingly to be intermix'd therewith: especially by those who are the Stewards of the Mysteries of God, and who expect that others shou'd seek the Law at their Mouths; of whom 'tis requir'd that they be found faithful.*

Our twentieth Article tells us, *The Church is the Witness and Keeper of Holy Writ: and therefore must not bear either false or uncertain witness in so solemn a matter, as to say that is Holy Writ, which she has the greatest reason to judge is not such.* 'Tis a dismal thing to have it said to your Flocks, *Thus saith the Lord, when the Lord hath not spoken it: and a hard task it is on him that reads this in the Church for St. John's Words, who doth not believe it to be such.*

3. Whether the *Honour and Interest* of our Holy Religion will not be better serv'd by disowning ingenuously what we find to be an *Error, even tho it have long pass'd as current as Truth?* Weak People, I confess, may be apt to cry out of *Innovation* (as upon all sorts of *Reformation*) *That Religion is subverted, that all is uncertain, &c.* Archbishop * *Laud* once made this sad Complaint: *When Errors are grown by Age and Continuance to strength, they which speak for the Truth, tho it be far older, are ordinarily challeng'd for the Bringers-*

* Preface against Fisher.

in of new Opinions: and there is no greater Absurdity stirring this day in Christendom, &c. This indeed may grieve a good Man; but must *Truth* and *Piety* therefore be sacrific'd to the *Ignorance* and *Perverseness* of Men? Must we then *prophecy to them smooth things*, only because they love to have it so; and not acquaint 'em with their Errors, because they'll murmur against us? I remember *St. Paul* once made some of his Friends to become his Enemies, by telling 'em the Truth, Gal. 4. 16. God forbid that any of his Successors shou'd be so discourag'd by it, as not to tell the truth, for fear of making Men their Enemies. If so, we shou'd appear to take more care of our selves, than of the Interests of Christ, and his Religion.

Pardon me, if I speak with *humble Freedom*, what I think not of without *real Grief*, that this *false Notion of Peace* has often well nigh ruin'd Religion. Christianity had never come in, if our *Blessed Master* had stifled the Truth for fear of disquieting the Family, by dividing the Father against the Son, and the Mother against the Daughter, Luke 12. 51, 52, 53. This *Political Wisdom*, which is first peaceable, and then, or never, is pure; is just the Reverse of that *Wisdom from above*, which is first pure. If it be possible we must live peaceably with all Men, Rom. 12. 18. but, we can do nothing against the Truth, says the same *Apollo*, 2 Cor. 13. 8. ἢ ἑαυτῶν must give place to ἢ ἀνάμειξα.

For true Religion is never more in credit, than when her Votaries, and especially her Guides and Teachers, who minister in her Holy Offices, deal sincerely and openly in things appertaining to God: Not walking in Craftiness, nor handling the Word of God deceitfully, but by Manifestation of the Truth commending themselves to every Man's

Conscience

Conscience in the sight of God. Not by putting false colours upon what *they know* they cannot justify, or seeking to deceive Men in Sacred Matters; *which* being once discover'd, *weak Minds* are apt to think the worse of Religion, for *what* is none of *her* fault, but is acted in a plain Violation of *her* Laws.

Nothing will tend more to *harden Unbelievers* in their *unjust* Suspicions and Reproaches, than to see that no Amendment can be obtain'd upon the most *manifest* discovery of an Error; but that *right or wrong*, their Teachers and Guides will *continue* with resolution, what they find *came in by Mistake*. What will it avail for honest Men to *study* and inquire after *Truth*, when *convincing* Men will not make 'em *reform*? As if Reformation was such an *unreasonable* thing, that it were better to *continue* our Faults, when *they* can't be *forsaken* with a general Approbation.

In the Case before you, 'tis *too late* to conceal the Evidence *against the Text* I have treated of: it has been *long* observ'd, *oft* objected, and much needs Satisfaction. And if *your Lordships* and the *Reverend Clergy* shall please to instruct us, by *better Evidence*, that there is *no wrong* done to the *Text* of St. *John*; or, being convinc'd that *there is*, shall hereupon promote a just Alteration of *this* in our *printed Books*, according to *all the Greek Manuscripts*, that so *your People* may see that, at least, you take it for *doubtful*; will not *this* upright Method shew to the World that you are *fair* and ingenuous beyond exception, and that you seek after *Truth in the Love of it*? This shall convince *them* that you are their *faithful* Guides; which will enable you, in a very *serious* and not *far distant* Hour, with St. *Paul*, *rich* and *happy* in the *inestimable Treasures* of a good Conscience, to make that triumphant Boast,
That

That with Simplicity and godly Sincerity, and not with fleshly, or worldly, Wisdom, by the Grace of God, you have acted towards the World, and towards your Flocks.

I think I may safely add, that *what I propose*, will greatly silence the *Cavils* of the *Anti-Scripturists*, when they object the *different Readings* in the several Copies of the *New Testament*. To *which 'tis* a very good *Answer*, that *these Differences* are only in *Circumstances*, or in matters of very *little consequence* to Religion; and which 'tis morally impossible shou'd be otherwise, in a *Book* so oft transcrib'd, and in so long a *Tract* of Time. In *other Instances* 'tis truly so; the *Differences* are very small, as *Dr. Mill's Collection* of the various Readings doth abundantly shew. But wou'd not *this Answer* be somewhat clearer and *stronger*, if justice were done to the *Text* in the Point I have argu'd? I know not *one Instance* which interferes with the abovesaid *Answer* so much as *this*. How shall we say that *this Text* is of small consequence in Religion, which is so oft alledg'd by *Preachers* and *Writers*, as of eminent force in proof a *Fundamental Article* of *Christianity*? Is it not pity we shou'd *needlessly* leave 'em *such* an unjust Pretence? Were it not better to cut off all Occasion, from them who seek Occasion to censure the *Holy Scriptures*, when we can so truly and justly do it? because there really is *no* difference in the *Greek Copies*, but *all* of 'em agree in wanting *this Verse*; so that the *Objection* appears stronger than *it is*, or than it ought to *appear*.

4. Doth not the *sixth Article* of our Church exclude *this Verse* from being a part of those *Holy Scriptures* which *she* receives? for *it* tells us, that by the Scripture she *understands* those *Canonical Books* of the *Old and New Testament*, of whose

Authority was never any doubt in the Church. Is not the Case the same with any part of those Books? And will any venture to say there never was, or that at present there is not very great doubt of this Verse in the Church? Whereas if there be any doubt for it, 'tis the utmost that can be made of Dr. Mill's Dissertation.

5. Whether in our printed Bibles some Words are not quite omitted, or by a smaller Character visibly distinguish'd, as doubtful, for which there is far greater Authority, than for these under consideration? Nay, this is done in this very Epistle of St. John, ch. 2. v. 23. Dr. Mill has shown that those Words, *He that acknowledges the Son, hath the Father also*; are in several valuable Copies, and ancient Versions, and in the Fathers; even in St. Cyprian too: and yet not being in many other Copies, the Wisdom of the Church hath mark'd 'em for dubious, to shew how cautious she was there, not to put wrong or uncertain Scripture upon her Members. Yet here is a Text in the same Epistle, which has not one quarter, nay, I think I may truly say, has not any of that Authority for it; and which was once in the same case, distinguish'd by smaller Characters, as of less certain Authority, from the beginning of the Reformation: and now the former Caution is withdrawn, this is advanc'd into the Rank of undoubted Text, whereas the other is left as it was. Which, however, serves to shew us, what we may fairly expect in reason shou'd be done, by such a Text as has nothing, even of that lesser Evidence, which hath not yet advanc'd the other into the undoubted Text. If there had not been some more occasion for one than for the other, 'tis possible they had both remain'd in the same state. Therefore,

6. It may reasonably be enquir'd, if there be *any more Evidence for this Text*, since the first Reformation? The present current Notions of the *Trinity* were receiv'd *then* as much as *now*, perhaps more; and yet as *Luther* wou'd not put *this* into the *Text* in *any* Edition of his *German Bible*, nor durst *Bullinger* take it in, so our old *Bibles* in *Henry VIII's* and *Edward VI's* time, had *these Words* of the *seventh Verse*, and the words *in Earth*, in the *eighth*, in small Letters, and sometimes in a *Parenthesis*; to shew they were not to be esteem'd of the *same certain Authority* with the *other* parts of the *Epistle*, because the *Manuscripts* wanted 'em. In *Queen Elizabeth's Bible*, 1566. I find the *same*; and *her* latter *Bibles* were the *first* which *took 'em* in, as they now are, between 1566, and 1580. but whether by the influence of the *Convocation* which interven'd, I know not. And if it was a *dubious Text* then, some may ask what *further Evidence* arises since, to have caus'd this change? Has any *antient* valuable *Greek Manuscript* newly appear'd? Yes; the most valuable of *all*, the *Alexandrian Manuscript*, has since that time been brought among us: but alas! *this* has added great weight to the *Evidence against it*. Besides, *Erasmus's British Copy*, and the *Complutensian Testament*, and the *Mistake* about *Stephens's seven Manuscripts*, were not understood to be so void of all weight, as *now* they appear to be. If the first Reformers then had *as much Evidence for it*, and thought they had *more* than we can now think *we* have, and not so much to say *against it* as *we*; and yet *they* judg'd it but just to leave it *doubtful*: how is it that we shall justify *their* Successors, who have ventur'd upon what they dared not to do?

Nay, if your Lordships and the Reverend Clergy don't think this *Text* to be *certainly spurious*, I wou'd humbly propose, whether it be not *most likely* to be *so*? And then whether it be not safer to put it *out*, than to keep it in the place 'tis *in*? Nay, whether it be not at least *dubious*? and then whether it ought not to be mark'd as *such*, for your Peoples Observation? I beseech you, let us but obtain *so much* as I think your *selves* will, and as the *first Reformers* did see to be just and reasonable, or convince us that this Request is not *so*: else what remains, but to sit down, wonder, and despair? 'Tis but an easy step, and will be well warranted, to return to that which our *first Reformers* wisely and unblamably did. It can be no reproach to be as just to the People as *they* were; and to return again *with Reason*, to that which has been alter'd *without Reason*.

7. Lastly, the great *Importance* of the subject matter of *this* much-doubted *Text*, well deserves your most impartial Judgment upon it. The *Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity* is purely dependent on *Revelation*; variously understood by *Christians*, both of the *Clergy* and *Laity*; and bound upon the *Members* of the Church by very *direful Anathema's*, scarce any *more* terrible, except that of *St. John* against such as shall *add* to, or take from *his* Writings. Now, since 'tis to the *Scriptures* that you make appeal for *proof* of this *Doctrine*, and for the *right understanding* of it; 'tis most just that in so solemn a matter you warn your *Flocks* not to be misled, by mistaking an unwarranted modern *Addition* for an *inspired Oracle*.

I pretend not to make any Interpretation of *the Words*, till their Authority be prov'd: but most judicious Expositors understand *These Three*

are One, of an *Unity of Consent*, or in Witness-bearing; as *Bullinger, Calvin, Beza*, and many other, both *Protestant* and *Popish Writers*.

But let 'em signify much or little, in the Controversy about the *philosophical Nature* of the *Three Persons*; yet as *they* are always likely to be drawn into the service of what is most *prevalent* and *current*, so 'tis certain the common People have their eyes upon *this*, more than on any *undoubted Text* in the Bible, in *this Controversy*. And *so far* they must be deceiv'd, if it be *spurious*. And it is in *your Lordships* and the *Clergy's* power to let 'em know it, and to refer 'em to *other Texts*, which you can *assure* them are *genuine*.

Nor is there any doubt to be made, but the People think *some Branches* of the *Liturgy* have their main Foundation on *this one doubted Text*. When they hear, *Three Persons and One God*, in the *fourth Petition* of the *Litany*; and *who with thee and the Holy Ghost ever liveth and reigneth one God*, in the *Doxologies*; they think nothing in the *New Testament* so like it as *this dubious Text*. And will you not think it great pity, that your People shou'd build so weighty things on such a slender Foundation, if *your selves* so judge it?

I speak *this*, because I know not any *other Text* that *directly* or *clearly* says the *same thing*, *viz.* that *the Father, Word, and Spirit, are One*. They are not join'd in one *Doxology*, nor indeed do I find *any* given to the *Holy Spirit* in the *New Testament*, either *jointly* or *separately*; much less is the *Spirit* said to be *one with the Father and the Son*. I read of *one Spirit, one Lord, one God and Father*, Eph. 4. but not that these *Three are the One God*. And if there be no *other Text* which says *this*, 'tis not the *more likely* to have been

been St. John's Saying here; but the *more grievous* to have it inserted by any who had not *his Authority*.

Whether, upon the whole, *this Passage* shall by your direction, in our *printed Books* be fairly *disown'd* and *mark'd* as formerly, or better *vindicated*, I know not: but if *neither* of *these* be done, and if Preachers and Writers still go on, without due regard to *Justice* and their *own Esteem*, to urge *this* as an *Authority*, after all that is said to shew it has *none*; I apprehend, there are many understanding *Christians* will be apt to think they are not *fairly* dealt with.


And I hope it shall not be thought to proceed from *any* want of due Veneration for *your Lordships* and the *Reverend Clergy*, if an high Esteem of the *Learning*, the *Judgment*, *Integrity*, and hearty *Zeal* for our Holy Religion and the Sacred Scriptures, which they are persuaded dwell with an *English Convocation*, shall excite many of *your People*, as well as of the *Clergy*, to some Expectations in this matter.

I shall only set down the Advice and Request of *Bugenhagenius*, a *Lutheran Divine*: having observ'd *this Verse* to be *put in*, without any reasonable Pretence of Authority, and having exclaim'd against it as an *impious bold Addition to the Sacred Scripture*, and what (he says) *establishes the Arians Blasphemy*, and therefore suspected was *their Contrivance*; he concludes, * *I beseech the Printers, and such Learned Men as are aiding to them, that when at any time hereafter they shall reprint the Greek Testament, they leave out that Ad-*

* Obsecro igitur Chalcographos & Eruditos Viros qui Chalcographis adsunt, ut cum rursus posthac N. Test. græcè excudendum est, illam additionem omittant, & ita restituant Græcæ suæ priori integritati & puritati, propter veritatem, ad gloriam Dei. *In Exposit. Jonæ.*

dition, and so restore the Greek to its former Purity; for the Love of Truth, and the Glory of God.

With which Request, I humbly hope your Lordships and the Reverend Clergy will see great reason to comply; and the rather, because I am instructed by a very Great † Prelate (who was once the Head of such a Convocation, and very tender of the Church's Honour) That the Church is not so bound up, that she may not, on just and farther Evidence, revise what may in any case have slipt by her. Whether this be not one of those Cases, is submitted to your impartial and discerning Judgment.



A Postscript, in Answer to the Excuses offer'd to take off the Force of this Address.

I Am persuaded, the *Address* I have made to your Lordships and the Reverend Clergy, is for the Matter of it so reasonable and necessary, and may with so much good Conscience and Justice to Truth be comply'd with; that I am embolden'd again to renew it, with the Earnestness which becomes a matter of so great importance to the Honour of our Holy Religion.

It might indeed in your Wisdom seem meet to wait a while, to see what could be said in defence of *the Words*, which are charg'd to be an Interpolation of the true and sacred Text, before the Convocation should determine what to do with *them*. But since no Man has attempted it to any purpose, and all seem silent

† *ABp Laud's Preface against Fisher.*

under the Imputation of so great a Wrong done to the Holy Scripture and the Church of God; and since I can learn nothing from the Publick, either from the *Convocation* or the Press, why our common Bibles should not in this place be regulated according to the true Original, as I have humbly propos'd; I have inquired in private what any of the Clergy or others have to say in excuse of it. And tho I do not think the Reverend *Bishops* or *Clergy* in Convocation will abide by any such slender *Apologies*, yet for the Satisfaction of private Persons, I will set *them* down here, and consider the Force of them.

Excuse 1. There is no need to urge this matter any farther, say some, because *this Text is given up already*, and is allow'd by Learned Men not to be genuine.

Resp. These Men do indeed confess that the Text ought to be given up, as past all just defence; but 'tis very wrong to say, 'tis enough that a few learned Men know it. The Bible is a *publick* Book, for the use of all, and is translated for the use of the Unlearned; and for their Good it should be set out free from all known Corruptions. And the Learned, who know this *Text* is to be given up, should honestly let the World know it too, who are as much concern'd as they. But 'tis never *given up* fairly, till it be left out of our printed Copies; nor is it declared to be *dubious*, till it be again mark'd in small Letters. Let a difference be made between what is given up, and what is not so, lest some think other even genuine Texts be given up too, tho they stand unmark'd, since this is so. But alas! 'tis vain to say 'tis given up, while 'tis read undistinguish'd in the Church, and urg'd from the Pulpit, in proof of a *fundamental* Point of Religion: and while Commentators still deliver it as

their Opinion that 'tis genuine, and according to the true *Original of St. John*. Which *Dr. Wells*, tho' without answering the Arguments against it, and therefore without just reason, has not fear'd to do, in his late Exposition of this *Epistle*; and yet he is one who has appear'd in the Controversy this *Text* relates to, and has had the Arguments against its Genuineness laid before him, in *Dr. Clarke's Letter to him*, and therefore ought to have consider'd this matter, and if he could, to have answer'd the Arguments that lie against his bare Assertion.

Excuse 2. Others say, *the Words* may stand as they do, because if *St. John* has not said them, yet *other Texts* say the same thing.

Resp. 'Tis not so; as has been said already, p. 354. I never found any seriously pretend to it; only that they could by consequence infer the like, as they imagin'd, and others deny it. And must a doubtful Consequence of one Text be thrust into another part of Scripture as express Text? What Scripture shall we have at this rate, if every Church or Party may put their disputable Interpretations into the Sacred Text? Some may think *Three Infinite Minds* to be proved by good consequence (as they imagine) from some Texts; others that *Three Infinite Modes* are the three Persons, *Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*: shall this be put into the Text therefore, *viz. And these Three Infinite Minds are one, or these three Infinite Modes are one*? I see not but the same Apology as well would serve them, as it does in the present case. We are not seeking what other Texts may imply, but what *St. John* has expressly said.

Excuse 3. Others say, that *St. Cyprian* (on whose mistaken Authority the Cause has chiefly rested hitherto) *does however own the Sense of these*

these Words, if he did not find them in the Text; since he makes it the Interpretation of the next Words, in which he judg'd St. John to have said the same in effect.

Resp. What if St. Cyprian did suppose so, viz. that the *Water, Blood, and Spirit*, might be accommodated to the *Father, Son*, (for he does not say the Word) and *Spirit*? Shall St. Cyprian's little Fancy be put into the Text? Is St. Cyprian's Authority as good as St. John's? I enquire what St. John has said, and these Men tell me only what Cyprian says. If Cyprian had any good Reasons for such an Interpretation of the three Witnesses, in the next words, I hope they will still be heard when produced; and so long as this Text, about the *Water, Blood, and Spirit*, stands undoubted, there will always be this Proof of the *Trinity in Unity*, left safe and sound for the Followers of St. Cyprian, in all the clearness and strength it had in St. Cyprian's time. But then let it only be proved from these genuine Words of St. John, and let not the suppos'd Inference be thrust into the Text, to make it pass more current; since a human Inference may with modesty be question'd, when a Divine Oracle is immediately assented to as sacred.

Excuse 4. Lastly, Some think it best to have it pass for the *Printer's Fault*, in omitting to put the Words in small Letters as was usual, without any Order.

Resp. But are not the Reverend *Bishops* and the *Clergy* the Overseers both of the Church and of the Sacred *Depositum* of the *Holy Scriptures*, that they be kept undepraved, for the Edification of their Flocks? Have they not had time sufficient, these hundred Years and more, to espy this Fault, and to amend it? Nay, 'tis plain they have approv'd it, for 'tis read

in the Church as Sacred Text; 'tis oft preach'd on, and alledg'd in proof even of what is accounted the most fundamental Article of the Christian Faith. Add to this, that our Bible has been revised and amended by the new Translators, since this Interpolation crept in; and yet they have continu'd it as it was. So that I think the Fault is taken off from the *Printers*; and where it ought next to be laid, is an Inquiry which I humbly hope your *Lordships* and the Reverend *Clergy*, in Faithfulness to your Flocks, and in Love to the Truth, and at the earnest Desires of the very * *Laity*, will by an effectual and timely Amendment of the Mistake, wholly supersede as needless: that instead of such poor Excuses and Evasions, Men may be taught honestly to confess the Truth, and to be content with the Sacred Text, as God and his Holy Spirit gave it, rather than desire to have it amended, better to suit their own Schemes and Fancies.

Psalm 119. 128. *I esteem all thy Precepts to be right, but I hate every false Way.*

* See the Layman's Address to the Bishops and Clergy, pag. 18. We flatter'd our selves, some or other of your Learned and most Venerable Order would have given an Answer to that Inquiry; (i. e. into 1 John 5. 7.) but instead of that, we have of late been alarm'd with Reports that a very learned Critick, a Member of the Lower House, Dr. Bentley, Master of Trinity-College, being an Archdeacon, is upon an Edition of the Greek Testament, and intends to omit that Text. And we see nothing in defence thereof, but a short Letter written on that occasion to the Doctor, by a Layman. This therefore we humbly pray may be taken into Consideration.





Dr. BENNET's *New Theory of the
Trinity, Examined:*

OR SOME
CONSIDERATIONS

ON HIS


DISCOURSE of the Ever-
blessed Trinity in Unity;


AND

His Examination of Dr. CLARKE's
Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity.

*Egregie Aristoteles ait, nunquam nos verecundiores esse
debere, quam cum de Diis agitur---quanto magis---
cum de Deorum Natura disputamus, ne quid temere,
ne quid impudenter, aut ignorantes affirmemus, aut
scientes mentiamur? Sen. Nat. Quæst. l. 7. c. 30.*







T H E I N T R O D U C T I O N.

IT would be something strange, if this Book, of so fam'd an Author as Dr. *Bennet*; a Book of so long Expectation, and so deliberate a Birth; on so important a Subject as the *Holy Trinity*, and against so celebrated a Writer, and eminent a Divine as Dr. *Clarke*; should pass in the World without any notice. One great Question, I find, has been, from which Quarter an Answer would first come; whether from those against whom, or from those for whom 'tis pretended to be written. I who know not the Intentions of any other in this matter, do adventure to give freely my own Thoughts of his Performance, which, I confess, contains in it something new.

For, tho' the Subject of the *Holy Trinity*, and the *Divinity of our blessed Saviour*, has with sufficient Boldness been teaz'd and tortured by the Schoolmen, and wrought into great variety of fine Schemes; yet, it seems, something has
been

been left for the *Scholastick Genius* of Dr. Bennet to supply: and still, I apprehend, none of 'em all will satisfy; and no wonder! For

Tho it may not be hard to understand what we find of these Subjects in the Scriptures themselves; yet when Men think they must adjust the Scripture-Accounts to obscure *Ecclesiastical Terms* and *Phrases*, which lie very cross thereto, this requires a busy Invention to find out, or handsomly to frame some Scheme, that may at least seem to take in both the *Scriptures*, and the prevailing *Ecclesiastical Notions*: and if *these* can never kindly agree to the satisfaction of sober *Christians*, then they must try another Scheme, and so on, unto weariness; till Men can learn the Wisdom to be content with the plain *antient Creeds*, and leave out all the modern inconsistent Additions that give them so much trouble.

Christianity, or *Christ crucified*, was originally a Doctrine of great Simplicity; but to the Greeks *this was Foolishness*. Those grand *Sophists* and inquisitive *Disputers of the Age*, required something more profound and sublime, some towering Speculations, and puzzling *Metaphysics*, with pompous Words and Dress, which might be above the vulgar Understanding, and give the Men of Philosophy an opportunity to shew their distinguish'd Genius in unravelling and explaining 'em. But *that Jesus of Nazareth, whom God anointed with the Holy Spirit, to go about and do good, was crucify'd for our Sins, and rose again; thro whom we have access to the Father, by one Spirit*: This was such a plain unaffected Narrative, that they could not easily make it serve their Pride and Vanity. This, alas, is a Gospel the Poor may understand! and let them receive it! but the Haughtiness of the Philosopher

pher affected something more abstruse and mysterious.

So that it must be observ'd, the *Pride of Reason*, which hinder'd these Men from believing in Christ, did not lie in refusing to submit their Faith to mysterious Speculations, which puzzled their Reason; but, on the contrary, it lay in a proud Affectation of swelling Words and philosophick Mysteries, and in not humbling their Understandings to receive a plain Gospel, and familiar Doctrine: which, instead of subtile abstracted Speculations, affords indeed a wonderful Mystery, but of Practical Influence, to excite Love, Gratitude, and devout Obedience; *viz.* a *Mystery* of the great Loving-kindness of God, *in not sparing his own Son*, and of the *unsearchable Riches of Grace in Jesus Christ*, in humbling himself so low, in Life and Death, on so compassionate a Design, as the Salvation of miserable Sinners: this is the Mystery the *Apostles* magnify and recommend to Christians, which the *Poor* may understand and improve; and not a Mystery of unintelligible Words, of philosophical Paradoxes; nor of Essences, and consubstantial *Hypostases*, *Circum-incessions* and *Communication of Idioms*, &c. Too much of this came in, when the *Pride of Philosophy* made Men ashamed of the primitive Simplicity of the Gospel; how far the Author of the *Book* I have under Examination, has contributed his Endeavour to recover this primitive Simplicity, I leave the Reader to judge: while yet I can truly esteem, and respect him, for his valuable Abilities; for his industrious Application of Mind, to an Examination and Inquiry into the important Matters of our Christian Religion; and for divers other worthy Qualities: *viz.*

1. Particularly for his Civility and Candor towards his Adversary, whom he has opposed in an amicable calm manner; not with rude Reproaches, and persecuting Fury, but with a great deal of *good Temper*, and *good Manners*: and if a few smart Censures are dropt, now and then, they are laid on softly and tenderly, as with a friendly hand.

I know indeed he opposed one, whose great Abilities, and well-known Excellencies are such, that no Man, with any good Grace, could have treated him with either Anger or Scorn: but still I believe better of Dr. *Bennet's* Disposition, than to think he had any Inclination to it.

2. For his resolute Contempt of those *false* Topicks of Persuasion, by which ignorant and degenerate Minds are led captive into Error, or lose the Praise of it, if it should be into Truth; *viz.* all human Decisions by Councils or *Churches Authority*, when their Judgment is not agreeable to the Holy Scriptures. In this case he has asserted the true Christian Liberty of judging for himself, and opposing others; and speaks as if he had the Courage and Honesty to oppose the most triumphant Errors of his Age. He is so sensible of the attractive Charms of Truth, that let her be called *Sabellian* or *Socinian*, or by any ugly Name whatever, it shall not affright him from being her open Advocate. And indeed, *her Price is far above that of Rubies, and happy is the Man that findeth her.*


3. For his zealous Profession of Integrity, exciting others to act honestly and openly, according to their Judgments; and not to use Arts of Disguise and Hypocrisy in Sacred Matters: for so I understand him in those excellent words, *Whatever little Ends may be served in this World, by Artifice, Shift and Collusion;*

yet

yet nothing but the most unbiass'd Integrity in our Conduct here, can prevent our everlasting Disgrace hereafter.

In these things I greatly praise him, as worthy of Imitation. And if I cannot so much commend his *Notions*, as worthy to be receiv'd by Christians; I hope the following *Discourse* will evince that it is for this good Reason, viz. That they are the Result of Imagination, more than of Evidence.





A N

EXAMINATION

Of the Reverend

Dr. BENNET'S *New Theory*.

Propose four Things in relation to
Dr. *Bennet's* Book.

- I. To shew what Texts of Scripture he discharges from that hard Service, against the *Arians* and *Socinians*, which so many have long and unjustly press'd them into.
- II. To examine his new Notion of the *Quiescence* of the W O R D, which he supposes to be distinct from Christ's Rational Soul, and by which he thinks to answer some Texts and Arguments, which are urged against the supreme Self-existent Deity of Jesus Christ.
- III. To consider the Strength of those few remaining Texts, which he has reserv'd as his only Defence in this Cause: To which I have added an Appendix concerning the *Deity of the Holy Ghost*.

IV. To make some general Observations upon his *New Theory*, and Scheme of the *Trinity in Unity*, as containing very great Absurdities.

C H A P. I.

I Begin with a brief Representation of those Texts and Arguments upon them, which the Doctor owns have no Force in them to prove the Supreme Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ, after all the stir which some have made about them; *Whilst they have been afraid to part with any one* P. 21. *Argument that has been urged in favour of Orthodoxy by their Predecessors in Controversy.*

As for that remarkable Text, *Phil. 2. 6. Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God*; he spends his whole Seventh Chapter in an elaborate and judicious Confutation of those who interpret this of Christ's Divine Nature; and frankly concludes, that *St. Paul is so far from teaching (in this remarkable Passage) that the Divine Nature of our Lord Jesus Christ is inferior to the very God*, that he does not, therein, speak one Syllable of his Divine Nature, but only of his Human Nature. So that being in the *Form of God, and equal to God*, he allows, may and must agree to Christ's Human Nature only.

In the next Chapter, he throws up, at once, all the Arguments taken from the Gospel-History of our Saviour's Life, Actions, and Doctrine; with a professed Design to prove *this Proposition, viz. That during the time of our Saviour's Ministry, the Disciples did not believe he was anything more than a mere Man, conducted and assisted by the Spirit of God*: And tells us, pag. 94. *That as there is not in*

all the New Testament one Passage, which implies the Disciples believed him to have had any Divine Nature during his Ministry: so 'tis very remarkable, (says the Doctor) that the whole Course of our Saviour's wonderful Actions affords no Proof, nor even the smallest Intimation of his having any Divine Nature at all; viz.

1. Not his knowing the Thoughts of Mens Hearts; and therefore he answers to such Texts, as *John* 2. 24, 25. *John* 16. 3. and such like Expressions.

2. Nor his Miracles, casting out Devils, and raising the Dead; since the Disciples did the very same things in every kind; as he says, pag. 101.

3. Nor his taking on him to forgive Sins, *Mat.* 9. 2, 5. which he grants a mere Man may do, if God pleases, whatever the Jews pretended against it.

4. Nor his conferring on others a Power to work Miracles: *Mat.* 10. 1.

Next, he goes on to consider what Things our Lord said of himself, which many take to be Proofs of his Divine Nature given to his Disciples; but indeed were not so, viz.

1. Not his saying, he came down from Heaven.

2. Nor his having Glory with the Father before the World was, *John* 17. 5.

3. Nor his calling himself the only-begotten Son of God, *John* 5. 16, 18. which he says did not discover that he had any Divine Nature at all, pag. 109. being only on the account of his being Man, pag. 162.

4. Nor his saying, *I and my Father are one*, *John* 10. 30. the same Phrase expressing the Union between Christ and his Disciples.

