

1072 1073

A
VINDICATION
OF
CHRIST'S DIVINITY:
BEING A
DEFENSE
OF SOME
QUERIES,
RELATING TO
Dr. CLARKE's
SCHEME of the H. TRINITY,
IN ANSWER TO A
CLERGY-MAN in the COUNTRY.

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

Ἐγώ εἰμι Ἰησοῦς ὃν σὺ διώκεις· σκληρόν σοι πρὸς
κέντρα λακτίζειν, *Act. ix. 5.*

CAMBRIDGE:

Printed for CORN. CROWNFIELD, Printer to the
University: And are to be Sold by JAMES KNAPTON,
and ROBERT KNAPLOCK, Booksellers in *St. Paul's*
Church-Yard, LONDON. MDCCXIX.



THE

PREFACE.

THE following Queries were drawn up, a few Years ago, at the Request of Friends; when I had not the least apprehension of their ever appearing in Print, as might be guess'd from the negligence of the Style and Composition. The Occasion of them was this. A Clergyman in the Country, well esteem'd in the Neighbourhood where He lived, had unhappily fallen in with Dr. Clarke's Notions of the Trinity; and began to espouse them in a more open and unguarded manner than the Doctor Himself had done. This gave some uneasiness to the Clergy in those Parts, who could not but be deeply concern'd to find a fundamental Article of Religion called in Question; and that too by one of their own Order, and whom They had a true Concern and Value for. It was presumed; that a sincere and ingenious Man

A

(as

The P R E F A C E.

(as He appeared to be) might, upon proper Application, be inclinable to alter his Opinion: And that the most probable way to bring Him to a Sense of his mistake, was to put Him to defend it, so long till He might perhaps see reason to believe that it was not defensible. With these Thoughts, I was prevailed upon to draw up a few Queries (the same that appear now, excepting only some slight verbal Alterations) and when I had done, gave them to a common Friend to convey to Him. I was the more inclined to it, for my own Instruction and Improvement, in so momentous and important an Article: Besides, that I had long been of Opinion, that no method could be more proper for the training up one's Mind to a true and sound Judgment of Things, than that of private Conference in Writing; exchanging Papers, making Answers, Replies, and Rejoinders, till an Argument should be exhausted on both Sides, and a Controversy at length brought to a Point. In that private way (if it can be private) a Man writes with Easiness and Freedom; is in no pain about any innocent Slips or Mistakes; is under little or no Temptation to persist obstinately in an Error (the Bane of all publick Controversy) but concern'd only to find out the Truth, which (on what Side soever it appears) is always Victory to every honest Mind.

I had

The P R E F A C E.

I had not long gone on with my Correspondent, before I found all my Measures broken, and my Hopes intirely frustrated. He had sent Me, in Manuscript, an Answer to my Queries; which Answer I received and read with due Care; promis'd Him immediately a Reply; and soon after prepared and finish'd it, and convey'd it safe to his Hands. Then it was, and not till then, that He discovered to Me what He had been doing; signifying, by Letter, how He had been over perswaded to commit his Answer, with my Queries, to the Press; that They had been there some time, and could not now be recalled; that I must follow Him thither, if I intended any thing farther; and must adapt my publick Defense to his publick Answer, now altered and improved, from what it had been in the Manuscript which had been sent me. This News surprized Me a little at the first; and sorry I was to find my Correspondent so extremely desirous of instructing Others, instead of taking the most prudent and considerate Method of informing Himself. As He had left Me no Choice, but either to follow Him to the Press, or to desist, I chose what I thought most proper at that Time; leaving Him to instruct the Publick as He pleased, designing my Self to keep out of Publick Controversy; or, at least, not designing the Contrary. But, at length, considering that Copies of my Defense were got abroad into several Hands, and

A 2

might

The P R E F A C E.

might perhaps, some time or other, steal into the Press without my Knowledge; and considering farther that this Controversy now began to grow Warm, and that it became every honest Man, according to the Measure of his Abilities, to bear his Testimony in so good a Cause; I thought it best to revise my Papers, to give them my last Hand, and to send Them abroad into the World; where They must stand or fall (as I desire They should) according as They are found to have more or less Truth or Weight in Them.

