

1695
L A 43

1695

b/a

ANIMADVERSIONS

ON

Mr. HILL's BOOK,

ENTITLED, *A*

A Vindication of the Primitive Fathers, &c.

Peter Abbot

20 + 17
(3) 15 (3) P
Full title A.

374
154
294
391

ANIMADVERSIONS

ON

Mr. *HILL*'s BOOK,

ENTITLED,

*A Vindication of the Primitive Fathers,
against the Imputations of GILBERT,
Lord Bishop of Sarum.*

In a Letter to a Person of Quality.

LONDON:

Printed for *W. Chiswell*, at the *Rose and Crown* in
St. Paul's Church-Yard. 1695.

Thos. Thos. 391

(1010, US 12-11)

[39] [Allx (Peter)] Animadversions on Mr.
Hill's Book, entitled, "A Vindication of
the Primitive Fathers, against the Impu-
tations of Gilbert [Burnet], Bishop of
Sarum," (65 pp.), sm. 4to, unbound, 6s
[6.2] 1695

Traced JUN 27 1928 4/-

ANIMADVERSIONS

ON

Mr. *HILL*'s Book,

ENTITLED,

*A Vindication of the Primitive Fa-
thers, &c.*

S I R,



IN obedience to your Commands,
I here send you my Thoughts up-
on Mr. *Hill's Book*; the whole of
which consists of Four Heads. The
First contains a Censure of what
the Bishop compendiously supposes
concerning the Doctrine of the
Trinity. The *Second* Criticises
upon what he says about the Mystery of the
Incarnation. The *Third* is a Vindication of
the Fathers, whom he thinks the Bishop has
treated very ill, as to the Explication they
have given of these Two Mysteries. The *Fourth*
and last is an Explanation of the Mystery of the

the Trinity, which he advances as much more agreeable to the System of Scripture, and of the Ancients, than the Bishop's.

As to the first, Mr. Hill picks a Quarrel with the Bishop, because in speaking of the Persuasions of *Socinians*, *Arians*, and *Orthodox*, concerning the Nature of Christ, he calls them three different *Opinions*. He would not have had the Bishop use the word *Opinion*, in speaking of that which we look upon as founded on Divine Revelation, and receive as the Object of our Faith. This doubtless is a most heinous Crime, which deserved all Mr. Hill's Exaggerations, tho' Gregory of Nazianzen has used the same word, *Orat.* 35. Certainly, when an Author undertakes to consider the principal Tenets touching the Nature of Jesus Christ, namely, that of *Artemas*, that of *Arius*, and that of the Church; he may, I think, without a Crime, call them three *Opinions*; especially, as the Bishop has done, before he had proved any thing by Revelation. Every body knows that strong Expressions are not to be used in the stating of a question, but only after the matter has been well proved. So that a Criticism of this Nature, gives no great Character of the Author.

With as much sincerity does Mr. Hill endeavour to bring under suspicion the Bishop's Expressions, because he does not distinctly say, whether the *Socinian* or *Arian* Opinions, have been within or without the Church. "For," says he, *page 2.* "if the Bishop supposes that these Opinions have been within the Church: Then indeed here is an Insinuation laid for the Communion with *Socinians*, which

"which is a blessed comprehension. This he repeats or insinuates again somewhere else. If a Pagan had made this Reflection against a Bishop, he might have been charged with want of Candour. But what can we say, when these words come from the Mouth of a Priest, against a Bishop, of the Church of England? And what means Mr. Hill, when he finds fault with the Notion of Faith given by the Bishop; to wit, that we believe Points of Doctrine, because we are persuaded that they are revealed in Scripture? Does it follow from thence, as Mr. Hill supposes, p. 6. *That Faith resolves it self into each private Man's Opinion?* Which indeed has occasioned all the Heresies and Divisions that have been in the Church.

This Censure has somewhat so singular in it, that it well deserves to be taken notice of; and I promise you to remember it, and to shew you that the Author espouses a Principle as dangerous as any in Point of Religion. But I must not do this at present, for it would lead us out of our way, and bring us off from the Article of the Trinity, which we have now chiefly in view.

Mr. Hill pretends that the Bishop does not explain himself clearly upon this Mystery. These are his surmises. The Bishop has not distinctly set down that there are Three Persons; and every Bishop, who does not express himself by the word *Person*, which is received in this matter, gives alight to any one to say, that he denies the Trinity; whereas this at most were but *Sabellianism*. Upon this unjust foundation he takes occasion,

tion to divert his Reader, borrowing for that purpose the witty Conceit of the *Socinian* Author of a little Book, Entituled, *The Doctrine of the Trinity set in its True Light*, p. 40. &c. For, p. 19. he brings in a Catechumen, who desires to know of the Bishop what he understands by the Three of the Trinity; and seeing that the Bishop avoids the word *Person*, he laughs at the Instruction which the Bishop gives him, and leaves him to seek some comfort in the Doctrine of the Philosophers. I am surprized that Mr. *Hill* gives himself so much trouble to prove, that the word *Person* occurs in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, and in *Tertullian*, since he shews himself, that the Bishop believes as much as he does upon this Article, p. 17. The Bishop had expressed himself very clearly upon the matter, p. 97. These are his words, "This is the Doctrine that I intend now to explain to you: I do not mean that I will pretend to tell you how this is to be understood, and in what respect these Persons are believed to be One, and in what respects they are Three."

But Mr. *Hill* was resolved to give his Suspicions a full scope, and he would rather rob the Bishop of this Confession, than do him Justice by acknowledging the truth. All this favours very much of a Spirit of Disputation, and argues but little sincerity. But after all, it may be asked, why has not the Bishop made use every where of the word *Person*, which is consecrated by so long a Custom in the Church, and why does he more frequently say the Blessed Three? Any body else,

but

but Mr. *Hill* would easily have apprehended the reason of it. The nature of the dispute with *Arians* and *Socinians*, who will have us stick to the words of Scripture, requires that we should express the truths of Christianity in Scriptural words, if we would have them to be received. If we at first dash mingle with them words which they look upon as foreign, and which need to be softened, to give them a sense free from absurdity in the matter of the Trinity; this serves only to render the Dispute intricate, whereas we should aim at the convincing of them by that principle which they acknowledge, namely the Authority of the Scripture.

But there is something more to be said for the Bishop. In all likelihood he would not engage himself in the Method of those, who to defend the Doctrine of the Trinity against the *Socinians*, seem to have given them great Advantages by laying down Principles, from which it is to be feared occasion may be taken, to impute *Tritheism* to the Defenders of the Trinity. This inconvenience may be avoided by reducing the dispute to the terms of Scripture, which cannot so easily be done, when we employ such words as are made use of by the *Socinians* against the *Orthodox*, to prove them guilty of *Tritheism*, which is justly look'd upon as the overthrowing of the whole Article of the Trinity.

The Bishop therefore, who himself uses the word *Person* where he has occasion for it, could have no manner of design to condemn that word, tho sometimes he abstained from it; he only leaves it out of

B

the

the Dispute, that he might not involve himself into an unnecessary Contest with relation to a *Socinian*. He has exactly kept himself to the terms of Scripture, which he thinks are precise enough to convince an *Arian*, or a *Socinian*. I am perswaded, That if Mr. *Hill* had been to handle this Subject with the same views, he would have done as the Bishop, and that no Bishop would have censured him for it. But Mr. *Hill* was resolved right or wrong, to appear in Publick against his Lordship.

Mr. *Hill* comes on with a new Charge, and endeavours to fasten a suspicion upon the Bishop, as if he did not believe the personality of the $\alpha\gamma\theta$ before the Incarnation. The Bishop says, That the word *Person* was adopted, chiefly, in opposition to the *Patripassians*. This does not satisfy Mr. *Hill*, he labours to prove that *Praxeas* was the first Author of that Heresy; and he shews by St. *Paul's* Epistles, that the word *Person* was in use before *Praxeas's* time. 'Tis not very material, and yet no Digression, to shew that Mr. *Hill* is mistaken about the Antiquity of the *Patripassians*. *Simon Magus* was the Author of that Sect, above 160 before *Praxeas*. At least, this is what we are told by *Irenaus*, St. *Augustin*, and *Theodore*. *Vid. Cont. in lib. Constit. p. 285*. Neither is it certain, that *Heb. 1. 2*. Character *Hypostaseos* must be rendred by *Person*; the Vulgar has rendred it by *Substance*, as well as *Chap. XI*. And the Fathers of the Council of *Nice* have taken the word *Hypostasis* in the Creed, for *Essence* or *Substance*. Those who were at the Council of *Alexandria*, in the year 362. took it in the same

same sense; and St. *Jerom* understood it so, *Ep. 57*. However, says Mr. *Hill*, the Bishop has not given to the *Word* the true Notion of a *Person*; besides that he has avoided that Expression in speaking of it. The Bishop only acknowledges, That the Father, the *Word*, and the Spirit have a particular distinction from one another, by which every one of them differs from another; and tho Mr. *Hill* cites the Bishop's words, who affirms, That in the Essence of God there are Three which are really different from each other, and which differ from one another more than three Names, or three Economies, *ad extra*, or three Modes; yet he is not pleased with the Bishop's Notion, but he must needs be a *Sabellian*. This Judgment is made too rashly. The Bishop says, That the word *Person* must not be understood in the matter of the Trinity, as we ordinarily do in relation to Creatures, a complete Intelligent Being. And does this offend Mr. *Hill*? For my part, I can see no harm in it. The Bishop has of his side all the Sober Divines, who have considered the Doctrine of the Trinity with some attention: For there is that difference betwixt the Persons of the Trinity, and Persons among Creatures, to which the Definition of a *Person*, rejected by the Bishop, does belong; that if that Definition were admitted into the Trinity, it would import the Multiplication of the Essence, as well as the Multiplication of the Persons, which is justly to be abhorred by all Divines. After all, if the Bishop has not determined the nature and degree of the precise distinction which is betwixt the Three Persons, but has adhered

in this matter, to what the Scripture teaches, he ought to be commended for his Modesty, instead of being reproached for not having explained that which all prudent Divines own cannot be explained. Mr. *Hill* himself knows well enough, that one cannot explain these differences, without either falling into difficulties, out of which he can't extricate himself, or asserting Contradictions which do much more weaken than illustrate and confirm the belief of this Mystery.

These are Mr. *Hill's* chief Accusations upon the Article of the Trinity. He has not been willing to consider, as any equitable Man would have done, that the Bishop did not design to write a Treatise upon the Trinity, which would have obliged him to handle this Subject in another manner, but that he glances only upon what must be said in general, to be understood, in order to his treating of the Divinity of Christ, which is the only Subject-matter of his Discourse. And since he briefly lays down the Article of the Trinity as a foundation to explain that of the Incarnation, those who after this can charge him with not believing the Trinity, because he does not treat that matter in its full extent, must either be very malicious, or very defective in their Judgments.