5. Nor in saying, *As the Father knoweth me, so I know the Father*; *John* 10. 15.

6. Nor

6. Nor in those Words, *John 14. 7—11. He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father.*

7. Nor in those, *John 5. 19. Whatsoever things the Father doth, these also doth the Son.*

8. Nor in saying, he was greater than the Temple, *Mat. 12. 6.*

9. Nor, that he was *Lord of the Sabbath*, *Ver. 8.*

10. Nor in saying, he had *Life in himself*, even as the Father hath; *John 5. 26.*

11. Or that all things that the Father hath are mine, *John 16. 15.*

12. Nor in saying, that he should raise the Dead at the Day of Judgment, *John 6. 40.*

Of all these Declarations, (the Doctor says) they might have been made strictly true, and might have been made by him; tho he had been nothing more than a mere Man, conducted and assisted by God's Spirit, *p. 116.* So that for any thing argued from these Texts, the Doctor plainly implies, he might not have had any divine Nature personally united to his Manhood, at all.

In like manner he grants, that *John 3. 31.* where the Baptist says of Jesus, *He is above all;* and those Words, *John 1. 18. The only-begotten Son, who is in the Bosom of the Father;* and those, *John 5. 17.* where he calls God, ἰδιον πατέρα, (whence the Jews falsely inferred, that he made himself equal to God) are all applicable to his Human Nature; and so is the Character of the *Image of God*, and the *First-born of the Creation*, *Col. 1. 15.* See *pag. 170.* The same he says, *pag. 173.* of those Expressions, the *Heir of all things*, the *Brightness of his Father's Glory*, and the *express Image of his Person*, or Substance; *Heb. 1. 2.*

Of all Christ's Declarations during his Ministry, the Doctor reserves to himself only these three Texts, *John 5. 22, 23. foretelling*, he says, his *receiving of religious Worship*: *Mat. 18. 20. foretel-*

ling his Presence with his Disciples after his Ascension: and lastly, John 14. 13, 14. Assuring them he would answer their Prayers. He grants that these (and perhaps there may be others such) did *hint and imply* our Lord's having a Divine Nature; but then 'tis because he supposes this Mystery revealed to us other ways: and so the Meaning of those Declarations becomes clear to them who believe it before-hand, for other Reasons, and bring that pre-conceiv'd Meaning with them to the Text. But he does not think the Disciples took the *fore-said Hints*. Nay, on the contrary, he says, our Lord's having a divine Nature, was what they least suspected, and would have been most shock'd at.

I may add several other common Topicks which he recedes from, *viz.* from *Christ's raising himself* when dead, which he allows to be done by the human Soul, pag. 149. So from his *judging the World*, which the Disciples knew of, and yet little thought of his having any divine Nature, pag. 155. and from his being an Object of religious Worship, pag. 29. and lastly, from the Form of Baptism, where the *Son betokens* (he says p. 211.) the Man Christ. And now from hence I only infer two Things:

(1.) That without believing or suspecting any Divine Nature in the Lord Jesus Christ, we may have such a Faith as was acceptable in the Disciples, even such Faith as that for which our Saviour pronounced St. Peter Blessed, telling him he had that right Knowledge of him the Son, which *Flesh and Blood had not reveal'd, but was the particular Favour of God to him*; and that unless we have higher and clearer Evidence of his having a Divine Nature, than they who knew him and conversed so long and intimately with him, then had, we are as excusable, in not believing it, as they were.

(2.)

(2.) I infer, that 'tis not the Baptifmal-Creed or Trinity, that the Doctor contends for againſt Dr. *Clark*, or others; for he acknowledges with them, that in the Form of Baptifm, (*viz. into the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*) the *Father*, or firſt of that Trinity, implies all that is the one ſelf-exiſtent God, (who is uſually ſtil'd the *Father*, and never is ſaid to be the *Father of the Word*, or of any Perſon in the Divine Nature :) that the *Son* betokens the *Man* Chriſt, a Being diſtinct from the very God: And that thus the *Father*, and the *Son*, ſignify through the whole Goſpel. I ſee then no diſagreement in the Doctor with *Arians*, at leaſt not with *Socinians*; their *Baptifmal* Trinity (which our Creeds are built upon) and his, is juſt the ſame: he indeed imagines another *interior* Trinity in the *Father*, or *Firſt* of this Trinity; and may, if he pleaſes, another, in the firſt of that again, and ſo have a Trinity of Trinities: but the *Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt*, into which Trinity we are baptized, are, I find, not the matter of diſpute with him; and yet I dare ſay, moſt People thought the Controverſy lay there; and that if there be another *Trinity* in the *Father*, and if the *Word* be one in it, yet we are not baptized into that *interior* Trinity, ſince no notice is taken of it there. And as the honeſt Chriſtian may be eaſy and glad to find this Point agreed, ſo I preſume, that as the Doctor hath granted his Adverſaries this *Baptifmal* Trinity, they, in return, ſhall not oppoſe his *Philoſophical* Trinity of Modes, or Powers, and Operations, in the *Father*, if he will not impoſe it on them as the *Scripture-Trinity*. Let me then beſpeak both ſides in *Mofes's* courteous Words, *Ye are Brethren, why do ye wrong one to another?*

Let none think I intend, by this Enumeration of the Texts, by him freely ſurrender'd to the

Adversaries, in the least to upbraid him with any Design to betray the Trinitarian Cause; for whatever be the real Consequence, I am well satisfy'd of his hearty Zeal to defend it: but he has too much Sagacity to be imposed on by Texts unnaturally apply'd to the Proof of Christ's supreme Deity, which he judges will prove just the contrary; and was constrain'd to throw them up, and glad to get rid of them, by interpreting them of Christ's human *pre-existing* Soul: tho, I remember, the late Dr. *Sherlock* (writing against the late Bishop of *Glocester*, who had made the like Interpretation) says, he had given away *most of the principal Proofs* of our Saviour's Deity.



C H A P. II.

I AM next to examine the Doctor's new Notion of the *Quiescence* of the W O R D, *Ch. 9.* by which he thinks to answer some Texts and Arguments which are urged against the supreme Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and without which he acknowledges they cannot be answer'd; and insinuates this for a Proof of the Truth of his Notion; *Pag. 128.*

P. 125.

His Notion of the *Quiescence* of the W O R D is this, That the *Word* (tho personally united to the Man Christ Jesus) *did not communicate any extraordinary Influence to him, more than to other Mortals; i. e.* no more than if there had been no such Union at all: infomuch, that none of his Disciples could perceive any sign of such a personal Union, from any thing he did or said, during his whole Ministry, till after his Resurrection; but that he was wholly under the Conduct of the Holy

Holy Spirit. By this he hopes to defend himself against some Texts urged by his Adversaries; particularly that of the Son's not *knowing the Day of Judgment*: and indeed against all the great Prejudices that must needs be raised against the Doctrine of our Lord's supreme Deity, from the Non-appearance, or no Evidence of it, in the whole Course of his Life and Doctrine. To this he answers, true; but tho his Divine Nature did not appear, yet it was united to him; only it lay as still and silent as if not so: and because his Opposers will say, this is but a Pretence, and that if there was such an Union, it would not be without some suitable Effects, or to no purpose; therefore he labours to constrain them too, on their own Principles, to admit this Quiescence of the *Word*, in their Notion of it.

In the first place he takes it for a certain Truth, that our Lord Jesus had two intelligent Natures in him united to his Body (otherwise, if there be but *one*, he has proved that cannot be the self-existent God, but pre-existent Soul.) He knows this touches not at all the *Socinians*, who assert but one intelligent Being in our *Saviour's* Person; nor much those *Arians*, who suppose the *WORD* to be the Soul of Christ, or the Soul to be the *Word*: nor do I find that Dr. *Clark* has ever said, they are two distinct Beings, tho he would fain urge it upon him, as well as on the *Arians*, that they must grant it (as a Consequence of the high Character they give the *Logos* or *Word*) that it cannot be the Soul of the Man Christ Jesus, if he was a Man in such Sense as other Men are. But without inquiry into the Philosophical Notion of a Man, whether any rational Spirit united and limited to, and sympathizing with such an organized Body as ours, does not truly become a Man, or be of another *Species*; I think his way

of reasoning does not make out the Consequence pretended in his third *Chapter*. For as the Doctor cannot prove against 'em by any direct Testimony, that the *Word* and rational Soul are two; any more than that *Jesus* and *Christ* denote two Persons; so neither does his Reasoning extort an Acknowledgment of it from themselves, as he imagines.

His main, if not his whole Argument for this, is, That Dr. *Clarke*, and also the *Arians*, allow the *Word* to be *superior to all created Beings whatever*; and that *all were made by him*, and call it a *divine Nature*. But what then? Is not the Man *Christ Jesus*, according to the Doctor's own Assertions, superior to all created Beings whatever, having all Power in Heaven and Earth given to him? Does he not tell us, That *the Man Christ Jesus is the first-born of all the Creation*? 1. Because his Soul was created before all other Creatures. 2. Because *he is now in possession of the Jus Primogeniti* (or Right of Primogeniture) *which the divine Nature is incapable of receiving, being the Governor of all created Beings, and God's Vicegerent*; and that *the whole Creation is at his Command*. These things, he says, *must, or most fairly may be understood of his human Nature only*; with many more such high Characters of the Man (or human Soul of) *Christ*. Now I appeal to any one, if this be not as high and lofty as any thing said by the *Arians* of the *Word*; at least that need be said by 'em,] in maintenance of their great Article. They don't make him in Power and Honour superior to all Creatures, in a greater degree than the Doctor makes *Christ's* human Soul now to be; and therefore 'tis no Argument against the *Word's* being a Spirit of the same kind, in that he was thus superior, as one of the same kind now is.

That

P. 171.

P. 173.

That Mind which has such transcendent Glories now, surely was naturally as capable of great Glory before: and he who is now God's Minister (or Vicegerent, as he often terms the Man Christ Jesus) in governing and judging the whole Creation, was as capable, for ought that he has said, to be a subordinate Minister in the Formation of it. And that human Soul (rather Mind) which, in its Separation from the Body of Christ, he grants, *might be endued* (pag. 149.) with a miraculous Power of raising himself from the Dead, as well as he had before raised others, might, I conceive, by the like divine Power, raise the first *Adam* out of the Dust also into Life: And I think, to give Life is the noblest Part of the Creation. But yet neither this nor the other, does necessarily give one the Dominion, or make him God, over them he has ministerially raised, since the Apostles were without this Dominion.

The Doctor indeed pretends the Word, or the rational Spirit, thro which, according to his Opposers, all things were formed, must be *essentially superior* to all; and that the *Power* and *Wisdom* manifested in the Creation, must be *essential to the great Architect of the Universe*. To P. 15. which I answer, most certainly infinite Power and Wisdom are essential to the Great *Architect*, and Master-Builder, or Creator of the World; even to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus, and of all things else. But as I know not that either *Arians*, or any primitive Christian Writers, ever adventured to give the Character of *great Architect of the Universe* to Jesus Christ, chusing rather, with the sacred Writings, to say in softer Language, that *thro him* God created all, and reserving the absolute Title of *Creator of the Universe*, to another, *viz.* the God and Father

John 1. 3.

Eph. 2. 9.

Heb. 1. 2.

of the *Word*: so I see not, that the essential native Power either of Miracles, or Creation, (which are much the same) is at all required in such subordinate Ministers, who do all by a communicated Power from him who acts by them. 'Tis enough that this Fulness is in the original Source and Fountain; the Channel is well supply'd with derived Streams. No more, in short, needs be essential to him, by whom God is pleas'd to form and frame all, than to that human Soul, by which, as the Doctor grants, he governs all. So that the Superiority of the *Word*, to all created Beings, hinders not its being the Soul of Christ; which 'for its immediate Production, and the Honour of being the First-born of the Creation, and for the Dignity and Authority conferred by God, has been stiled God, and a *divine Nature*, by them who believe him not to be the self-existent independent God, as the Doctor professes his Belief to be. But,

The Doctor further argues, on the other hand, against the *Word's* being the Soul of Christ, from the Miseries and Temptations he felt: which he thinks, the *Word*, under such high Characters, could not possibly be subject to. If the superior Excellencies of the *Word* don't make it impossible to be Christ's Soul, he will have the Imbecillities and Troubles of that Soul render it inconsistent with being the *Word*; so that both shall not be one and the same Mind. He says, *The Maker and Former of all Things, who is essentially superior to all created Beings, could not be tempted, &c.* But this being grounded on the same Mistake of a necessary essential Superiority supposed, has its answer in what I have already said, and may be further considered when I come to meet the same as urged again
for

for an Argument of his *Quiescence* of the *Word*: for as he thinks the *Logos* cannot be Christ's rational Soul, he thinks also, that without its Cessation, and *Quiescence* during his Ministry, its Union to such an afflicted Soul, as Christ's oft was, is inconsistent. And therefore having laboured first to prove a self-existent divine *Word* (distinct from the human Soul) united to our Lord Christ, he labours as much, in the next place, to prove, that there was no Sign or Token of his having any such thing, nor any use for it during his Ministry; which I am next to consider.

That there was no Appearance of any such self-existent supreme Nature personally united to him, or such a *Word*, is readily granted without proving it; but that it was *Quiescent* in him, will be deny'd by those who hold there was no such thing, and that therefore there could be no just Signs of it. And for the *Logos*, in the Sense of Dr. *Clarke*, and others, (who, for ought I see, take it for the Soul of Christ) the Doctor will not pretend, nor need, that this should be *Quiescent*. So that till he can, by good Arguments, constrain them to yield that the *Word*, and rational Soul of Christ, are not the same, but *two* different Minds; there is no occasion to dispute about this *Quiescence* of nothing.

But because the granting the *Quiescence* of the *Word*, while the rational Soul in Christ did not quiesce, would carry with it a Concession, that it was not Christ's rational Soul, but a distinct Mind; for this reason he endeavours to persuade us, that both Dr. *Clarke*, and also the *Arians*, must on their own Principles grant, that the *Word*, in their Sense of it, was, at least some- P. 123.
times, quiescent during his Ministry, viz. when under Temptation by the Devil, and under his Agonies:

Agonies : because, says he, no Temptation could affect him ; and no Agony be upon him ; if the *Word*, so powerful and excellent an Agent, did exert and communicate its mighty Influences.

To this it may be reply'd, that the Doctor has no right Apprehension of the Humiliation and Incarnation of the *Logos*, according to his Opposers Sentiments ; for they think the *Word* really *emp-ried* it self, and became like the rational Soul of another Man, which is limited by the bodily Organs, and is in a manner dormant in Infancy ; for by the settled Laws of Nature, it exerts not then its noblest Powers : so that the Man is at first but like an Animal, and gradually those Powers, and latent Faculties, discover themselves according as the Organs admit ; and never display themselves, probably in all their full Strength, in this gross and feculent Body ; not till it be spiritualiz'd and refin'd at the Resurrection. Now according to this Opinion of the *Word* (which also makes our Saviour's Humiliation very astonishing and endearing, and which is the true and great *Mystery of Godliness, God manifest in the Flesh*) 'twill be easy for them to admit the *Word* to be deprived of its former extraordinary Abilities, and to become subject to sore Temptations, and great Afflictions, in reality : Also to *grow in Wisdom* as others do ; tho at the same time it did conduct his Actions, and something very extraordinary too appear'd in him at twelve Years of Age, even before his great Unction with the Holy Spirit, when he reasoned so wonderfully with the *Jewish Doctors* : so that it acted as the bodily Organs admitted.

But the Doctor's self-existent supreme God (which is the *Word* in his Sense) will not be supposed capable of such Abasement. Can the Almighty *Jehovah* be brought low, or deny himself?

self? Can his eternal Perfections be confined? or his infinite Mind lock'd up within narrow Organs? or be tempted or afflicted? No: and therefore they who might admit some *Quiescence* (in some kind and measure) upon the *Arian* Principles, will still be as far as ever from *granting it upon his*. Nor is it harder to conceive the *Word* to be thus reduced, than the Doctor's allow'd pre-existent Soul of Christ to be so.

He might as well argue from the *Quiescence* of that noble pre-existent Soul, which he allows had so often *personated the Almighty*, and had conducted his People *Israel*; and yet, after all that vast Wisdom and Experience which this supposes, he must grant, became as the Souls of other Infants; and increased in the common Wisdom of Men; and became subject to ordinary Infirmities. Let him apply this to the *Word* in the Sense of his Opposers, and then see what Advantage he can make of it, in favour of his *Quiescence* of the supreme God (as he supposes) who is not subject to such Passions, or Restraint.

I grant this hinders not, but the Almighty may dwell in Silence, and manifest himself more or less as he pleases, as he did in Prophets and Apostles at different Seasons; but that in a *Personal* Union to the Man Christ Jesus, he should, in so many Years, give not one mark of it, is what the Doctor must prove for himself: for his Opposers have no Occasion for his kind Help in this matter, and can do without it, if he cannot.

That the *Word*, in the *Arian* Notion, should be sometimes quiescent in some degree for a while, and not exert its Powers by external distinguishing Tokens, is no Wonder: for the human Soul of Christ was so quiescent, whenever our Lord Jesus slept, till he awoke again; and so 'tis with other Men. But what is this to a
constant

constant Quiescence, which alone will do the Doctor any Service? Nay, even the human Soul of Jesus did acquiesce in his Agonies, so far as not to exert all it could for preventing his Death; since he says, he could pray to his Father, and have Angels enough sent in his Aid; and shewed, when the Officers came to arrest him, that he could have confounded and disarm'd 'em. He had then some Form of God, a God-like Majesty and Authority; which yet he would not use, but laid by, and calmly suffer'd the Death of a Slave, and so took the Form of a Servant. But some Quiescence at particular Times, is not like a perpetual Cessation, that never affords one Proof of the Being of a Thing which should be quiescent. And yet this is all the Quiescence which *Irenaus* mentions in the Doctor's Citation out of him, viz. That he submitted to be tempted, to die, and did not oppose his Power to prevent the Tryal: But *He* was far from saying the *Word* was silent at other times, viz. in his Miracles and Discourses; nay, rather on the contrary, the Cessation or Quiescence on those particular Occasions, implies, That the *Word* was not so usually, or at other Times; much less at all Times, in that Father's Opinion.

I will not urge the Doctor with Testimonies of Primitive Christian Writers, which Method he chuses to decline; yet since he replies upon *Irenaus*, it will be but reasonable to let him and others know, that *he* was not of his Opinion touchning the *Word*: for he supposes the *Logos* to be *passible*, in opposition to the *Cerinthians*, in the Chapter whence this Citation is taken; and

L. 1. c. 4. expressly says, ὁ Λόγος ἐπαθεν, the *Word of God was made Flesh, and suffered*; and calls him, *Pa-*

L. 2. c. 20. *tians Verbum, the suffering Word of God*. So that he neither thought the *Word* to be the impassible self-existent God, as the Doctor does; nor that he

he

he was wholly quiescent, as to the bearing those Afflictions, which yet he did so far acquiesce in, as not to prevent their coming on him, or to be a real Temptation, and to afflict him sorely. Having clear'd the way so far,

I will next suggest some strong Presumptions against his *Hypothesis* of the *Word's Quiescence*.

First, There is not the least Hint of any such Thing in the Gospel-History of Christ to found it upon. Tho' the *Gospels* were written many Years after Christ's Ascension, and after the Disciples are supposed to have been informed of this new and unsuspected Mystery; yet they have not dropt one word of such a Quiescence of the Divine Nature, nor made any Apology for Christ's not appearing to be what, they since found, he was; nor made any Reflections upon their own Ignorance or Mistake, as in other Cases they did. 'Tis strange that St. *John* (whose Expression, *the Word was God*, is in a manner the whole Foundation of the Doctor's Opinion, as to Christ's Supreme Deity) should not say something, why or how this had been purposely hid from Men, during Christ's Abode in the Flesh: Nay, which is more, St. *John* takes notice of the Quiescence, or undiscover'd Secrecy of the *Word*, before his Incarnation, even according to the Doctor's Account, in those Words, *And the Word was with God*: 'Tis strange, I say, he should not carry it farther, and say something to his lying hid too in his Life! And, which yet presses harder, the Doctor tells us, those Words, *The Word was with God*, are opposed to his Manifestation, when the *Word was made Flesh, and dwelt among us*; and that the *Word was with God*, till the Time when *God was manifest in the Flesh*. It seems then, he was not hid with God any longer; it was no longer a Secret; but the *Word* was plainly discovered, when
once

once he took Flesh and conversed with Men. And if so, then the Disciples were not so ignorant of the Word's Personal Union to the Flesh or Body of Christ; for it was now *with them*, which formerly had been *with God* alone; the hidden secret Condition of the Word was over: and therefore St. *John* might well say nothing of the Doctor's *Quiescence* of the Word, when he had told us, he was manifested, and *they beheld his Glory*; which yet he could hardly but have spoken of, if otherwise.

Secondly, 'Tis strange, the Apostles, in their Epistles, should not take some notice of this surprising Discovery, newly made to them, that Jesus Christ was quite another Person than they had ever thought him to be; and he, whom they always had taken for a mere Man, aided by God, by later Information since receiv'd, they understood was the self-existent God: They knew there was Reason doubly to inculcate such an important Point, and the more, because it was what had never been suspected by Christ's Followers, who had never, from himself, had the least Intimation of it, and would, as the Doctor says, have been much *shock'd* at it. But is there any Notice of this great Change in their Opinion?

Acts 3. 17. They tell us, *The Princes of this World knew him not*; but do they ever complain of their own great Mistake? They tell us often how different and more glorious an Estate he was advanced to by his Exaltation, in large Expressions; but not one Word what a much greater Difference they had learned from his being in Personal Union to the Almighty God.

Phil. 2. 9,
10.

The Doctor says, *He presumes our Lord did then (i. e. at a Meeting with the Disciples after the Resurrection) reveal to them his Divine Nature.* So that he is not certain, this Article of Christ's

Supreme Deity is any part of that Gospel, which *was first preached by our Lord, and afterwards confirmed by them who heard him*; but however he *presumes it, and is confident it was either by his own* P. 125. *Discourses after the Resurrection, or else by the miraculous Effusion of the Spirit at the Day of Pentecost, that this Doctrine was imparted to them.*

But, since we have some Account of both, let us see if there be any Notice of such a new Discovery in either; the Evangelist tells us what Christ discoursed of to his Disciples, after the Resurrection, *Luke 24. 27.* But is there a word of this new and surprizing Account of his Divine Person? In that *Chapter*, Excuse is made for them who knew not his Bodily Form, that their Eyes were held; but is there any for the Darkness of their Minds, that they had not known him to be the self-existent God before? Is there any thing intimated of their changing their Minds about his Person, in this amazing Point?

The same Evangelist tells us what was preached on the Day of Pentecost, at the first Effusion of the Spirit, by *St. Peter*; 'twas this, *Jesus of* Acts 2.22. *Nazareth, a Man approved of God by Signs and Wonders which God did by him.* Is this any higher Account of Christ's Person, than they had learned before? One would think, that having just now receiv'd that new and amazing Discovery of Christ's being the self-existent God, the Apostle would have been full of it, at least not have left it out in his devout and just *Encomium* of his sacred Lord and Master. *St. Peter* seems to have learn'd nothing new of Christ's Person, or more than appear'd in his old Confession, *Thou art the* Mat. 16. *Christ, the Son of the living God.* Nor do any of the Apostles take any notice of this great Alteration of the Christian Faith in this Point.

I know of no other Writings that pretend to give any Account of our Lord's Discourses after his Resurrection, unless it be the *Apostolical Constitutions*; and these are so very contrary to the Doctor's Notion of the Self-existent *Word*, that I will not suppose he shall appeal to them.

Thirdly, How can this Personal Union consist with this pretended Quiescence, which he supposes was total? What does the Doctor mean by Union? What is the Personal Union, but a near Relation and Presence of the Divine Nature to the Human, in order to special Operation upon, and by it? And where there is no such Operation, what is the Union? I think he will grant, as all Men, I conceive, do grant, that the Personal Union is dissolved between Man's Soul and Body, when the Soul ceases, at Death, to act in, and by the Body; tho a sort of ineffectual Relation may remain between the two Natures still: and will not his Quiescence of the Word, for so many Years, equally imply such a Dissolution of the Personal Union, if there had been such, between a Divine and Human Nature, in Jesus Christ? Otherwise I want to know what he means by Personal Union. Hence,

Fourthly, 'Tis a great Objection against his Quiescent Word, that Jesus Christ himself gives us not any Account of there being any such *Person* in the divine self-existent Nature, or any such *Word*, (Name or Thing) more than was manifest in himself. The *Father*, and the Spirit too, are oft mention'd by him; how is it then that he never mentions any *Word* or Second Person (which was not, as the Doctor grants, suspected to be himself) on any account? He might surely have spoken of the Almighty *Word*, and let his Disciples know there was such a Person, and their Duty to him, without saying any thing

of the Personal Union to him; nay, since the Operation and Assistances of the Father and Spirit do not prove such an Union of them to himself, why might not the *Word* sometimes have been particularly owned, and some things ascribed to him by Jesus Christ, which yet would have given no more Suspicion of his being the *Word*, than of his being the *Holy Spirit*? But that it should always be declared, that he wrought by the *Spirit of God*; and that the *Father dwelt in him*, and *did his Works*, and the like; and never once, that the *Word* (who was not thought, as he supposes, to be himself) assisted him, must seem very strange. Why his Agency in common should be passed by, the Doctor gives no account, nor so much as *presumes* any; tho, he is not the backwardest, nor most barren in Speculations, as his *New Theory* of the Trinity has convinced the World. So that 'tis plain, his Quiescence of the *Word* was not at all needful, for Concealment of the Personal Union; but was altogether as great, as even the *Arians* or *Socinians* would need, on the Supposition that there is no such Person at all in the self-existent God; and who therefore say, 'tis no wonder there were no marks of it in the Life or Doctrine of the Blessed *Jesus*.

Fifthly, I can't see, upon the Doctor's Hypothesis, any ground left to assert any Incarnation, or Union of the *Word* to the *human Nature*, so early as *Christ's Birth*: Then indeed the pre-existent Soul was embodied, as other Mens, and soon manifested it self in the natural Season; but what reason has he to say the Divine *Word*, another intelligent infinite Being, was then united? I remember not any Countenance the Scripture is pretended to give in this case; it says, the *Word was made Flesh*; but when? If it does not

say, at his Birth or Conception, and if there appeared no good Sign of it in all his Life; then why might it not be afterwards, and not till his Resurrection? when he was Begotten from the Dead, and it was said, *this Day have I begotten thee,* by Almighty God. I can't but think this would mend the Doctor's Scheme, and save him the labour of making out his *Quiescence* of the Word; by saying, our Lord Jesus had been only a Man in his Life-time on Earth; but became the self-existent God afterwards; since 'tis not till then that he finds any Proof of his Personal Union.

Sixthly, I see not by any thing in his Account, but that the Word is quiescent still, if it was so during Christ's Ministry. For what Manifestation has there been of a divine Word or Nature in our Saviour, which may give us a clearer Discovery of its Personal Union to his Flesh, since the Resurrection, than before? What new Proofs (waving a while the Sense of that Expression, the *Word was God*) can the Doctor alledge in fact, to shew this hidden divine Word has since shone forth in fuller Evidence? True indeed, Christ rose from the Dead; and ascended on high; and sent forth the Spirit in miraculous Gifts; but what then? Did not the Disciples hear him foretell these things, and yet not suspect his Divine Nature at all? And why shall the raising himself from the Grave, be a Proof (as he supposes) of his being the Supreme God, to *Thomas*, who had, without suspicion of this, seen him raise *Lazarus*, who had been longer dead? and which the Doctor equals to his raising himself. As for his sending the Holy Ghost in miraculous Gifts, he had formerly given his Disciples a Specimen of that, and exercised it himself oft: and the Doctor ascribes this Effusion of the Spirit to the Man Christ

Acts 13.
33.

P. 149.

Mat. 10.1.

Christ

Christ Jesus, telling us, That *the Man Christ Jesus* P. 205.
disposes of these Influences of the Spirit, as also the
Apostles did. And since he tells us, That *he con-* P. 155.
stantly declared to his Disciples, that the Man Christ
Jesus should judge us at the Great Day, and yet they
little thought of his having a Divine Nature ; I can-
 not imagine what Evidence, from any Fact, there
 is to this day, of his having any Divine Na-
 ture in him, which was never discovered during
 his Ministry on Earth. And if it be still quief-
 cent, for what end will the Doctor say the Per-
 sonal Union serves ?

Seventhly and Lastly, I don't see, by the Doc-
 tor's way of arguing, that he can make it appear,
 that our Lord Jesus himself knew he had a Divine
 Nature united to him ; but that the Man Christ
 was as ignorant of the *Personal Union*, as of the
 Day of Judgment, till his Resurrection. For since
 nothing that he said or did, discovered that he
 had any Knowledge of it, why should I believe
 he did know it ? And it would be a strange per-
 sonal Union, that himself neither was conscious,
 nor so much as inform'd of.

And now since the Doctor rely'd so much on
 this Notion of the *Word's Quiescence*, to furnish
 him with Answers to many things objected a-
 gainst Christ's supreme self-existent Deity ; and
 particularly confesses, that without supposing it,
 no tolerable Account can be given of our Sa-
 viour's not knowing the Day of Judgment: I P. 128.
 hope, if this fail him, he will rather yield, than
 betake himself to any *Intolerable* Accounts. If
 this great Magazine of Stores for Defence be
 blown up, it will be expected, that he presently
 surrender with the poor Remains, into the hands
 of victorious Truth.



C H A P. III.

I Come now to examine the Strength of those few remaining Texts, to which he retreats in his twelfth Chapter, as his only Defence; to see if they prove our *Lord Jesus Christ to be the one self-existent God.*

Here I find but *two* Texts, on which he grounds his Proof, (indeed he had not many more left, and 'twas time to stop, else he had given up his Cause) viz. *John* 1. 1. and *Heb.* 1. 10. For his other Proof from *1 Tim.* 2. 5. relies wholly upon the Interpretation of the *first* of those *two*, and needs no particular Answer.

First, He produces *St. John's* Testimony, viz. *The Word was with God, and the Word was God.* And indeed this alone must bear the Weight of the whole Cause, or he must give it up.

His Argument lies thus: ' *Since the Holy Scriptures fully and expressly declare, both under the Law and the Gospel, that there is but one God, and but one Being who is God; and since 'tis acknowledg'd by all, that St. John intends the one self-existent Being, by the Term God, with whom the Word was; therefore in saying the Word was God, he must mean that he was the same self-existent one God, or he must contradict the whole Tenour of the Scriptures, by asserting a God besides the one God: whereas the Scriptures (says he) never distinguish upon the matter, nor once inform us, that tho' there is but one Supreme, yet there is another Subordinate God.*' Upon this he is so warm and positive, as to say, ' *No possible Exposition or Sense of the word God, can reconcile the Contradiction of this Verse of St. John,*

‘ to the other parts of the Bible, without admitting
 ‘ that the *Word* is the self-existent God: so that we P. 189.
 ‘ must either give up all the rest of the Scripture,
 ‘ or reject St. John’s Gospel, as subverting the Unity
 ‘ of God.’ But since I am not so willing to give
 up either St. John’s Gospel, or the rest of the
 Bible, I will still attempt to reconcile ’em, ra-
 ther than hastily to declare, that if, on the
 other hand, St. John do not mean the *Word* to be
 God in an inferiour sense, I will either reject
 him, or all the rest of my Bible: and I hope to
 shew, that the same Sagacity and Candour, with
 which the Doctor has been able to extricate him-
 self so easily out of the pretended Difficulties of
 other Arguments and Texts, will as easily help
 him thro this, and that in the very same way
 of Reasoning. What I have to offer against his
 Argument from this Text, is,

1. That tho the Holy Scriptures do declare
 there is but *one God*, yet they do at the same
 time call other Beings by the *same Name* of
 God. The Doctor owns, that *Angels are often* P. 61.
call’d אלהים, Elohim. Now that is the very
 word which is translated *God*, in all those Texts
 cited by him, in which ’tis said, there is *no God*, P. 177.
 or *Elohim, besides me*; and yet there are *Elohim*,
 or Gods, besides him, by his own unavoidable
 Confession. And the same self-existent Being,
 who says there is *no Elohim, or God, besides him*;
 does himself say, to mortal Men in Power, I P^{sa}l. 82. 5.
have said ye are Elohim, or Gods, but shall die as
Men. So again, *Worship him all ye Elohim, or* P^{sa}l. 97. 7.
 Gods, with many more the like. And what
 will the Doctor do in this case? Will he now
 give up the rest of his Bible, or all these Texts?
 Is not the very Foundation of his Argument
 gone? If there be but one God, and yet other
 Gods also; is it not a very natural Solution, to

say there is emphatically but one God, in a peculiar super-eminent sense; and yet others, in a lower sense, by bearing some faint Impressions of that supreme Majesty, and without comparison to him, are Gods also? And if in this sense St. *John* should say the *Word was God*, and *was with the God*, i. e. with the Supreme *Πατρις ἡγεμονία*; were this any more inconsistent with the Scripture-Account of but one God, than what I have already mention'd? So that he cannot say, the Scriptures do not distinguish, upon the matter, between *Elohim* supreme and subordinate, when expressly the Lord is said to be *a God of Gods*, or a great God above all Gods.

Deut. 10.
17.

2. If our Lord Jesus Christ might justly be call'd God, even tho he were not the one self-existent Being, or God; then St. *John* may very justly be interpreted, to mean the *Word was so God*, as not to be the self-existent God: because St. *John* in that sense would speak but justly; and therefore to make him speak justly, 'tis not necessary he should mean the *Word* to be the supreme God, when he says he *was God*. And that our Saviour might justly be call'd God, without being the Supreme, the Doctor himself does grant, where he says, *Moses is stiled a God to Aaron and Pharaoh, because he was inspired, and they learned the Will of God from him: and (N.B.) consequently, our Saviour, who received the Spirit without measure, might more justly have been stiled a God, on the account of his having been a great Prophet.* Now since *Moses* was justly call'd God, (for it was by God himself) surely our Saviour, who might more justly be so call'd, without supposing a divine Nature, might very well be so call'd by St. *John* in this Text. So that the Contradiction, fancy'd in this Sense of the Text, between St. *John* and the rest of the Bible, begins,

P. 44.

gins, I hope, to be less frightful. And I would not have him say *that* was impossible to be said by St. *John*, which himself grants most justly might have been said.

3. Besides what I have said, that St. *John* might justly call the Word God, and yet not the Supreme; I add, that he has actually made a *distinction* between God, and *the* God. (1.) In the emphatical Article prefix'd to the first, and not to the other. This Article indeed is not always found before $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, when spoken of the Supreme God, nor seems it needful: but if St. *John* intended to make a distinction, (when speaking of two under that Character, it might be requisite to distinguish) he could not well omit giving the Emphasis of *the* God to the Supreme, whilst he withdrew it from the other. And therefore the Doctor had no good reason to make so light of this, which is counted of such moment, by *Philo* in *Lib. de Somniis*, by *Clemens Alexandrinus* in *Lib. 3. Strom.* p. 460. *Ed. Paris.* and *Origen*, *Tom. 2. in Johan. &c.* who tells us, that the True Almighty God is distinguish'd by this Article, from a God without it. And *Origen* makes $\delta\ \Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ to distinguish the true God from Christ, who is $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$; as $\delta\ \Lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, the *Word*, said here of Christ, differences him from other $\Lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\iota$, or *Words*: for any of the rational Spirits, Angels, or human Spirits, were oft so call'd, as may be seen in *Sandii Dissert. περὶ τοῦ Λόγου*. But 'tis the more considerable in *Philo Judæus*, who being a *Jew*, was very earnest and jealous for the *one* God; but yet thought it not inconsistent to admit a subordinate $\Lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, under the Title of a God; and this in St. *John's* own time: Which shews, how easily the Christian *Jewish* Churches would understand St. *John's* Words in this Sense; but could never have admitted the Doctor's

Sense of a self-existent God, being said to be with a self-existent God. (2.) In that the *Word*, call'd God, is said to have been *with God*. And this is inculcated twice; *The Word was with God, and the Word was God, and the same was with God*. Now if the meaning was, as the Doctor would have it, that the *Word* was that same God that he was with, 'tis hard to see the occasion of guarding it before and after, with so much Caution: as if any one could run into such an Error, as to think he should not be with himself. Or if he had intended so much, 'tis very likely he would have said, he was with *himself*, rather than with God; which looks more like another than the same, in ordinary Speech. What the Doctor says of *αφ' ου τὸν Θεόν* being oppos'd to his Manifestation *αφ' ους ἡμᾶς*, is true, but nothing of an Answer: for his being in secret with God, no more shews him to be that same God, than his being with Men afterward, proves him to be any of those same Men he dwelt with. So that the Difficulty and unnatural Harshness of his Interpretation, remains still as an Objection against it: and is just such an Objection, as lay against the different way of the *Photinians* reading this very Text; when they read the last Clause thus, *And God was*, and not *the Word was God*; leaving out the *Word*, or *Logos*. This is censur'd as most absurd, to make *St. John* say, *And God was*, when before-hand he had said the *Word was with God*: So that there could be no doubt but he was, *Quod nemo sanus scripserit, multo minus Evangelista*, *Θεόπρευρος*, says the judicious *Dr. Mill*, *Proleg.* Surely it was no more reasonable to say, he was with himself.

4. 'Tis to be consider'd, that only *St. John*, and he very late, uses the Term *Word* (in which alone the Doctor finds the very Deity of the second

cond Person of the Trinity.) And is it likely, that so many years after the Gospel of Christ had been preach'd, far and near, to Jews and Gentiles; and so many Churches formed upon its Principles, (be it thirty, or forty, or more years) that St. *John* should then first reveal such an *Article*? or should mean any thing considerably more, in calling our Saviour the *Word*, than the rest of the Apostles (who were most, if not all of 'em dead) had meant by other Characters, *viz.* the *Son of God*, the *Christ*, the *Lord Jesus*, &c. in which the Doctor pretends not to find this *Article*? Why should the *Word* in St. *John* signify so much more than St. *Paul*'s calling him the *Image of God*, or the *Brightness of his Father's Glory*? And yet the Doctor plainly suggests, that if these were interpreted of his divine Nature, it would fairly prove that Nature to be inferior to the very God. So that if it had been said, *And that Image, &c. was God*, it had meant only an inferior God: and is it any harder to interpret, *the Word was God*, the same way? especially when he allows that the same St. *John* applies the Character of the *Word* to the *Man Christ Jesus* only, without any regard to the divine Nature, or *Word*; and which, if understood of the divine Nature, or of the whole God-man, would really imply, that the *Word* is inferior to the very God; pag. 167. compar'd with pag. 170. Now if those Words, *He was clothed with a Vesture dipp'd in Blood*, and *his Name is called the Word of God*, must be spoken only of the Man Christ Jesus; or at least of such a Nature as is inferior to the very God; I think St. *John*'s other Expression, *The Word was God*, may be allow'd the like Interpretation: since there is no reason to imagine the same inspired Writer should not in both places (and perhaps all in which 'tis used)

used) use that remarkable Title, of the same Person, in the same Sense.

P. 216.

But I must not press this too hard, because, tho the Doctor hath said all that I have mention'd ; yet, to do him justice, he says quite the contrary afterwards: for he makes that Name, the *Word of God*, to be a proof of his being a distinct Person in the self-existent God, whose *Word* he is; and this after he had numbered it among those Texts, which are spoken of the Man Jesus Christ, *without any regard to the Word, or divine Nature*: as indeed the whole Context speaks of a Man with his *Name on his Thigh*. So that until I know which half of the Contradiction he is willing to part with, I let it pass.

5. There is no more difficulty in the seeming Contradiction between those Texts, which declare there is but one God ; and St. *John's* styling the *Word* a God, in another and inferior Sense, than there is in many other Instances: which yet the Doctor, and all other *Trinitarians*, (if I may count him such) can easily reconcile; and therefore he ought not to make it so insuperable a Difficulty in this single Case, as he pretends it is.

Isa. 43. 11.

Hosea 13. 4.

P. 161.

For instance, 'tis as positively and expressly said by God himself, *There is no Saviour, besides me*, as that *there is no God besides me*, in the following Chapter. And both are put on the same foot together, *Thou shalt know no God but me, for there is no Saviour besides me*. And yet the Man Christ Jesus is certainly stiled our Saviour, or *Jesus*, all along in the New Testament; which, the Doctor confesses, *betokens that Man whom the blessed Virgin brought forth, and implies nothing of an incarnate God in the Notation of it*. Nay 'tis a Character into which he is exalted by

by God, and therefore can't belong to the infinite supreme God: *Him hath God exalted, to be a Prince and Saviour.* And he is called Saviour at the same time, where the great God is called so, tho' in an inferior Sense, and as subordinate to God. *The Love of God our Saviour appear'd* Acts 5.31.
~~—~~ *who saved us by the renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us, thro' Jesus Christ our Saviour.* So that here is God our Saviour; and yet another instrumental Saviour; tho' the Scriptures say there is but one (in the most emphatical Sense) who is Saviour. Just as in *St. John*, there is *the God* (in the most eminent sense) and *a God with him*; tho' still there is but one God in the high sense of that Character, according to the Scriptures. Tit. 3.4,6.

So again, we read there is but one Lord: *Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one Lord;* Mark 12:29. which is the same as to say, there was but one Lord, as well as but one God, as the Scribe's Answer shews. And yet we find another Lord, *The Lord said to my Lord, ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ.* Ver. 32. So again, if it be said, there is but one only who knows the Hearts of Men, the Doctor can easily reconcile this with the Man Christ Jesus's, nay, with the Apostles knowing the Hearts of others; tho' not as God knows 'em, of himself, but as knowing 'em by the Spirit's assistance. Again, *God alone doth wonders;* and yet the Apostles Psa. 136.4. did great wonders also, but by God's Power. Twenty Instances, I suppose, might be produced, of Characters appropriate, in some sense, to the supreme God, which yet are (without any express Marks of Distinction, but what the Nature of the Subjects plainly suggest to us) attributed to inferior Beings. *God only is holy; he only is* Rev. 15.4. *wise, &c.* But these give no difficulty to a candid Mind, tho' others be said to be holy and wise

wise too, in an inferiour sense. And therefore if St. *John* should have stiled the *Word* a God, in a subordinate Notion; and did think, by saying he was with *the God*, he had sufficiently distinguished him from the one supreme God; especially telling us, *that the Word was Flesh, &c.* I see not how the Doctor, with his usual Candour about him, can be offended, or any way perplexed, to reconcile this with the Scripture-Testimonies of one God only. He need not give up the rest of the Scriptures, nor yet reject St. *John's Gospel*. He needs only part with his own harsh, unnatural Interpretation of the first Verse of it, and then all will be easy: for I don't find any other Text would give him much trouble. And this Method is no more than, in other cases, he would and does frankly use: so that I can't but think he might have given up this Text, as well as others, if he had any other in reserve, by which to support his Hypothesis, or to give any graceful Appearance of having maintain'd the current Orthodox Doctrine.

To conclude this Argument, I would only know of the Doctor, who counts it impossible to reconcile the One Self-existent God, with giving the Character of God to any who is not that same Self-existent God, what he thinks of his so oft-approv'd *Nicene Creed*, which he imagines may be proved by Scripture; when having first stiled the Father, *the One God*, it calls the Son, *God of God*? Does he really think; (*he who justly trembles at the Guilt of Collusion, in subscribing or using such Forms, as thwart the Sense of a Man's own Mind*) that it means the Self-existent God, of the Self-existent God, begotten before all Worlds, of the Father? Does he thoroughly receive and believe this? Or does it not mean

a derivative, subordinate God, of a self-existent God.

Secondly, His other Text, now to be consider'd, is *Heb. 1. 10.* *And thou Lord, in the beginning hast laid the Foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the Work of thy hands: They shall perish, but thou shalt endure—— They shall be changed, but thou art the same, and thy Years fail not.*

The Doctor tells us, the Author of this Epistle assures us, that this Passage is meant of the Son, viz. our Lord Jesus Christ, and that the 102d Psalm, whence 'tis cited, is addressed to *Jehovah*, or the self-existent God: and thence it follows, that the Son is that *Jehovah*, the self-existent God. I shall wave what he says of *Jehovah's* being the incommunicable Name of God, (which I think he has not proved, but rather the contrary) because I rely not on that Answer. Only I cannot but observe, that having, as he thought, got another and surer Argument, by proving Jesus Christ to be *Jehovah*, he now begins to give up what he had argued from *St. John*, by saying, *Whatever Latitude may be allow'd to Θεός, God, in St. John; yet Jehovah is appropriate to the one God, in contradiction to all other Θεοί.* So that it seems the Word God, in *St. John*, may, after all, be allow'd a Latitude; and others may have that Character, beside the one self-existent God; and consequently the Word being stiled God, might yet not be the self-existent God. And why then did he stand so stiffly to it before? But perhaps he did not then see, he had this other Argument for a Reserve. But to his present Argument, I reply:

1. That every Accommodation of a Text to any Person, is no sufficient Evidence that 'tis the same

same Person, of whom it was originally spoken. For instance, *St. Matthew*, chap. 2. 15. says *it was fulfill'd, in Jesus Christ, what the Lord had spoken by the Prophet, saying, Out of Egypt have I called my Son.* Now where will the Doctor find these words, but in *Hos. 11. 1*? where, 'tis plain, they were spoken of the People of *Israel*: *When Israel was a Child, then I loved him, and called my Son out of Egypt.* Were the People of *Israel* and *Jesus Christ* therefore one and the same, because, for the Likeness of the Case, what was said of one is apply'd to the other? No, surely! And therefore if the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, who had said, *ver. 1.* that *God made the Worlds by, or through, his Son*, did, from this, think he might accommodate to the Instrument, what had been said of the Principal, working by him: is this more strange or unsuitable, than the foregoing Application was?


2. It doth not appear to me, that the Author of the Epistle assures us, these Words are spoken of the *Son*: For observe how he brings 'em in, *ver. 8; 9; 10.* *Unto the Son he saith, Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever — Thou hast loved Righteousness, and hated Iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the Oil of Gladness above thy Fellows. And thou, Lord, hast laid the Foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the Work of thy hands: they shall perish, but thou remainest; they shall be changed, but thou art the same, thy Years shall not fail.*

Here we may observe, that the tenth Verse, *And thou Lord, &c.* (tho 'tis a new Citation) is not prefaced with, *And, to the Son he saith*; as *ver. 8.* or with an *again*, as *ver. 5, 6.* and so *Chap. 2. 13.* but barely, *And thou Lord.* Now the


the God last mention'd was Christ's God, who had anointed him; and the *Author* thereupon breaks out into the Celebration of this God's Power, and especially his unchangeable Duration; which he dwells upon, as what he principally cites the Text for; in order, I conceive, to prove the Stability of the Son's Kingdom, before spoken of: *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever; God thy God has anointed thee; and thou Lord; i. e. thou who hast promis'd him such a Throne, art he who laid the Foundation of the Earth, and made the Heavens, which tho of long and permanent Duration, yet will perish; but thou remainest, thou art the same, thy Years shall not fail.* So that it seems to be a Declaration of God's Immutability made here, to ascertain the Durableness of Christ's Kingdom, before mention'd: and the rather so, because this Passage had been used originally for the same purpose in the 102d Psal, *viz. to infer thence this Conclusion, ver. ult. The Children of thy Servants shall continue, and their Seed be established before thee.* In like manner it here proves the Son's Throne should be establish'd for *ever and ever*, by the same Argument, *viz. by God's Immutability; and so was very pertinently alledg'd of God, without being apply'd to the Son; to shew how able his God, who had anointed him, was to make good and maintain what he had granted him, viz. a durable Kingdom for ever.*

And it gives some farther strength to this Interpretation, that the Creation of the World is never once, that I remember, ascribed immediately to our Blessed Lord *Jesus Christ*, in such Terms; but constantly 'tis said that all things were made *through him, &c.* And if 'tis never said elsewhere in Scripture, that he created all things,

things, 'tis not very likely it should be said of him by the *Psalmist*, or the Author of this Epistle, since there is not full Evidence of it.



An APPENDIX, containing some Considerations on what the Doctor says concerning the Holy Ghost.


WHAT relates to the *Holy Ghost*, the Doctor says, he hopes to bring to a more speedy Issue. And I think he has done so indeed: for he has roundly given up his *Personality*, and consequently ended the Dispute with those *Socinians*, who account the Holy Spirit to be only the *Divine Virtue and Energy*; and who will never deny the Divinity of the Power or Attributes of the Almighty Father: and so he has done the Work with great Expedition. Indeed having formerly confuted the *Eternal Procession*, which, says he, some of the *Antients in the fourth Century*, hurried on by Zeal for a *Fundamental*, so as not duly to weigh their Arguments, thought to be a *Demonstration of the Divinity of the Holy Ghost*; but they took a wrong (tho I think the only one pretended) Text to make it out by: Annot. on the Com. Prayer, p. 290. he had so much the less to do.

The reason why I say he has given up the *Personality* of the Holy Spirit, (tho he sometimes calls him a *Person* still) is, that he has yielded up either the only Argument for it, or at least that grand Argument, in the Overthrow of which, all

all the rest must sink: and that is, from Christ's Promise of the Comforter, *viz.* the *Holy Ghost*, *John* 16. where the Spirit is set forth under so many Personal Notes and Characters; *He shall come, He shall guide, &c.* especially *ver.* 13. ἐνεῖνθ, τὸ πνεῦμα, *He, the Spirit, &c.* that it has been, I think, the only Difficulty that has given the *Socinians* any great trouble smoothly to remove. They have pleaded it was a *strong Figure*, and the Doctor says it is so; and represents it as an *Allegory* and *Metaphor*, and a *Chain of Metaphors*; by *P. 204.* which *we are to understand no more, than that God or Christ bestows the Gifts of the Spirit*; and likens it to *that admirable Prosopopœia*, *Prov.* 8. 22—31. So that a Power, or Operation, is set out under the elegant Fiction of a Person, tho it be none in reality.

I do not say but the Doctor and the *Socinians* have very much to alledge in the Case; nor do I blame him for complying with just Evidence, wherever he thinks he sees it: but then, I think, he can never retrieve the *Personality* of the Spirit, by any stronger Argument from the Holy Scriptures. He may, indeed, offer something for the *Deity* of the *Holy Spirit*, if no *distinct Person* from the *Father*; yea, he may do it with Consent of all sides. And all his Arguments to prove the Holy Ghost *very God*, shall be granted him by the *Unitarians* of all sorts, while he grants them their Arguments, to prove the Holy Spirit is no more but a *metaphorical Person*.

Not that I think the Doctor was overseen, or unawares was too easy in this matter; no, all things consider'd, he has been wary and subtle enough. He had one to oppose, who is generally look'd on as *Arianizing* in this point, pleading for the *real Personality of the Spirit*, from our Lord's Description of him, as a subordinate Messenger

P. 205.

and Minister; and I judge, he saw well enough, that if that Description was to be literally taken, as of a real Person, it would prove him one inferior to God and Christ; and there would be no defending his Supreme Deity: and therefore he calls it a *very difficult Passage*. Hereupon he takes shelter under the *Socinians* against the *Arians*, and hopes he may defend the Deity of the Holy Spirit, whatever becomes of his true distinct Personality. For granting the Spirit to be a Person, there was no pretence for an Allegory.

Nor do I find any Argument to prove it such, or that the Spirit was not literally sent as a Messenger: however it be, I can't but observe how gracefully the Doctor sets the matter off: lest any should think it a disappointment to find the Promise of the Comforter so interpreted, he spares no *Encomium* upon it; he tells us of Figures, Allegory, Metaphors, *Prosopopœia*; but then they are not ordinary ones: they are Figures, but they are *strong Figures*; 'tis an Allegory, but 'tis a *noble Allegory*; 'tis a *Prosopopœia*, but 'tis an *admirable one*.

And thus indeed he may very well prove the Deity of the Spirit: for take away his proper distinct Personality, and who will deny the Divinity of God's Power, or Operations, as connoting in them their Agent? But this is so far from being a peculiar Christian Doctrine, that I suppose no *Turk*, *Jew*, nor *Pagan*, doubts such *Figurative*, *Metaphorical*, *Prosopopœia-Persons*, (in the Deity) of Attributes, Operations, Modes, Properties, or any such *Sabellian* Disguises. And indeed when the Doctor is got out of his Metaphors, and speaks directly of the Spirit's Personality; I think it amounts to no more: of which hereafter. And this will answer all his Arguings for the *Holy Spirit's* being the *very God*.

The

The Question in dispute is not, Whether there be not, in God, something that is call'd *Spirit*; or whether the *Spirit*, in Scripture, does not sometimes imply what is God: for if *God be essentially a Spirit*, then, no doubt, this *Spirit* is God. And this is said of the Father, and so carries no personal Distinction in it: *John 4. 24. God is a Spirit.* So *Psal. 139. 7. Whither shall I go from thy Spirit?* Nay since (what none can deny) the Doctor owns, in agreement with Dr. *Clark*, P. 245. that the Holy Spirit, in Scripture, sometimes signifies *the mere Power of God*; there needs be no dispute neither, whether this be not God, and have not all the incommunicable Characters of the Almighty. But the Question is, whether, besides this allow'd Notion of the Holy Spirit, there be not, by our Saviour, mention made of John 16. an Holy Spirit, who is a distinct Person from the Father (who is a Spirit) in a proper sense; or at least who is more properly a Person, than the mere Power and Energy of the Almighty is? The Doctor has not shown there is any such Holy Spirit at all, and the *Arians* say there is, and that he is inferior to God; and may well complain that their Opposers, when they would prove the Holy Spirit to be the one God, only bring their Proofs in relation to the former Notion of the Spirit, or the divine Power and Energy, (which is not deny'd) but none that proves the Deity of any other Holy Spirit, viz. *a Person*. And this is manifest in the Doctor's *two* Texts, on which he relies, for evidence of the Holy Spirit's Deity.

His Argument, from *Luke 1. 32, 35.* is, viz. *That since Jesus Christ is therefore the Son of the most High God, because the Holy Ghost begat him,* P. 200. it follows, the Holy Ghost must be *that very God*, else the most High God was *not his immediate Father*. But 'tis plain, by the Holy Ghost there, is

meant the Power of God, and 'tis so explain'd; *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and (or even) the Power of the Highest overshadow thee.* Strange! that one, who says the Holy Spirit, in Scripture, sometimes signifies the *mere Power* of God, should pretend any other Sense here, where 'tis so express'd; and then sure enough the Power of God will not be *another Being from him.* But what is this to the Holy Spirit, about which the Controversy lies; and which is a distinct Person? This is the unjust way of, almost all, the Writers for the Deity of the Holy Ghost; tho they grant it has different Acceptations, both for the *Power* of God, and also for a *Person*, yet they never distinguish in their Arguments, but confound both together; and because the Divine Power, or Holy Spirit, has *supreme* Characters, therefore the *Holy Spirit, Christ's prime Minister* (as the Doctor calls him) must have them also: as if both were one and the same. But by distinguishing them, *their* Arguments are easily answered, who, of *one* Holy Spirit, prove the Personality, *viz.* that in *John* 16. and of the Spirit in the *other* Sense, *viz.* the divine active *Virtue*, prove the Deity, and then put both together into one: whereas they should prove the *personal* Holy Spirit to be *God*, or that the same Spirit which is proved to be a distinct Person is so; else they argue not *ad idem*, in the Deity, and in the Personality; nor at all against the *Unitarians.*

His other and main Argument is from *1 Cor.* 2. 10, 11. *The Spirit searcheth the deep things of God: For what Man knoweth the things of Man, save the Spirit of Man, which is in him? Even so the things of God, knoweth none but the Spirit of God.* Hence the Doctor infers, that the Spirit of God is as much that God, whose Spirit he is, as the Spirit of a Man is that Man in whom it is; and that the Spirit

P. 209.

P. 199.

Spirit of God is as much God himself, as the Spirit of a Man is the Man himself, and not a distinct Being.

But, whatever be the Meaning of these Expressions, what does this avail towards proving the Deity of that Spirit, who is a distinct *Person*, in God? For it may as well be argu'd hence, that as the Spirit of a Man is the same Person, and not distinct from the Man, so the Spirit of God is the same Person with God, and not a distinct Person from that God whose he is: For the Spirit of a Man (to which the Spirit of God is liken'd) is as *much* the same Person with the Man, as 'tis the same Being; and perhaps something *more* so: because, in the Man, there is another different Being besides his Spirit, but not another Person. So that it may be as well pretended that the Spirit of Man is a different Person from the Man himself, as (and in the same sense too) that the Spirit of God is a different Person from God. And yet this, I think, is all he pretends to prove the personal Distinction from, *viz.* because 'tis called the *Spirit of God*; P. 216. and this, it seems, as the Soul is the *Spirit of Man*, which yet is without being a distinct Person. So that whether by the Spirit of God, in this Text, *St. Paul* meant only God, who is essentially a Spirit, as the rational Soul is a Spirit; or the divine Virtue, and Inspiration of God; neither of these is the Person of the Holy Ghost, which the Inquiry is of, or whose Deity is deny'd.

And this is evident, according to the Doctor's (at least the common) Principles, that it is not their one distinct and third Person in the Godhead, that is intended by the Holy Spirit in this Text; because 'tis said, *None (ὅδεις) knows the things of God, save the Spirit of God*: which, if appro-

priated to the third Person, would exclude the *Word*, nay, and the first Person too, from this Knowledge; and so in proving the Deity of the Holy Ghost, would destroy that of the *Word*.

Indeed I think it most likely, that the Apostle, by the *Spirit*, here, intends the divine *Afflatus*, or Inspiration; because, *ver.* 12. he calls it τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, the Spirit which comes forth, or out from God: and is opposed to the Spirit of the World, *i. e.* the *Genius*, the *Dispositions*, or Dictates and Wisdom of the World. So the

P. 210.

Doctor expressly tells us, *This Expression τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, relates to the Allegory of his Mission, signifying the Gifts of the Spirit, and not the Being from whom they flow*; as he says a little after of the Holy Ghost.

So that there is no reason to stretch a Similitude, for Illustration, to its utmost length, when it no way appears that the Apostle intended to shew more than this, *viz.* how the immediate Inspiration of God was the only effectual way of coming to the right knowledge of divine Mysteries. For he does not say that *because* the Spirit of God is one with God, in the same manner that the Spirit of a Man is one with the Man himself, therefore it knows the things of God; but only, *as* the Spirit of a Man knows the things of a Man, so the Spirit of God knows the things of God, *i. e.* as certainly and perfectly knows them, or rather makes them known: because the

Ver. 12.

Apostle uses the Word so, *I desire to know, i. e.* (by an usual Hebraism) to make known, *nothing among you, save Christ, and him crucify'd*; and the Context requires, or well fits it. And then, if the Doctor can spare us his noble *Allegory*, or one Link of his long *Chain of Metaphors* only, by a very easy and usual *Prosopopœia*, to speak of the divine Inspiration, after the manner of a Person, the Apostle's Words (which are to prove,

that

that God had revealed Mysteries to them) are thus; For the divine Inspiration discovers the secret things of God; for as no Man can make known the things of a Man, i. e. what his own Thoughts and Purposes, and Inclinations are—except the Man himself discovers them; so none but the Inspiration of God hath made known the Purposes and Mind of God. Now we have receiv'd, not the subtle Learning and Wisdom of the World, but this Inspiration of God, that we make known to Men what we have freely receiv'd of God; which things accordingly we speak, &c. So that here is nothing of Difficulty, nor of the Controversy in hand, unless it be to shew, against Dr. Clark, and others, that there is no real Person meant by the Holy Spirit in Scripture, only the divine Power and Inspiration, which is what most Socinians agree to.



C H A P. IV.

I Come in the last place to make some general Observations on the Doctor's *New Theory of the Trinity in Unity*; and to shew some of the great Absurdities and Inconsistencies therein, as they appear to me.

But I would first take notice that he agrees entirely with Dr. Clark, with *Arians* and *Socinians*, against the *Athanasians* and *Trinitarians*, in the Scripture-Notion of the Divine Father, viz. that he is but one Person in the common Sense; and that there is no Almighty God, or Person, but he; and that there is no Almighty Eternal Person intended by the Character of Son of God there; but that the Son is a pre-existent, inferiour Mind, united to a Body by the Holy Ghost; and that the Holy Spirit sometimes signifies the Power and Opera-

P. 231.

P. 245.

P. 202. Operation of God the Father. And it happens that the Doctor has given the same Interpretation of the Baptismal Form, *Mat. 28. 19.* as Dr. *Clark* had in his *Paraphrase*.

Indeed he makes the *Son* and *Spirit* of lower Consideration, than Dr. *Clark* does; not thinking altogether so highly of the inferior pre-existent rational Nature of Christ, nor so much maintaining the proper *Personality* of the Holy Spirit, as he.