Let us come now to the point of the Incarnation. After that Mr. *Hill* has supposed, contrary to all truth, that the Bishop does not believe Three Persons in the Trinity, he downright charges him with denying the Personality of the *Word*, and acknowledging the Personality of the Messias no
other

other way, than as the Personality of Jesus Christ did result only from the Union of his Two Natures. Then he gives himself a great deal of trouble to confute his own Whimsy. But I need only remember him of the forecited words of the Bishop, to shew him how unfairly he deals in this matter. He does not act more honestly, when he withdraws this Expression of the Bishop, *That Divine Person in whom dwelt the Eternal Word*, to prove that he acknowledges no Personality, but in the Humane Nature of Christ; Especially, says he, because the Bishop has not exploded the Imagination of those, who conceive that the Character of *Son of God* has its foundation in the Humanity which the *Word* has assumed. The Bishop has rejected this Notion as a false Doctrine, tho he has not refuted it *ex professo*, his Subject leading him to something that was more material. But might not he speak in the same strain with all those, who speak of the Human Nature of Jesus Christ? None else but Mr. *Hill* would have taken it amiss. He must be strangely given up to his Suspicions, to conceive and publish such as these against the Bishop upon such slight and poor Arguments. And does not Mr. *Hill* deserve to be admired, when having criticized upon these words of the Bishop, he observes, That since the Bishop does not tell us, whether the Father, and the Spirit did enter into the Personality, which resulted from the Union of the Two Natures, or not, but only that God and Man are become One Person, he has left a Door open for many Heresies upon this Mystery. One had need have much
patience

patience to follow an Author so fruitful in vain Conceits. He quotes these words of the Bishop, that the *Word* dwelt in Flesh; and yet he is angry because the Bishop says elsewhere, that God and Man are become one Person; as if under the general name of God, the Bishop would leave his Reader to think that he understands the Father and the Spirit as well as the Word. At this rate when we say that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, we leave the Hearer in suspense, whether we mean that he is only the Son of the Father, or likewise the Son of the Holy Ghost. When a Man reasons thus in a matter of so great moment, one would think he designs nothing else but to be laughed at, or to be read with indignation.

He goes on to the Divinity of the Messias, upon which he raises new Accusations against the Bishop; though he confesses p. 45. That the Bishop has advanced many Good and Orthodox Truths upon this Article. This being the main thing intended by the Bishop, it will not be improper to give you a short account of it, that you may judge the better of the Justice of Mr. Hill's Accusations. First of all the Bishop gives an Idea of the dwelling of the *Word* in Flesh; and he explains in a very intelligible manner, what's called in School-terms the *Hypostatical Union*; or *Shékina* is borrowed, namely, from the Divine Presence, granted to the *Jews* in the Cloud of Glory which was over the Tabernacle. He very exactly observes, That the God of the *Jews* is called *Jehovah*, a word which the Seventy have rendred constantly by

by that of *Κύριος*, and that the Evangelists and Apostles ascribe constantly that word to Jesus Christ, because of the indwelling of the *Word*; so that when the Apostles have proposed Jesus Christ as the true Object of the Adoration of Christians, they did not change the Object of Adoration received among the *Jews*, since it was the same *Jehovah* who inhabited before the Cloud of Glory, that now dwelt in Flesh, in an inseparable manner, which is to continue for ever. This is a short abstract of what the Bishop explains at large, and with several reflections upon divers Texts of Scripture, p. 120. His words are; "In opposition to all which, we Christians own but one supreme God, and we do also believe that this great God is also our federal God, or *Jehovah*, by his dwelling in the Human Nature of Jesus Christ; so that he is our Lord not by an assumption into high Dignity, or the communicating divine Honour to him, but as the Eternal Word dwelt bodily in him: And thus he is our Lord, not as a Being distinct from, or deputed by the great God, but as the great God manifesting himself in his Flesh or human Nature; which is the great Mystery of Godliness, or of true Religion: And this will give a clear account of all those other passages of the New Testament, in which the Lord Jesus is mentioned, as distinct from, and subordinate to God and his Father. The one is the more extended Notion of God, as the Maker and Preserver of all things; and the other is the more special Notion, as appropriat-

"ted to Christians, by which God is federally their
"God, Lord, or *Jehovah*.

Certainly a Man must have a small stock of Modesty or Sincerity, who having read this Explication, can charge a Prelate with Socinianism, or Nestorianism. And thus he goes about to prove his accusation. He takes notice of an Expression of the Bishop's, p. 25. We believe, says the Bishop, That Christ was God by virtue of the indwelling of the eternal *Word* in him; the *Jews* could make no Objection to this, who knew that their Fathers had worshipped the Cloud of Glory, because of God's resting upon it. It is a fine thing to see how gravely Mr. Hill snaps up this Expression of the *Jews* worshipping the *Shekina*: Here he makes a pompous shew of needless Remarks, to convince the Bishop that God and the Cloud were two different things; and that the *Jews* never worshipped the Cloud of Glory, because otherwise they had been Idolaters. And all this, because the Bishop has taken the *Shekina*, for God dwelling in the Cloud. I confess that Expression is not altogether exact; but a candid Reader would easily have understood it by so many other Expressions which the Bishop employs in speaking upon this Subject, where he shews the difference which he makes between God and the Cloud of Glory. No body has found fault with Dr. Tenison for taking the *Shekina* for the second Person, (of Idolatry p. 319.) these are his words; "Accordingly
"when God is said in the Old Testament to have
"appeared, they seem to mistake, who ascribe it
"to

"to an Angel personating God; and not to the
"second Person, as the *Shekina* (or as Tertullian
"callest him) the representator of the Father.
"The same Expression occurs p. 380. of the same
"Book. And yet Dr. Tenison has not been accus-
"ed hitherto of confounding the Habitation, with
"the *Logos* that dwelt in the Cloud. Dr. Whistly
"says as much as Dr. Tenison, and Mr. Hill does
"not take it ill. He has read Tertullian's Book
"against *Praxeas*, but he seems not to have understood
"that Maxim in it. — *Malo te ad sensum rei; quam
"ad sonum vocabuli exerceas*; at least he does not pra-
"ctise it much in respect to the Bishop; especially
"since he owns, p. 27. that the Bishop has corrected
"that Expression. But Mr. Hill does not only at-
"tack this Expression, which though in it self it may
"be somewhat improper, is yet usual enough; but
"he falls upon the whole Argument of the Bishop;
"and to overthrow it, he denies in the first place
"what the Bishop advances. That the word *Jeho-
"vab* has been always applied to the Divinity dwel-
"ling in the Cloud of Glory. Secondly, Though
"this were granted, he denies, That the Divinity
"of the Messiah can be inferred from *Jehovah's*
"dwelling bodily in him, as the Bishop would have
"it. And he does not believe that St. Paul, Col. 2.
"has furnished the Bishop with a notion of the Di-
"vinity's dwelling in Jesus Christ, sufficient to
"ground Adoration upon. Lastly, He accuses the
"Bishop of not having fully answered a difficulty
"which he proposes to himself from 1 Cor. 8. which
"seems to appropriate the name *Logos*, or *Jehovah*,
"to the Son exclusively of the Father; and he gives

us another Solution which he thinks is better. We shall resume every one of these Heads in their order. And,

I. Mr. *Hill* denies that the word *Jehovah* is always ascribed to God, with relation to this Habitation in the Cloud. What tho the Bishop had been somewhat too positive concerning the word *Jehovah*, in asserting that it always refers to the Habitation in the Cloud? Here were after all no great harm, since Mr. *Hill* himself owns that he is called so where spoken of as in Covenant with the *Jews*. A little Candor and Common Sense would have prompted an Ingenuous Reader to make that Restriction of the Bishop's words; but in vain should the Bishop look for so much Equity from Mr. *Hill*, who disputes for disputing's sake. Divines of a greater Name than Mr. *Hill*, laugh at those Remarks which he has accumulated. Dr. *Tennison* has proved, That the *Shekinah* is celebrated down from *Adam* to *Noah*, from *Noah* to *Moses*, from *Moses* to the Captivity, and from the Captivity to the *Messiah*. This is in his Book of Idolatry, where one would think he intended a Refutation of Mr. *Hill*. After all, whatever the meaning of the word *Jehovah* may have been before the Law, it's certain, as I said, That under the Law that word denoted the God which the *Jews* worshipped in the Cloud of Glory, and that it is with respect to that Habitation that St. *John* lays, speaking of his Incarnation, That the Word has dwelt amongst us. The Bishop, who intends to prove that the Apostles did not propose another Ob-

ject

ject of Adoration, than the *Jehovah* worshipped under the Law, desires no more than this, which is sufficient for his purpose.

But can we rationally infer the Adoration of the *Messias* from this, that the fulness of the Godhead dwells in him bodily, as St. *Paul* tells us? Col. 2. The Orthodox have believed it to this day, and the Bishop with them; but out of spight to the Bishop, Mr. *Hill* will not allow this to be a good consequence; he does not much concern himself, whether the *Socinians* triumph or not, provided he may quarrel with the Bishop, by alleging I know not what frivolous Exceptions, of which himself would have been ashamed, had he not been transported with his Passion. To rake this passage from the Bishop which seems so full to his purpose, Mr. *Hill* gives it so Chimerical an Interpretation, that probably he is the first Inventor of it; he pretends that the Apostle speaks there in opposition to the *Gnosticks* Notions, who excluded Jesus Christ from the Supreme *αληθινος* or Divinity; but that tho St. *Paul* had declared *Jehovah* to be in Jesus Christ, yet of what sort of inexistence soever this might be understood, it could not be concluded from it, that the *Messias* was to be adored. I am not of Mr. *Hill*'s mind concerning the sense he gives to the word *αληθινος* in that place of St. *Paul*. 'Tis not very probable that this Apostle had an eye to the *Gnosticks*, and it is much more natural to understand this fulness in opposition to the Manifestations of the Deity under the *Old Testament*; the Sequel of the Discourse seems to lead us thither, since the Apo-

He declares that it dwelt bodily, which is opposed to Figures. *בשר* is the word which the Apostle has expressed by *σαρκὶς*, which signifies really and substantially. But be this as it will, what can Mr. *Hill* mean, when he denies that from such an Habitation as this, by which the Flesh is personally united to the Deity, the Adoration of the Messias cannot be inferred? It's plain, that the Bishop does not pretend that the Flesh ought to be adored in the Person of Jesus Christ; but it is yet more certain, that no Christian, except those that deny the Hypostatical Union of both Natures, denies that the word incarnate is to be adored, that is, the Messias, who is God and Man. They all agree, That the Principle of *Adorability*, or that for which the Person of the Messias is to be adored, is the Divinity of the Word; but they don't deny, as Mr. *Hill* seems to do, that Jesus Christ is the Object of Adoration, because the indwelling of the Word is such, that thereby the Human and Divine Natures are united in one Personality.

Here is another Criticism of Mr. *Hill's*. He owns, That the Argument which the Bishop draws from the word *θεός*, that is constantly given to Jesus Christ in the *New*, and answers to that of *Jehovah* in the *Old Testament*, is an excellent Argument, but he thinks the Bishop had not skill enough to free it from an Objection arising from 1 Cor. 8. The *Arians* have insisted upon that place, Verse 6. *Nobis tamen unus Deus pater*, to prove that the Son was not God. They have been answered, That when the Father is named here, the

the Son is also evidently supposed, as having the Divine Nature, if he be truly the Son of God. It has been often said to them, that by the same reason we might conclude, That the Father is not *Dominus*, because the Apostle adds, *& unus Dominus Jesus Christus per quem omnia;* and wherein has the Bishop enervated this Argument? Because the Bishop affirms (says Mr. *Hill*) that the word *θεός* answering to that of *Jehovah* in the Seventy Translation, is here appropriated to Jesus Christ, which he establishes as a consequence of his Hypothesis, that the word *θεός* is a federal Title of God, with relation to the *Jews*. Now Mr. *Hill* thinks that's a false Hypothesis: On the other hand he pretends, That the word *θεός* is opposed to that of *αγγέλιος* by St. *Paul*, which cannot be rendered by *Jehova* in the Plural Number; from whence he concludes, That the Bishop has not taken off the Objection he makes to himself. The question started by Mr. *Hill*, whether the word *θεός* expresses that of *Jehovah*; and whether supposing it expresses the *Jehovah* of the *Old Testament*, it is a federal word with respect to the *Jews*; this question, I say, is decided in favour of the Bishop, not only by the *Moderns*, but also by the *Ancients*. If Mr. *Hill* has a mind to be informed of the Opinion of the *Ancients* in this matter, let him read *Origen* upon the 8th of *Ezekiel*, p. 1. and St. *Jerom* upon the same at the beginning of his 9th Book; he may read also the Learned *Pearson* upon the Creed, as to the second thing controverted here between the Bishop and him. The foundation of this Opinion is more solid

solid than Mr. *Hill* is aware of; almost all the Ancients prove the Divinity of Jesus Christ, because it was he who appeared under the *Old Testament*; and that he who then appeared is named *Jehovah*, which the Seventy render by *κύριος*. Therefore the Apostle might say, according to this Phraseology, that if the Christians did acknowledge but one God, they acknowledge likewise but one Lord, viz. Jesus Christ; giving to the *κύριος* the Title of *Jehovah*, which is rendered by *κύριος* in the *Old Testament*. So that it is St. Paul's Doctrine, that the *κύριος* is *Jehovah*, and that the *κύριος* Incarnate is no less *Jehovah* than he was before the Incarnation. If it were otherwise, St. Paul had argued like a Sophister, when he proves by a passage out of *Isaiah*, that Salvation belongs to Christians, because they invoke Jesus Christ, who is the Lord spoken of in *Isaiah*, *Rom. 10*.