To make amends for these, he has started another Trinity in the *Scripture-Father* (the first Person in the *Baptismal Form* and *Creed*.) The first, he says, is nameless, the others are the *Word* and *Spirit*; all three in the *Father of the Man Christ Jesus*, his only-begotten Son. So that here is a Trinity of *Fathers*, who all have that common Name, and who all beget the Son of God, which he expressly says of the *Spirit*, and does not say the *Word* was *quiescent* in this matter. Now as Dr. *Clark* has not affirm'd or deny'd any thing, about such a Trinity in the *Scripture-Father*, as not to the purpose of Religion, and which in some sense may be in every intelligent Mind; and for which there is no just Pretence from Scripture, unless it be taken from the Attributes and Operations of God the Father: so I can't but judge the Doctor's new Scheme as very absurd, for these Reasons:

First, His Notion of *Persons* in the Godhead amounts to no more than Attributes or Operations, allow'd by all sorts of *Unitarians*. His Notion is laid down, pag. 218. where he says (of the three Persons) *What is meant is pretty generally agreed, viz. that the Father, Word, and Spirit, tho they are really distinct, so that one is not the other, yet are not separate Beings, but one and the same Being, which is the Self-existent God.* This is what he so
oft

oft refers us to, as his Sense of the Term *Persons*. P. 245. Some things truly distinguish'd, in the same Being, is his Notion of Persons. Now cannot any one say as much as this of the divine Attributes, of Wisdom, Power, Goodness, Truth, Holiness? Are not these truly distinguish'd, and yet not separate Beings? And indeed he seems not to pretend to any higher Distinction than that of the Faculties or Operations of every Mind, by what he says, *I do not affirm, that the Word is the internal Reason or Wisdom of God, an Attribute or Power of him; because the Scriptures have not declared any such thing: (as if this should not also have kept him from calling this Word a Person.)* So that he pretends not to have any thing from Scripture or Reason, against the *Word's* being an Attribute of God; only he had not enough to warrant his asserting it. But yet *it may be so*, for any thing he intends to say to the contrary. And for what does he then pretend to write for the *Holy Trinity*, or against Dr. *Clark*? Who is his Adversary? Who denies a Trinity in the Almighty God; which he finds in himself? *viz.* of Operations, Powers, &c. tho all may not agree what Names to give them.

But then he can't tell how to make this consistent with the *Incarnation of the Word only*. 'Tis hard to pretend an Operation or Faculty of the Soul should be *made Flesh*, and not the Soul it self; and if so, then all the Powers of it are incarnate together. And if the *divine Nature* was incarnate, then all the Attributes are included in it, and so all three Persons become incarnate, which confounds the whole Scheme: And for this reason, a Scholastick Trinity, of Modes and Attributes, has justly been rejected with great Contempt, as trifling with sacred Matters; and arguing indeed against no body.

The Doct^r's Explication of this Matter by a *Triangle, touching a Point at one Angle only*, shews how necessary a *real Distinction* of Beings is, to make out the Incarnation of one of the Persons only; for unless he supposes the three Persons are as much three as the three Angles of the Triangle, which are distinct Parts, and make up one compound, 'tis not to his purpose. And truly he seems to me, at other times, to suppose that the three Persons are three *distinct Beings*; and that, by one self-existent God, he means one, consisting of the three Beings. I know very well, he speaks of *God's simple uncompounded Being*, but then 'tis only by way of supposition, as what *may be*. And what he means by God's Simplicity, he lets us know, by saying, *It only excludes a Composition of separable Parts*. So that distinct Beings, or three infinite Minds *inseparably* united, may consist with his Notion of the divine Simplicity and Unity; which he farther shews, by resembling the Union of the three Persons into one God, by the Union of the *two Beings*, Soul and Body, into one Man; whom he calls *one and the same Being, which they are necessarily constitutive of*, and therefore are inseparable Parts, (I think of a Man, in his sense.)

Now if Soul and Body, two most distinct Beings, and of different kinds, may be one and the same *Being*, in the Doct^r's account; I see not but the *Father, Word and Spirit* may be three distinct Beings, or Minds, and yet make still *but one Being*, in his sense. *I do by no means*, says he, *say the Father, Word, and Spirit are different Substances, as the Soul and Body in Man are, the one material, and the other immaterial: i. e.* he is only against the three divine Persons being of divers kinds, but says nothing against their

their

their being distinct individual Beings, of the same kind; but concludes, *If the Union of distinct Substances may constitute one and the same Being, Man; then the Father, Word, and Spirit may constitute one and the same uncompounded Being, God.* He cannot well mean, by uncompounded, any thing, but not consisting of *different sorts* of Beings, as Soul and Body are; because if he intends by uncompounded, not constituted of three distinct Beings at all, his Inference would be ridiculous: *viz.* if the Union of Soul and Body, which are two Substances, can yet constitute one compounded Being, then surely these three, Father, Word, and Spirit (who are not two Substances) *may* constitute one uncompounded Being; since they then not only may, but *must* necessarily be one Being: and there could be no need to prove that what is not *two*, may be but *one*. Indeed he says he will *affirm nothing of their joint Substance*, i. e. I suppose, whether it be constituted of distinct Substances join'd together, or not: but then he cannot affirm they constitute one uncompounded Being, if it may be constituted of three united Beings; unless by uncompounded Beings, he means one uncompounded of several sorts of Beings, in which sense only he allows the great God to be a simple Being and uncompounded. Nor would it at all follow, that because two different Substances may be one *compounded* Being, therefore three distinct Substances, not different, may be one *uncompounded* Being; unless it means uncompounded of different sorts.

I am sensible 'tis Folly and Rashness to talk so freely of the *Substance* of the great God, and the *Constitution* of his Being; for we know not what we talk about, and do but *darken Counsel by Words without Knowledge*; but that the Doc-

tor's Reasonings upon it have led me to take some notice thereof: and indeed they who are so positive as to declare it for an Article of Faith, That the one God and his Son are *consubstantial*, (as the Doctor in his *Preface* does, calling it that *Great Truth*) shou'd, I think; know well what it means, when they are so very sure of it. The like I may say, as to the Meaning of the Word *Persons* in the Godhead, which being not the Scripture-Language, but of Mens own introducing and devising; I may justly demand, what their Meaning by it is. And they are justly to be censured, when they voluntarily introduce, or chuse and justify Terms of Art in great Articles, and then cannot tell what they mean by their own Inventions, but sometimes one thing, and sometimes another; thinking to get off by saying, *Let these Terms be used, till better be substituted in their room*; as if it were better to talk at random, and so perhaps foolishly and inconsistently of the Almighty, than to hold our peace in humble and reverent Silence. And therefore the Doctor's defective, insignificant, and uncertain Account of his Meaning by the Term *Persons*, is one just Objection against his Book; as leaving the main Point in utmost Confusion and Obscurity, which it pretends to explain and prove.

Secondly, I find that instead of a *Trinity*, which he pretends to prove in his way, he has found out but *two* Persons in the very God; and having lost the *first Person*, his *Trinity* is lost too. He all along supposes the Term *Father* to be no *particular* Name of *one* of the Persons in the sacred Scriptures, but that it denotes the self-existent one God, in *which* his three Persons are to be found; (because he is sensible there is no supreme self-existent God, but he whom the Scriptures stile the *Father*, and the *God and Father*

ther

ther of our Lord Jesus Christ: and tells us oft, that he is never called the *Father of the Word*.) P. 237. Hereupon he racks his Thoughts to find out a Trinity here: but tho he finds a *Word* and *Spirit* to say something of, he cannot find a *first Person* mention'd; for he says, *That he is never by any particular Name distinguished in Scripture from the Word and Spirit*. Where then must he find this other distinct Person, whom the Scriptures have not once vouchsafed to name; as if only the *first Person* was of no concern to Men? Why truly he will gather it by Implication; and how does he make it out?

All his Evidence is, that in Scripture the *self-existent God* is plainly distinguish'd from the *Word* and *Spirit*, in that the *Word* is called the *Word of God*, and the *Spirit* the *Spirit of God*; and consequently they are distinguish'd from God, whose they are. P. 216.

Now one would be apt to think by this, that the *Word* and *Spirit* should not be that self-existent God from whom they are so plainly distinguished, as he very truly affirms: And indeed at another time the Doctor thinks the Substance of the self-existent Being will admit only of some Distinction *in it self*, but not *from it self*, P. 221. which is more cautious than the other. But then to make out three Persons distinct from each other, it was necessary to say the *Word* and *Spirit* are distinguish'd from God, because the Doctor could find nothing to distinguish 'em from, but the self-existent God; and yet they must be the same with what they are plainly distinguish'd from. So that now the *Word* and *Spirit* are to be distinguished from what Dr. *Clark* accounts the first Person, or intelligent Being, the very God, which yet he denies elsewhere. P. 235.

But

But 'tis a most weak Pretence the Doctor offers for proof of some other third *Person's* being imply'd in the Word *God*, (supposing the Word and Spirit to be not distinct Beings, but *this God*, as he does suppose) for there is then no need at all of a third Person, to justify the Expressions, the *Word and Spirit of God*, by his own Principles, (except that he needs to find out a third somewhere, to make out his Trinity) because these two alone, *viz. Word and Spirit*, will suffice to solve all: for if the *Word* be God, and the *Spirit* be God, the *very God*; then the Expression *the Word of God*, may mean the *Word of God the Spirit*; and the *Spirit of God*, may mean the *Spirit of God the Word*; and *the Word with God*, may be *with God the Spirit*: what needs he invent a third? Let two suffice, since he owns he cannot find any more mention'd in Scripture; only let him not call them a *Trinity of two*; for that is all he can pretend to, in this way of proving it.

And yet 'tis on this mighty Pillar alone that the Doctor builds his Proof of the *Trinity*; and of all he says in justification of the *eternal Generation*, and his calling the *Word* the *eternal Son of God*, without any Precedent in Scripture for such an Attempt. In a word, all he can say, in justification of the Church's *Litany, Creeds and Offices*, in the use of these unscriptural Terms, according to his Principles, relies upon this poor Quibble, which I am astonished should see the Light from any Man of his Thought and Learning.

For to argue from the Expressions, the *Word of God*, and *Spirit of God* (whom he takes to be that same God) that there must be a third Person meant by God, whose they are; is just as if he had argued, that because we read of the Soul
of

of a *Man*, and the Body of a *Man*, therefore there must be a third thing in *Man* distinct from both, whose they are, tho' it have only the common Name of *Man*; when indeed there is no more in *Man* but those two: even so, tho' there were no more in *God* than the *Word* and *Spirit*, (and he says no more is named in Scripture) it might be truly said, the *Word of God*, and *Spirit of God*: so that this does not prove another, or third Person, which the Doctor still wants.

Thirdly, I observe, that as he has lost the *first* Person, so even of these his remaining *two* Persons, he has confounded the Characters, and has left no distinction between 'em: For in straining to make the *Word* in the divine Nature, a *Son*, (I suppose, to accommodate it to the Offices of the Church, tho' he grants, 'tis not according to the P. 162. Sacred Text) he has overdone it, and made them both *Sons*. Since the Patrons of the common Opinions run wholly upon the Characters of *Father* and *Son*, in the Trinity they worship as the supreme God, it was needful for him to make some pretence for applying these Characters, which belong to Christ's human, to the divine Nature; and for that end to make out the Relations of *Father* and *Son*, within the one self-existent God, that as *Son* he may be esteem'd one of the divine Persons, and worthy of the supreme Adoration, given him under that Character, and not that of the *Word*.

This was indeed an hard Task! since he grants, the Scriptures know no *Father* but the *one God*; nor *Son of God*, but the *Man Christ*, begotten by God, by a temporal Generation. How then shall he make out a *Father* and *Son in the Deity*? Yet, says he, because the *Word* subsists eternally in P. 217. God, as one and the same Being; and because God,

or that which besides the Word and Spirit, is in God, is represented so, as that the Word is his; therefore we justly think, that so much of God, as is not, by a more particular Name, distinguished from Word and Spirit in Scripture, and is conceived by us as prior, in consideration, to both Word and Spirit, is very properly termed, the Eternal Father of the Word, and the Word very properly termed his Eternal Son.

But since both these pretended Reasons are equally apply'd by him to the Word and Spirit, they prove both to be Sons, or neither; and if the Doctor had dealt fairly, he would have said, therefore, That Prior thing in God, &c. is very properly term'd, *The Eternal Father* of the Word and Spirit both; and both Word and Spirit are very properly termed his *Two Eternal Sons*. I dare appeal to him, if he did not see this, which is so manifest; and if he did not resolve to shew the matter thus partially: for, does the Word become God's Son, because it subsists eternally in him; and does not he say the same of the Holy Spirit expressly? Or is it because it is called the Word of God? And then is not the other much oftner called the Spirit of God? Is not this a brave Foundation for building the Relations of Father and Son, and the Doctrine of the Eternal Generation, upon? If the Doctor had so well confuted, formerly, the Notion of the Eternal Procession, he has here brought in the Eternal Generation of the Spirit, in the room of it.

So that upon the whole, having under the foregoing Remark shewn that the Expressions, viz. *The Word of God*, and *Spirit of God*, do not imply any Third thing in God (upon the Doctor's Supposition, that they are that God) which takes
away

away his pretended ground of *Sonship*; I think I may adventure to say, that the Doctor has first supposed a *nameless Father*, and then assign'd him *Two Sons*, and this (as he grants) without any direct Scripture-Warrant; and yet this he would have believ'd to be the *Everblessed Trinity* of the Christian Faith. Sorry I am that the sacred and awful Names of the *Father*, the *Son*, and *Holy Spirit*, in the Gospel, should be thus sported with, and, I wish I may not say, wantonly misapply'd. And when he had, in this poor trifling manner, strained for some Pretence to name the Persons, *Father* and *Son*, methinks it had been enough to say, that, by some sort of *Analogy*, one may adventure to speak of them so: but to say, *These are just Thoughts of the Divine Nature*, and that for *these* Reasons (which plainly are none) we may *properly so speak*; yea, and *very properly* too; is what I cannot well account for. The plain truth seems to me to be, that the Doctor could not make the Scripture express Trinity, of *God the Father*, and his *only-begotten Son Jesus Christ*, and the *Holy Spirit*, agree well with the common Offices of the Church; and therefore he contrived to bring all the same three Names into the *First Person*, where, under the name of *Son* (which has still the same Sound, tho another Sense) he can safely worship God the Father with that supreme Adoration, which he could not give to the *Son of God*, as 'tis meant in the Scriptures: The Son of God, in the Gospel, signifying, as he thinks, only the *Man Christ*, he must find, or make another Son, which is God; and then he can say of him all that others say and intend, of the *Scripture-Son of God*.

And now I dare appeal to any impartial and sober-minded Man, whether the Doctor found this airy, lame, and inconsistent Scheme of a Trinity in the Holy Scripture, or brought his *Hypothesis* with him, and contrived how to force and skrew the sacred *Text* into a little seeming Accommodation to it.

To conclude: As I am firmly persuaded the Doctor's Notion of the *Trinity*, is neither expressly affirmed, nor so much as intimated in our establish'd Liturgy; so I cannot see how he can reconcile the Passages therein relating to the Trinity, to his own Sentiments; or how he can repeat his *Subscription*, &c. with an honest Integrity, (which yet I believe he greatly values) any more than Doctor *Clarke* can; or how he can use the *Creeeds* and *Forms of Devotion*, which, without a violent Interpretation, must, I think, thwart the *Sense of his own Mind*. As for instance; can he, according to the *Athanasian* and *Nicene Creeeds*, believe the *Son of God*, who was not made nor created, to be begotten before all Worlds; and this as a Branch of the *Catholick Faith*, which the Scriptures teach, when so oft he declares, from the Scriptures, only the *Man Christ* to be the Son of God, who was made and created; and that the *Word*, or divine Nature, is never called *God's Son*, nor was ever derived or begotten at all of the very God, (however he might be termed *Son*, by some subtle Strain, or mental Reservation) but is that very self-existent God? Or else can he believe the Holy Ghost not to be begotten, when he has given no Notion of the Son's Filiation, but what belongs equally to the *Spirit*, as being as much, according to his account, begotten, as the *Word* or *Son* is? Can he heartily say, *God of God*, who

owns

owns no derivation of the *Son*? I imagine his Sense of such Passages will not be more tolerable, or less violent, than Dr. *Clarke's* Interpretation appears to him to be.

And therefore if there be so much Hardship on both sides, in subscribing and using the publick Offices and modern Creeds; so that ingenious and considering Men are put to their shifts (and the more considerate, the more hardly put to it) how to make them consist with their own Sense, and the Scripture-Accounts; I heartily wish the Doctor, and all such Persons, worthy of Respect for their very valuable Abilities, and for their diligent Consideration of religious Matters, would in the most publick manner use their Interest, to have these Matters fairly examined, and as honestly amended, in a regular calm way, where there may appear just Reason for it; in order to prevent the ensnaring or confounding Mens Minds, in their holy Devotions. Every Man's Head is not so able to carry a Collection of nice *Scholastick* Distinctions to the Church, and to handle them so dextrously, and apply them so nimbly to every Article of a very *hard Creed*, as Dr. *Bennet* may.

I would desire him to consider but that one thing, of *three Persons and one God*, in the Litany and Creed call'd *Athanasian*, what he thinks the People must mean by *three Persons*? Himself confesses, *That in common Speech, a Person and an intelligent Being are the same*; and that in the God-head there are not three Persons in *this* Sense. And yet neither he nor others do give us any other determinate Sense to fix upon. Now, as one would think, that Words in *Common Prayers* should be used, as taken in *common Speech*, because People naturally will take them in the common

sense; so if there be no other determinate Sense given them, I see not how they can avoid misunderstanding them; or how I can with hearty Freedom use such Words, which I expect will mislead their Devotions, *viz.* from *one* God to *three*: And especially, if, in the same *Creed*, where I profess *three Persons in God*, I use that Word, *Person*, as apply'd to one of the three, in the more common sense; it will be hard (having no other known Sense of the Word) to go both against the common Sense, and the very Sense of it in the same Offices. And therefore the Doctor's Inference, from his granting that the Word *Persons*, is not taken in the common sense, *viz.* *That therefore there is no reason to wrangle about a Phrase*, is just the Reverse of what should be; for *therefore* rather there is reason to except against what is out of the way of the Peoples Apprehension, unless there be a weightier Reason for it, than their Edification.

I dare appeal to the Doctor's own Candour in his most serious moments, if in the course of the Prayers in the Liturgy, the Church does not intend, under the Character of *Father*, *heavenly Father*, and *everlasting Father*, to address to another Person, than either the Doctor, or, by his Account, the Scriptures intend by that Name: for instead of the one self-existent God, in whom, he says, the whole Trinity is included, *viz.* the *God* and *Father* of the Man the Lord Jesus Christ, &c. (and who is always meant by that relative Character *Father* in Scripture, as he declares) the Church intends plainly, in many Instances (and so in the rest it will be presumed to be in one and the same uniform Sense) to address to only *one* of the divine Persons, as the *Father*, *viz.* in all those *Collects*, which end thus, *Thro Jesus Christ*
thy

thy Son, who with Thee (i. e. Thee, the Object of our Prayers) and the Holy Ghost, ever liveth and reigneth one God for ever. Is not Thee, or the Person pray'd to, plainly distinguished from the other two, which, with him the Father, constitute the one God?

And may it not be for this Reason, that the Church, with very great Caution, has, in the *Communion Rubrick*, directed the usual Words, *Holy Father*, to be omitted at the *Lord's Table* on *Trinity Sunday*? perhaps lest the People should think they did not address all the *three* Persons on that peculiar Day; but on other days, it seems not, that there was any such need of that Caution. I know indeed the Doctor says, *That the* P. 260. *Father can't be worshipped separately from the Word*: but I think it appears, it may be intended by Men to express their Adoration of but one of the Persons singly; tho the Doctor may intend all three Persons, under the Church's distinguishing Character of one, *viz.* the *Father*.

Since then the Doctor cannot well approve such Applications to God, I hope he is by this time convinc'd of some Difficulty in interpreting many Passages in the Liturgy to *his own* Sense, as well as Dr. *Clarke* to his: only this may be said for the *latter*, that he is willing to have these things examined and reformed according to the original Standard of Christianity; and owns his Interpretation to be harsh. Let the Doctor be like-minded, and not applaud such Notions, as he confesses are not in Scripture expressly (and I have shewn are not there implicitly, where he pretended it) *viz.* the Relation of a *Father*, and an *Eternal Son*, in the *one self-existent supreme God*. Let him not palliate and encourage what he has declar'd to be beside the sacred Text, by saying

nevertheless, 'tis *just thinking*, and *properly*, and *very properly speaking*: And that he desires the Use of such Words in an uncommon (and so far a dangerous) Sense, *may be continued till better be substituted*; but let him endeavour what he can to get *such* substituted, by them on whom lies the *Care of the Church* for its Edification. I hope he will seriously represent to them, how much more easy it will be to save the publick Offices, and the Ministry from Disrespect, when none shall suspect any of subscribing or using such Forms of Devotion, as thwart the true Sense of their unbiass'd Minds.


I may conceive the more hopes of this from the Reverend Doctor, who is not so bound up by old Prejudices, nor past Decisions of *Synods*, nor by a superstitious Reverence for what the Church professes; but that he will oppose a Doctrine inconsistent with the holy Scriptures, *if our Church did never so expressly affirm it*. 'Tis honestly and generously spoken! And I must acknowledge he has not evil-entreated others, who use the same liberty, but with Christian Candor and Breeding has pleaded his own Cause.

And tho' I cannot find the *select Topicks* mention'd in his *Preface*, which *shall convince the best Understandings*, and *satisfy every Reader*, because I my self being among the latter, am not satisfy'd by his Arguments; yet shall I be very glad if this, or his other zealous Services done or intended for the Church, may gain him such Esteem and Influence with his *Reverend Brethren of the Clergy*, as may render him of great Use to promote the Truth, and to *rectify* some things, more than he has *rectify'd* Dr. Clarke's *Notions of the Trinity*; that so by approving our selves to God, in a sincere Love of the Truth, and by an honest

Ma-

Manifestation of that Truth, commending our selves to the Consciences of Men, as in the sight of God; we may, all of us, come to the Unity of the Faith (as I hope we shall, after all our diversity of Thoughts in these Matters) and of the Knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect Man, unto the Measure of the Stature of the Fulness of Christ: that so, with joyful harmonious Concord, we may give Blessing, and Honour, and Glory, to Him who sitteth upon the Throne, and to the Lamb, for ever and ever. Amen!







THE
Previous QUESTION

TO THE

Several Questions about Valid and
Invalid BAPTISM, LAY-BAP-
TISM, &c. consider'd;

VIZ.


*Whether there be any Necessity (even upon the
Principles of Mr. Wall's History of Infant-
Baptism) for the continual Use of Baptism
among the Posterity of Baptiz'd Christians?*

Rom. 11. 16. *If the Root be Holy, so are the Branches.*

—It fully appears that Water-Baptism was never intended by God, but either only, or chiefly, for an Introductory or Planting Ordinance, i. e. to attend the Gospel for a time, at its first Reception by a People, until it should get some Rooting among 'em, not for a standing Ordinance in one and the same place; whereof good reason might be given, &c. says Mr. John Goodwin. Water-Dipping no Footing for Church-Communion, p. 30.



Year	Population	Area
1900	1,000,000	100,000
1910	1,500,000	150,000
1920	2,000,000	200,000
1930	2,500,000	250,000
1940	3,000,000	300,000
1950	3,500,000	350,000
1960	4,000,000	400,000
1970	4,500,000	450,000
1980	5,000,000	500,000
1990	5,500,000	550,000
2000	6,000,000	600,000
2010	6,500,000	650,000
2020	7,000,000	700,000



Quære, *Whether Christian Baptism was intended by our Lord Jesus Christ, for such as descend from Christian Parents, and are born in the Church ; or only for such as become Profelytes to Christianity from an Infidel State ?*



AM sensible it will be look'd on as a great Presumption, to call into question a Practice that has so long and so generally obtain'd among Christian Churches, as has the Practice of baptizing the Posterity of Christians, whether in their Infant or Adult Estate ; and upon which so many rest their Confidence, as on a most glorious Privilege, and mighty Means of their Salvation : But as I am one who admit no Plea of Prescription against Truth, so shall I judge it a sufficient Defence against all such popular and weak Arguments, if once it can be made appear, that *from the beginning it was not so practis'd, nor ordain'd.* And tho I do not positively assert, that according to the original Institution of *Jesus Christ*, none but such as came out of Infidelity were to be baptiz'd, yet I profess I very much
question

question whether it were not so; and therefore desire a fair Solution of the Difficulties which I apprehend are not duly consider'd, by them who plead for the Baptism of such as are born of and educated under Christian Parents.

The great Ground of this my Doubt arises from that fundamental Proof of *Infant-Baptism*, taken from the Use of Baptism among the *Jews*, by which Profelytes were wont to be initiated, as 'tis set forth in Mr. *Wall's History of Baptism* (which has put me upon this Essay) and many others before him.

'Tis well argu'd by the Learned *Pædobaptists*, that our Saviour's Command to baptize, being general, must in all reason be suppos'd to mean, that it should be done according to the known common Practice of Baptism (if there were any such Practice) which his Disciples well understood, and had been acquainted with. Otherwise it had been most necessary for our Lord Jesus to have made such Exceptions from the general Method of Practice, and such new Rules as his Disciples were to observe, and which they could not learn without some farther Direction, than his general Command to *go and baptize*. For our Saviour only bids them *Go and baptize all Nations, &c.* he adds not one word of Limitation or special Direction about the *Subjects* of Baptism. So that if the *Jews* had been accustom'd (as Mr. *Wall* asserts, and with very probable Reason too) to disciple Infidels, whether Infants or Adult, by baptizing them into their Communion; there is no just doubt to be made, but that our Lord, speaking among *Jews*, and bidding them, *Go and disciple all Nations, baptizing them*; did leave 'em to understand it of their practising it under the like Rules, and upon the like Subjects, as was usual among the *Jews* already. 'Twas indeed to be a

Baptism

Baptism into another Religion, and to be extended to all Nations; but no other Exception was made from the known Rules of Baptism: and therefore Mr. *Wall*, in his *Introduction*, has upon this very Principle built his Argument, and very strongly infers, that Infants are the due Subjects of *Christian* Baptism, because they were so of the *Jewish*.

Nor can I see any room left for a modest and ingenuous Denial of the Inference, supposing the Premises to be true, *viz.* That Baptism of Profelytes and their Infant-Children, was an usual and known Practice among the *Jews* in our Saviour's Days on Earth. I must confess I cannot see any Argument for Infant-Baptism so forcible as this, taken from the Practice of baptizing *Jewish Profelytes*; nor does Mr. *Wall* seem to me to rely on any other, without this. How Mr. *Wall* can reconcile Infant-Baptism to the Method and Office for Baptism, prescrib'd by the Church of *England*, is another question; by which the Child is suppos'd to be a Believer, and by its Sureties does profess, *I believe*, and *I desire to be baptiz'd*; which an Infant not grown up to Understanding will not easily be suppos'd capable of, so that it seems tacitly to be intended only for actual Believers: and by this one Concession, great Advantage is afforded, and some think the Cause is in effect given up to the *Antipædobaptists*, who plead only for Believers Baptism. But this is only an Argument *ad hominem*, or against the Church, and weakens not the Cause of Infant-Baptism in general, which is so well establish'd upon his main *Topick*, *viz.* the antient *Jewish* Practice of baptizing Infant-Profelytes; and which I suppose Mr. *Wall* is more concern'd to defend, than the *Office* of a particular Church, tho ever so well constituted.

I know the *Antipadobaptists* do not admit the Evidence to this Practice of *Jewish Baptism* in our Saviour's time; but I think impartially, that Mr. *Wall*, after others, has made it highly probable at least; from very many Testimonies of the *Jewish Writers*, who, I think without any one dissenting Voice, allow the Fact. And tho' the Testimonies be from *Jews* since Christ's time (we not having any of their more antient Writings, except the Sacred) yet since they who best knew their own Traditions that were current among them, and especially of a visible open matter of Fact, as this of Baptism was, and from whom only one can hope to understand their own History of Facts, not recorded expressly in Scripture; since they, I say, do unanimously agree in this Matter of Fact, I take it to be a Testimony of very great Force, and not to be slighted by such as cannot say half a quarter so much, indeed can say nothing at all, for proof of the Negative. The Pretence of *Rabbi Eliezar's* denying any such Custom among the *Jews*, taken from Sir *Norton Knatchbul*, is sufficiently expos'd at the end of Mr. *Wall's* Introduction; being indeed no Denial of such a Practice at all.

And indeed besides the mention of a *Jewish Baptism*, by some of the antient Christian Writers, to which they oppose the Christian Baptism; 'tis hard to be deny'd, that there is a broad Intimation, even in the Gospel it self, of such a known Practice among the *Jews* in *John the Baptist's* time, in that Question of the *Pharisees*, *Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not the Christ, nor Elias, nor a Prophet?* They wonder'd not at profelyting by Baptism; for they ask'd not, What meanest thou by this Action? as they had probably done, had it been a novel and strange Ceremony; but only they demand by what Authority

he

he thus made Profelytes, *i. e.* among the *Jews*, who were already of the true Church and Faith; and therefore without some new Dispensation (for establishing whereof there needed at least some great Prophet) he could have no Authority to baptize or profelyte among the *Jews*. They speak as if they knew such Baptism to be of that great Importance, that none but one authoriz'd to introduce a new State of Religion, might authorize this Practice of it. How come they to esteem it of so much more Signification than other Ceremonies, which they scrupled not to admit upon less Authority than of a great Prophet? I suppose 'twas because they had been accusom'd to such a solemn Use of it, as that of profelyting Persons to the true Religion.

I own this is not expressly nor demonstratively to be shewn from the Text; but I see no Sense of it so fair and natural as this. And therefore taking this only for a strong Presumption, added to the former Testimonies, for the antient Practice of Baptism among the *Jews*, I think that all taken together, ties the Argument so hard, that the *Antipadobaptists* cannot solve it, nor offer half so many Probabilities either from Reason or Testimonies, against this *Matter of Fact*, as are brought for it; I mean for the Use of baptizing Profelytes into the *Jewish* Religion: since they can neither find one antient *Jewish* Writer who denies this Custom, whilst so many affirm it, nor one of them who own the Use of Profelyte-Baptism at all, that ever denies it to have extended to *Infants*, as well as to others.

Especially are these Testimonies of the *Jewish* Writers of greater weight, because this very Practice which they report to have been of so antient a date, did still remain among them: for I must confess, that if it had not been of that

Antiquity which it pretends to, *viz.* before Christ's time; I cannot suppose it would ever have become a Custom among the *Jews* *afterward*. Would they begin to profelyte Persons to their Religion by Baptism, in imitation of the Disciples of *Jesus of Nazareth*, whom they held accursed? They would never so far own him, as to bring in a new Institution in conformity to his Command; which Innovation among them could not but be taken great notice of, and 'tis likely would have been observ'd and remark'd by some Writer, Jewish or Christian. 'Tis of no force to say, that the latter *Jews* might pretend Baptism to have been an old Practice among their Nation, on purpose that the Christian Religion might be thought to borrow from theirs; since this was never deny'd by the Christian Church. We know that Christians are but *engrafted into their Olive-Tree*, of which they were the natural Branches; and that we are built on the *Foundation of their Prophets*; that Christ instituted his Supper after the manner of the *Post-cænium*, at the Paschal Supper of the *Jews*, and borrow'd many Customs from that Church. Christians suffer nothing by owning this, nor was there any Contention about it to prompt the *Jews* to forge an Evidence in the Case. So that if this *Profelyte-Baptism* were taken up by them since Christ's time, it must have been a mere Innovation in imitation of Christians; which whether that be most likely, I leave any one to judge. For my own part, I am much more ready to believe their own Testimonies to the Antiquity of that Practice, as being antecedent to Christ's Institution of Baptism, as their Paschal *Post-cænium* was to his other Institution of the *Lord's Supper*.

But then, if these Premises be true, and the Inference for *Pædobaptism* be just, both which Mr. *Wall* strenuously maintains; I cannot see but ano-

Rom. II.
Eph. 2.20.

another Inference will be equally just, tho not so grateful to Mr. *Wall*, viz. That then none of the Posterity of Christians descended from baptiz'd Parents or Ancestors, in a continu'd Christian Line, not interrupted by open Apostacy from Christianity, are bound by Christ's Institution to be baptiz'd. And so both *Pado* and *Antipadobaptists* will be in great measure silenc'd at one blow.

To make this appear, we must consider that Mr. *Wall's* and the *Padobaptists* Argument hence for Infant-Baptism, has no force but upon this ground alone, viz. that our Lord Jesus giving his Command to baptize in general, without any *Caveat* or Limitation, did leave his Apostles to apply Baptism to all the same Subjects as the *Jews* were wont to do; and therefore to Infants as well as to others. And it will be said, that for the same reason the Christian Baptism was to have no other Subjects than the *Jewish* Baptism had, which was never apply'd to any of the Offspring of Believers, born in the Church. For Mr. *Wall* has fully prov'd, by the same Authority which evidences their Custom to baptize *Infant-Profelytes*, that the *Jews* never did baptize any that were born of Parents who were profelyted before; and that 'twas a Maxim among them, *Filius baptizati habetur pro baptizato*; i. e. *The Child born of one baptiz'd, is accounted as one baptiz'd himself*. It seems that the *one Sanctification* of the Parents was to them and their Issue, unless they cut off the Entail by their Apostacy to Infidelity.

So that if our Lord left his Disciples to practise according to the known establish'd Rules of the *Jews*, it follows that he no more allow'd them hereby to add any new Subjects of Baptism, viz. such as the Offspring of Believers, than to bar any of the former allow'd Subjects of it, i. e. the *Infant-Profelytes* born in the Uncleanness of In-

idelity. If Mr. *Wall's* Argument be good, it leaves the Case, as to the Subjects of Baptism, just as it was before : since there is no more warrant from Christ's Institution to add, than to diminish ; or to baptize born Members of the Church, than to cut off the Infants of new Profelytes.

Mat. 28.
19.

Nay, if we consider well Christ's Commission to baptize, it seems directly to respect only the Profelytes from Infidelity : *Go disciple* (i. e. *profelyte*, says Mr. *Wall*) *all Nations, baptizing them.* 'Twas upon their going to convert the unbelieving Gentiles, that they were empower'd to baptize 'em ; so that where there is no more profelyting, there may seem to be no more baptizing intended. And as none, I think, can pretend that the *Jews by Nature* were accounted Profelytes among the *Jews* ; so neither can such as are born and educated in the Christian Church, and of Christian Parents, be counted Christian Profelytes. How then come the Posterity of Profelytes to be the Subjects of Baptism now, among us Christians, if they were not so among the *Jews* ; when at the same time the Custom and Practice of the *Jews* is own'd to be the Rule of Christ for the Practice of Baptism among Christians ?

So that Mr. *Wall* must either allow, that Baptism may cease among Christian Churches where no Converts from Infidelity come in, and so yield the Cause to the *Socinians* ; or if he still plead for the baptizing the Offspring of Christians, he must own that he goes quite off from his own Principles, and can never justify it by the *Jewish* Practice of Baptism ; and so gives up his fundamental Argument for Infant-Baptism, after he had taken pains to establish it. And to what purpose does he call the *Antipedobaptists* to observe Christ's Institution, interpreted by the known *Jewish* Practice,

tice, when he himself is no more guided by it than they? 'Twill be expected that he either reconcile his Practice of baptizing Christians holy Posterity, to the *Jewish* Rule of not baptizing the Children born of Profelytes; or that he renounce his Opinion, *viz.* That Christ's Command is to be practis'd according to their known Rule, when he says, *Go and baptize.* And if he do this, he will have a hard task to answer his own Arguments to the contrary.

The Sum of what I justly gather from Mr. *Wall's* Argument, is this; Jesus Christ has required his Disciples to profelyte and *baptize the Nations*: Now 'tis known how the *Jews* must needs understand such a Precept, *viz.* according to their own Usage, which was to baptize Profelytes and their Children born in Infidelity, but not any descended from them: And therefore let us go and do likewise.

And this seems to be built on good Reason, from the Nature and Design of Baptism; which seems not to be intended for the washing away the Pollutions contracted in a State of Christianity, for then 'twere useful to repeat it often upon Christians; but only the Uncleanness of Infidelity, when Men were *Aliens* to the Christian Church. They who came of a polluted abominable Stock, and Enemies to the Church of God, had reason to be symbolically purify'd by Baptism, because they were held for profane and unclean, till naturaliz'd and engrafted into the Holy Church. But being thus naturaliz'd, it seems to be for them and their Posterity all at once. Their Descendants are a holy Race of course; for says the Apostle, *If the Root be holy, the Branches are also* Rom. 11.
holy: there needs no new engrafting of the natu-
16.
 ral Branches. Washing is not appointed for the Pure and Clean, but for the Unclean: Now the

1 Cor. 7.
14.

Text says expressly, that the Children of Christian Parents *are not unclean, but they are holy, or pure; i. e.* by being come of cleansed holy Parents. It seems they are accounted as already baptiz'd, or cleansed in their Parents Baptism; just agreeable to the *Jewish* Maxim above said. 'Tis a strange Inference of some, that Children must be baptiz'd because they are said to be holy or clean, when the End of Baptism is to cleanse and make holy; and if the Apostle says, they have that Effect already by being of Christian Parents, what need of Baptism can be prov'd, where the Person is already politically and relatively holy, and has all the real Cleansing and Holiness, that is to be suppos'd to be wrought by such external Rites of Purification?

As I take the *Antipadobaptists* Interpretation of that last mention'd Text to be too forc'd, who think by *being holy* is meant *being legitimate*; whereas none are ever said in Scripture to be *ἅγιοι*, *Saints* or *Holy*, merely for being not Bastards: so I judge Mr. *Wall's* Sense to be no less violent, and as like a Shift to serve a Turn as the other. He understands it of a Holiness by being baptiz'd, as if the Apostle had said, *Else were your Children unbaptiz'd, but now they are sanctify'd by Baptism.* But how can this be a Consequence of the foregoing part of the Text? *The unbelieving Wife has been sanctify'd (i. e. has been baptiz'd, as Mr. Wall expounds it) by the Husband, else were your Children unclean, (i. e. would be kept unbaptiz'd) but now are they holy, or Saints, i. e. they are generally baptiz'd, and so become holy.* See his *Hist. of Inf. Bapt.* p. 68. I say 'tis no just Consequence which he makes the Apostle to draw; nor would it follow, that if the Husband do not prevail upon the unbelieving Wife to be converted and baptiz'd, that then the Children would be unbaptiz'd; because, tho' only the Father were a Believer, the Child might

1 Cor. 7.
14.

might be brought to Baptism, if nothing else hinder: and so in this sense the Children would not be unclean, tho the unbelieving Wife were never baptiz'd. So that this is not to be taken for the Apostle's Meaning.

And therefore Mr. *Locke's* Paraphrase, which Mr. *Wall* calls absurd, without shewing why, may yet stand; viz. that by being holy, is meant that such Children are not in the state of Heathens, but *born Members of the Christian Church*; not profane Aliens, but pure and natural Branches of the Common-wealth of the Christian *Israel*. Which seems to be all the Holiness which *Jerom* judg'd them capable of, when speaking of this Argument, and allowing a relative Holiness, such as belong'd to the Vessels of the Tabernacle, he adds, that nothing can be properly holy, but *what has Sense, and fears God*. 'Tis not then want of Baptism, but want of Sense and Capacity, that hinders their being real Saints: and relatively they are such, antecedently to any Baptism. Nay, they are really Saints in design, or to use *Tertullian's* Words, *Sanctitati designati*, design'd for real Holiness: by the Advantage of their Birth, and in the Intention of their Parents, and the Prospect of a Christian Education, they are the Expectants or the hopeful Candidates of real Piety, whether baptiz'd a-new or not, as far as yet appears.

It still strengthens the Presumption on this side, that in all the History of the Apostles and Churches in the *Acts of the Apostles*, we find not one Instance of the baptizing of any, that were born of Christian Parents, either Infants or Adult. The *Antipadobaptists* demand an Instance of any Infant being baptiz'd, and the *Padobaptists* ask for an Instance of any Adult Person's Baptism, who had been born of Christian Parents: but neither

Side can produce any Evidence; no, not in all that first History of the Churches, running thro a Series of near thirty Years, in which time multitudes, no doubt, were born of Christian Parents, and grown up to Maturity and Manhood: and yet not one of 'em is mention'd to be baptiz'd; tho of many Profelytes 'tis often observ'd. So that it looks at best doubtful, whether any born Christians, or the Seed of Profelytes were baptiz'd, any more than the Seed of the *Jewish* Profelytes were. Nay, since the baptizing the holy Seed of Profelytes was beyond the known Rule and Custom of the *Jews*, in their Use of Baptism, 'twas the more necessary to have been taken notice of in that *History of the Acts*, if the Apostles so practis'd: because it does not at all appear in Christ's Institution, that he intended such a Variation from the common Rules of the known *Jewish* Practice, and therefore it requir'd to be made plain by the History of the Apostles After-Practice. For if neither the original Institution of Christ, nor the After-Practice of the Apostles, do warrant this considerable Alteration in the Practice of Baptism, I cannot see how it should be known, or from whence Christians should be able to infer it to be a Duty.

So that upon the whole matter it must be own'd, that Mr. *Wall*, from the Custom and Practice of the *Jews*, has indeed urg'd a very strong Argument against the *Antipædobaptists*, and shews well, that Infants along with their profelyted Parents are to be enter'd into the Christian Society by Baptism. But then 'tis just as strong an Argument against himself, and all those who are for continuing Baptism among the Posterity of Christians. His Argument establishes Infant-Baptism; but then 'tis of no Infants, nor others,
but

but who were born in Infidelity, or of Parents not Christian.

And therefore whatever weight he supposes our Lord to have laid upon Baptism in that Text, *John* 3. 5. it can only relate to such as are converted from Infidelity: Nor could *Nicodemus*, as a Master in *Israel*, be suppos'd to have understood him otherwise; since with the *Jews*, only such were Subjects of Baptism.

And now when there is so much appearance of force in this Argument, against the Necessity of repeating Baptism to the Posterity of Christians, that an honest Mind may well be suppos'd to be convinc'd and determin'd by it; one would wonder what occasion Mr. *Wall* had, for *Introd.* that poor, invidious, and, I believe, false Sug- P. 54. gession: 'Tis easy, says he, to guess what sway'd *Socinus* into the other Opinion, viz. his Desire of abolishing the Doctrine of the Trinity; which 'twas hard to accomplish, so long as Persons were continually baptiz'd into that Faith: As if *Socinus* was against that Trinity, which he judg'd the Christian Baptism to relate to; or would have that Doctrine abolish'd, which he understood Baptism to countenance. For 'tis certain he never imagin'd, that Baptism into the Name of one, to whom *all Power was given*, could be a reasonable Proof of that Person's Supreme Deity. So that 'tis much more likely he was sway'd by the pure Force of the Argument here insisted on, without the need of any other Prejudice. But 'tis hard to guess what sway'd Mr. *Wall* to such a mean Suggestion; whether his great Prejudice, so oft vented against the *Socinians*, or his Willingness to make his Reader slip over the true reason of *Socinus's* being of that opinion. For it is a pretty crafty way of some Writers, when they find their Adversaries produce a strong Argument,

61. gument to support their Opinion; instead of answering it fairly, they fall a guessing what else may bias them, and insinuate some slender or odious secret Reason, when they have given an open and more likely reason for themselves; which their Opposers find so troublesome, that they had much rather start some new imaginary Reasons for them, which they think they can better deal with. But Mr. *Wall* will be above this Method, who has observ'd (which on this occasion comes to mind) that a *great Stock of Learning does not always cure that Narrowness of Soul, by which some are inclin'd to do any mean and foul thing to favour a Side, or set up a Party*; which is the heavy load he lays so unmercifully upon the illustrious *Grotius*, upon no sufficient occasion, I judge, if the Matter alledg'd were truly stated and consider'd.

I know not how early Instances Mr. *Wall* or any other can give of the Baptism of Children; or the *Antipadobaptists* of the Baptism of any adult Persons, that were born in Christianity. He has shown that all the antient Instances which the *Antipadobaptists* bring of adult Persons being baptiz'd, are of Persons most probably born of unprofelyted or Infidel Parents; and that there is but one Instance (and this very obscure and modern) to the contrary, *viz.* in *Greg. Nazianzen*, which is too late to be valu'd in an Inquiry after the Original Practice of Christians, being so late as the *fourth Century*. Now if Mr. *Wall*, on the other hand, cannot find any Instances of Children of baptiz'd Parents, who were baptiz'd in their Infancy, in early Antiquity (as I think he has not pretended to do for the *two first Centuries*) I think it follows hence, that there are no Instances to be found either on one side or the other; *i. e.* neither of the Baptism of any Adult, nor of any
 Infants

Infants descended from baptiz'd Parents ; which is a great Presumption that no such were baptiz'd : However others, both Infants and Adult, might be so, *viz.* among new Converts from Infidelity.

Even *Tertullian* himself, tho a Man of no great Esteem by *Mr. Wall's* Account, seems to me to make a difference between the Issue of *Christians* and of *Pagans*, as to the Needfulness of Baptism ; he says (in *Mr. Wall's* Citation) *That no Birth, almost of the Heathens, is pure or clean, but that the Apostle has said, the Offspring, of either Parent sanctify'd, are holy : willing to be understood that they are design'd for Holiness, and by this to Salvation ; otherwise (i. e. in any other Case, viz. of an unclean Birth) he would have minded 'em of the Lord's Decree, Except one be born of Water, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God ; that is, he shall not be holy.* It seems *Christ's* Rule for Baptism was not judg'd by him to extend to other than Heathens profelyted, who had that Uncleaness to be wash'd away, which the *Christians* Offspring had not. Hist. p.22.

And for the Fancy, that by the *designatos sanctitati* is intended, that they were design'd for Baptism, I see no ground for it at all ; but rather that they were design'd for Holiness, without any particular *Baptism* : whereas, in *others*, he supposes Holiness to be the Consequence of it by *Christ's* Decree.

However, be his meaning what it will, as I build not on it, so I scarce think *Mr. Wall* will judge of the Primitive Practice by *Tertullian's* Judgment or Advice, which is not very favourable for early Infant-Baptism, or for appropriating the Act to the *Clergy* ; especially in a Business wherein he writes with such Uncertainty and Inconsistency, and was certainly in the wrong

wrong, either in allowing the Baptism of Infants; or in pleading for the delay of Baptism to riper Years, by such Arguments as he uses: so that he seems not to know fully what the Practice of the Church, or the Duty of Christians was in that Affair; or perhaps the Practice was not settled then, but wavering and various.

The plainest and fullest Evidence in Antiquity which Mr. *Wall* brings for baptizing the Children even of Christian Parents, is in St. *Cyprian's* time; but then there is as plain Testimony from that Author *de Lapsis*, that it was customary to give the *Eucharist* also to Infants: And if this was an Innovation and an Error in the Administration of the one Sacrament, 'tis no wonder if there should be an Error as to the Application of the other also. Superstition begun to spread apace; and who knows which began first, whether the communicating the Infants of Christian Parents, or the baptizing them? So that unless more early Instances can be given of baptizing the Offspring of profelyted Parents, than of communicating Infants (which *Austin* judg'd so antient as to account it an Apostolical Tradition) I don't see any better Authority from Antiquity for the one than for the other; and both may seem to stand on the same ground. The antient Practice will then give us no more true Light into the Apostolical Practice, as to Baptism, than it will do as to the Apostolical Practice in the *Eucharist*; if the one was corrupted, why not the other? Both might possibly be apply'd beyond their due bounds, and extended to wrong Subjects: when once Men plac'd more Virtue in these Rituals, than was meet, no wonder if they were fond of applying 'em to more than was at first intended.

I know Mr. *Wall* takes some notice of the Advantage, which from his Argument redounds to

Socinus's Opinion, viz. of the no-necessity of continuing Baptism to Christian Posterity; and seems to enter some *Caveats* against the Consequence I am drawing from his way of proving Infant-Baptism: but he is far from obviating or overthrowing this Consequence by any thing that he has suggested. He endeavours to guard himself, by telling us,

Object. 1. That there never was any Age (at least Introd. p. 55. since Abraham) in which the Children that were admitted into Covenant, whether of Jews or Profelytes, had not some Badge of such their Admission. To this I answer, 1. If it was so before Abraham, this is enough to shew that 'tis not necessary always to be otherwise. Many things were us'd all along in the Church from Abraham's time, that are laid aside under the Gospel; and indeed the time since Abraham, amounts to no more than just the Jewish Dispensation that began in Abraham, and was more compleatly establish'd under Moses.

2. No such Badge of such Admission was ever in any Age necessary, without a Divine Command; and therefore if there be no Command for such Admission by Badge, there is no such reason for it as of old. But,

3. The Matter of Fact asserted by Mr. Wall is not true; for even since Abraham's time, yea and ever since that time, the Female Children of natural Jews and Profelytes were admitted into the Jewish Church, by virtue of their Descent and Birth, without any new Badge requir'd in order to their Admission: for that these Females were wont to be admitted by Sacrifice ever since Abraham's time, nay since Moses's time, Mr. Wall has confidently asserted, but cannot prove; nay, that in any Age it was necessary for them to be admitted by that Ceremony, he cannot shew; nor did God ever require any such thing.

thing. If the *Jews* had lately introduc'd such a Custom (which yet he has not made appear) 'tis not to be quoted for a *Precedent*, or as an Instance of the Divine Method with his Church, when 'twas only an arbitrary human Injunction at most. So I turn Mr. *Wall's* Argument against him, and say, That if there never was any Age in which God did not admit divers Persons into Covenant, or into his Church, without any visible Badge of that Admission in their own Persons, then it will not be unfutable to his former Methods, if he so admit some under the Gospel-Dispensation.

Obj. 2. He says, *The Male Children of Jews and Profelytes were admitted by Circumcision.*

Answ. 1. I allow it; but then it was because this was particularly requir'd of them by God, and probably for some other reason (proper to their Constitution) than admitting 'em into the Church; since the Females were admitted without it. Let such a Divine Ordinance be produc'd for baptizing the Offspring of Christians, and it shall suffice with me, else there is no Consequence in it. To say, that because the Jews circumcis'd the Children of circumcis'd Parents at God's Command, therefore we must baptize the Children of baptiz'd Parents, tho contrary to what was practis'd by the Jews, is quite besides the meaning of Christ's Command. For,

2. I add, That the Jews Practice of Circumcision, is not the Christians Direction for the Practice of Baptism; because our Lord Jesus did not bid his Disciples to baptize as they were wont to circumcise among the Jews, but to baptize as they were wont to baptize, as Mr. *Wall* owns. Therefore 'tis no matter how Circumcision was apply'd, but the Question is how Baptism was so; and if Baptism was wont to be practis'd in

a different Method, and on different Subjects from what Circumcision was, then 'tis plain our Christian Baptism, which Christ requires to be regulated by the Jewish Baptism, ought to be conform'd to the known Rules of Baptism, and not to them of Circumcision.

Nor can any pretend to urge *Parity of Reason* in the Case, because it cannot be made appear that such Circumcision of the Infants of Jews was not *either* a mere arbitrary Injunction of God, *or* else founded upon some particular reason, proper to the State of that People, who were to be kept separate from all other Nations. In the latter Case there will be no *Parity of Reason*, and in the former no reason at all from the Nature of the thing, being God's Sovereign Pleasure, which is at liberty to vary. And as to the Nature or intrinsic Goodness of the thing, there seem'd no Excellency at all in such a Badge, as *Justin Martyr* well observes of Circumcision; *In signum, datam circumcissionem, non tanquam opus justitiae, quidquid enim ad justitiam virtutemque pertinent, etiam feminis Deus dedit, ut ex aequo servare possint.* Dial. cum Tryph.

But adds *Mr. Wall*; *St. Paul* says, Baptism serves instead of Circumcision, calling it the Circumcision of Christ, *Col. 2. 11, 12.* But what then? I hope it does not follow that the Subjects of Baptism must be just the same as of Circumcision, because there may be some common use of both. They that were baptiz'd into Christ, as the *Colossian* Profelytes had been, were spiritually circumcis'd, and mortify'd to Sin, as much as the Jews who were circumcis'd with hand: but this does not argue that all Christians must be baptiz'd, since as the one half of the Jews Posterity were capable of this inward spiritual Circumcision, without the external Circumcision, and

and were in a fort held for circumcis'd or clean, by virtue of their Descent from circumcis'd Parents; even so may the Posterity of Christians have this spiritual Circumcision, without any other Baptism than that of their Christian Parents, which in a fort may be held to be virtually the baptizing of their whole Race and Offspring. This intirely depends on the Will of the Lawgiver, which Mr. *Wall* has not made appear to be, that the Seed of Christian Profelytes should be baptiz'd, any more than the Seed of Jewish Profelytes were so.

If it be said Baptism is necessary, even for such as are born in Christianity, to engage them more solemnly to dedicate themselves to God personally, and so give them a quicker Sense of their Duty and Obligation, than they can be conceiv'd to have by such a general relation to God and Christ, as rises from their being come of Christian Parents:

I answer, 1. That if we must be directed in the use of Baptism, by the Advantages we imagine it may be made serviceable to, then it seems as necessary that we often repeat our Baptism, to revive our Obligation, after many years are past, and the fresh sense of that Solemnity is worn off. So that this Argument (unless the Divine Command makes a difference) has as much force in it, for often renewing Baptism on others, as for renewing it upon Children, who have been already engag'd to God; and in some sort have been baptiz'd in their Parents Baptism; and are born in Covenant with him.

2. I judge one may have as lively a Sense of his Ancestors Baptism, and their Engagement for themselves and their Issue, as for his own personal Baptism in the Incapacity of his Infancy,
of

of which he has no more remembrance than of the other, which is to him the same thing.

3. There are other sufficient ways to revive the Sense of our Duty to God, and of our religious Bonds, *viz.* by the other religious Duties of our Profession, and in particular by the *Lord's Supper.*

Perhaps some may say, Suppose it be not certain that any but immediate *Converts* are requir'd to be baptiz'd; yet what harm can there be in renewing it to their Posterity, tho' it may not be necessary?

1. I say, as to the harm of doing it, there will be no more nor less harm in baptizing the Children of Christians, on a Supposition that they be already sanctify'd in their Parents Baptism, than there is in rebaptizing Persons once duly baptiz'd, or *reordaining* Ministers once duly ordain'd; 'tis only doing a thing with great Solemnity in God's Name that is needless, and to no purpose, unless something else can make it needful besides Christ's Institution.

2. If it be not necessary to be done, then I add, that tho' there should be no great harm in doing a thing not necessary, yet there may be great harm in not leaving others to their liberty, and in urging the necessity of such personal Baptism, in order to Church-Communion, if it be not commanded by Christ. All needless Occasions of Contention are hurtful; and therefore tho' I would not measure my Duty to God, nor interpret his holy Command, merely in accommodation to any outward Interest, no not that of external Quiet and Rest from contentious Divisions, at the expence of Truth (since our Lord himself will have Truth profess'd, tho' it prove an occasion of setting Families at variance, *Bro-*

Mat. 10.
35.

ther against Brother, the Mother against the Daughter, and the Daughter against the Mother) yet if what I advance be consistent with Truth, I shall think it the better for having a good tendency to promote Peace, and taking away many occasions of unhappy Strife among Christians, as I judge it will. For

P. 154.

P. 381.

This will ease us of many bitter Controversies about *Baptism*, as whether by Immersion or Effusion? Whether Infants or Adult Persons are to be baptiz'd in a Christian-Church? Whether by Bishop or Presbyter? Since we are all generally descended from some or other Ancestors, that no doubt have been regularly baptiz'd: Nay this may probably prove Quakers to be of the Christian Church still, tho not baptiz'd themselves, while they are the Seed of baptiz'd Parents, and still own Christianity, as they understand it. Nay this may give great ease to the Clergy, and particularly to Mr. Wall, who is very much against the Doctrine which involves the Baptizer in endless Scruples, which Infants he may baptize, and which not: and therefore is for Baptism of all Children, the Owners of which desire Baptism for them. But tho this be a compendious way of ending Scruples as to the Subjects of Baptism, yet even still there are many Scruples will meet him again at another turn on his Principles. For

If every Christian must have a particular Baptism duly administred to himself, and may not be admitted to the *Eucharist* without such Baptism, then 'tis incumbent on the Administrator or Presbyter to examine into the Validity of the Baptism of every Communicant: As whether he ever was baptiz'd, or not? By whom? Whether by a Catholick, or a Schismatick, or Heretick? Whe-

Whether by a *Tritheist*, or a *Socinian*? Whether by one ordain'd aright, or an Intruder? I confess I don't think these Matters are inquir'd into, in order to Communion either with the Church or Dissenters, except in some Points by the Antipædobaptists, who usually place their main Zeal in this Article; yet I must think these are needful Questions concerning a Communicant, if a true authentick Baptism be necessary to Christian Communion, and to Salvation among Christians.

It would be hard to question Mr. *Wall*'s great care in these matters, especially now there are, as he owns, so many *Socinians* in the Church, and out of it; against whom he has eas'd his Mind, by such a discharge of his heavy and angry Censures, without much Argument; and declares against Communion in Worship with them, who believe *Jesus Christ to be in his best Nature of finite Dignity and Capacity* (i. e. say the *Unitarians*, in other words, to be the *first-begotten of the Creation*, or that *the Father is greater than he*, as Christ himself speaks.) I say, no question but Mr. *Wall* takes care that he has no such Communicants in his own Parish, and I think he cannot admit any, of whom he is not rationally assur'd, that they were baptiz'd by sound Catholics. This is not a matter to be loosely suppos'd in the general, if Baptism be so necessary to Salvation and to Christian Communion, as he seems to suppose it to be. Col. 1. 15.

I do indeed agree with him, that if he and the *Unitarians*, *Arian*, or *Socinian*, do worship two different Gods, as he is inclinable to think, P. 72. he cannot be too wary in admitting 'em. I cannot see, says he, *that we worship the same God*, since our God is *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*;

i. e. the *Unitarians* take the first Command according to the Letter, *Thou shalt have no other Gods but Me.* But Mr. *Wall*, &c. interprets it, *Thou shalt have no other Gods but us Three,* and therefore they worship not the same God. But then let Mr. *Wall* consider what follows, That if the *Unitarians* worship the true God of *Israel*; that God who made all things, the *God and Father of our Lord Jesus*, and the same God which *Jesus Christ* worship'd (who never is said to worship any but his *Father*) then it follows, that if Mr. *Wall* worships another God, 'tis not that true God; and then I doubt he will hardly have the Honour, he derides the *Socinians* with, of being admitted to wear a white *Turbant* in *Stambole*. He must e'en go a little farther off, and among some of the remote *Indians* may perhaps find some Associates, with whom to have brotherly and unenvy'd Communion. I only mention this, to shew him the Consequence of his rash Zeal; not that I think he really is for another God than the *Socinians* or *Arians*, tho' of that God he may have other Notions, as the several sorts of *Trinitarians* have different Conceptions of him from each other. I pray God preserve him from gratifying his Passion and Aversion to *Arians*, &c. at so dear a rate, as the renouncing the true God for their believing in him, or the admitting many Gods because they hold but one.

At this rate, how many different Gods might an envious Mind tax the Christians with? Thus the several sorts of *Trinitarians* will have several Gods: Our God, says one *Trinitarian*, is *Three Infinite Minds*; but, says another sort, our God is but one *Infinite Mind*, with three Modes or Somewhats, &c. Ergo, they don't worship the
 same

same God, according to Mr. Wall. So the *Arminians* and *Calvinists* will have two Gods; for says one side, Our God is of a *Nature* holy and good, he can't will Sin and the Misery of his Creatures: Our God, says the other, does will and decree Sin, and makes Men do it, to please himself in their Damnation, as an Act of Sovereignty; *Ergo*, we have not the same God, nor of the same Nature. This is a fine healing Method which Mr. Wall is setting up!

Many have wondred how it comes to pass that the *Unitarians*, who have the most to say for themselves, and whose Arguments are serious, sober and pertinent, by Confession of their Opposers, should yet be run down with more Odium and bitter Censures than any other Sect: But the Solution is not difficult; for when once any Party, either by the Constitution of their Church, or by the sacred Ties of a beneficial Income, are oblig'd to subscribe, or openly pronounce the *undoubted everlasting Perdition* of their Brethren, then the next thing likely to be done by a considerate Man (whose Heart smites him for it, as a harsh uncommon piece of Cruelty) is to devise, and strain, and aggravate Matters as ill as he can, that he may make those Persons look something like such as are fit to be thus curs'd and damn'd by him; since curs'd and damn'd, with great Solemnity, they must needs be: Lest if they should be thus censur'd without a Cause, that Text, *Judge not, that ye be not judg'd*, Mat. 7. 1, 2. might bode them ill, and frighten them with that same Damnation which with such undoubting Confidence they have openly denounc'd against their Brethren. That therefore they may be able to perform their part heartily, 'tis requisite to make things look

as bad as possibly they can on the *Unitarians* side, and to imagine these worship another God, and blaspheme Jesus Christ, &c. that so without relenting, they may, in open view, chearfully offer 'em up to the forest Indignation of God for ever; which if they do escape, 'twill be without much Thanks due to the Disciples of *Vigilius Thapsensis*.

This is the more unreasonable in Mr. *Wall*, for that he has given us two Characters of fundamental Doctrines, which will go very far to clear the *Unitarians* from the Charge of Error in Fundamentals: Three Persons in one and the same God, or Infinite Mind, being never expressly or clearly and plainly deliver'd in any Text of Scripture, whatever proof be pretended from remote Consequences, which some sincere Persons cannot perceive, no not with the help of an early Education therein, and a strong Bias too from great worldly Interest, which are not wont to blind the Eyes in favour of the losing side of a Question. Nor was it in the next place put into the most antient *Cree ds*, witness the common antient *Creed*, call'd the *Apostles Creed*; nay even the *Nicene Creed* never determin'd the Equality of the Third Person to the Father, and therefore a part of the *Constantinopolitan Creed* is tack'd to the end of it, and now-a-days it passes all together for the *Nicene Creed*, as the Learned well know.