I know not why Mr. *Hill* is not satisfied with this Solution; 'tis his fault, and not the Bishop's: For whoever asserts that St. Paul finds the Fountain of the Deity in the Father, by reason of which he calls the Father the only God, and whoever maintains that the Son is the second Person, who is called *κύριος* by the *Jews*, and by whom God has acted all along during that Oeconomy, leaves no force at all to the Objections of *Arians* or *Socinians*.

Lastly, Mr. *Hill* rejects the Argument for our Saviour's Divinity, which the Bishop draws from this; that we don't read either in the *Acts of the Apostles*, or in their *Epistles*, that ever the *Jews* d.d

did object to *Christians* that they were guilty of Idolatry; this Argument seems to him false and impertinent. 'Tis strange how men are sometimes blinded by Passion, and carried away with the eagerness of Disputing! The Bishop does not argue here against all sorts of men, but only against the *Socinians*, who maintain that Jesus Christ was exalted to the Title of God after his Ascension. It's certain, that in this case the silence of the *Jews* is a very strange thing, for they would not have failed to object against Christians, that their Religion did propose a new Divinity, altogether unknown under the Law. On the other hand, if this objection was ever made against the *Christians*, 'tis very strange likewise, that the Apostles should nowhere obviate the Scandal which the *Jews* might so justly have taken at that new object of Religious Worship, which they proposed. I don't know how Mr. *Hill* is made, but I am sure that a *Socinian* could never make use of those Answers which he furnishes him with: At least, if I remember well, the *Socinian* who has Answered his Lordship, has thought fitter to say nothing upon this Argument of the Bishop, than to have recourse to Mr. *Hill*'s Solutions, which he has not judged to be a solid and sufficient Answer to this Observation of the Bishop.

Mr. *Hill* having thus censured what the Bishop says concerning the Trinity and the Incarnation, one would have thought that he was going to enter upon the Examination of those Censures which the Bishop has made of the Fathers in general; but he returns to the Doctrine of the Trinity,

nity, and accuses the Bishop of having suppressed the Notions which distinguish the Persons; *viz.* Generation and Procession.

This Accusation is as unjust and as ill grounded as all the rest; for the Bishop says enough of that Matter, *p.* 132, 133, and 134. He should have considered, that since the Bishop did not undertake a Treatise concerning the Trinity, he was not bound to examine the whole Dogma; it was enough for his purpose to mention only what he thought most fit to establish the Divinity of Christ, that he intended to prove against the *Socinians*. Besides, Mr. *Hill* ought to have done the Bishop the Justice to believe, that he does no less include in the Mystery (which he does not pretend to explain for fear of destroying the nature of it) those Notions which distinguish the Persons, than the Dogma it self. And indeed, though these Notions which the Bishop owns to be so real, as to produce a real and numerical distinction betwixt the Persons, are used by us in speaking of the Trinity, Mr. *Hill* cannot be ignorant that they are no less Mystrious and Difficult to be explained than the Dogma it self. We understand what made Mr. *Hill* return to this Subject; he had a mind to bring in question the Bishop's believing of the Trinity, because he says in a Letter to Mr. *Boyle*, that in many ancient Manuscripts he has not found that celebrated place of St. *John*, *There are three*, &c. Here he opposes to the Bishop an Author who takes this place for Genuine; this is no great piece of Cunning. For neither the Bishop, nor the other learned men, who

who compare the Manuscripts upon controverted places, do thereby give the Hereticks any advantage. Dr. *Fell*, the late Bishop of *Oxford*, who took so much pains in this kind of Literature, would have thanked the Bishop of *Salisbury* for his Discovery: For that great Man judged of things otherways, and by more elevated Principles than Mr. *Hill*. I am sure Dr. *Mills* will make use of the Bishop's Observation, and do him that Justice which the Bishop of *Oxford* would have done, if he had executed his Design. But this keeps me from the main Subject.

Let us see at last what Mr. *Hill* censures in the Bishop, concerning his pretended ill usage of the Fathers, *p.* 31. He taxes the Fathers, says Mr. *Hill*, "for no real Obliquities, but their Catholic Principles; fixes on them such Theories as they never dreamed of, and such as are destructive of their own avowed Faith; and this without quoting so much as one passage out of them; he gives them not so much as one good word, but finally presents them to us as a parcel of impertinent and self-contradictory Babelers. Here is the Charge, and the Proof follows, *p.* 54. In this, says the Bishop, *i. e.* in their teaching the Respects and Modes of this Unity and Distinction; too many both Ancients and Moderns have, perhaps, gone beyond bounds, while some were pleased with the Platonical Notions of Emanations, and Fecundity in the Divine Essence. The Bishop, you see, uses the words *perhaps* and *too many*, he does not say all; which does mightily

mitigate his Assertion. And yet Mr. *Hill* is pleased to say, That he reflects upon the whole Ancient Church before and after the Council of *Nice*: This is not very sincere. But granting the Bishop had spoken so generally as Mr. *Hill* imputes it to him, yet he had said nothing upon this Matter, but what many learned men of both Communions have advanced. Mr. *Hill* says, That we may very well ascribe Platonical Notions to *Arius*, since *Petavius* avers that *Arius* was a Platonist; but not to the Fathers who have disputed against *Arius*. This matter of Fact is not so certain as Mr. *Hill* thinks. Doctor *Cudworth* pretends that *Petavius* is mistaken, and that *Athanasius* and the Fathers of *Nice* were much greater Platonists than *Arius*. But without entering upon that Question, it's undeniably true that the Fathers have made use of *Plato's* Authority to explain the Mystery of the Trinity. *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Origen*, and *Ensebius Casariensis*, have done it before the Council of *Nice*; and St. *Cyril* does the same after them against *Julian*. And yet Mr. *Hill* comes and tells us positively, that the Fathers were not Platonists, because *Petavius* says that *Arius* was a Platonist. *Petavius* acknowledges that *Plato's* Trinity does very widely differ from the Christian Trinity. Doctor *Tenison* says the same, and proves it with great Exactness and Learning (of Idolatry, p. 77, 78, and p. 139.) And after this, Is it a Crime for the Bishop of *Salisbury* to reject those Platonical Notions of the Trinity?

Justin. M.
Ap. 2. p.
93. B. C.

But

But after all, says Mr. *Hill*, The Doctrine of Emanations is derived from the School of the *Jews* before Jesus Christ, and applied by the Fathers to the Doctrine of the Trinity; and the Bishop ought not to have supposed that some of the Ancients did reject them, while they were admitted by others. This Accusation may be refuted in a word. The Bishop himself admits of Emanations, as giving us the properest Idea to express what we conceive of the Trinity; but he rejects the Platonical Emanations, which have no manner of Conformity with the Trinity of Christians, although many Ancients and Moderns have adopted them, as all the learned do acknowledge.

I shall make the same Answer concerning Fecundity, whereof Mr. *Hill* thinks the Bishop has avoided the Notion in explaining the Trinity. Mr. *Hill* grows so exceeding warm upon this Point, That he pronounces *Anathema* against the Bishop if he does not acknowledge it. But why so much Noise? The Bishop employs his Discourse in proving the Divinity of the *Logos*, to whom the Father has communicated the Divine Nature; this is what we call Eternal Generation: So that he can't be said absolutely to deny the Fecundity of the Divine Nature, which consists in that it is communicated to several persons. But he does not believe Fecundity, according to the common Notion implied in that word, and which seems to import that the Son must beget, as well as the Father, having the same Nature in himself; and if he denies this Fecundity, with

D 2

relation

relation to the Holy Ghost, Must he be therefore struck with *Anathema*?

This word *Fecundity* may be used in a good Sense, in speaking of the Generation of the Son; which is the communication of the Divine Nature by the Father to the Son; but I question whether it may be used with respect to the Emanation of the Holy Ghost, *a Patre & a Filio*; this Emanation is never called Generation in Scripture, the Language whereof should be our Rule in speaking of this Mystery; and whatever some Divines may have thought, it is more prudent to abstain from it. The Nominals maintain that it is as true to say, *Deus non generat*, which is true in regard of the Son, as to say, *Deus generat*, which is true of the Father. I would fain know Mr. Hill's Opinion about this Proposition, *Voluntas genuit voluntatem, ut sapientia genuit sapientiam*. I am persuaded he would not like it, though it is certainly true that *Athanasius* and *St. Augustin* have carried thus far the Notion of *Fecundity*.

Mr. Hill fancies to Nonplus the Bishop, when he charges him with ascribing to the Fathers such Notions as were altogether Heathenish, and even saying, that they introduced them into the *Nicene Creed*, which has, *Lumen de lumine*, speaking of the *Eternal Word*. These are the Bishop's words, p. 61. "For we have footsteps of a Tradition, as Ancient as any we can trace up, which limited the Emanations to Three." And "these thought there was a production, or rather

"an

"an Education of two out of the first, in the same manner that some Philosophers thought "that Souls were propagated from Souls; and "the Figure by which this was explained, being "that of one Candle being lighted at another, "this seems to have given the rise to those words "*Light of Light*. It is certain that many of the "Fathers fell often into this conceit, &c. From these words Mr. Hill concludes, *First*, That the Fathers, according to the Bishop, have borrowed their Notion of the Three Emanations, from that of the Philosophers touching the Propagation of Souls, namely, the Notion of the Original of Souls *ex raduce*. *Secondly*, He pretends that the Fathers did never use that simile of two Candles, whereof one is lighted by the other. *Thirdly*, He charges him with fixing a *Platonick*, i. e. a Pagan Notion upon that *Nicene Article*, *Light of Light*. All this *Criticism*, which takes up about thirty Pages, may be reduced to nothing in a few words.

And, *First*, nothing is more certain, than that *Tatian*, *Justin Martyr's* Disciple, has the Similitude of a Torch or Candle lighting another. "*Cum* "*voluit Deus*, says he, p. 145. *verbum ex ejus simplicitate proficiscit, & verbum non inaniter prolatum, primogenitum opus sit ipsius spiritus. Hoc scimus autem esse principium Mundi, Natum est autem, non per divisionem, non per avulsionem; quemadmodum enim ab una fase permulta accenduntur, nec tamen prima facis lux minuitur, &c.* *ὡς ἀπὸ ἑνὸς πυρὸς πολλὰ, & ὁ πρῶτος οὐδὲν ἀντὶ τοῦ πρῶτου*

Lib. de
signal. p.
223. F.