But to return (after this Digression made necessary by Mr. *Wall*'s Warmth against the *Unitarians*) to the Argument of Baptism; I am sensible one Question may arise, from what has been said about the not baptizing the Seed of Believers, *viz.* Whether a Person may communicate at the Lord's Table who is born in Christianity


tianity of baptiz'd Parents, but has not been himself baptiz'd in Person? But this will easily be determin'd by what has been said, according to the Strength or Weakness of my main Argument.

For tho Mr. Wall says, *Of all Absurdities none ever maintain'd that the Unbaptiz'd should communicate*; yet if he will not allow the Seed of baptiz'd Parents, for baptiz'd Persons by virtue of their Christian Birth, he must either shew that the Offspring of Believers were in Person baptiz'd in the early beginnings of Christianity, or there will be some ground to suppose, that what he accounts an Absurdity was the first Practice; and that Christians did communicate by virtue of their Birth-Privilege, as the Seed of baptiz'd Parents: since they who were bound to communicate, were not (as far as yet appears) bound to be, in their immediate Persons, baptiz'd.

And if we look to the *Jewish* Custom, in relation to the *Postcœnium* of the Passover, whence our Lord took the occasion of instituting his Supper, we may find yet more countenance for our Supposition, in that all the *Female Communicants* were admitted without Baptism, or any other requir'd Badge of Initiation; so that they were but such as descended from circumcis'd Parents, tho the *Males*, on some other account, were to be first circumcis'd. Whence it appears, that if we make the Case of Admission to the Lord's Supper parallel to this, we can only say, That such as are requir'd to be baptiz'd, must be so before they communicate, and no others: and then this resolves the Business into the extent of the Command for Baptism, whether it reach to the Seed of Profelytes, or not; other-

wise there is no necessity from the nature of the Ordinances themselves, that all should be solemnly initiated by a Ceremony before communicating.

Now upon the whole, as I have no Interest, Party, nor Prejudice to serve (which scarcely any but a Layman can truly say) so I am not dogmatical, nor positive in the Matter, but only propound it as a Problem: Nor will I violently defend it, but shall be altogether as well pleas'd to see my Argument fairly confuted, as any one shall be to undertake it; and will conclude with Mr. Baxter's Words (in his *Catholick Communion doubly defended*) *I flatter no Party, and I look to gain by none: I have gather'd no Church to depend on for Kindness, nor is the fear of displeasing them a Bias to my Judgment.*



P O S T S C R I P T.

AS I was never peremptory in my Determination of this Problem, so I am ready to give what Arguments I can, whether it be on the one side or the other; and therefore, because the following Passages may be thought to give some light into the Question, I think fit to set them down here.

Just. Mar. in his Apol. speaking of the Eucharist, says, To which none is admitted, but who believes our Doctrine to be true, having been washed in the Laver of Regeneration for the Remission of Sins,

Sins, and living as Christ has taught. As many as being convinced do believe the things we teach, and promise to live according to 'em, after Prayer and Fasting, are led by us to the Water, and are regenerated after the same manner as we also were.

And to the same purpose, say the *Constit. Ap.* Let none eat of these things who is not initiated, L. 7. c. 25. but those only who have been baptiz'd into the Death of the Lord. But if any one (not initiated) is a Partaker thro ignorance, instruct him quickly, and initiate him, that he may not go out and despise you. To these general Expressions, I may add this particular Passage, that is more determinate; where speaking to Christians, the words are, Baptize your Infants, and bring 'em up in the L. 6. c. 15. nurture and admonition of the Lord. Which if spoken, as I think they are, of proper Infants in Age, will, I confess, shew the continued Use of Baptism, in Christians Posterity, to be intended, so far as this Authority can carry it: and that 'tis indeed spoken of little Infants before Instruction, I think appears,

1. In that these *νήμα*, or little Children, are distinct from the *Catechumens*, the baptizing of whom is made another distinct Article, which follows, c. 18. *Instruct the Catechumens in the Elements of Religion, and baptize them.* So that they are not the same with the *Catechumens*.

2. The Method prescribed is different: the *Catechumens* were first to be instructed, and then baptized; but these *Infants* were to be baptized, and then instructed. These seem to be the Children of Christian parents, and the other to be *Profelytes*, who were to be first instructed. And the same Method of previous Instruction seems not to be used with the two sorts.

3. There

3. There is a difference in the Phrase, *your Infants*, and only *the Catechumens*, to express a nearer and more natural Propriety in the one, as Parents, than in the other.


So that I think these *Constitutions* do hereby favour the Practice of *Infant-Baptism* among Christians: Tho, it can never stand upon that Foot, on which Mr. *Wall* and others have set it, *viz.* the antient Practice of the *Jews*. And let these things weigh what they will, I thought it but fair to lay 'em before the Reader; as I wou'd do the like in any other doubtful Controversy, in order to the discovery of Truth.

See also L.
7. c. 44.

F I N I S.

E R R A T A.

Title-Page of the Narrative, l. 15. read *περοδοιπορήσαντες*.
P. 255. l. 32. for this read *thy*. P. 280. l. 17. read *cobling*.
P. 371. l. 15. *dele* made.



A TABLE of the Contents of the several *Treatises*.

I.

I <i>N</i> what Sense Christ is called God.	Pag. 3, 4
<i>Inferiority of the Son to the Father.</i>	7
1 Cor. 15. 24—29. explained.	8
Philip. 2. 6. explained.	11
<i>Absolute Goodness reserved to God only.</i>	13
<i>The Day of Judgment not known to the Son.</i>	15, 169
<i>The common Evasion absurd.</i>	17
<i>How far all Knowledge, and that of the Heart, is attributed to Jesus Christ as Man.</i>	24, 26
<i>What sort of Worship is given to Jesus Christ.</i>	37
<i>How the Mediation of Jesus Christ is subverted by them who suppose him the Supreme.</i>	38
<i>Trinitarians of two very opposite Opinions.</i>	40
<i>How to reconcile the primitive Christian Writers, who seem to differ in their Characters of Jesus Christ.</i>	44
<i>Charitable Latitude of Justin Martyr.</i>	46
<i>How the Progress of Christianity has been hindered, &c.</i>	48

II.

<i>Worship of Christ, in what sense Divine, or not so.</i>	52
<i>How the Son is to be honoured as the Father,</i> John 5. 22.	53, 54
<i>Origen's Sense about Prayer to Jesus Christ.</i>	56
John 16. 23. Ye shall ask me nothing, consider'd.	ib.
	Of

The CONTENTS.

<i>Of Internal Acts of Worship paid to Jesus Christ.</i>	58
<i>Of External Acts of Worship.</i>	59
<i>Of Baptizing in his Name.</i>	60, &c.
<i>Upon what the Worship of Christ is, and on what 'tis not, founded in the Scripture.</i>	65
<i>Rom. 14. 11, 12. explain'd.</i>	68
<i>Subordinate religious Worship due to Christ.</i>	69
<i>Not ultimate Worship, according to Mr. B.</i>	73
<i>His absurd Explication of John 5. 22, 23.</i>	80
<i>Subordinate Worship of Christ intrenches not on the incommunicable Honour of God.</i>	87
<i>The Man Christ Jesus is our Advocate.</i>	94
<i>Luke 4. 10. not against this Subordinate Worship.</i>	97
<i>Trinitarians give God's Glory to another, by their Principles, in worshipping the Human Nature.</i>	106
<i>Subordinate Worship of Christ, is not like the Idolatry of Pagans or Papists.</i>	110
<i>How the Primitive Writers vindicated their Worship of Jesus Christ, from the Charge of such Idolatry.</i>	124
<i>Rom. 1. 25. not against this Worship.</i>	126
<i>The Objection from Gal. 4. 8. answered.</i>	127
<i>The Case of Papists and Unitarians not alike.</i>	131, 2
<i>How the Primitive Writers say they worshipp'd none but God.</i>	133, 4
<i>Mahometans not so scandaliz'd by the Unitarians, as by others.</i>	138
<i>Rashness of Mr. L'Abbadie, &c.</i>	140
<i>The Unitarians Worship more safe.</i>	141, 2

III.

<i>The Phrase, according to the Flesh, does not signify the Human Nature.</i>	151
<i>When we may leave the literal Sense of a Text.</i>	154
<i>How the Incarnation of the Supreme God favours the Anthropomorphites.</i>	155, &c.
<i>The Divine Nature of Jesus Christ is derived.</i>	158
<i>God Almighty one single He or Mind.</i>	164, &c.
	IV.

The CONTENTS.

IV.

- Dr. South perplexed to make out Christ's coming down, &c. in his Divine Nature.* 179
The Arians Account of it more easy. 181
Bishop Fowler's Reasons for the Pre-existence of Christ's Human Spirit. ib.
The Notion of Christ's Human Nature not being a single human Person, considered. 185
Dr. Sherlock's Hypothesis of a visible Personal Glory of Christ, put off at his Incarnation, examined. 187

V.

- A Contradiction in one Nature, is so in others.* 196
A Trinity of Three Faculties will not agree with the Incarnation of the Son only. 201
Nor a Trinity of Three (like Three Human) Persons with the Unity of God. 203
Generation in the Divine Nature not proved necessary. 204

VI.

- How Contradictions may be discerned, even when relating to God, tho he be incomprehensible.* 223
To say the contrary, lays a Foundation for Scepticism. 225
The Plural Elohim is used of a single Person. 230

VII.

- The State of the Question relating to Christ's Satisfaction: the Unitarians Notion of it.* 237, 257
The Justice of God not obliged to punish all Sin to the utmost of its Desert. 239
Of the Covenant of Works, with Adam. 245
The Truth of God's Threatnings obliges him not to exact full Punishment of all. 246
Nor do the Ends of Government. 247
Dr.

The CONTENTS.

<i>Dr. Stillingfleet's Inconsistencies about this Matter.</i>	249
<i>Jesus Christ not punished by the vindictive Justice of God.</i>	253
<i>A Note upon Acts 4. 27, 28.</i>	255
<i>Christ did not suffer to make a strict equivalent Payment to Justice, or a full Compensation.</i>	258
<i>This Notion destroys the Free Grace of God, in the Pardon of Sins.</i>	259, 60
<i>2 Peter 2. 1. and Acts 20. 28. explained.</i>	263
<i>The Jewish Sacrifices and Atonements were no Compensation to Divine Justice, but a Penitential Application to Mercy.</i>	264
<i>Atonement sometimes without shedding of Blood, and Heb. 9. 22. explained.</i>	266
<i>The Jewish Sacrifices were to a quite different purpose from Christ's Sacrifice.</i>	270
<i>No need nor possibility of Infinite Punishment, for a Satisfaction by Jesus Christ.</i>	272
<i>The common Scheme of Satisfaction defective, leaving Two Divine Persons still unappeased.</i>	277
<i>In that Scheme Jesus Christ is honoured far above his Father, by the Consequences of it.</i>	278
<i>The Socinians own Eternal Punishments, as much as their Opposers,</i>	280
<i>Unitarians are Christians.</i>	284
<i>Tritheism and Paganism charged on some Trinitarians, by others.</i>	285
<i>The Trinitarians sadly distracted with disagreeing and contrary Notions.</i>	287
<i>The Injustice of denying Toleration to Unitarians in their Worship of God.</i>	291

VIII.

<i>Punishment, even of Papists, for Religion, not warranted by the Jewish Laws</i>	297
<i>Christians more cruel Persecutors than Jews.</i>	299

IX.

The CONTENTS.

IX.

<i>Dr. Mill's Evidences against the Authority of</i> 1 John	
5. 7.	308
<i>Not in the Greek Manuscripts.</i>	310
<i>How they might slide into the Text.</i>	311
<i>Not in the most antient Versions.</i>	ib.
<i>Not in any Genuine Greek Writer.</i>	313
<i>Nor Latin, for several Centuries.</i>	316
<i>Evidence offered for the Text.</i>	318
<i>The Preface under Jerome's Name rejected.</i>	ib.
<i>Greek Manuscripts pretended, and some Latin found.</i>	321
<i>Victor Vit. considered.</i>	324
<i>The British Manuscript examined</i>	326
<i>And the Complutensian.</i>	327
<i>And the Seven Stephens's Manuscripts.</i>	328
<i>Tertullian's and Cyprian's Words accounted for.</i>	333
<i>Dr. Mill's supposed Account unreasonable.</i>	340
<i>Reasons for altering our printed Text.</i>	346
<i>How the Words are expounded by Calvin, Beza, &c.</i>	354
<i>Excuses for not altering them answered.</i>	356

X.

<i>Pride of Reason, in affecting subtle and sublime Mysteries, instead of the plain Simplicity of the Gospel.</i>	364, 5
<i>Dr. Bennet's Commendation for the Manner of his writing.</i>	366
<i>What Texts are given up, particularly Phil. 2. 6.</i>	369
<i>The Dr. contends not with Dr. Clark about the Baptifmal Creed, or Trinity, but another Trinity.</i>	373
<i>The Doctor's Notion of the Word's Quiescence.</i>	375
<i>The Man Christ Jesus the First-born of the Creation.</i>	376
<i>The great Humiliation of the Logos.</i>	380
<i>Irenæus favours not the Doctor's Notion.</i>	382
	Pre-

The CONTENTS.

<i>Presumptions against his Notion of the Quiescence.</i>	383
John 1. 1. <i>The Word was God, explained.</i>	391
<i>A known Distinction in that Text between the God, and a God.</i>	293
Heb. 1. 10. <i>not certainly said of the Son, but rather of God the Father.</i>	400
<i>The Personality of the Holy Spirit given up.</i>	402
<i>The main Question about the Holy Spirit's Deity, refers only to the Personal Spirit, not to the Power of God.</i>	405, 6
1 Cor. 2. 10, 11. <i>cleared.</i>	ib.
<i>A Trinity of Three Fathers imply'd by Dr. B-- His Three Persons but Operations.</i>	410 ib.
<i>At other times they are Three Beings.</i>	412
<i>No Trinity but only Two Persons in his Scheme.</i>	414
<i>The Characters of the Two Persons confounded.</i>	417
<i>Inconsistency of his Notions with the Offices of the Church.</i>	420, 21, 22
<i>The Church's Caution, in the Communion-Ru- brick.</i>	423

XI.

<i>The great Proof of Infant-Baptism taken from the Use of Baptism among the Jews.</i>	430
<i>This Practice intimated in the New Testament.</i>	432
<i>From this, it only follows, that Children born of Infidel Parents must be baptized.</i>	435
<i>No Instance of any, old or young, who being born of Christian Parents, were baptized, for a long time.</i>	439, 442
<i>Infant-Baptism not proved from Circumcision of Infants.</i>	446
<i>How Unitarians and Trinitarians worship the same God.</i>	452
<i>One unjust Cause of the Odium upon the Unitarians.</i>	453
<i>Two Characters of Fundamental Doctrines.</i>	454
<i>Infant-Baptism, how far according to the Apostolical Constitutions.</i>	457



A N
A N S W E R
T O

Mr. *Martin's* Critical Differta-
tion on 1 *John* v. 7. *There are Three*
that bear Record, &c.

S H E W I N G

The Insufficiency of his *Proofs*, and the
Errors of his *Suppositions*; by which he
attempts to establish the Authority of that
Text from *supposed* Manuscripts.







T H E

P R E F A C E.



HIS Gentleman, whom I propose to answer in the following Treatise, has certainly set off his Arguments with a great deal of Address and handsome Flourish. I believe few cou'd have said more upon the Point, tho perhaps some wou'd have chosen to say less. The Extract of my Inquiry in the Hague-Journal seems to have given the Occasion of his Dissertation. I had traced the learned Dr. Mill, κατὰ πρόβλας, to whose accurate Labours, little that was new cou'd be added. What few Remarks I may have made, to clear or strengthen some Arguments, Mr. Martin has not always taken notice of; so that I thought at first he had only seen the Extract, till I observed he has cited the Pages which are not inserted in the Journal.

I commend his pious Zeal for the Credit of the Holy Scriptures, but do not think his Inference just, viz. that, if the Text in debate be found not genuine, it is rational to suppose the same thing may have happened to some other Texts whereon the Faith has been founded. For if our Faith be justly founded

upon any Text, 'tis because we have better proof of its Authority; and if we have not, 'tis not Faith, but Credulity, which is no Christian Virtue. And I believe this Gentleman cannot give such another Instance of one important Text rely'd on, which is not better proved than this; nor admits any one else, nor yet the Passage of Josephus it self, upon such lame Evidence. Nor can I think that Man a true Friend to the Honour of Christianity, who declares it must stand or fall with this, or (if there were any) other Texts in the same Case.

Since therefore he agrees to this, that we ought to reject this Passage if 'tis not Scripture; and I, that we ought to receive it, if it be so; we are not to fright our selves with Consequences, to engage our Passions on one side or on the other, but seriously, and in the Integrity of our Hearts, to inquire and examine to the bottom, whether it be a part of Sacred Writ or not. Only I must observe that 'twas not fair to say, It turns only upon the Silence of some antient Writers, and the Omissions in some Greek Manuscripts of St. John's Epistle, and that nothing else can be urged; when we do urge the Omission of all the Greek Manuscripts, and earnestly desire him to direct us at least to one, before he bars us of this Plea, and also the Omission in all the genuine antient Greek Writers, as far as appears. And till this Examination be over, and full Satisfaction given, he shou'd not, I think, have called it one of the most excellent Passages of the whole Scripture, lest he happen to give the preference to a Dictate of some ordinary and erroneous Man.

I can't say but Mr. Martin has written with Decency, and the Civility of a Gentleman; but such Treatment must not, it seems, be expected from all. For from the Pulpit, at a publick Lecture of Dissenters, I have been very lately attack'd with heavy Censures, and angry Reproaches, in order to vindicate

this contested Text. *It seems that Dr. C—, on the 13th Instant, thought it the best Method to begin with Mens Characters rather than with their Arguments, and in effect to tell his People, that very good Men had been for the Text, and some very bad or indifferent ones against it: And then he descended to Particulars; viz. Mr. Le Clerc, Mr. Whiston, and F. Simon, as the Chief of the opposite Side, who for Piety and Learning were not to compare with some of the other; tho they are well known to be Men of superior Abilities, and singular Learning, of whom, if on his Side, perhaps he would have boasted with as great Glory.*

As to myself, I only complain, that it was not very charitable in him to say from the Pulpit, That tho it's true the Text is not in the Alexandrian and Vatican Copies, yet that I (under the Name of the Author of the Inquiry) had such an Aversion to that Doctrine, that if the Text had been in those Copies, and twenty more (I think that was the Number) he believed I would cavil against it still; and insinuated to the People, as if I had attempted to huff and hector 'em out of the Text.

I addressed my Inquiry to my Superiors in Convocation; and if I did write in a huffing and hectoring manner, I should be very sorry, since I intended to do it with fair Arguments and decent Respect; but I must leave this to equal Judges that have read my Book, and let them pronounce whether my Book, or such Preaching, have more of the Huff and Hector.

'Twas hard he should be so very uncharitably confident, what I wou'd have done, and how I would have acted against the greatest Evidence, if there had been any in the Case. I'm persuaded he can't shew where ever I have cavill'd against such Evidence as he mention'd, in any one Point of religious Dispute. I can tell of several Instances where I have yielded to Evidence against my former religious Opinions, and
against

against my worldly Interest and Reputation too: nay, I once valued this supposed Text, as much as I can now any Proof of its being spurious; perhaps much more, because I found far more need then to have it for me, than I do now to get clear of it; and yet when Evidence did appear against it, I did not cavil.

I appeal to any one of Understanding, whether John 10. 30. I and my Father are one, be not altogether as opposite to the Opinion of such as are counted Arians, with relation to the Deity of Christ, as this other Text; and yet do I or others cavil at that?

I think this should convince any Man who is not too far gone in Passion and Prejudice, that 'tis Difference of Evidence makes me willing to admit the one, and reject the other; since there is no more difficulty (and indeed I find none at all) in reconciling the one to my Opinions, than the other: And indeed I was as easy in my present Sentiments while I did not reject this Text, but thought it more probably genuine, as I am since. I think this may satisfy: And yet I don't know but he that can heartily believe the Words genuine without the Authority of one Manuscript, may think it easy for another to disbelieve 'em, tho he found 'em in all.

It may be observed how ready some are to inflame their People with Indignation and Rage against such as differ from them, and that in Matters they are no way capable Judges of. We know well what the marking Men out in the Pulpit with odious Censures serves to.

I am sorry if these are some of the first Fruits of the kind Indulgence granted, viz. to fall so foul upon others, even before that was quite finished. I suppose, to censure and lessen by Name or Marks, is a Liberty which the kindest Laws never intended: When these provided that Dissenters should not be disturbed by others, it was supposed others should not be affronted by personal open Reflections from them.

Why can't a Point of Criticism, or History, or an Opinion be calmly argued? Can't a Man go into a Pulpit without Heat and Ruffle, and there produce his Evidences fairly? If he can find none that please him, he need not be forward to undertake it, but should not be out of humour; by which 'tis great odds, but he will expose one more than he intended.

I meddle not with his Arguments, for indeed they were deferred till the next; and if his Reasons be as strong in his next turn, as I thought his Passions were in the last, it will make much more Impression on me. And I promise him that if he will try me with but half the Evidence, nay with one quarter of the twenty Greek Manuscripts, which he concluded I would cavil against, he shall find I am not so perverse as he represented me. And when he gratifies the World with these Discourses, if he will come forth as a Scholar, or rather as a Christian, serene and ingenuous, and I should judge it requisite to take any notice of them; I assure him I am not so disturbed, but that I really intend to use more Temper and Civility out of the Pulpit, than I have sometimes seen in it: I remember the Servant of the Lord must not strive, but in Meekness instruct those who oppose.


2 Tim. 2.
24, 25.


I am so sensible that Victory, in angry and uncharitable Strifes, even for Truth it self, however it may gratify our present Vanity, is yet inglorious; and so injurious to the Interests of our Holy Religion, that I am ready to fear, what a certain General is said to have reply'd, when congratulated upon a great but costly Victory, That a few such Victories will undo us.

Jan. 24. 1718.

T. E.

An





*An Answer to Mr. Martin's
Dissertation on 1 John 5. 7.*



MR. MARTIN, Minister of the *French* Church at *Utrecht*, having published a *Dissertation* in defence of the genuine Authority of 1 *John* 5. 7. *There are three that bear Record in Heaven,* &c. wherein he pretends to give a sufficient Proof of its *Authority*, and to enervate the Arguments given by me from *Dr. Mill*, of its being a manifest *Interpolation*; I thought it proper to consider what he hath said, and to dispel that Mist, wherewith, by specious *Insinuations*, and fine *Suppositions*, and smooth *Turns*, he has endeavoured to impose upon the Minds of such as do not thoroughly understand the Matters of *Fact*.

This Gentleman is alarmed to this *Defence* by an Opinion of the mighty Consequence of this *supposed Text*, for the Support of the *Orthodox Doctrine*; and is therefore very earnest not to let go his hold of it, tho he pretends indeed the same thing is to be found in *many other Places of Holy Scripture*; which yet I apprehend he has some distrust of.

For my part, I think I am no way influenced by any such contrary *Motive*, in writing on the other side of the Question, being fully satisfy'd that the Words, if *genuine*, were as favourable to those call'd *Arians*, as to any; and clearly would argue against the *Sabellian Unity of one single Mind*, or *one intelligent Being*; because it would make the *three Witnesses* to dwindle again into *but one*, and so to lose much of the Force of the Argument from *three*. And therefore *Calvin* and *Beza* declare, that 'tis not *Unity of Being* is here spoken of, but *Unity of Consent and Testimony*; which will imply *distinct Minds* concurring in their Evidence, since Consent is always between more than one: So that it injures *Mr. Martin's Cause* to depend on such a Proof; as *Erasmus* says*.

In loc.

I am only concerned to do justice to the *Sacred Writings*, and to discover what is true in it self; not what is convenient or agreeable to my liking. And as my Design at first was to state the *Facts* on *Dr. Mill's Evidence*, so I judge I did make it appear that he had left no Foundation for the just support of the Authority of this *supposed Text*: But yet if any new Evidence arises, or any well attested *Authorities*, or, hitherto concealed, *Manuscripts* of Credit, can be produced, I am as ready as any Man to allow 'em a due regard. But *Mr. Martin* has not try'd me, I conceive, with any such Matters as these; but with fine *Suppositions*, and abstracted *Possibilities*, of this and the other thing, which in a Matter of Fact will not go very far with me against plainer Evidence.

* Hoc non est confirmare Fidem, sed suspectam reddere, si nobis hujusmodi Lemmatis blandiamur. *Eraf. in locum.*

He supposes the Words in debate might not harm the *Context*, nor disagree to *St. John's Stile*; but what is this to the purpose, to prove that in *fact* they were originally written by *him*? 'Tis so easy by one fetch or other, according to Mens various Fancies, to wind *almost* any thing into an obscure *Context*, when once it is resolved it *must* be in; that I take such Arguments to be but trifling Supplements, where good Reasons are wanting. But then as to what he calls a *third Advantage* in favour of the Text, *viz.* That his Ch. 1. Adversarys cannot produce one single Passage from the *Antients*, whence it may appear that they had any Suspicion concerning this Text: It may be said that it had been indeed strange, if any had made a Dispute about a *Text*, which they had never seen or heard of; which I think is true of the *Primitive Writers* for many *Centuries*: and for others since, 'tis no wonder if creeping into *private Books* in Ages of *Darkness* and *Confusion*, we find no notice remaining of any Opposition of theirs to what did not offend them.

On the other hand, there are three great *Disadvantages* which Mr. *Martin* labours and sinks under, and which are fatal to his Cause.

1. That he has not produced one *genuine Greek Writer* that ever cited this *Text*, thro so many hundreds of Years past. Even the spurious *Synopsis Scripturæ* among *Athanasius's Works*, by saying that *St. John shews us the Unity of the Son with the Father*, gives no ground to say that this uncertain Author had *this Text* in his eye; probably it refers rather to some other Passages, (to *ch. 2. 23.*) or to the 8th Verse of this 5th Chapter mystically interpreted, &c. However, who, or at what time, this Author, whether *Greek* or *Latin*, was, is not known.

2. That he cannot direct us to one *Manuscript Greek Copy* in the World, where this *Text* is at this day to be found; and yet the *Manuscripts* have been in very safe keeping with the Orthodox all along: so that if ever they had been seen with *this Text* in 'em, they might be so still. If *Arian Kings* and *Emperors* had borne the Sway, we should have had it confidently said by Men of slight Thought, that then it was these *Manuscripts of Stephens*, and the *British Manuscripts*, and the *Vatican Manuscripts*, &c. were alter'd, and the Words rased out, as now they vainly pretend it might be of old; but who has alter'd 'em all now since the *Reformation*?

3. That he has not produced one credible Witness, that ever directly said he had at any time seen any one particular *Greek Manuscript* in which *this Text* was; or described it by any Mark of Distinction, by which it may be known, upon Inquiry after it. We have several indefinite Assertions, *that 'tis*, and that *we find it*, and the like, in some Copies, as *Beza* and *P. Amelot* speak; but that they saw it themselves, and took it not from others upon loose Presumption, is, I think, not once fully manifested: and it signify'd nothing to mention *Ximenes*, and *Cajetan*, and *Laurentius Valla*, and more such, only to make a pompous Show of *Names* and *Numbers* for nothing; when 'tis not proved they say any thing to the Point in hand: and one may say of 'em all, as *Erasmus* of *Laurentius Valla*, *Quid legerit, non satis liquet*; How *Valla* read, is not evident. But of this Matter somewhat more particular shall be said, when I come to examine what *Mr. Martin* says of the *Greek Manuscripts*. And indeed, 'tis only on this third Head that I need much to concern my self: for as to the two former Points, he makes no great Defence; the genuine *Greek Writers*, and the present

sent Greek Manuscripts are not to be found, nor are so much as summoned in for Witnesses on his side.

Indeed, Mr. *Martin* would fain invalidate this *negative Argument*, from the total Silence of the *Greek Fathers*, and that of the *Latins* too, for 400 Years, (for he has not proved *S. Cyprian's* Words to be more than his *Interpretation* of the 8th *Ver.* as *Facundus*, yea and *Fulgentius* too, as I had shown, do declare 'em to be) by pretending that they might be in *other Writings of the Antients which are lost*; or that it might not come into their *Minds* to mention 'em: even as that Text of *Baptizing in the Name of the Father, Son, and Spirit*, was not mention'd by some of them, in several of their Works where it might have been proper.

But is this like the Case we are upon? For as *those* Words were not so peculiarly necessary for their purpose against any Adversaries they had to do with; so 'tis granted, that if they were omitted in one part of the Writings, they are still alledg'd in another; or if by one Writer, yet they are cited by others, both *Greek* and *Latin*; and also have the concurrence of the *antient Greek Manuscripts* to back it all. Now is this, or any thing like it, to be said in the present Case? where the *Text* in dispute is not once mention'd, neither in one genuine *Greek Writer* nor in another; neither in one part of their Works, nor in another; and where they had such provoking frequent Occasions, as would not suffer 'em to be, *all* of 'em, and *always*, forgetful of so proper a Text; a Text so emphatical and so singular, such an one that Mr. *Martin*, and some others, cannot tell how to spare; and where, all the *Greek Manuscripts* known to us, are as silent as the *Greek Fathers*, and the *Latins* too for many Ages. Can any *negative Argument* be stronger? Or can there

be any but negative Arguments to prove a Negative? And shall it be enough not to answer, but evade such Proof, by strange Suppositions of extreme Possibilities of such things, to which perhaps the like never yet happened?

Mr. *Martin's* 2d, 3d, and 4th Chapters are nothing but a Proof, by a long Series from the 14th Age backwards to the time of *Charlemain*, that *this Text* was in the *Latin Bibles* in these *Western Parts*; so that he pleases himself with tracing it up to the End of the *Eighth Century* in the *Latin Copy*: which yet is no more than has been freely allow'd on all sides; I mean that *this Text* has from that Age been found in divers *Latin Copies*, not in *all*, or in the *West*; the nearer they were to our present Times, the more they agreed in this Point; and the higher we go, the Evidence appears weaker and weaker, till at last, without the help of a strong Fancy, we can discern none at all.

And even in these *Latin Bibles* 'tis confess'd, that *this Text* is in various shapes; in some the Words in *Heaven* are wanting; in others, *these Three are one*; and in some the *whole Verse*: sometimes the *Six Verse* comes before it, and sometimes 'tis as in our *present printed Books*; sometimes 'tis in the *Text*, and sometimes in the *Margin*. And tho' Father *Simon* owns the Words to be in that ancient *Manuscript* of *Lotharius*, copied
cap. 11. from *Charlemain's Bible*; yet he says, that it
cap. 13. was greatly disfigured, some Words interlin'd, and some deaced, to substitute other Words in their place: so that he might well reckon *this* to be of less ancient Authority, than the *Body* of the Copy; and therefore there was no great reason here to triumph over him as *contradicting himself*.