Dial. cum
Tryph. p.
358. B. C.
D.

Athenago-
ras Theo-
philus. Cle-
mens Alex-
andrinus
Tertullian
Or. Laſtan-
tius.

διὰ τὸ ἕκαστον τῶν πολλῶν δαδῶν εἶναι ἐλαττωθῆναι τὸ φῶς, ὅτι καὶ ὁ λαὸς τοῦ θεοῦ οὕτως ἐστὶν ὡς τὰ παλῶς δυνάμεως, ὅθεν ἀλογον πεποίηκε τὸ γρηγορεῖν, p. 145. B. and this Similitude they seem to have borrowed from *Philo*, who speaking of the Spirit imparted from *Moses* to the Seventy Elders, saith this was not done, κατ' ἀποκρίσιν, by Abscission, but as Fire is lighted from Fire, or one Taper from another, without Diminution of its light, ἀλλ' οἷα γένοντο ἀνὰ πόδας ἢ καὶ μωρίας δαδὰς ἐξάλλη μέρει μὴδ' ὁτιέν ἐλαττωθῆναι ἐν μεγέθει; or at least, from his Master *Justin*, who saith, that in Explication of this matter he used this Example, rather than that of the Light of the Sun. 'Tis plain, That the Fathers have built on this bottom, when they made use of the Similitude of the Sun, and its Beams. Secondly, The Bishop might have proved very well by the Testimonies of *Justin* and *Tatian*, that the Ancients had not a very just Idea of the Doctrine of the Trinity, when they conceived two Generations of the *Word*; the one *ab aeterno*; the other before the Creation of the World; the one by which the *Word* is only as *in potentia*, in the Father; the other by which he is actually produced by the Will of the Father, cum voluit Deus, says *Tatian*, p. 145. This System was also followed by *Theophilus* of *Antioch*, and *Athenagoras*. This is but a light Error in those Ancients; if we believe Mr. *Hill*, who says, That this System was never condemned in the Church, tho it was never made or esteemed a necessary Point of Faith or Doctrine, p. 75. What

What a bustle would Mr. *Hill* have kept, if the Bishop had advanced the like Proposition? I'm afraid a Judicious Reader will be tempted to think, when he sees this severity of Mr. *Hill* towards the Bishop, and his great Indulgence to the Ancients, that he has two Weights and two Measures. For after all, the Bishop's reasons to reject the System of the Ancients, are much more solid than those by which Mr. *Hill* endeavours to soften and excuse it. 'Tis in vain for Mr. *Hill* to assert that this System is not Platonical, because *Justin* had renounced *Plato's* Philosophy: I can tell him that that System is much more conform to that of *Plato*, than to Scripture; and in fact, it was laid aside in the Controversy with the *Arians*, who drew great advantages from it. Thus some other *Hypotheses* of the Ancients were rejected, as that of the Invisibleness of the Father, and the Visibleness of the Son.

In fine, let it be granted to Mr. *Hill*, that the Fathers of *Nice* have borrowed the Article, *Light of Light*, from the Platonists Notion, and that the Bishop of *Salisbury* does affirm it; pray where is the Crime of that? Was not the κύριος ἐλέησον borrowed from the Heathens? If this Notion which was common to Scripture, with the wisest Philosophy, could be usefully employed to denote that the Divine Essence is in the Father, and in the Son, as Light is of the same Nature in two Candles, one of which is lighted by the other; why should not they have made use of it? This is *Tatian's* Notion, and the learned Dr. *Bull* believes

lieves that the Fathers of *Nice* have followed the same, p. 60. *Eusebius Casariensis* drew the Scheme of the *Nicene* Creed; and it appears by his Book, *De Preparatione Evangelica*, how much stress he laid upon *Plato's* Authority to establish the Dogma of the Trinity. The Fathers of the Council added only to it the word *ὁμοούσιον*, which at first seemed hard to *Eusebius*, but he admitted it afterwards. This word *ὁμοούσιον* had been disgraced by the abuse that *Paulus Samosathenus* made of it, having employed it to denote that Jesus Christ was only of the same Nature with us: But the Fathers of *Nice* have used it to signify, that he was of the same Nature with the eternal Father. After this the Fathers of the Council of *Chalcedon* have made use of it, in the first Sense, to express the Faith of the Church against the *Apolinarians* and *Eutichians*, who denied that Jesus Christ had a Soul. No man has found fault with him for making that use of the word *ὁμοούσιον*. If *Eusebius Casariensis* had not been the first Author of this Creed, Mr. Hill's Objection would be of some force. But as it is certain, that the *Nicene* Fathers have used the Creed, drawn up by *Eusebius Casariensis*, without adding any thing else to it, but the word *ὁμοούσιον*; and the Condemnation of *Arius's* Propositions confirming the Condemnation pronounced before by *Alexander*; so it is visible that they have made use of a Notion in it, which was received by those Fathers that were *Platonists*: It seemed to them consonant to the *Christian* Faith; and we receive it at this Day, taking it

it in a commodious Sense; I say we take it in a large Sense; for it is certain that this Expression *Deus de Deo*, being as strictly taken as Mr. Hill usually takes words in Disputing against the Bishop, does rather denote the Substance than the Personality, as that of *Lumen de Lumine*; and when in pronouncing these words we refer them to the Personality, we have more regard to the Sense of the Church, than to the natural Import and Signification of the Expression; for we only mean that the Son is derived from the Father, who communicates the Divine Essence to him; and not that the Essence of the Father's Divinity produces such another Essence in the Son.

Mr. Hill might very well have forborn his Censuring the Bishop upon this Article of the Creed; for whatever pains he takes to deliver his Readers from this thought, that the Fathers of the Council of *Nice* have referred the Expression *Deus de Deo*, & *Lumen de Lumine*, to the second Generation, yet he himself furnishes us with a sufficient Argument to confute him, in the passages which he quotes in the Margin out of *Tertullian*, *Theophilus*, *Athenagoras*, *Justin* and *Tatian*. For the Fathers have used these Expressions with *Tertullian* against *Praxeas*, to denote the second, but not the eternal Generation of the Word. *Tertullian* particularly called the second Generation the true Nativity of the Word. What can a Reader conclude from thence, but that the Notion *Deus de Deo*, & *Lumen de Lumine*, in the Council of *Nice*, relates to this second Generation? Which Mr. Hill himself calls an odd Conceit, p. 12. though he

affirms, p. 75. that the Church never condemned it: So that upon the whole Matter, it is very natural to believe that the Fathers of *Nice* took these words in the same Sense in which they were taken by the Ancients.

Mr. *Hill* may see now of what use the Platonick Notions have been to explain the Doctrine of the Trinity. The learned confess that the $\nu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, or the $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ of *Plato*, and his $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$, or $\delta\epsilon\iota\mu\omega\nu\eta\tau\iota\varsigma$ have nothing common with the two last Persons of the Trinity. This is not only acknowledged, but proved by the learned Dr. *Tenison*, in the Book before cited. On the other hand, it's no less certain that the Ancients have made use of the Platonick Notions, upon the $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ and $\delta\epsilon\iota\mu\omega\nu\eta\tau\iota\varsigma$, to shew that *Plato* owned the two last Persons of the Trinity. What follows from all this, but that Mr. *Hill* might have spared his Censures against the Bishop? And that notwithstanding all his endeavours, all what he has said to justify the Ancients, is useless and insignificant.

I shall add but one word more upon this Head; viz. That it does not become Mr. *Hill* to find fault with the Bishop for having asserted that the Fathers before the Council of *Nice* did conceive in the Trinity a Subordination, importing an inequality of the two last Persons with the first: He will give himself a very needless trouble if he undertake to clear them from that. The Bishop has but too many Proofs upon this Article; and none but those who never read the Ancients, or read them without attention, can disown it. This

is acknowledged by *Petavius*, Dr. *Cudworth*, and *Huetius*, *Origen*, lib. 2. q. 2. By this kind of injudicious Accusations Mr. *Hill* would almost tempt a man to draw such a Picture of Antiquity, as would not be much to its advantage. We may say in a word, That if there have been some among the Ancients who have recommended the study of Pagan Authors, because of the use that a Christian might make of them, to render the Doctrines of his Religion more probable to the Heathens, there have been others who have almost absolutely condemned that study, seeing what impression Platonism had made in the Minds of the Primitive Christians; so that Pope *Gelasius* was in the right, in the Roman Council, when he ranked with prohibited Books the greatest part of those Authors who have spoken so crudely upon the point of the Trinity.

Mr. *Hill* proceeds to another Accusation, which is as ill grounded: He pretends that the Bishop has unjustly charged the Fathers with believing a specifick Unity of the Divine Essence, and with having understood the word $\delta\upsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\chi\eta\iota\varsigma$ in that Sense, p. 91. and seq. Mr. *Hill* thinks this is to charge the Fathers with Tritheism, which he may with so much the more reason impute to the Bishop; that the Bishop supposing that the Fathers have attributed to the Persons Operations *ad extra*, different from each other; he is not only fallen himself into the same Notion, but which is more, he has insinuated, by his method, that he believes a *Tetras* in God, namely the Essence in abstracto, and the three Persons. I say this is a very ground-

less Accusation; for it's true that there are but too many of the Ancients who have gone upon this Hypothesis the Bishop speaks of, in explaining the Dogma of the Trinity. Mr. Hill may be informed of it by reading amongst others Father Petav. de S. Trinit. l. 6. c. 9. The Learned Dr. Cudworth has said as much as the Bishop; these are his words, *Intellect. Syst. p. 604.* "However it is evident from hence, that these reputed Orthodox Fathers, who were not a few, were far from thinking the three Hypostases of the Trinity to have the same singular existent Essence; they supposing them to have no otherwise one and the same Essence of the Godhead in them, nor to be one God, than three individual men have one common specific Essence of Manhood in them, and are all one Man. But as this Trinity came afterwards to be decried for Tritheism; so in the room thereof started thereup that other Trinity of Persons numerically the same, or having all one and the same singular existent Essence; a Doctrine which seemeth not to have been owned by any publick Authority in the Christian Church, save that of the *Lateran Council* only.

I know there are some learned men, who, as Dr. Bull, have endeavoured to give a good Sense to their Expressions, and by a long compass of Consequences reduce them to the ordinary Notions. We cannot but commend their Zeal for Antiquity; but after all, it were expedient that those who have the Opinions of the Fathers but at the second hand, should not be so positive in justifying all their Sentiments. Those who are

troubled

troubled at those failings with which the Fathers may be charged, ought to consider; *First*, That without examining Questions with great care, it is not possible to foresee all the Consequences that may be drawn from them. *Secondly*, That these Questions have risen one after another in process of time, and of many Disputes. *Thirdly*, That it easily happens, even to those who handle Matters with the greatest caution, to fall into Expressions, which being strictly taken, have a harsh Sense. *Fourthly*, That the Authority of some great men has often gained to them great numbers of Followers, concerning things which Posterity has justly condemned. *Fifthly*, That almost all the strayings of the Fathers do rise from thence; that in combating the Hereticks they departed from the simplicity of Scripture Expressions, and undertook to explain this Mystery by human Ideas very remote from the Truth.

But Mr. Hill tells us, The Bishop of *Salisbury*, who imputes to the Fathers a sort of *Tritheism* by his Explanation, falls himself into the same Absurdity; nay he establishes a kind of *Tetras* in the Godhead, which is worse than *Tritheism*. This is a great Charge. In the Divine Essence, says the Bishop, there may be Three that may have a diversity of Operations as well as economies. Here is the heresy of these words, according to Mr. Hill, page 8. (Now, whatsoever acts by another, is distinct from that other by which it acts, if prior in the Agency, by the order of reason. Here we have indeed a special Hunter of Hereticks: I shall not answer him, that there have been

been divers Schoolmen who believed an absolute Subsistence of the Divine Essence, besides the three Subsistences, which make the Personalities, without acknowledging that *Tetras* that Mr. Hill speaks of; the Bishop, I am sure, would not use this Apology; But I answer, That he offers a manifest violence to the Bishop's words, that contains nothing but what is agreeable to the constant way of speaking which Divines use concerning the Operations appropriated to each Person, without confounding them with the notional Expressions that serve to distinguish them. The Name of God, sometimes signifies his Essence, sometimes the Three Persons; and sometimes it imports but One Person of the Trinity; do we therefore acknowledge a Quaternity? To draw such consequences as these in order to ascribe Heresies to those who sometimes use the Word GOD in one of these significations, and sometimes in another; is meer Sophistry. We say, That the Father is God, to denote his Divine Essence: We say, That God has created the World, to express the common Work of the Trinity: We say, That God is incarnate, to signify the Union of the Word with Humanity. How many Heresies might be imputed to Writers, if one would make such Objections against them, and urge upon the word GOD Notions altogether foreign to the Subject in hand. But God be thanked, that all those who write, are not of Mr. Hill's temper.

Mr. Hill follows his blow; after he has reproached the Bishop for representing the Ancients as Tritheists, he accuses him of maintaining that those

those who succeeded them, have used Notions that were little better, when they made use of that Notion of the Sun, with its Light and Heat; and of that of the Soul, from whence flows the Understanding and the Will, to express the Processions of the Trinity. Nay, he objects to him, that those who have supposed different Operations in the Two Persons, are, according to this System, as much Tritheists as the first. Mr. Hill affirms on the contrary, That these Notions of the Fathers which the Bishop rejects, have been used from the beginning; so that the Bishop ought not to have said, that the using of these Notions was only that the Fathers might get out of *Trithesism*. This is a very pitiful Accusation: It seems Mr. Hill did not understand the Bishop's meaning, when he says that the Emanation of the Son and Holy Ghost were expressed by the acts of Understanding and Will; he does not intend to deny, that this Notion was used in ancient Times, but only to condemn the boldness of the Schoolmen, who would almost make this way of explaining the Procession of the Persons, pass for an Article of Faith, namely, that the Son proceeds by the Understanding, and the Holy Ghost by the Will; tho very Eminent Divines have rejected these Definitions, as *Zanchius lib. 5. C. ultimo*, and *Deauxus* refutes them in 1. *Disp. 6. q. 2*. As to what Mr. Hill fancies, that the Bishop is guilty of *Trithesism*, because he ascribes different Operations to the Two Persons; the poor man is visibly mistaken. Does not all Divines acknowledge different Operations of the Two Persons? Are they thereby infected with *Trithesism*?

Tritheism? Or was St. Paul infected with Heresy, when he said, *There are diversities of gifts, but the same spirit; there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord; there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God, who worketh all in all*, 1 Cor. 12. 4, 5, 6. I see what led Mr. Hill into this Error. He did imagine that, because it is a Maxim in Divinity, that the Actions of the Trinity *ad extra*, are common to the Three Persons, there are no Actions particularly belonging to One Person, according to the Oeconomy of the Three Persons. But doubtless he makes a very ill use of this Maxim, which may hold with relation to the Acts that constitute the Three Persons, and are proper to every one; for instance, the Act of Generation, which is proper to the Father exclusively of the Son and Holy Ghost; but this maxim does not hinder us from being firmly persuaded, that it was the Son only who took upon him the form of a Servant in the singularity of his Person; and not in the Unity of the Divine Nature; in what was proper to the Son, and not in that which was common to the whole Trinity. This is distinctly expressed by the forged *Dionysius de div. Nom. c. 2. &c.* and approved in the sixth General Council, Act 8. where his Authority is made use of, and it is also acknowledged by *Damasce. lib. 3. de fide c. 3.* by *Elias Cretensis* upon the fifth Oration of St. Gregory, and by *Nicetas de fid. Orthod. c. 34.* Mr. Hill should have known besides, that in the mission of the Persons *ad extra*, the action by which they act upon a particular Subject is proper to them, and is common to the three Persons only in respect to the Will; the acts of which are common to the three Persons. You

You see, Sir, how the Bishop has fallen into the hands of a Man, who understands things only by halves. Mr. Hill is not pleased with the Bishop's way of treating the Fathers, but he is yet more offended at the Explication and Notion which the Bishop advances of the Doctrine of the Trinity: This is what the Bishop says, p. 104. "We do plainly perceive in our selves two, if not three Principles of Operation, that do not only differ, as Understanding and Will, which are only different modes of Thinking, but differ in their Character and way of Operation. All our Cogitations and Reasonings are a sort of Acts, in which we can reflect on the way how we operate: We perceive that we Act freely in them, and that we turn our Minds to such Objects and Thoughts as we please. But by another Principle, of which we perceive nothing, and can reflect upon no part of it, we live in our bodies, we animate and actuate them, we receive sensations from them, and give motions to them; we live and dye, and do not know how all this is done. It seems to be from some emanation from our Souls, in which we do not feel that we have any liberty, and so we must conclude, that this Principle in us is Natural and Necessary. In acts of Memory, Imagination, and Discourse, there seems to be a mixture of both Principles, or a third that results out of them. For we feel a freedom in one respect, but as for those marks that are in our Brain, that set things in our Memory, or furnish us with words, we are necessary Agents; they

"come in our way, but we do not know how :
 "We cannot call up a figure of things or words
 "at pleasure ; some disorder in our Mechanism
 "hides or flattens them, which when it goes off,
 "they start up and serve us, but not by any act
 "of our Understanding and Will. Thus we see,
 "that in this single undivided Essence of ours, there
 "are different Principles of Operation, so different
 "as Liberty and Necessity are from one another.
 "I am far from thinking that this is a proper Ex-
 "planation or Resemblance of this Mystery, yet it
 "may be called, in some sort, an Illustration of it ;
 "since it shews us from our own Composition,
 "that in one Essence there may be such different
 "Principles, which in their proper Character
 "may be brought to the terms of a contradiction,
 "of being free and not free. So in the Divine
 "Essence, which is the simplest and perfectest
 "Unity, there may be three that may have a di-
 "versity of Operations, &c.

Mr. Hill thinks that this Notion is not less im-
 pertinent to explain the Trinity, than that of the
 Fathers ; Thus he speaks, p. 106. "This is a
 "worthy Simile indeed (to supplant that scouted
 "one of the Ancients) in which is no representation
 "of the *Logos*, and its Parent Principle, nor of the
 "Spirit of Holiness that is in the Father and the
 "Son, nor one of their Co-essentiality, Co-eter-
 "ternity or Order, all which are resembled in
 "that Simile which this undermines. Then he
 Examines it particularly, and endeavours to shew
 many absurdities in it. One may easily judge,
 that it is not hard for him to do this. If all the

Similies

Similies given of the Trinity, ought to express all
 that we conceive of it, what Simile can we use ?
 At this rate, how can we justify that resemblance
 used by *Athanasius*, of the Root and the
 Branches, to give us an Idea of the Co-equality ?
 And that other, of a Fountain, a River, and a
 Vapour. That which makes Mr. Hill to be so
 unfair a Critick, is, that he does not consider,
 that Similies are used generally for one particular
 design. When a Divine would express the Con-
 substantiality, he brings Resemblances that serve
 only for his purpose, and he does not matter
 whether they explain the whole *Dogma* of the
 Trinity, or not. The Bishop therefore was in the
 right, to use a Simile, which served to prove
 what he designed to establish, namely, that in
 a most simple Substance there may be various
 Principles of Operations. A Man must have but
 little judgment, to think that he was bound to seek
 for some of another nature. It's very observable,
 that St. *Augustine*, who has advanced more Si-
 milies than any of the Ancients, as you may see
 in his Books of the Trinity, from the sixth to the
 fifteenth, which is the last, declares himself in
 the 15th Book, Chap. 7. that they are very im-
 perfect and unlike, and that it's vain for us to seek
 in Created things, representations of an incompre-
 hensible Mystery. If the Bishop has not made use
 of that Notion of the *Logos*, which signifies the
 Reason upon which *Basil* and *Gregory of Nazianze*
 have insisted, it is because he thinks that that
 Name is not so much given to the Second Person,
 because he is the Reason of the Father, as because

F 2

(according

(according to those Divines who have more accurately Examined the Style of Scripture.) St. John has respect in that word to the description of the Creation, and to the Ministry of the Messiah, by which God did always express himself, according to the Hypothesis of the Ancients. But what would Mr. Hill say, if by ill luck it appeared, that what the Bishop has alledged to illustrate the Trinity, were the Notion of St. Augustine himself in his Books of the Trinity? And yet this might be easily proved, if it were worth our while. I confess Mr. Hill will find in the Ninth Book, that there, for a resemblance of the Trinity, he gives us Man Created after God's Image, in whom he finds a sort of Trinity, namely, a Mind, a Knowledge of himself, and a Love by which Man loves himself. But tho' this be Mr. Hill's favourite Notion, and that of many Schoolmen, yet St. Augustine in his Tenth Book prefers another before it, which seems clearer to him, and more proper to explain the Idea's of the Trinity, that is Memory, Understanding, and Will. In fine, as if these Notions could not satisfy him, he borrows Similies from Brutes, Plants and Trees, from the inward Senses, from Learning and Wisdom, &c. And after all, he is forced to confess, that all these Representations cannot give us a perfect Idea of the Trinity. If we had some portion of Mr. Hill's Criticising Spirit, here were a large field to shew many dissimilitudes in those Similies, but he who can give himself that trouble, must have little to do, and had need to have a very patient Reader to bear the tediousness of it.

We

We are come at last to Mr. Hill's System, which he opposes and prefers to that of the Bishop, as having nothing in it, but what is drawn both from Scripture and Antiquity. And first, I must give him his due, and acknowledge that he says many good and Orthodox things upon this matter. I agree with him, when he tells us, that he cannot conceive three Minds in God, without establishing Treitheism, p. 112. But he is absolutely mistaken, when he denies, that several of the Ancients have acknowledged three Minds in God. Mr. Hill may easily be convinced of this; he owns, p. 113. that to acknowledge three Minds in God, is by consequence to acknowledge three Substances; but nothing is more evident, than that most of the Fathers have acknowledged three Substances. This would be soon demonstrated; if I would insist upon the Expressions of the Fathers, who have followed Plato's Notions; for it's not the Father which the Platonists call *vous*, as Mr. Hill does, but it's the *λογος* which they call *vous*. Dr. Cudworth, p. 591. of his System, has given us the reason why the Platonists did so, by shewing, that they looked upon the Notion of *vous*, as inconsistent with the most simple Nature of the *raison*, which they conceived as the source of the Deity, that was communicated to the *vous* or *λογος*. This may be seen in *Macrobius*, lib. 1. in *Sonn. Scip. C. 14*; from whence it appears, that the Platonists, as Dr. Cudworth and Dr. Tension do agree, acknowledged three Substances in their Trinity. Mr. Hill owns as much, in his *Origeniana*, concerning those Divines who did,

did, like *Origen*, follow the Notions of *Plato*, to explain the Doctrine of the Trinity.