Such Marks of Confusion seem plainly to shew, that this *Text* had, as yet, been a *Stranger* there, and had not any fixed Settlement assigned to it: perhaps in *St. Bernard's* time, viz. in the *XIth Age*, it might be got into the *Ordo Romanus*, and the Offices of the Church, both *Latin* and *Greek*; even as in *England*, I find these same Words were introduced among the *Epistles* into the *Common-Prayer* of King *Edward 6th*, without any mark of Suspicion, while at the same time, and long after, they were marked for doubtful in the publick and common Bibles. So that it does not always follow, from a *Text's* being quoted, or being brought into the Offices of a Church, or placed in the *Bible* it self, that it was received as undoubtedly genuine, because the Offices of a Church are sometimes apt, as we see, to out-run their *Bible*; and Posterity will be abused, if any, in after Ages, shall persuade 'em, that the *English Church* of this or the last Age, prefer'd the old reading of *Psalms 105. 28.* And they were not obedient to his Word, merely because 'tis retain'd in the Church's Office or *Psalter*; when 'tis so well known, that all our more common, and publickly authorized Bibles, have for above an hundred Years maintain'd the reading, which is just contradictory to it, viz. And they rebelled not against his Word. So that it would be a wrong Step to suppose our Zeal for Uniformity had been carry'd so far as this; I mean, to an exact Agreement of the *Church-Service* with the *Church-Bible*.

But what tho this *Text* were found to be directly in the *Bible* of *Charlemain*, which *Father Simon* opposes not? will this prove it to have been in the *Greek Manuscripts* at that time? In the *Latin* for certain, it has long been, and is in many other *Versions* at this day; and yet we have not found hitherto one *Greek Manuscript*, by which

to justify it : And therefore tho *Charlemain*, about *Ann. 798.* caused the vulgar *Latin Bible* to be review'd and purged of many Errors and Corruptions that had crept into it, since *St. Jerom's* time; and to that end employ'd *Alcuin*, and other learned Men of that Age; it will not prove they had the Authority of any *Greek Manuscript* to warrant this Text, as *Mr. Martin* would have us to suppose. *It is not to be imagined*, says he, that these learned Men wou'd only consult and compare with the *Latin Copies*; they wou'd go, without doubt, to the original *Greek of the New Testament*: and pleasantly asks, if *Father Simon* himself (had he been one of them) would have put in **THIS TEXT** upon the Credit of a few Copies only among many, &c.

But 'tis absurd to think, the Men of that Age wou'd or cou'd take such Measures as the Learned of the present Age wou'd; for as the *Greek Manuscripts* were probably very rare, and hard to be come at in the *Western* parts, so the Learned of those Times had scarce any thing of that critical Skill, or *Genius*, which these later Ages have arrived at, and which is so necessary for such a Work: It does not appear that they took any pains to compare with one *Greek Manuscript*, which, if they had had before 'em as their Rule here, and had made such account of, they might probably have been still preserved to us: but as we have no such *Manuscript* to be now found, or that has been seen, as far as we know, for any of the Ages past, between us and them; so it does not appear there ever was one such in the World. Nay, if they follow'd one, or a few, even of the *Latin Manuscripts*, where different from the *most* and *best*, I think 'tis no great wonder. I am satisfy'd this has been often done, *viz.* to prefer the Reading, that has pleased best, when against the *most* and the *best* Copies. Did
not

not the *Complutensian* Editors so? Did not *Erasmus* do it? And why might not these Revisers under *Charlemain*, have the *Ansa calumniandi* as much at heart as he had? especially since they might fancy, as others do now, that *this Text* might have been omitted, as the Preface, under *St. Jerom's* Name, to the seven Epistles, does suggest; which Father *Simon* judges (and the contrary does not appear by *Mr. Martin* himself) to have been about this same time composed and inserted; and to give it the greater Authority, they father'd it upon *Jerom*. Not having any Authority to produce from any *Greek* Copies of their own to justify their Complaint of the *Latin* Translators Omission, perhaps they might think it best to refer the matter back to *St. Jerom*; especially if they found it already put in any Copies of his *Latin Bible*, tho, by a late Corruption, which carry'd no offence in it to them: this might afford 'em a specious Plea, and wou'd prevail upon many others, I believe, to do the like in their Case, when there were none to remonstrate against it. So that if they did but as others have done, the whole Argument is spoil'd.

And then *Mr. Martin* will fall short of his *Conclusion*, viz. that from this Review of the *Latin Bible*, Anno 798. there can be no doubt at all made, but *this Text* had been current in the Bibles of the 7th, 6th, and the 5th Ages; because, says he, we can't suppose they went by *Manuscripts* of less than two or three hundred Years standing; and so they must have had at once before 'em [and not, but they ought to have had, &c. as the *English* Translator puts it] both the Copies of *St. Jerom's Bible*, and also them of the old *Italick Version* made in the second Century, and which had continued to the seventh, to be the Bible of all the *Latin Churches*: and then concludes, that this clearly shews, *The Text* had ever been in Ch. 3.
the

the vulgar Version. And thus, by the Strength of a vigorous Imagination, he is speedily arriv'd, in a manner, at the End of his Journey; without being beholden to any the least Proof by way of Evidence, that these *Revisers* did find, or did say they found, *the Text* in any *one Greek Manuscript*, or in *St. Jerome's*, or in the *Italick Version* it self; much less that they found it in any *ancient* Copies of Credit, that might shew it was no Innovation, if it was found in any others.

I do not see but *Mr. Martin*, without tiring his Fancy by a long train of Suppositions, might as well have made shorter work, by saying, (for I can't well call it arguing) that we see at present our *printed Copies* have *this Verse*; and we ought not to doubt but the World has always been so *honest*, so *wise*, so *watchful*, and *careful*, that it cou'd never have been brought in, if it had not always been in the true Copy from the first. But yet, alas, 'tis too evident, that several Corruptions, Interpolations, and Omissions, have happened frequently, before the Art of Printing; according to the Skill, the Care, or the Fancy of the Transcribers; and for that reason, *St. Jerome* was put upon correcting the *Latin Version* of the New Testament with very great Labour and Difficulty: and afterwards we see *Charlemain* caused another Review to be made, because of new Corruptions: and then in the *tenth Century*, the *Sorbon* another.

And 'tis as certain, that such Reviews are not wont to set all things right again; that upon a little doubt, some things are removed, and others that please better are retain'd, upon very slender grounds; so that we must not presume and suppose, that all *was done* which we now think was *fit to be done*.

The truth is, the World has already too long
gone

gone upon *Suppositions* in this matter, and 'tis that has brought us into this Confusion. The Learned supposed for a long time, that the *Complutensian* Editors had kept close to the *Vatican Manuscripts*; especially to that famous, and most ancient one, recommended to their exact Regard by Pope *Leo*; and therefore that they had *this* good Authority for putting *this Verse* into their Edition. But, tho' this is more than Mr. *Martin* has to warrant his Confidence in the *Charlemain Revisers*, yet, it seems, the Learned supposed too much here, since these *Manuscripts* are found to want what was supposed to be taken from them. Thus the Learned World long supposed that *Stephens* had nine *Greek* Copies which had *this Verse*, and *seven* more that had all but the Words in *Heaven*; and what is become of their *Suppositions*? I believe Mr. *Martin* will part with some of them; and yet they were very plausible, and partly grounded on *Stephens's* own, but mistaken Account: and yet must we still be treated with such trifling *Suppositions* in the same Case, instead of Evidence? But there is no end of supposing, on one side and on the other; and I have no Fondness for a Contest, which not the strongest Reason, but the strongest Imagination must decide.

I shall take my leave of this Subject, by shewing only how groundless and false Mr. *Martin's* fundamental *Supposition* is, *viz.* That the *Latin* Bibles, of the 6th, and 7th, and 8th Ages generally had *this Text*, from the decisive words of that transcendent *Critical Genius* of this Age, Dr. * *Bentley*.

* Two Letters to the Reverend Dr. Bentley, concerning his intended Edition of the Greek Testament, with the Doctor's Answer, and some account of what may be expected from that Edition, p. 24, 25.

I formed a Thought, a priori, that if St. Jerom's true Latin Exemplar could be come at, it would be found to agree exactly with the Greek Text of the same Age; and so the old Copies of each Age (if so agreeing) would give mutual Proof to each other. Whereupon, rejecting the printed Editions of each, and the several Manuscripts of seven Centurys, and under, I made use of none, but these of a Thousand Years ago, or above, (of which sort I have Twenty now in my Study, that one with another, make 20000 Years.) I had the Pleasure to find, as I presaged, that they agreed exactly like two Tallies, or two Indentures; — By this you see that in my proposed Work, the Fate of that Verse (i. e. 1 John 5. 7.) will be a mere Question of Fact. — And if the fourth Century knew that Text, let it come in, in God's Name: But if that Age did not know it, then Arianism in its height was beat down, without the help of that Verse: and let the Fact prove how it will, the Doctrine is unshaken. Now if these twenty so antient Copies all agree in wanting that Verse, (as I am satisfy'd, none supposes they agree in having it) we may see what Credit is due to Mr. Martin's strongest Imagination, concerning the Copies of those Ages. Here is plain Fact against his extravagant Fancies. And I doubt not, when the Doctor; who alone appears to be *par huic negotio*, shall gratify the expecting World with his Noble Performance, things will be set in a yet clearer Light.

Mr. Martin's 5th Chap. is an Attempt to retrieve the Credit of the pretended Preface of St. Jerom to the 7 Epistles; which complains much of the Latin Translators of the New Testament, that they had omitted this Verse, which the Greek Copies had in them. If this had been genuine, it had been of great weight; but for many Reasons the Learned have judged it to be

a Forgery in St. *Jerom's* Name: some of these Reasons Mr. *Martin* thinks not to be sufficient, but that still it may possibly be St. *Jerom's* own Work. But he can never give a good answer to all: For the *Preface* professes him to have restored *this Verse*, after such injustice done to it; and declares it to be a principal Support of the Christian Faith, by which the one Substance of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, is confirmed. But then how comes it, that *this Text*, in all St. *Jerom's* true Writings, where he contends for *this Faith*, and searches so much for Texts and Arguments, is not once mentioned by him? Cou'd he omit what he judged the great Rampart of his Faith? Cou'd he always omit, and always forget, such a Text, which he had been the Preserver and Restorer of; and wou'd therefore be more than ordinarily fond and careful of? Besides, St. *Jerom* surely wou'd never be guilty of such a false Insinuation that all the Greek Copies had *this Verse*, when the total silence of all the Greek Fathers in that, and preceding Ages, is an undeniable Evidence of the contrary; not to be answer'd by little Presumptions and airy Suppositions.

But Mr. *Martin* uses such an Argument, Chap. 5. which he says is very considerable, to prove this *Preface* was St. *Jerom's* and not a Forgery, that I confess is to me very surprizing. If, says he, the Writer of it was a feigned Person, who designed to put off his own Piece for St. *Jerom's*, he was certainly not a Master of much Address, in complaining of unfaithful Translations in his Time; for no one can produce the least Proof, that new Latin Versions were ever made in the Age 'tis pretended this *Preface* was composed: whereas 'tis plain from St. *Augustin*, St. *Jerom's* Cotemporary, that in their Days divers had undertaken to make Latin Versions of the New Testament, and undoubtedly

the Complaint in the Preface respected some one of these Versions; which is a considerable Reason to prove it was truly St. Jerom's. Now I can't but think just the contrary; that the feigned Author, by this was a Man of great Address: for if he intended a Fiction in St. Jerom's Name, it was to be suited to St. Jerom's Time, when Mr. Martin says, there were divers Versions made; and having said none can produce the least Proof of Latin Versions made in that Age which this Preface was pretended to be composed in, he says, there is plain Proof, that in St. Jerom's Days, there were such Versions, which is the very Age it was pretended for: but if he means the feigned Man shou'd have framed a Preface, in St. Jerom's Name, that had only been suitable to Charlemain's Age, he had been a Bungler indeed, tho, with Mr. Martin, a Man of Address. But if such Reasoning as this can confirm him in this Opinion, it will be very difficult to conceive how he shou'd ever be unsettled in any thing. May I not say to him, what he, on no Reason that I can see, says of Dr. Mill; *Sure he did not consider what he said, [not, did not think what he said, as the English Translation is, Ch. 5. at the end] and his Eyes and Understanding went not together.*

But Mr. Martin says, 'Tis of no great moment, whether it be granted to be St. Jerom's or not, because he thinks it will yet prove this Text to have all along been in the Bible; in that the Preface must be allowed to be very antient, and to have been in the Bibles, for above 800 Years; and F. Simon supposes it put in by some of those who revised the Bible under Charlemain. Hence he argues, that if these Learned Men made this complaint of the Unfaithfulness of the Latin Translators in omitting this Verse, it is a certain Argument of its having been in St. Jerom's Bible; else

else they cou'd not have brought such an Accusation.

I grant they cou'd not *justly* do so, unless they knew it had been even in all the *Greek Copies* too, which therefore they pretend; but they might do this *unjustly*, i. e. without Ground, and upon mistaken Presumption, as I have already said; or perhaps upon just such Supposition as Mr. *Martin* himself goes upon, when he says, in his 6th Chap. that either *this Verse* was in St. *Austin's* Bible, or that it *ought to have been in it, because it was in some Bibles of that time.* And so, for ought I know, some *Latin Bibles* might have *the Verse* in them in the 8th Age, and before; and perhaps the Composers of this *Preface* were as loth to think, it was put *lately* in, as Mr. *Martin* is: and contrary to what he says of E. *Simon*, I may ask him, whether if he had been one of *them*, he wou'd not have done the same thing according to his way of Reasoning, or rather of *Presuming*, without Evidence.

But if, from the former Evidence of Dr. *Bentley's* words, it appears in Fact, that St. *Jerom's* Bible had not *this Text*, then there is an end of this Dispute, and the *Prologue* cou'd not be Ch. 5. his; since, 'tis granted to be *ridiculous*, to sup- Part I. pose he shou'd reproach other Translators, for leaving out *this Text*; and yet himself leave it out in that Copy to which this *Preface* was made: therefore the *Preface* is a Forgery; and be it whose it will, is of no force to prove that *this Text* had been either in St. *Jerom's*, or in any *Greek Copy*. So that the great, and middle Link of the imaginary Chain in the 8th Age, is broken; on which hangs the Supposition of *such Greek Manuscripts*, for about 7 Centuries before, and which supported that Supposition for about as many Centuries after; till Matters of Fact came

came to be looked into, and the *Greek Manuscripts* themselves inspected; which, we shall see presently, are all wrong on Mr. *Martin's* side, when I have considered the few private *Citations* of his *two* next *Chapters*.

Mr. *Martin*, in his *6th* and *7th* *Chapters*, goes on to prove that *this Text* was in the antient *Italick Version* of the New Testament. This he wou'd infer, from its being in St. *Ferom's*, which, I hope appears already to be a groundless Surmise; and so the Argument will turn on the other side, and be retorted upon him, *viz.* that if St. *Ferom's* New Testament had not *this Text*, 'tis a great sign, the *Italick*, which he corrected, had it not neither: *Otherwise his Bible had been so defective, that it wou'd have been bitterly exclaimed against, by such as made such ado with him, about his changing but one single word for another; as we learn out of St. Augustin.*

As for his Instances of the mention of *this Text* by *Fulgentius* (in the *6th* Century) and by *Vigilius Tapsensis*, I pass them by, as I had done before, as coming too late to be of any great use in the Case; nor can the mention of *this Text* by them or *Victor Vitensis*, signify any thing more than what I had supposed formerly, *viz.* that at the latter end of the *5th* Century, some might begin to pretend that for *Text*, which had so long and currently been the Interpretation of the *next Verse*. And therefore I did not, as Mr. *Martin* insinuates, put by *Victor Vitensis's* Testimony, for being a fabulous Writer; but I shewed, (to which Mr. *Martin* hath made no reply) that it was no Evidence of the current Admission of that *Text*, or of its long standing; and that from the common way, in that Age and Place, of interpreting the *next Verse*, in such a manner as cou'd not well consist with ha-
ving

ving *this Text* also in their *publick Bibles*: I say their *publick Bibles*, because as *F. Simon* has shewn, Hist. of Versions, c. 3. that tho it appears not that different *Latin Versions*, Translations were then read in the *Western Churches*, yet *private Persons* took the liberty of making new Translations; and that by this distinction, between the *Bible* read in the *publick Service*, and these particular *Versions*, we may easily resolve the *Objections* taken from *Tertullian, Cyprian, &c.* whose *Citations* agree not with the *Italick Version*. They read the *vulgar Copy* with the *People*, which was in use in their *Churches*, because they cou'd not do otherwise: but in their *Writings*, they took the liberty to translate as they thought fit.

And therefore supposing *Victor's* relation of that *Confession of Faith* to be truly as we have it, yet whether drawn up by *one Bishop* or by *four*, it does not follow that *this Text*, even at the end of the *5th Age*, was in their *common Bibles*, tho they might have some *Countenance*, or some *Notions* on which they presumed to bring in the words for a *Proof*; whether it was that they had the direct words in several *private Books*, or relied on the current *mystical Interpretation* of the *next Verse* to bear them out: which last may, for ought I see, be all that is intended in such *Testimonies* or *Citations* of these *Words*. I do not confidently assert it, or say, that even these late *Writers* had only *Three Witnesses*, in the *Bible*; which sometimes they mentioned by their direct *Names, Water, Blood and Spirit*, and sometimes by their *mystical Names, Father, Son, and Spirit*; or *Father, Word and Spirit*: but I conceive there is some ground to think so from this, *viz.* that while one speaks of the *Water, Blood and the Spirit*, and another of *Father, Word, and Spirit*, as *St. John's three Witnesses*; I have not

observed that any of them speak of both together, or of *six Witnesses*: which looks as if it was all but *one Text*, with its Interpretation. (I confess *Eucherius's* Testimony, in the next *Chap.* has all *six* set down there; but to that I shall have something to say.) So that for ought appears, Mr. *Martin's Cloud of Witnesses*, as he calls this huge number of *African Bishops*; *everyone*, says he, *coming with his Bible in his Hand, offering us this Passage of St. John to read*; may be but a *Cloud of an hand-breadth*, three or four only, without any Warrant from the publick Copies, long established, as it appears by others of that Country in that same Age, from what has been already said.

Ch. 7.

Pag. 333,
&c.

The Testimonies of *Eucherius*, *Cyprian*, and *Tertullian*, are to carry on the Proof of the *Italick Versions* having *this Text*; but as here is nothing new about *St. Cyprian*, (to which *Tertullian* is but an Appendix) so I have already stated the matter concerning him in my *former Discourse*, and have accounted for what Mr. *Martin* here repeats; but he takes no notice that even *Fulgentius*, whom he brings to confront *Facundus*, does rather, as I have shown, confirm his Judgment of *Cyprian's* words, *viz.* that they are an Interpretation of the *8th Verse*; and for certain they are not the direct words of the *7th Verse* contended for. And yet here is all that is pretended to, from *St. John's* Time to the *5th Century*; for neither *Greek* nor *Latin*, small nor great Writer, for so many hundred Years, gives the least shadow of a Proof, that they knew any thing of this great and remarkable *Text*; perhaps the most obvious, and adapted for their constant occasions, of any Text in the Bible. And yet this contested Passage of *St. Cyprian* only, so well accounted for, and upon so good Authority, must outweigh all,

all, even against the express Testimony and Sense given of St. *Cyprian's* words, by a following *Bishop* of the same Country, whom none contradict, and whose Testimony, if believed, is entirely decisive.

But the Passage Mr. *Martin* brings out of *Eucherius*, of which indeed I was not aware before, will need more Consideration; for tho' it only concerns the 5th Century, in which I did allow that possibly the Words might become Text, in some Books, yet it will carry it half a Century higher, than the Confession of the African Bishops in *Victor Vitenfis*: and, I confess if the Passage be genuine, it is more to the purpose than any, yea than all the other Testimonies, before or after *Eucherius*, for some hundreds of Years: because here we find both the 7th and 8th Verses together, at once to shew us all the six Witnesses; and that there was *Father, Word, and Spirit*, beside what was said of the *Water, Blood and Spirit*; whereas, only *Father, Word, and Spirit*, might have been the same Things mystically interpreted, after the prevailing Custom of that Time. So that I cannot deny but Mr. *Martin* had some ground to say, *this is decisive*, i. e. as to its being acknowledg'd by *Eucherius*, in the 5th Century. But,

The Instance being singular, is indeed apt to raise suspicion about it, yet I shall not for that Reason reject it, but shall offer such other Arguments, as will, I think, acquit me from the Charge of being influenced by mere Partiality, in judging it to be probably an *Interpolation*, added by the Transcriber of *Eucherius*.

In general, the Learned know very well, that in the Copies and Editions, especially, of the *Latin Fathers*, such Interpolations of Texts are frequent, and were thought innocent: for when

the Transcriber found a Text only refer'd to by his Author, he would supply it at large, or perhaps rectify it, by putting it in according to what was in his own Bible of another Age, which he thought must be right. This was but natural; and I understand this is the Case in a like Instance with *Bede's Comments* on the 8th Verse; *There are three that bear Record, the Water, Blood, and Spirit*: for so I am informed the Manuscripts of *Bede's Works* have it, whereas in the printed Edition, the Words *in terra, on Earth*, are added to make it agree to the current Versions of After-Ages. So that if *Eucherius* had only said, *As to the Trinity St. John has spoken as in the 8th Verse*, the Transcriber finding in After-Ages the 7th Verse also in his Bible, might join both, as easily as he now would add *Chapter and Verse*: And thus an Alteration of a Text was the likeliest of all.

But 'tis not enough to say it might be so, I shall therefore offer my Reasons on which I judge it was so here; because,

First, It appears to be not very consistent with *Eucherius* himself elsewhere; for in his Interpretation of *Ver. 8.* or the *Water, Blood, and Spirit*, he declares, *that most did by a mystical Interpretation understand thereby the Trinity*, i. e. by the *Water* the *Father*, &c. in which he seems entirely to acquiesce also; which is much what *St. Cyprian* had said before, according to *Facundus's* Testimony. Now I cannot imagine how to reconcile this with *Eucherius's* acknowledging the Words of the 7th Verse; for how could any, according to common Sense, set themselves, by forced mystical Interpretations, to extort from the 8th Verse such an unnatural Meaning, and make the *Water, Blood, and Spirit*, to mean *Father, Word, and Spirit*, if they had read it directly

directly in the 7th Verse already, that there are *three in Heaven, &c. Father, Word, and Spirit?* Could they make the three Witnesses *on Earth* to be the same which had just before been called the Witnesses *in Heaven?* Would they make the *Six* to be but *Three* Witnesses? and the Apostle to say the same thing twice over? and after the mention of *them* by their *proper* Names, to mention 'em by *mystical* Characters, *i. e.* to speak of 'em darkly and enigmatically, after he had spoken of 'em plainly? One would think it not credible that Men should use so much Force and Straining to search for the *Trinity* in the dark, if they had found it lie plainly before 'em, so close and near to them.

Secondly, It appears that this *Treatise* of *Euchorius de formulis Spirit. &c.* in particular was in very great Disorder, and it seems the Copies were not alike; for *Joannes Alexander Brassicanus,* in his Prefatory Epistle, tells us, as I find it in the *Bibliotheca Patrum,* that he took a great deal of pains, unto Weariness, *in repurgandis & restituendis, &c.* in leaving out and adding many things: *id quod deerat adjecimus,* says he. So that all things considered, it is not improbable that this Passage may be one of those Additions. To which I may subjoin,

Thirdly, That this *Text* was not necessary to his Design, which (tho I will not say he keeps strictly to it) was to insist upon *mystical* Interpretations, like the *Jewish Cabala,* under the several Numbers *one, two, three, &c.* which the 8th Verse did serve him in. This appears in the Title of this *Chapter,* which is, * *Of Num-* * *De nu-*
bers whose Significations are allegorically explained: *meris quo-*
 whereas the 7th Verse was not subject to such a *rum signi-*
 secret figurative Interpretation. And according- *ficaciones*
 ly in the beginning of his Work, he prays God *in allegoria*
trahuntur.

to reveal the secret abstruse *Sense* of the Scriptures, that he might produce what was their secret Meaning. However, I submit *these Reasons* to the Judgment of the Impartial, who, I think, will not wholly despise 'em all: But still it must be remember'd, that if by any they be not thought sufficient to take off the Authority of this Testimony, yet as 'tis the first clear mention of *this Text* by any *Christian* Writer, so it was not till a good way in the *5th Century*.

And now there is nothing remains to be considered, but what Evidence there is to be found from the *Greek Manuscripts* of the *N. T.* to authorize this *Text*: for it signifies little that the modern *Latin* or *Greek* Churches have admitted it, unless they had Authority from the *Greek* Original for so doing; and therefore this Article of the *Greek Manuscripts* is of greatest Importance in the Case.

Mr. *Martin* in his *8th Chapter* undertakes to shew that this *Text* was found in the *Greek Manuscripts* of these last Ages, and says so many things with such undaunted Confidence, and positive Assurance (which a wise and cautious Man would not say, unless he knew 'em to be true) that if it be found he has said 'em without *Truth* and *Evidence*, I think it will not gain his Work any Credit in the end, tho it may stagger the unlearned Reader at first. He begins with a fine popular *Harangue* upon the old Story of its having been in the original *Greek* of *St. John*, and thence passed into the *Italick Version*, and so into *St. Jerom's Bible*, and thence into *Charlemain's*; for he says, *We must not doubt but the learned Men he employ'd in correcting the Bible, had Greek Manuscripts to*

* Oremus Deum ut revelet abscondita Scripturarum, & proferramus quomodo secretiora intellectu sentiendum sit.

consult. And indeed if we must not doubt their having such *Manuscripts*, nor that they exactly corrected the *Latin* by 'em in every Place that differ'd, nor that they really put this *Text* in their Bibles, then the Work is done if we may doubt nothing; but Mr. *Martin* knows these things are doubted, yea, and that *some*, or *all* of them, are deny'd, and strongly opposed: and 'tis trifling, on no better grounds, to tell us we must not doubt the principal Matters in debate.

Next he argues from *F. Simon's* saying, *This Passage is in very few Greek Copies*, that therefore he grants it was in many; which is no true Inference at all, because Mr. *Martin*, but a few Pages after, cites him for saying the *Text* was not in any one Greek *Manuscript*; which he calls contradicting himself formally, and retracting, &c. but very unreasonably: for *F. Simon* having seen many *Manuscripts* in which *this Text* was wanting, but not all that might be seen, might well pronounce hereupon, that it was not in the greatest Part of 'em, and that it certainly was but in few, tho' he never intended hereby to say it was in any. And when he had searched more thoroughly, he then ventured to say it was not in any one; and therefore those vain Triumphs, not to say Insults, on that celebrated Scholar, might have been better spared than utter'd upon so slender, or rather no true Occasion. And if Mr. *Martin* were not willing to catch hold of any thing, he would never have made an Argument of such a poor pretended Concession of *F. Simon*, which he knew he disowned, or rectify'd.

And now he comes to Particulars. 1. He tells us, *Laurentius Valla*, in the 15th Century, recover'd seven Greek *Manuscripts*—and this Passage of *St. John* is found in all seven; and he thinks it is hard if none of them was then four or five hundred Years

old: but however he is so modest, as to let 'em be but *three or four hundred Years*. And yet after all this *particular Account*, given without mincing, or hesitating about it, I dare say this Gentleman knows nothing of the Matter, but speaks all upon Fancy and Guess. If perhaps you imagine he has got *L. V's Manuscripts* in his possession, or at least, that he has seen 'em fully; he tells you no, not he, nor any Man else that he knows of, has either seen *Valla's Manuscripts*, or knows what is become of 'em. Is not this a pretty Account? Dr. Mill says he had only *three Greek Manuscripts*, Mr. Martin says *seven*. *Erasmus* says, *How Valla found or read* (this Place in *St. John*) *does not fully appear*; Mr. Martin says roundly, this *Text* was in *all the seven*; and yet does not know any Author who says he ever saw these *Manuscripts*, nor produces any Words of *Valla's* own, to prove that he saw this *Text* in them.

Next comes Cardinal *Cajetan*, and what says he to the Point? Truly no more but that he doubted whether *this Verse* were in the *Text*; because, says he, 'tis not in *all the Greek Manuscripts*, but only in *some*; whence the *Difference* arises, I know not. This is much what *F. Simon* had said, as I have observed before; he might not see the Words in *any Manuscript*, but at that time never questioned but they were in *some*.

Then for the *Complutensian* Editors, Mr. Martin says boldly, that they put *this Text* in upon the warrant of *one or more Manuscripts* (he can't tell which) and yet takes no notice of the Evidence given to the contrary in *my former Tract*, that they had it not where it was presumed and pretended they had it.

As for the *Codex Britannicus*, by which alone *Erasmus* was influenced to put the *Words* into his *third Edition*; if *Erasmus* never says he saw it, what

Chap. 11.

Proleg.
N^o 1086.

what signifies it to mention *F. Simon's* saying it ? And therefore 'twas very unfair and unjust to insinuate that I had *called in question the Veracity of this learned Man, two hundred Years after his Death,* when I never once suspected his Testimony in the least, and only said that I never found he gave any such Testimony. And is his Credit attainted, by not believing any groundless *Story* that others tell of him ? Cannot he be thought an honest Man, if all that *they* say of him should not be true ? Had that great Man, who was the *Wonder and Glory* of his Age, and who laid the Foundations for After-Ages to build upon, said such a Word as that he had *seen it,* I had easily relied upon his Sincerity ; who, I conceive, was too great to use such Falshood and Deceit.

Indeed Mr. *Martin* thinks it enough to say, *'Tis not our Concern now to inquire what is become of this Manuscript, or if any others have seen it besides Erasmus*—and that this Method will introduce a new sort of *Scepticism in Matters of Learning.* But with his leave, I think it does concern us greatly to know whether such a *Manuscript* be in being still, which was too remarkable to be lost in Obscurity, if it had once been taken notice of ; and whether any one else ever saw it, since 'tis confessed so much whether ever *Erasmus* saw it, or pretended to it. And I dare say, such a *presuming Credulity* as Mr. *Martin* propounds for the Cure of Scepticism, which would hinder a severe Examination into *Facts,* would do, and has done, the World far more harm than such Scepticism itself ; and the longer Men go on to take things so on trust, the more grievous will the Scepticism be at last.

Stephens's Manuscripts are next in tale ; but on what mistaken Grounds, will be further seen in the Review of the next Chapter.