1. But we have yet more evident proofs of this truth. 1. It is certain that the *Greeks*, before the Council of *Nice*, have constantly supposed that there were three Hypostases in the Trinity; and it's no less certain, than that by three Hypostases the *Greeks* understood three Substances. The thing is so unquestionable, that the Council of *Nice* uses the words *ὑποστάσεις* & *οὐσίαι*, for one and the same thing. I know that St. *Basil* in his 78 Epistle, endeavours to give another sense to these words of the Council, but we may justly oppose to him *Athanasius*, who had been at the Council of *Nice*: For he expressly affirms in his fifth Oration against the *Arians*, that the Father and the Son have but one Nature and Hypostasis; he says the same in his Epistle to *Liberius*, and in that to the Bishops of *Africk*, where he positively asserts that the Hypostasis is the Nature. We may further oppose to St. *Basil*, *Alexander* Bishop of *Alexandria*, who had been as it were the soul of the Council of *Nice*; for in his Letters, the one mentioned by *Theodoret*, and the other by *Socrates*, he takes constantly Hypostasis for Essence. This we see likewise in the addition to the Synodical Epistle of the Fathers of *Sardica* in *Theodoret*, Lib. 2. C. 6. where they charge the *Arians* with believing three Hypostasis, because they believed three different Substances, that of the Father, that of the Son, and that of the Holy Ghost. The same may also be observed in the 57. Epistle of St. *Jerome*, which he writes to Pope *Damasus*, where he maintains, that to say three Hypostases,

postases is the same as to say three Substances, and that all men speak so, when they will speak *Greek*.

That too many of the *Greek* Fathers, who have disputed against the *Sabellians*, have taken these words in this sense, is but too evident from the instance of *Dionysius* of *Alexandria*, surnamed the Great. This great Man is vindicated by *Athanasius*, as having never entertained any impious opinion about the Trinity. But St. *Basil* rejects him upon many Articles, chiefly where he confirms the *Arian* Heresie; if he defends him somewhere, it's only with this Apology, that while he too eagerly intends to confute the *Sabellians*, he falls into the contrary opinion; and besides, he accuses him of having impious Opinions concerning the Holy Ghost. Phot. Cod. 232. pag. 902. I have observed this concerning *Dionysius* of *Alexandria*, 1. Because the *Arians* boasted that he was of their side. 2. Because *Alexander* of *Alexandria* follows some of his Expressions, in his Synodical Epistle to all the Bishops, when he accuses *Arius* of not believing the Son to be like the Father in respect of his Nature, and calls the Father and the Son *ὁμοῦγενεταί*, just as *Origen* had done. 3. Because Mr. *Hill* has suffered himself to be imposed upon by a spurious piece, which he cites under the name of *Dionysius* of *Alexandria*, as truly his, but it's visibly false, since the Doctrine it contains is altogether contrary to what we know to have been the Doctrine of that Ancient Author.

2^{ly}. It's certain that most of the Ancient Fathers, before the Council of *Nice*, have held a Generation-
of

of the Word *in tempore*, before the Creation of the World *. The Learned Dr. Bull

* Justin, M. Ap. 2. p. 66. E. Dial. cum Tryph. p. 285. D. 358. B. C. 359. B. Athenag. Legat. pro Christ. p. 10. D. Theophil. ad Autol. p. 38. B. p. 100. B. Lactant. p. 145. B. Clem. Alex. Strom. 5. p. 553. B. 591. B. Strom. 6. p. 644. A. Strom. 7. p. 700. c. Tertull. Apol. c. 21. p. 19. contra Herm. c. 3. c. 18. 20. 45. adv. Prax. c. 5. 7. 12. Lact. I. 2. c. 8. p. 177. 178. I. 4. c. 6. p. 364. 365. 366.

use the words *made and created*. Now its certain, that *Alexander of Alexandria* does not serve himself of the Notion of this Generation *in tempore* before the Creation, to oppose the *Arians*, but urges only the Generation of the Son by the Father *ab æternis*, to prove that Jesus Christ was not made before the World; and that he was Creator and not a Creature. In this sense we ought to take the words of the *Nicene Creed*, which may justly be looked upon as the confirmation of *Alexander's* Synodical Letter to all the Bishops. This Remark is the more necessary, because most of those who have disputed against the *Arians* after the Council of *Nice*, have abandoned the System of the Ancients; concerning the two Productions of the *Logos*, as *Alexander* had abandon'd it: This great man being it seems more used to this Controversie, had found that this second production gave mighty advantages to the *Arians*. If the Reader have a mind to know what those advantages were, we may easily satisfy him. 1. The Fathers following some Texts of

of Scripture, granted that the second Nativity of the Son, would make him to be look'd upon as Created; it was in opposition to this that the Council defined, *genitum, & non factum*.

2. It gave occasion to believe that the Son was not eternal, and that the Father had not been Father *ab æternis*, which did absolutely destroy the Divinity of the Son.

3. It is to be observed, that *Origen* as well as *Dionysius of Alexandria*, having been cited by the *Arians* as their great Author, to prove that the Son was begotten and made *γεννητὸς καὶ ποιητὸς*, it was afterward defined, that the Son was *γεννητὸς ἀμὲν καὶ ἀγέννητὸς*, *γεννητὸς* in respect of the Essence, *ἀγέννητὸς*, because he was not made; this is *Epiphanius's* Observation against the *Origenists*, *Parag. 8.* where he accuses *Origen* to have called the Son of God, *γεννητὸν θεόν, Deum factum*. See *Vales. ad Theodoret. Lib. 2. c. 6.*

4. It is evident, that tho some believe that the word *ὁμοῖος*, which was used in the Council of *Nice*, denotes the Numerical Unity of the Divine Essence: Yet many of the Fathers have used it only to express the same Specific Essence. Dr. *Cudworth* has very well observed it, *Pag. 611.* upon a passage of *Epiphanius*, and another of *Athanasius*. *Athanasius* speaks thus, *οὗτοι γὰρ πάντα φερούμεν ὡς Σαβέλλιος μνησάσθων καὶ ἐκ ὁμοῖου. Exposit. fid. p. 241.* *Epiphanius* makes the same remark, *καὶ λέγομεν ταυτοῦσιον ἵνα μὴ ἡ λέξις παρὰ τινι λήρηται Σαβέλλιον ἀπεικάζειν, ταῦτον δὲ λέγομεν ἡ θεότητι καὶ ἡ οὐσίᾳ καὶ ἡ δυνάμει, H. 76. n. 17.* from whence Dr. *Cudworth* draws this Conclusion: "It's plain, that the Anci-

"cient Orthodox Fathers asserted no such thing,
 "as one and the same singular or numerical E-
 "sence, of the several Persons of the Trinity,
 "this according to them being not a real Trinity,
 "but a Trinity of meer Names, Notions, and in-
 "adequate Conceptions only.

5. You ought to know, that the Fathers for the most part, till St. *Augustine's* Time, who did confute it, and obliged those by whom it was received, to reject it; which is, that the Father alone being of his own Nature invisible, the Appearitions of God mentioned in the Old Testament could not be ascribed to him, but that they must be referred only to the λόγος, as to him whom the Father has not only employed as a Minister in the Creation, but by whom also he always Revealed himself under the Old Testament. This may be seen in *Justin Martyr*, Dial. against Tryph. p. 275. A. 283. B. and 357. B. C. in *Tertullian* against Praxeas, p. 648. in *Novatian*. lib. de Trinit. Now this Notion, supposed that the Father and the Son were not of the same Nature; and without doubt, this was the reason why St. *Augustine* did reject and confute it, as appears in his Books of the Trinity.

It were endless, to take notice of all those Expressions of the Fathers, which import a diversity of Substance; it's enough to have considered the most remarkable, out of the chief Authors, cited by Mr. Hill to confirm his System, (such as *Origen*, and *Dionysius of Alexandria*, Strained the Truth, who is especially famous for having opposed *Orbellianism*,

Add Theophilus l. 2. ad Autoly. cum. p. 100. Tertul. adv. Jud. c. 9. p. 194. adv. Marcion. l. 2. c. 27. p. 395, 396. synodus Antiochena Concil. To. 1. Eccl. Lab. To. 1. p. 845. D. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 1. c. 2.

bellianism, to which I could add some passages out of *Clemens Alexandrinus* reported by *Photius*, Cod. 106. and out of *Theognostus* of *Alexandria*, mentioned by *Photius*, Cod. 106. I shall not take notice of those which relate to the Holy Ghost, of whom they speak meaner yet than of the λόγος. Mr. Hill may read what *Theognostus* says of him in *Photius*, Cod. 106. and *Lactantius* in his Institutions, and *Eusebius* against *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*; after this, let him say, if he dare, that the Fathers have constantly acknowledged but one Substance of the three Persons; and if they have not acknowledged this, with what Confidence did he impute to them an Opinion, which how true soever, is yet quite contrary to their Doctrine?

The second thing which may be Censured in Mr. Hill's Hypothesis concerning the Trinity, is, that it accommodates the Scripture to the System of *Thomas Aquinas*. I have observed before, that the Scripture speaks of the λόγος, under another Notion, than that of Reason, which contains and judges of the Ideas that are in the mind. *Theophilact* is aware of this, upon the 1st of St. John, where he rejects that famous division of the λόγος into προφύρεον, and ενδεδειγμενον, in disputing against *Porphyry*; and all the more Learned Divines do likewise acknowledge it; whereas *Thomas Aquinas*, to give a Reason why there are but three Persons in the Trinity, builds upon the two Faculties, of Understanding and Will, which we conceive in the Humane Soul. I confess, that St. *Augustine* may have given some occasion to the Schoolmen to frame that System, and to apply it to the

Words of Scripture, which speak of the Trinity. But upon this, I have three things to observe against Mr. Hill. 1. That tho' the Doctrine of the Trinity is clearly explained in Scripture, as to the *ὄν*; yet there are such difficulties about the *διόν*, that it were by much the wisest thing to speak of it only in Scripture words. This was the Maxim of *Alexander* Bishop of *Alexandria*, in his Letter to *Alexander* of *Byzantium*; where he says, that *St. John* has concealed the generation of the *λόγος*, because it is incomprehensible to Men and Angels, and that one cannot without Impiety dive into this Mystery. *Irenæus* hath a whole Chapter to prove *Generationem ejus inenarrabilem esse*, in which he speaks to the Hereticks in words as put against the Schoolmen, *vos autem Generationem ejus ex Patre divinantes, & verbi hominum per linguam factam prolationem transferentes in verbum Dei juxta delegimini a nobis. Et addimus si quis itaque nobis dixerit, quomodo ergo filius prolatus a Patre esse, dicimus ei quia prolationem istam sive Generationem, sive nuncupationem, sive adaptionem, aut quomodolibet, quis nomine vocaverit Generationem ejus inenarrabilem existentem, nemo novit nisi solus qui generavit, Pater, & qui natus est Filius, &c.* This was also the Maxim of *St. Basil*, in his second Book against *Eunomius*, p. 44. where he affirms, that we ought not to ascribe any thing to the Son, but what is expressly attributed to him in Scripture; and that we ought not to speak of God, but in Scripture Terms, this is repeated in his Book *de vera fide*, p. 250. It was also the Notion of *Gregory of Nazianze*, *Orat. 12. p. 204.* Where he says, that the Trinity alone comprehends, *quo ordine erga se sit.* In his thirteenth Oration, p. 211. and in 23. he declares

declares, that if he were asked the *Modus* of the Eternal Generation and Procession, he would leave it to them who alone know themselves, according to the Testimony of Scripture. *In divinis scientia sua ignorantia maxima scientia.*

The second thing is, that since the Fathers acknowledge, that the Mystery of the Trinity is unknown to us, and even to the Angelical Beings, it were very prudently done, never to engage our selves into those Explanations, much less to deliver them with an Authority almost equal to that of Scripture. This is the Judgment of *St. Gregory*, surnamed the Divine, in his 12th *Orat.* For after all, to what purpose are all those Similies used in this case? Since the same *Gregory* owns, that after having searched curiously for some resemblance of the Trinity, he could never meet with any, that was able to satisfy him; so that he frankly declares, that that of the Eye, that of a Fountain and a River, that of the Sun, the Beams and the Light, or any other whatsoever, were not proper Images of the Mystery of the Trinity. *Orat. 37. p. 611.*

The third thing which may be blamed in Mr. Hill's Hypothesis, wherein he has blended the Notions of the *Thomists* with those of Scripture, is that it is not liked even by a great part of those of the Church of *Rome*: For the *Scotists* make great Exceptions against it, and the difficulties which they urge against the *Thomists*, serve at best to render this matter more obscure and intricate. All their working to prove that there cannot be more than three Persons in the Divine Essence, seems to me as solid, as what *Irenæus* says, that there could

not

not have been more than four Gospels, *Lib. 3. Cap. 11.* Grotius does some-where very much commend the way of the Patriarch Gennadius, in explaining the Doctrine of the Trinity in his Confession of Faith, which he presented to the Emperor Mahomet II. And indeed it is very commendable; and it were to be wished that those many Divines who are so positive, would imitate the modesty of it, in explaining those great Truths which the Scripture proposes to us, that we may receive them with submission of Faith, and not pry into them, and give Systems of 'em, in which upon examination it appears, that Humane Reason has a greater share than Divine Revelation.

It is not my design at present to examine more particularly Mr. Hill's Hypothesis concerning the Trinity: A Learned Reader can easily see that he has compiled Dr. Bull. But it were to be wished,

1. That he had quoted the Fathers with a little more judgment, and cited only those that made for him; for that way of quoting Authors in a lump, is easie enough, and may impose upon those who never conversed with Antiquity; but it does very little honour to a Writer among those who are true Judges: I am sure, that if a man who is not a Scholar, would compare Mr. Hill's Citations, with what he reads in *English* of the Doctrine of those Fathers, in the Ecclesiastical *Bibliothèque* of Mr. Dupin, a Doctor of *Sorbonne*, he would be strangely surprized to see that Mr. Hill cites for his Opinion a great number of Authors who are Diametrically opposite to him. But if Mr. Hill was to undergo the Censure of the Learned, who have

have studied these matters in the Originals, he has laid himself open to a very heavy one.

The 2d. thing to be wished, is that Mr. Hill had not inspired his Readers with so profound a Veneration for Antiquity: It seems he has had the ordinary fate of those who dispute with too much heat; thinking that the Bishop rejected Antiquity with too great a contempt, he seems on the contrary to acknowledge the Authority of the Ancients as a Tradition almost infallible. If he is read in Antiquity, as he would fain persuade us he is, then he must be given over as a man past Cure, since his own reading could not bring him to have true and right notions concerning the Authority of the Ancients; but if he never read the Fathers, but relies upon the Extracts of others, I desire him to be a little better acquainted with the Ancient Doctors, before he presume to impose upon his Readers that blind Veneration for Antiquity, which he prescribes to them. Tho' most of the Fathers from the middle of the second Century to the Council of *Nice*, had been engaged in Opinions contrary to the right notion we have of the Doctrine of the Trinity, as *Petavius* confesses it; this would make no impression upon me, since those Fathers did acknowledge the Authority of Scripture, from whence I may immediately derive the Doctrine of the Trinity; I say this would not make me doubt of the revealed Doctrine. Nay, more than that, I say that tho' the whole Council of *Nice* had followed the opinion of those Fathers, it would not much move me; they were men, and liable to be mistaken, and those who can deny this truth

truth had as good renounce their Reformation all at once. Mr. Hill must remember what St. Hierom faith upon this very Question, in his Apology against Rufinus: *Et quomodo, (ô Rufine) inquires, in libris ecclesiasticorum scriptorum vitia nonnulla sunt? Si Causas vitiorum nescire respondero, non statim illos hereticos indicabo; fieri enim potest ut vel simpliciter erraverim, vel alio sensu scripserim, vel a librariis imperitis eorum paulatim scripta corrupta sint, vel certe, antequam in Alexandria quasi Demonium Meridianum Arius nasceretur, innocentes quedam & minus cautè locuti sint, & que non possint perverforum hominum calumniam declinare.*

This is what I had to say upon the Vindication of the Fathers undertaken by Mr. Hill, and upon the System which he opposes to the false Notions he ascribes to the Bishop of Salisbury. You see that the Fathers had need of another Apologist, especially, since by the way he was pleased;

1. To give a wipe to Tertullian, the first in his opinion who defended the Doctrine of the Trinity against Praxeas; he says that his words and his sense are sometimes very singularly odd concerning the Production of the Second Person: And yet it's very observable, that Tertullian says nothing, but what has been advanced by many other Ecclesiastical Writers before the Council of Nice; so that, notwithstanding all Dr. Bull's Endeavours to reduce what these Fathers say to an Orthodox sense, Mr. Hill must of necessity involve them in the same censure with Tertullian.

2y. Mr. Hill affirms concerning the Fathers, that in his opinion they generally taught a gracious

ious Adoption, and a Metaphorical Designation of our Nature in Jesus Christ, and of all the Saints by him. But to justify them in this Particular, we must say either, that Mr. Hill never read them; or that he did; he quarrels with them with as little ground, as when he censures the Bishop for using the Expression of Divine Person in speaking of the Pless; for both the Bishop and the Fathers, who often call Jesus Christ the *Seigneur*, have had the same Idea; so that they must either stand or fall together. But I shall take leave of this unfair Writer, when I have performed one thing that I promised.

I told you that I was very much surprized to find in Mr. Hill's Book a most dangerous Principle; I must now make you sensible of it.

These are his words, Page 6. "What I require, is, that the Catholic Doctrine be asserted as a Rule of Faith, which the Church is bound to adhere to on the certain Authority of Divine Revelation; this Revelation appearing real, not only to particular mens private Opinions, but originally committed to the charge and custody of the whole Church by the Apostles; and so preserved by their Successors."

H

"fors

"fors throughout the whole diffusive body;
 "Whereas his Lordship only lays down
 "this notion or form of Faith. That we
 "believe Points of Doctrine, because we
 "are perswaded that they are revealed to
 "us in Scripture; which is so languid and
 "unsafe a Rule, that it will resolve Faith
 "into every man's private Fancies, and
 "Contradictory Opinions: Since each man's
 "Faith is his Perswasion, that what he
 "believes for a Doctrine is revealed in
 "Scripture. Whereas the act of a Christian
 "Faith believes such Doctrine to be true
 "and fundamental in Christianity from the
 "certain evidence thereof in the Scriptures,
 "acknowledged by all Churches not led by
 "casual perswasions, but by a Primitive,
 "perpetual, universal and unanimous Con-
 "viction and Tradition. The deviation
 "from which Rule and Notion, to private
 "Opinions and Perswasions, is the cause
 "of all Heresies, and, by its consequent di-
 "visions, naturally tends to the ruine of the
 "True Christian and Catholick Faith.

You see that Mr. Hill is angry with the
 Bishop, for saying that we believe Points
 of Doctrine, because we are perswaded that
 they are revealed in Scripture; he thinks
 the Bishop should have said, that we re-
 ceive a Doctrine for fundamental, from
 the

the evidence thereof in the Scriptures, ac-
 knowledged by all Churches, not led by
 casual perswasions, &c. These Expressions
 are so intricate, that it's hard to guess at
 Mr. Hill's meaning. If these words, ac-
 knowledged by all Churches, relate to the
 word *Scripture*, which goes immediately
 before, it's very hard to apply what he
 says to all the Books of Scripture, so as that
 they may retain their Authority with Chri-
 stians; for it is notorious, that divers Books
 of Scripture, as the Epistle to the He-
 brews, &c. have not that Primitive, Uni-
 versal, and unanimous Tradition to esta-
 blish their Authority. This one Clause of
 Mr. Hill's will deprive us, at one dash, of
 all the Books, the Authority whereof we
 are told, in *Eusebius's* Ecclesiastical History,
 was for a long time questioned by great
 Churches. But if he refers the words, ac-
 knowledged by all Churches, &c. to the evi-
 dence of Fundamental Doctrines, as the se-
 ries of his Discourse, the Maxim of *Vincen-
 tino Lyrinensis*, which he cites, and what he
 says concerning the Creeds, seem to intimate,
 then this Proposition is not less dangerous
 than the other.

It is true, that a Fundamental Doctrine,
 the Revelation whereof is acknowledged by
 all the Churches, is most evident by that
 H 2 very

very thing, that all the World does acknowledge it. But must therefore all the Fundamental Doctrines, which have not been acknowledged by all the Churches, who they are clearly revealed in Scripture, be thought not fundamental, because they want this Evidence? *Præf. c. 1. p. 10.*

I confess Mr. *Hill* says, that he will not examine what Rules private men are to follow; but he affirms, that those who desire to arrive at a ripeness of Judgment and Knowledge, ought to take the Rule of *Vincentius Lirinensis*, p. 7. which the Bishop has rejected. *See Hill's Animadversions, p. 10.* But this, I say first of all, is a Notion that has no solid ground in Divinity. 'Tis granted, that Certainty of Revelation, in respect to those who live now, depends upon the Certainty of Revelation which the Apostolical, and after it the Christian Church, has had down to this time. But it is not a wild imagination, to oppose this Certainty which the Apostolical Church in a Body has had, to the persuasion of each Member of the Apostolical Church? What Certainty could the Body of the Apostolical Church have, but the Certainty which each single member of which it was composed had? Who ever heard, among Protestants, public that

that the Faith of each private man resolves it self into the Certainty of Revelation, which way soever he may come by that Certainty of Revelation?

Is it not rank Popery to assert, that our Faith is not immediately resolved into the Authority of God, who proposes a Doctrine to us in Scripture? Pray where shall we find Christians, if so be so, it is not enough to believe a Doctrine because Christ has revealed it; but one must believe besides, such a Doctrine to be true and fundamental in Christianity, from its certain evidence in Scripture, acknowledged by all Churches not led by casual persuasions, but by a Primitive, perpetual, universal and unanimous Conviction and Tradition?

One might perhaps think at first, that this addition to the definition of Faith were no great matter; but I assure you, Sir, it destroys entirely the nature of Faith, and contains the whole Doctrine of the Church of Rome upon this Point; it imports that the Gospel has no Authority, *quo ad nos*, till it is vouched by the Authority of the Church. The Church has been believed hitherto to be the Depositary of Scripture. But it was never believed that her Authority went so far, as that we ought not to receive a truth evident

evident in Revelation, but as it is acknowledged by all the Churches not led by casual persuasions, but by a Primitive, perpetual, universal and unanimous Conviction and Tradition.

Indeed, Sir, if what Mr. *Hill* lays down be true, it's hard to tell who has Faith now? I desire Mr. *Hill* to reflect upon that Article of the Creed, which establishes the Procession, *ab utroque*, and to tell me whether he does not think himself bound to believe it, till he has examined whether this is acknowledged by all the Churches not led by casual persuasions, but by a Primitive, perpetual, universal and unanimous Conviction and Tradition? It is somewhat strange, to see a Protestant use that as a necessary Character to establish Faith, which the Papists employ to destroy it? The Papist thinks to have driven the Protestant to the impossibility of shewing how Faith is produced in a man who reads the Scripture, because such a man can't be sure whether his being persuaded by Revelation of some Fundamental Truth, is a ground he may safely rely upon, before he has Examined whether all the Churches agree upon that point, that seems to be Revealed, or not. And Mr. *Hill*, it seems, being not satisfied with what we answer to this Objection, thinks fit to side with

with the Papist: How edifying this proceeding can be, let Divines judge.