In the Year 1574, says he, the *Louvain Divines* in a Preface to their *Latin Bible*, say they had seen this Passage of *St. John*, in many other Greek Manuscripts, as *Stephens* had in his. As for *Stephens's* Manuscripts, 'tis plain they only presumed it from what appeared in his printed Edition; but as to what they say themselves saw, I think *Mr. Martin* is mistaken in interpreting it of any Greek Manuscripts: I shall set down their own Words, in which he has left out one material Sentence, which was both in the *Latin*, and in *F. Simon's Translation*, (with what Design he best knows :) speaking of *Ferom's Prologue*, * *This*, say they, confirms the reading of the Text, which is likewise supported by very many Latin Copies; agreeable to which *Erasmus* cites two Greek Copies, one of Britain, the other of Spain; to that of Spain the King's Bible is both in all other Places and in this conformable: (this last Sentence *Mr. Martin* has omitted) we have seen many others which agree to these. Now the word *These* rather refers to the three last Copies, one whereof, viz. the King's Bible, was a printed Copy, which shews that they speak of any Copies promiscuously; or it may relate to the *Latin* Copies first mentioned. But why should *Mr. Martin* pick out the middle Sentence only for the reference of these Words? and by an unfair Omission represent it to his Reader as if it were the immediate Sentence before these Words of Reference, *tout d'une suite, &c.*? He says they are speaking of Greek Manuscripts of England, &c. but are they not speaking also of

Printed at
Antwerp,
1572.

* Quod pro textus lectione facit, & Latinorum librorum plurimi suffragantur, quibus consentientes duos Græcos codices, unum Britannicum, alterum Hispanicum, *Erasmus* profert; Hispanico ut ubique & hic conformis est Regius: multos alios his consonantes vidimus.

Latin Copies, and of King *Philip's* printed Bible? and perhaps *Stephens's* Manuscripts, which they instance in immediately after, may be some of the many which they saw did so agree to the other. But their own Account of *them* shews how they saw 'em, viz. as they were mark'd in the printed Copy only; and therefore they make some doubt whether he had placed his *Marks* right according to his *Manuscripts*; nay 'tis plain that even the Copy of *Spain*, which *Erasmus* cites, † was only the *Complutensian Edition*, and is what these Divines, I think, do intend here; and not a *Manuscript*, as Mr. *Martin* turns it.

But I have now before me the New Testament, of these *Louvain* Divines, by *Plantin*, *Antwerpia* 1584. with the same Approbation of *Molanus* annex'd as in the other Edition; and in their Notes on this *Text*, their Words are something different, * viz. *This confirms the reading of the Text, whereto agrees the Greek Complutensian Edition, and what are taken from thence, with many others which we have seen.* And then follow the Words about *Stephens's Manuscripts*, as in the other, but 'tis under the Title of the *Parisian* Copies. Now this, which seems to be upon their second Thoughts, puts it out of doubt that they spake only of seeing several printed Editions of the *Greek* Copies besides that of *Complutum*, but no *Greek Manuscript*. And I think 'tis not against common Sense, as Mr. *Martin* pretends, to understand even the former Account so, if I had not had this

† *Eras.* in locum, *Perlata est ad nos editio Hispaniensis.* Again, Exemplar, ex eadem, ni fallor, Bibliotheca (Vaticana) petium, secuti sunt *Hispani*.

* Quod pro textus lectione facit, cui Græca Complutensis Editio, & quæ ex ea sunt, cum aliis quas vidimus non paucis, consonant. Inter omnes *Parisensium* ne unus est qui dissideat, &c.

latter, which makes it more plainly appear. So then hitherto no one is proved to have seen any *one Greek Manuscript* for this *Text*.

His next Evidence he calls, is F. *Amelot*, who, in his Note on this *Text*, says, *Erasmus* said it *was wanting in one Greek Manuscript of the Vatican, but I find it in the most antient Manuscript of that Library*. Whether he found it by his own Search, or others Information, these Words do not fully determine. Nor does *Erasmus* only say it was wanting in *one Manuscript of the Vatican*, but in a *most antient Manuscript*, which he calls *Codex per- vetustus & Liber antiquissimus*: and since we are well assur'd the *Text* is wanting in the famous *most antient Vatican Manuscript*, by the concession of Dr. *Mill*, and I think of all that have inquir'd into it, and particularly by *Caryophilus*; and that upon a strict Search made by the Criticks, whom Pope *Urban* the 8th employ'd about it; Mr. *Amelot's* slight Testimony that it was in the *most antient Manuscript* there, cannot be consistent with their more accurate and credible Witnesses. Indeed Mr. *Du Pin* says *Amelot* was not very * exact; and Father *Simon* upon several Occasions shews how vainly he uses to talk. † Father *Amelot*, says he, *does not seem to be sincere, when he speaks of his searching out of Manuscripts*; and that he speaks of *Manuscripts* which were never extant but in his own *Imagination*: and as to his having carefully searched the *Vatican Manuscripts*, he says, *he cou'd not affirm it, since he produces no various readings but such as are in print*; and that he never saw, but in print, what he call'd seeing the *Manuscripts*. So that I think we may set this Witness aside.

* *Hist. of Canon of O. and N. Test.* Vol. 2. ch. 3. §. 1.

† *Crit. Hist. of Vers. of N. T.* Ch. 32, and 33.

His last is a sort of *Ear-Witness* rather, viz. 'tis said there is also one (Manuscript) at Berlin in the King's Library, that is believed to be 500 Years old. Father Long reports it on the Testimony of Saubertus and Trollius; and Dr. Kettner, on a Letter that he says he received of it from M. Jablonski, &c. But Mr. Martin, who makes the most of every thing, does not quite venture to say, that *this Text* is reported to be in that *Manuscript*, [tho his Translator makes him say so; of which I will not take any advantage, because I think he has done his *Author* some wrong] but it has the face of such an artful Insinuation. Father Long says only there is a *Manuscript*, and refers to Saubert (whom I have not seen) and Trollius, whom I have consulted; and he only tells us what sort of Book it is, viz. written in great Letters, *Literis uncialibus*, and without Accents, &c. but says not one word of *this Text* in St. John: and if M. Jablonski's Letter has said no more than these, what is this *Manuscript* mention'd for? If there be a *Manuscript* at Berlin that wants this *Verse*, does this prove the *Text* to be genuine? Or if Mr. Martin means, that we don't yet know what is in that *Manuscript*, is that an Argument for us to conclude, that it is in it, contrary to all the other Greek *Manuscripts* that we know of in the World? Surely the Presumption lies on the other side; and this Gentleman cou'd so easily have gain'd Satisfaction from Berlin in this Point, that I suspect he was fearful there was no such *Verse* in this *Manuscript*; or else he wou'd have come abroad well fortify'd with such an *Authority*: and if so, 'twas not ingenuous to make such a deceitful Flourish in so serious an Argument. But if indeed it has the *Text*, and we can be assured how the Case stands upon that *Manuscript*, it will then deserve good Consideration, and be

of more weight than all the rest that he has offer'd : Till then, 'tis amusing the World with random Conjectures, and *unfair Insinuations*, to tell 'em, they say some-body has written to some-body, that there is a *Greek Manuscript* which has in it we cannot tell what.

But since my writing what relates to the *Berlin Manuscript*, I have receiv'd Information from a very sure Hand, that *this Verse* is not in the Body of that Manuscript, but that it has been since inserted in the *Margin*, and the Manuscript is not above 300 *Years* old neither. If *Mr. Martin* had known this, and conceal'd it ; nay, if he could still not only insinuate this *Manuscript* to be in confirmation of his Argument, when it was directly against it ; but also cou'd even venture to add this vain Triumph immediately upon it, *We see here Manuscripts more than sufficient to convince us*, &c. (when yet he was driven to such hard Shifts, of pretending a false Authority to make out but *one such Manuscript* :) I say, if he had known this, I shou'd think it such an Imputation on his Sincerity in writing, that I cou'd not tell how to reconcile it to what he had said at the Entrance of his *Dissertation*, viz. that he had learned from the *Book of Job*, 13. 7. *That we should not talk deceitfully for God*. And if he did not know it, which I'll suppose, his offering it to the World at all adventures, with such an Air of Boasting, is nothing to the Reputation of his Discretion ; and will, I hope, convince him how unfit such a presuming confident Imagination is, to be brought into an Inquiry of this nature. However, if he be still burdened with a superfluity of good *Greek Manuscripts*, having *this Text*, I conceive they will all be taken off his Hands, and not one left him to turn to.

And

And now upon a Survey of all hitherto said, it appears that Mr. *Martin* has scraped together all the things little and great, that he cou'd think of, that so he might make a huge Heap and pompous Show of *Numbers*; and then with a popular Flourish retails 'em out singly, first by the *Names* of the Authors who were mention'd about 'em; *Valla, Ximenes, Erasmus, Stephens*, and many other learned Men have seen 'em: then by their place, some in France, some in Spain, some in England, and some in the Netherlands: and after all this, says he, *Shall the Text not have been in the Greek Manuscripts still?* And he has the Courage to say what I think is one of the strangest things to be said with so great Assurance, viz. *We see here*, says he, *more Manuscripts than there is need of, to convince us that this Text is not found only in a very few Manuscripts, nor only in such as are more modern, as Father Simon wou'd make us believe.* What! more than is needful? and yet after all, not one? How easily are some Men satisfy'd!

In the last place, we are come in his 9th Chap. to *Stephens's Manuscripts*. It has been shown, that of all his sixteen *Manuscripts*, (for so many Dr. *Mill* had allowed besides the *Complutensian Copy*, *Proleg. N^o 1176.*) only seven had *St. John's Epistle*; and that all these are found to want *this Verse*, tho, by mistake, *Stephens's Greek Edition* has marked only the words, *in Heaven*, ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, to be wanting. Mr. *Martin* being sensible this presses very hard, pretends to set this Matter in a clearer Light than ever; and undertakes to shew that more than seven of *Stephens's Manuscripts* had *this Epistle*, and consequently had *this Verse*, for certainly they are not among those seven which are marked as wanting it. And he is sorry to find that Mr. *Roger*, Doctor of *Divinity* at *Bourges*, and writing in defence

too of the Text, has, after his strict Examination of *Stephens's Greek Testament* (in which his Manuscripts are referred to) declared that he can find but *seven* belonging to *this Epistle*; and that not one of *Stephens's Manuscripts* had *this Verse*; tho, says *Mr. Martin*, they have always been accounted a *Bulwark* thereof: and, he says, *Mr. Roger* has not computed aright.

But I am amazed to see how weakly *Mr. Martin* goes about the Proof of this great Discovery; he mentions three more Manuscripts of *Stephens*, as having this Epistle of *St. John*, not before observed; these are marked *18. 19. 15. i. e. 14. 15. 16.* and he proceeds still upon his accustomed Topick of Presumption: because, forsooth, all the Epistles of the *New Testament*, viz. *St. Paul's*, and the seven *Catholick*, and the *Revelation*, are wont sometimes, to make *one Volume*; therefore finding by *Stephens's Testament* that these *Manuscripts* had *St. Paul's Epistles* before, and the *Revelation* of *St. John* behind, he strenuously argues that the seven *Catholick Epistles* were surely in the middle. However, since the *Manuscript* mark'd *18.* is referred to, upon *2 Pet. 1. 4.* which is one of those seven *Catholick Epistles*, he doubts not but that *Manuscript* reach'd *St. John's Epistle* also, and says briskly, this makes *eight Manuscripts*.

But certainly *Mr. Martin* cannot be so weak, to think this will pass for a good and *invincible Proof* with Men of Sense. Did he never see an old Bible which had beginning and end, and yet wanted some parts between? If he had read and considered *Dr. Mill*, he wou'd have found it so here; that accurate Inquirer tells us often, with exact nicety, what *Books*, what *Chapters*, and what *Parts* of a Chapter, are wanting in several of the *Manuscripts*. And he tells us these three

↓

were

were mutilated ; and as to the *last*, *id.* he is so particular, that he tells us this was a Copy of three Gospels, *Matthew, Luke,* and *John*, but that at the end were *Two Leaves*, in which was a part of *Acts 10th Chap.* and the first *Chap.* of the 2d Epistle of *Peter*. One might hope such a great Disappointment as this shou'd take us off from presuming and fancying, where *Facts* lie so cross in the way.

Millii Pro-
leg. N^o.
1174,
1175,
1176.

He brings *Beza*, as one well acquainted, he thinks, with the matter, to confirm this Point, *viz.* That more than those noted *seven Manuscripts* of *Stephens* had *St. John's Epistle* in 'em, and consequently *this Verse* ; because he says, *this Verse is in the Manuscripts of England—and in some of Stephens's antient Manuscripts.* Yet I do not think it appears by all that *Mr. Martin* says, but that *Beza* intended it of those aforefaid *seven Manuscripts*, which he, as well as others, imagined by *Stephens's Marks* to have all but the words *in Heaven* ; which small Defect might yet not hinder him from saying in general Terms, the *Verse* was there : And tho after he had said this *Verse* is in some of *Stephens's antient Manuscripts*, he adds that the Words, *in Heaven*, are wanting in *seven Manuscripts* ; it does not follow that he distinguishes these *seven* from the *some Manuscripts* before, but only that he expresses the number of *Manuscripts* determinately, which before he had expressed indefinitely and uncertainly : And what wonder is it, tho he did not express himself so accurately in a Matter he might be in some Confusion about ?

But supposing *Beza* did, as perhaps he might, imagine that some other *Manuscripts* of *Stephens* had this *Verse* ; this has been long thought by others, thro mistake, and why might not he mistake as well as others ?

For tho Mr. *Martin* represents *Beza*, as having seen all *Stephens's Manuscripts*, and compared 'em, and that they were in his hands, &c. and thence infers from *Beza's Words*, that the whole *Verse* was in some of 'em; and afterwards argues, that in the rest of them only the *ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*, in *Heaven*, was wanting; and that *Stephens's Marks* were not wrong plac'd; because *Beza*, who would have observ'd it, if he had found the contrary to either of these things, appears to confirm it all: yet I apprehend the very Foundation of his whole Argument is but a mistaken Presumption; for it no way appears that ever *Beza* had all, if any of *Stephens's Manuscripts*, or that he had the Manuscripts of the *King's Library* to compare at all: and tho he uses the Phrases, *Legimus, & invenimus in nostris: We read, and we find them, &c.* and compares them with the (supposed) *British Copy*; yet all this might well enough be, without reading 'em any where but in *Stephens's own Notes and Collections*.

And this is most likely, if we consider the Case of *Beza*. *Henry Stephens*, the Son of *Robert*, had collected the *Readings* of ten more Copies, and written 'em into one of the *New Testaments* of his *Father's* fair Edition, which had already for many various Readings noted in the Margin; this Treasure was put into *Beza's* hands, who being thus furnished, seems to have taken little or no further care to make any search of himself into those Copies or Manuscripts, nor perhaps ever to have seen 'em; in so much that *Dr. Mill* thought he had reason to say*, *That he took no care to search out what was the genuine Text—And when accidental—*

* N° 1258. *Proleg. De hoc enim parum laborat, & ubi de Lectionis cujuspiam auctoritas forte agit, ostendit quam nihil fere in his rebus viderit, vir alias eruditus & perspicax.*

ly he treated of it, he did but shew how little or nothing in a manner he saw into those Matters, tho otherwise a learned and sagacious Man. How Morinus also blames him, may be seen in Dr. Stillingfleet on the Trinity, p. 159, &c.

But there need no more Words about it; the Matter is determined before; for if, as is already proved, Stephens had not one Manuscript of St. John's Epistle more than the seven which he had marked in the Margin, then to what purpose does Mr. Martin make ado to force the contrary out of Beza's Words? viz. that his *some Manuscripts* were not of those *seven*, i. e. were none of all he had. So that here is no News from Beza, of any one Greek Manuscript which has all the Verse; for these *seven*, he owns, want some Words. And let Mr. Martin hold to it ever so tenaciously, or reason ever so finely upon it, 'tis either Beza speaks wrong, or himself by mistaking him, argues so, since 'tis against plain Fact.

And therefore I judge Beza's Words can do him but very little service, in his 10th Chapter, to justify the Marks of Stephens's Edition being rightly placed; it being what he probably never examined into; and Stephens himself might not have it suggested to him. It has already been said and manifested, that there is Proof of this Mistake in those Marks, from ocular Inspection into several of those Greek Manuscripts which are found to want the whole Verse; but not one that wants only the Words in Heaven, as the Semicircle is put in Stephens's printed Edition. This Mr. Martin ought to have taken notice of, and then he would have blush'd to say, in the Conclusion of his Book, that his Opposers *alledge nothing but Reasonings without Proof*, but that *he establishes Facts upon Testimony*; and, that his Adversaries argue from the Text's *not being in the Vatican nor A-*

See Full Inquiry.

Alexandrian Manuscripts, that therefore it was in none of *Stephens's*. No Sir, we argue, that because 'tis not now found, nor any Rasure pretended, in any Manuscripts, even not in those which *Stephens* had, that therefore it was not there formerly, and that the *Semicircle* was misplaced: So that on our side is the Proof from *Fact*, on yours from *Reasonings* against it; while you bring not one *Manuscript* in proof, nor one Witness that says he saw such a one upon his own immediate Search.

And I would know what made the *Louvain Divines* make the Doubt long, Whether the *Semicircle* were in its *due Place*? Surely they had some reason for such a particular Suspicion. So that I think the Business of *Stephens's* Manuscripts stands as I put it before, and Mr. *Martin* has found no Evidence of any one *Greek Manuscript* here, which yet is his *last* and *chief* Refuge; for as to his *Codex Britannicus*, I think there needs no more be said to it, than that *Erasmus* either never saw it, or however judged it to be corrupted in this Place by some modern *Interpolation*.

Nor is that any *insuperable Difficulty* which Mr. *Martin* pretends, saying, that *Stephens* should at once have said in the *Margin*, ἐν παντί, &c. i. e. it was wanting in all, rather than said, 'tis not in this, nor this, nor this, and so of all the *seven Manuscripts*, if he had no more. Perhaps indeed that had been the shorter way; but who knows the Reasons of Mens Fancies, or why they chuse this or that way of expressing themselves, when they are at their own liberty? Perhaps when *Stephens* saw most of the Verse in the *Complutensian* Edition, and in that of *Erasmus*, he was loth bluntly to say so harsh a thing, as that he could find it in no Manuscript, and so might chuse to say it more softly, viz. not in such and such: And tho these indeed were all he had, yet *this* was not so obvious
to

to be observed by many, as the other had been, and therefore was less offensive.

But it may be asked, whence then did *Stephens* take *these Words*, since he did put 'em into his *Text*? *Res.* 'Tis enough that we can answer in the *Negative* upon good Authority, that he had 'em not from any of his *Greek Manuscripts*, and then 'tis no great matter where else he found 'em. Probably he took 'em, as he did the Words ἐν τῷ ἄρχῳ, from the *Complutensian Edition*; only the latter part of the Verse not being so agreeable to the *Latin Bibles*, as 'twas in *Erasmus*, from his supposed *British Greek Manuscript*, he might prefer the reading of this latter, and take εἶμι ὁι τρεῖς ἐν εἶσι, rather than the ὁι τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἐν εἶσι.

Nor is it any such puzzling *Question* as Mr. *Martin* fancies, viz. Why did *Stephens* observe that the *Complutensian Edition* had εἰς τὸ ἐν, i. e. agree in one, as peculiar to it, if the whole Verse was so? I answer, none can say the whole was peculiar to it, when the supposed *British Manuscript*, and *Erasmus's Edition* also had the rest of the Verse; and therefore this Part only was peculiar, and so was fit to be observed. Ch. 10.

Mr. *Martin* in Chap. 11. is so over-critical in marking the Differences of the *Codex Britannicus*, and the *Greek* of the Council of *Lateran*, that he observes one considerable Difference to be εἶμι and τρεῖς, when a very little Knowledge of the *Greek* would suggest that it was only an *Erratum*; probably the Mark over the εἶμι, a Circumflex with an *Aspirate*, was placed so as to be taken for a *Tau*, and a part of the Word.

I cannot but remark one thing more in Mr. *Martin's* 11th Chapter: He tells us, *The Complutensian Edition* does not teach, as do all the others, the *Unity of Essence* in the three Persons, but the *Unity of their Testimony*. But then I ask him and others,

what they mean by so often vouching this Authority? If we grant 'em *this*, then they will gain a *Text* which does not teach the *Unity of Essence in the three Persons*, but the contrary; and then perhaps they will throw it up again, and be as angry that we receive it, as they were before that we rejected it. Let 'em tell us whether they think we shou'd or shou'd not admit it, or else let 'em never more urge us with the *Complutensian Copy*.

The *two Testimonies* which Mr. *Martin* touches on in his 12th *Chapter* are amongst the supposititious Works ascribed to *Athanasius*. The *first*, taken from the *Synopsis Script.* has been observed to be no plain Evidence of any regard to *this Text*, let the Author be who it will; and for the *other* Author, Mr. *Martin* does not know but he was a *Latin*, tho he thinks he possibly might be a *Greek*: but of the 5th or 6th Century however, which is not worth striving about; since it can come but to this, that among the Multitude of *Greek* Writers, one, who possibly might be *Greek*, seems to have some relation to such a *Text*, but all the rest are silent; and yet his Words τὸ ἐϛ, will agree to the 8th *Verse*, by omitting (ἐϛ), as much as to the 7th by adding the (τὸ): so that *this Answer* will remain good against all he has said about the difference of the *Latin* and the *Greek*.

His 13th *Chapter* tells us, that *this Verse* is made use of in the *Greek Church*, in her *Confession of Faith, Ritual, and Lessons*; which may easily be, and yet be but of late Date. If he cou'd shew us they had it in their *Offices* in the *Primitive Ages*, 'twere to the purpose; but to say any of their *Offices*, which from Age to Age have been subject to variations or additions, have it *now*, is to say nothing: And to argue, that if they took it into the *publick Lesson*, (which is an antient part of the *Office*) it must be because they knew it was

an omission, and that it ought to be added; is just the same as to say, whoever put it into the Bible, or any Greek Edition of the New Testament, (which New Testament is certainly a very old Book) did it because they knew it was a defect, and that it ought to be added; which they cou'd not have thought, if the Words had not been in their Greek Bibles before, *i. e.* that it cou'd never have come in at all, if not at the first Penning of St. John's Epistle. Which is a pretty short Argument, but there needs no great Guard against its Force, by them who believe an Addition or Alteration to be no impossible thing. Let Mr. Martin prove *this*, and he will carry his Point indeed, by Reason, which he seems not so likely to do, by Evidence of Fact.

I come now to consider briefly his *Evasions* of the Arguments against this Text, which he calls Objections, in his *Second Part*, viz.

1. The Greek Manuscripts have not *this Text*; Ch. 1. but then, says he, *they want some other Texts also, which yet are Genuine.* Resp. Some Manuscripts may want *one Text*, and others *another*; but is there one Text of good Authority which they *all* want? for so the Case is here.

2. The Councils of Nice and Sardica mention it not: but it was, says he, Chap. 2. *because they had no contest about the Trinity, but only the Deity of the Son.* Resp. Very good! But was not *this Text* as much to the purpose for the Son's Deity, as for the Holy Spirit's, or as for the Deity of all the three Persons? Is not the Son one of the Trinity? and wou'd not a Text that shou'd be thought to prove *Father, Son, and Spirit* to be one God, prove as strongly, that the *Father and Son* are one? Was it not on all such occasions as good a Proof as that Text, *I and my Father are one*?

Ch. 3.

3. The *Greek Fathers* did not mention it ; but yet it might, he thinks, have been in some other of their Writings, which are lost ; as the Text of baptizing in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit (and some others) is not used by 'em in some Treatises where it was proper. Resp. What is this to our Case, where the Words are not omitted in one part, and found in another, or by one Writer, but found in other *Greek Writers* of his Age ; but are omitted in all the genuine Works of all the *Greek Writers* of so many Hundred Years that have remained ? 'Tis a hard Presumption indeed to imagine it shou'd be in a great many lost Writings, and not preserved in one of the many we have, to which they were so pertinent. As for the *Latin Writers*, they are accounted for in my *Inquiry*.

Ch. 4.

4. The Fathers who mention the 8th Verse, and yet not the 7th, says he, had only occasion for the one, and the other was not proper to their purpose. Resp. It might indeed happen so in some Instances, but not in all. Not in *Cyril*, who had plainly more occasion for the 7th Verse than for the 8th, in order to prove the *Holy Spirit God*, or to have the Name of God. I appeal to any Man, if the 7th Verse be not more likely to answer that purpose than the *Water, Blood, and Spirit*, &c. Not in *Augustin*, for he directly wanted such a Text to prove his point, viz. That where Two or more are said in Scripture to be One, they are not different, but the same thing ; nothing cou'd have hit his Fancy better, if it had been known to him. Not in *Facundus* surely, who urged the 8th Ver. for proof of the *Trinity*, but not the 7th. Mr. Martin says, he ought to have stuck to this last. But 'tis certain he did not ; and for what reason but this, that he knew not of any such Text ? And also that the *African Bishops*, by using the

Testimony of St. *John* for the *Father, Word, and Spirit's* being one, intended it only, as he expressly says St. *Cyprian* did intend it, of the mystical Interpretation of the 8th *Verse*. So that this Excuse will not do.

Besides, had they *never* any occasion for the 7th *Verse*? Cou'd they find no opportunity for bringing in this, *one of the most excellent Passages of the whole Scripture*, as Mr. *Martin* calls it, before he has proved it to be *any* part at all? Where are these Instances? What, not once in all St. *Augustine's Ten large Tomes*! Again, had not such a Commentator on St. *John's Epistle*, as *Bede*, (the most learned Man perhaps in the 8th Century) the same occasion for the 7th *Verse*, *viz.* to comment upon it, if it had lain in his way as the other did? Which was all the Occasion he wanted, that I know of. Therefore Mr. *Martin* adds in his 5th *Chap.*

5. Commentators have always been at liberty to expound only what Passages they pleas'd. Resp. True, they are so, for none can compel 'em; but I think Men are not wont to use their Liberty in this manner without some Reason, and against Reason, and the World's Expectation; or without some Apology for it, especially in so remarkable a Text. *Oecumenius* had no reason to omit it, and *Bede* as little. *Chrysoptom* indeed might omit or pass over one Sentence that was easy and plain, or of smaller importance, or that often occur'd, or the like; and so another might do by others: But how comes it that both *Oecumenius* and *Bede* shou'd agree to omit this same Text so very remarkable? Or is there one old Commentator that ever did observe the Words?

But Mr. *Martin* objects, *Oecumenius* and *Bede* knew it to be a Text receiv'd by some; and so had as much reason to say something to it, tho they had
had

had not own'd it, and yet are quite silent, against all reason that we can give. *Resp.* This is presuming what is not granted; for *Oecumenius* being a *Greek* Writer, cou'd probably have no manner of occasion to speak of it: forasmuch as *this* Passage does not appear to have been in one *Greek Manuscript* of the New Testament to his time, nor mention'd by one genuine and known *Greek* Writer, what Reason cou'd he have to say any thing about a Matter that had never been in being? Surely it must have been by a Spirit of Prophecy; for *Mr. Martin* has not shewn it was in *St. John's Epistle* in *Oecumenius's* time, he has only said it, and it had been strange if he had mark'd a Text which he had never seen.

As for *Bede*, the Words might begin perhaps to be taken into some private *Latin* Copies before his time, in *Africa* or other remote places; yet probably he had never seen or known it: and not having it in *his Latin*, nor in the *Greek* Copies, what reason had he to take notice of it? *Mr. Martin* makes a vain Supposition, that *Bede* found his *Latin* Copy had it; and that if his *Greek* wanted it, he shou'd not have failed to take notice of it; whereas no such thing appears, but rather both wanted it. As for *Bede's* knowing that *Cyprian*, *Victor Vit.* and *Fulgentius* had cited these Words, this is but a precarious Supposition neither; for if this was judg'd to be only their mystical Interpretation of the 8th Verse, then *Bede* had nothing to say of it, as of another Text by it self.

And indeed, if he had known the Words of *St. Cyprian*, and of the *African* Bishops, &c. (which yet does not appear) and had taken 'em to refer to a direct Text in *St. John*, yet if he knew of no such Text, how cou'd he tell where to insert it? Or where to take notice of it?

whe-

whether in *St. John's Gospel or Epistle*? Therefore it were no wonder he shou'd not mention such a loose uncertain Matter in *St. Cyprian*. But it had been strange indeed, if finding the Text in his Bible, he shou'd omit to comment on that in course, when yet he commented on the rest round about it, before and behind.

So that I think these Apologies and Excuses are too thin and weak to pass in the World: but the best of it is, the *Fathers* need 'em not, in my Opinion; because they had a much more substantial Reason for not mentioning *these Words*, if they never found 'em in their Bible.

And now I must leave it to the judicious and candid Readers to consider, whether Mr. *Martin* had good reason to go off with so much Ostentation and Opinion of his Performance. On the opposite Part, says he, we have nothing but Reasonings without Proofs; on ours, evident Proofs and Reasonings upon 'em. We settle a Matter of Fact on positive Testimonies of Witnesses, without ambiguity, without exception: they alledge dumb Witnesses that can't speak by Signs, — Manuscripts that have not the Text; Writers who have not quoted it.

Where are these Facts? these positive Proofs, against which nothing can be said? What! I suppose the *Berlin Manuscript* of 500 Years old? and all above the *seven Manuscripts* of *Stephens*, which had this Epistle? And where are they? Bring forth your Witnesses; I doubt they can't speak so much as by Signs, for there is not any Sign of 'em that I can see. And I suppose *Jerom's Preface*, and the *British invisible Manuscript*; &c. here are Facts indeed alledged, but they are only supposed Facts that want confirmation.

The most plausible Witness is *St. Cyprian*, which yet is not so plain, but that much is very reasonably said to shew he spake of another Text.

They

They have dumb Witnesses, — Manuscripts that have not the Text, says he. But are not negative Proofs proper to make out a Negative? If one obtrude some new Text in print, or a Mahometan shou'd urge a Text of our Lord's (as is pretended) speaking of Mahomet by Name, or Μακλῦτος; must not negative Witnesses confute it, by shewing 'tis not so in any Greek Manuscript Copy, nor mention'd in any genuine Greek Writer for many hundred Years? nor pretended to by any Favourers of Mahomet in the first setting up their Religion? And have we not all this Evidence against this Verse? If I produce a blank Paper, does not it prove there is no writing in it, only because 'tis silent and can't speak?


To conclude, *if it be so in fact, I hope 'tis no faulty Positiveness or Confidence to say it, viz. That there is not one old Greek Manuscript of the New Testament, written before Printing, yet known of to the World, which warrants this Text for genuine, tho there be a huge Number which all want it. So that I hope no candid Man will say I am immodest in pronouncing it doubtful, or that I wou'd not receive it, which I am sure I wou'd, if I had sufficient Evidence that ever St. John had deliver'd it to the Saints.*

F I N I S.

E R R A T A.

Page 501, l. 5, and 15, r. Tollius.





3/