Pray, Sir, tell me what you think of this, when you hear it said, that Faith has been so intrusted to the Custody of the whole Church by the Apostles, that it was preserved by the Successors of the Apostles? "But what I require, says Mr. *Hill*, is, that the "Catholick Doctrine be asserted as a Rule "of Faith, which the Church is bound to "adhere to, on the certain Authority of Divine Revelation; this Revelation appearing real, not only to particular Mens "private Opinions, but originally committed to the charge and custody of the "whole Church by the Apostles, and so "preserved by their Successors, throughout "the whole diffusive body, p. 61. Does Faith then depend upon the knowledge of the Apostles Successors, or their faithfulness or unfaithfulness in keeping this Sacred Depositum? This puts me in mind of what *Vasquez* says, that the Faith of a Christian does so absolutely depend upon the Authority of his Leaders, that if at this day a Heathen being cast by a storm into England, did embrace the Belief of our Church, which rejects Transubstantiation, he would be in a state of Salvation; tho' the Church of Rome, which alledges Tradition for this Dogma, and

and has it in her Creed, declares that one can't be Saved without professing that monstrous Doctrine.

I know St. *Augustine* has said, *non crederem Evangelio nisi me moveret Ecclesie Auctoritas*; it seems Mr. *Hill* was deceived by this Maxim, which the Papists have adopted after they had corrupted it: For St. *Augustine* speaks only of the Ministry of the Church, in proposing the Gospels as written by Authors Divinely Inspired. This was well observed by *Melchior Camus*, lib. 2. c. 8. The same Ministry may be attributed to the Church, with relation to the Creeds that it proposes to us, as a faithful Abridgment of the Apostles Doctrine; but it is ridiculous to imagine, that we cannot produce an Act of Christian Faith, without knowing the general consent of all the Churches in professing the same Truths. It is not the consent of the Church, that makes a Doctrine either true or fundamental, the Nature of the Doctrine it self makes it so. A Divine, who has pored long upon Antiquity, may by an exact study and meditation, have informed himself of that consent; but this serves more for his particular Instruction, and for the confirmation of his own Theological Notions, concerning the distinction of Points fundamental, from Points that are not fundamental,

mental, than to confirm his Faith as he is a Christian.

Mr. *Hill* makes a strange use of the Maxim of *Vincentius Lyrinensis*, *quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus*, &c. That Priest was a *Semipelagian*, that is, he thought that a Man could believe by his own strength, and that afterward God gave him Grace to Execute his Good and Pious Resolutions. He introduced this Maxim merely in opposition to St. *Augustine*, who pretended to have found his Doctrine concerning Grace in St. *Paul's* Epistles; so that this Father was obliged, either to confute the Fathers, or to abandon his Doctrine, which he had caused to be Authorised by the Councils of *Africa*. After all, he confesses himself, that his Method could only be of use against new-born Heresies, such as he pretended St. *Augustine's* Doctrine to be. There is nothing more easie, says Mr. *Hill*, than for us to be informed of the Belief of Antiquity. I confess, we have their Symbols and Summaries of Faith, but Symbols have

no Authority, but as they are extracted from Scripture; this our Articles expressly tell us. And the Apostles Creed, as we call it, was never known in the *East*, till within these few Centuries. What I have before mentioned upon the Article of the Procession, *ab utroque*, shews that Mr. *Hill* has confounded what belongs to a Christian, with what belongs only to Divines.

However, Mr. *Hill* grants, that Faith cannot be produced in a Man's Heart, but as far as he himself is persuaded of the Truth of what he believes: But what he adds is extream rash, when he assures us, that he, who cannot be persuaded to receive the common and established Systems of the Faith of the Universal Church, upon the Authority of which, it always stood and stands to this day, or frames fundamental Principles upon his own private Opinion, does not belong to the Communion of Christ's Church, tho' he fancies his Notions to be Revealed in Scripture.

I grant what Mr. *Hill* lays down, as to those who advance fundamental Articles upon their private Opinion; he seems thereby to reject the Articles which the Papists have introduced into the Creed, framed by *Pius* the fourth; but he can ascribe no other Authority to Confessions of Faith or Symbols, but that which they borrow from their Conformity with Revelation the sum of which they contain. What he affirms, that the Catholick Church has always stood upon the Authority of Symbols, is a meer Vision; the Church indeed made an Abstract of Faith, for the use of *Catechumenes*, which we call the Creed; she taught it to those *Catechumenes*, as an Abridgment of what's Revealed; the Faith therefore of *Catechumenes*, has an immediate respect to Revelation; it must rely and be founded upon that, if it be true. In a word, Mr. *Hill*, either because he does not understand the matter, or out of a desire to censure and contradict the Bishop, explains his Opinion after a very odd manner, his Expressions do very much fa-

Aniadvertions on

vour the Church of *Rome*, and are far from being so exact as a Cenſor ought to be; he ſhews that he himſelf ſtands in need of a great deal of Indulgence and Chriſtian forbearance.

I wiſh from my Heart he may come to himſelf, conſider his fault, and repent. If he could but for a minute reflect in cool blood, upon his outrageous way of writing, and upon the Service that he has done to the Enemies of the Trinity, by endeavouring to ſacrifice to them one of the Defenders of it, for whoſe Talents he cannot but expreſs ſome eſteem, how averſe ſoever he may be to his Perſon, I am ſure he would be aſhamed of his Book. For notwithstanding all his Paſſion, I am willing to believe, that the Chriſtian Spirit is not altogether extinguished in him. I would have him conſider, that in the ſight of God, 'tis not he that receives, but he that does the Injury, that is Unhappy.

If I have chanced in this Paper, to ſay
any

Mr. Hill's Book.

any thing that ſeems too ſevere againſt him, and that approaches too near to his Angry Strain, I humbly deſire, that without more ado, you would ſtrike it out, as being writ againſt my intention. I would by no means be my ſelf guilty of a fault, which I ſincerely lament when I find it in others, and which would but cover me with the more confuſion, if I ſhould be found to praктиſe that which I condemn in another.

April 12.
1695.

I am, Sir, &c.

FINIS.

*Books lately Printed for Richard Chifwell at the
Rose and Crown in St. Paul's Church-Yard.*

A Discourse of the Pastoral Care. By the Right Reverend *GILBERT* Lord Bishop of *Sarum*.

—His Four Discourses delivered to the Clergy of the Dioceses of *Sarum*: Concerning, I. The Truth of the Christian Religion. II. The Divinity and Death of Christ. III. The Infallibility and Authority of the Church. IV. The Obligations to continue in the Communion of the Church. 8vo.

Memoirs of the most Reverend *THOMAS CRANMER*, Archbishop of *Canterbury*: Wherein the History of the Church, and the Reformation of it, during the Primacy of the said Archbishop, are greatly illustrated, and many singular Matters relating thereunto, now first published. In Three Books. Collected chiefly from Records, Registers, Authentick Letters, and other Original Manuscripts. By *John Strype*, M.A. Fol.

Origo Legum: Or, A Treatise of the Origine of Laws; and their Obliging Power; as also of their great Variety; and why some Laws are immutable, and some not, but may suffer change, or cease to be, or be suspended, or abrogated. In Seven Books. By *George Dawson*. Fol. 1694.

A brief Discourse concerning the Lawfulness of Worshipping God by the Common-Prayer; in Answer to a Book, intitled, [A Brief Discourse of the Unlawfulness of Common-Prayer-Worship.] By *John Williams*, D.D. 4to. 1654.

Dr. *John Conant's* Sermons. Publish'd by Dr. *Williams*, 1693. 8vo.
Rushworth's Historical Collections. The Third Part, in Two Volumes. Containing the Principal Matters which happened from the meeting of the Parliament, Nov. 3. 1640. to the end of the Year 1643. Wherein is a particular Account of the Rise and Progress of the Civil War, to that Period. Fol. 1692.

The History of the Troubles and Tryal of the Most Reverend Father in God *WILLIAM LAUD*, Lord Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*: Wrote by himself, during his Imprisonment in the Tower. To which is prefixed the Diary of his own Life, faithfully and entirely published from the Original Copy. And subjoyned a Supplement to the preceding History; the Arch-Bishop's Last Will: His Large Answer to the Lord *Sey's* Speech concerning Liturgies: His Annual Accounts of his Province deliver'd to the King

King, and some other Things relating to the History. Publish'd by *Henry Wharton*, Chaplain to Archbishop *Saunder*. And by his Grace's Command. Fol.

A Commentary on the First Book of *Moses*, called *Genesis*. By the Right Reverend Father in God, *Simon Lord Bishop of Ely*. 4to. 1691.

The Hearts-Ease; or, a Remedy against all Troubles. With a Consolatory Discourse, particularly directed to those who have lost their Friends and Relations. To which is added two Papers, printed in the time of the late Plague. By the same Author. 1666. (Reprinted.)

A Discourse Of the Government of the Thoughts. By *Geo. Tillotson*, Sub-Dean of *York*. The Second Edition. 8vo.

The Bishop of *Sarum's* Sermon at the Funeral of Archbishop *Tillotson*, Who dyed in *Cambrs*, Nov. 28. 1694.

A Sermon concerning Holy Resolution, Preached before the King at *Windsor*: Decemb: 30. 1694. By his Grace *Dn Thomas Tenison*, Lord Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*.

His Sermon at the Funeral of the Queen, in the Abbey-Church in *Westminster*: March 5. 1694.

Historia de Episcopis & Decanis Londinensibus necnon de Episcopis & Decanis Assensibus a prima Sedis utriusque fundatione ad Annum MDXL. Accessit Appendix instrumentorum quorundam insignium duplex. Autore Henrico Whartono, A. M. 8vo. 1695.

The Possibility and Expediency and Necessity of Divine Revelation. A Sermon preach'd at *St. Martin's in the Fields*, January 7. 1693. at the beginning of the Lecture for the ensuing Year, Founded by the Honourable *Rob. Boyle Esq;* by *John Williams*, D.D.

—The Certainty of Divine Revelation, being his Second Sermon preach'd at the said Lecture, Feb. 4. 1695.

—His Vindication of the Sermons of his Grace *John Archbishop of Canterbury*, concerning the Divinity and Incarnation of our Blessed Saviour, and of the Lord Bishop of *Worcester's* Sermon on the Mysteries of the Christian Faith, from the Exceptions of a late Socinian Book, intitled, [Considerations on the Explications of the Doctrine of the Trinity.] To which is annexed a Letter from the Lord Bishop of *Sarum*, to the Author of the said Vindication; on the same Subject. 1695. 4to.

An Essay on the Memory of the late QUEEN. By *Gilbert Bishop of Sarum*. 8vo.

Remarks of an University Man upon a late Book, falsely called, [A Vindication of the Primitive Fathers, against the Imputations of *Gilbert Lord Bishop of Sarum*, Written by *Mr. Hill of Kilmington*.] 4to. 1695.

The Characters of Divine Revelation. A Sermon Preached at *St. Martin's in the Fields*, March 4. 1693: Being the Third of the

the Lecture for the ensuing Year, founded by the Honourable Robert Boyle, Esquire. By *John Williams*, D. D.

Of Sincerity and constancy in the Faith and Profession of the True Religion, in several Sermons. By the most Reverend Dr. *John Tillotson*, late Lord Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*. Published from the Originals, by *Ralph Barker*. D. D. Chaplain to his Grace. 8vo. 1695.

Advertisement.

THere will be published several other Sermons and Discourses of the most Reverend Dr. *JOHN TILLOTSON*, late Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury*, by order of his Administratrix, faithfully transcribed from his own Papers, by Dr. *Ralph Barker* Chaplain to his Grace. Which are disposed of to *Richard Chiswell* and his Assigns. If any Person Print any others (except those published in the Author's Life-time) they are to be look'd upon as Spurious and False: And the Publishers will be proceeded against according to Law.