Dr. Clarke has lately publish'd a Second Edition of his Scripture-Doctrine: Where, I perceive, He has made several Additions and Alterations, but has neither retracted, nor defended those Parts, which Mr. Nelson's learned Friend had judiciously replied to, in his True Scripture-Doctrine continu'd. I hope, impartial Readers will take care to read One along with the Other.

One thing I must observe, for the Doctor's Honour, that in his new Edition He has left out these Words of his former Introduction.
“ *'Tis plain that every Person may reason-*
“ *ably agree to such Forms, whenever He can*
“ *in any Sense at all reconcile them with*
“ *Scripture. I hope, none hereafter will pre-*
“ *tend to make use of the Doctor's Authority,*
“ *for subscribing to Forms which They believe*

The P R E F A C E.

not according to the true and proper Sense of the Words, and the known intent of the Imposers, and Compilers. Such Prevarication is in it self a bad Thing, and would, in Time, have a very ill Influence on the Morals of a Nation: If either State-Oaths on one Hand, or Church-Subscriptions on the Other, once come to be made light of; and Subtilties be invented to defend or palliate such gross Insincerity; we may bid farewell to Principles, and Religion will be little else but disguis'd Atheism.

*The learned Doctor, in his Introduction, has inserted, by way of Note, a long Quotation out of Mr. Nelson's Life of Bishop Bull. He can hardly be presumed to intend any Parallel between Bishop Bull's Case and his own: And yet Readers may be apt so to take it, since the Doctor has not guarded against it, and since otherwise it will not be easy to make out the pertinence of it. The Doctor has undoubtedly some meaning in it, tho' I will not presume to guess what. He * observes, " That there is an exact account given, what Method that learned Writer (Bishop Bull) took to explain the Doctrine of Justification (viz. the very same and only Method which ought to be taken in explaining all other Doctrines whatsoever) how*

* *Introd. p. 25, 26.*

The P R E F A C E.

“ zealously He was accused by many Systema-
“ tical Divines, as departing from the Do-
“ctrine and Articles of the Church, in what
“ He had done; how learnedly and effectually
“ He defended Himself against all his Adver-
“saries; and how successful at length his Ex-
“plication was, it being after some Years
“ almost universally received. This account
is true, but defective; and may want a Sup-
plement for the Benefit of common Readers,
who may wish to know, what that excellent
Method of Bishop Bull’s was, by means of
which his Explication proved so successful,
and came at length to be almost universally
received. It was as follows.

I. In the first place, his way was to ex-
amine carefully into Scripture, more than into
the Nature and Reason of the Thing abstract-
edly consider’d. He pitch’d upon such Texts
as were pertinent, and close to the Point;
did not chuse Them according to the Sound
only, but their real Sense; which He ex-
plain’d justly and naturally, without any wrest-
ing or straining. He neither neglected nor dis-
sembled the utmost force of any Texts which
seem’d to make against Him; but proposed them
fairly, and answer’d them solidly; without
any artificial Elusions, or any subtle or sur-
prizing Glosses.

2. In

The P R E F A C E.

2. *In the next place, however cogent and forcible his reasonings from Scripture appeared to be, yet He modestly declined being confident of them, unless He could find them likewise supported by the general Verdict of the primitive Church; for which He always express'd a most religious Regard and Veneration: believing it easier for Himself to err in interpreting Scripture, than for the universal Church to have erred from the Beginning. To pass by many other Instances of his sincere and great Regard to Antiquity, I shall here mention one only. He * tells Dr. Tully, in the most serious and solemn manner imaginable, that if there could but be found any one Proposition, that He had maintain'd in all his Harmony, repugnant to the Doctrine of the Catholick and Primitive Church, He would immediately give up the Cause, sit down contentedly under the reproach of a Novelist, openly retract his Error or Heresy, make a solemn Recantation in the Face of the Christian World, and bind Himself to perpetual silence ever after. He knew very well what He said; being able to show, by an Historical Deduction, that his Doctrine had been the constant Doctrine of the Church of Christ, † down to the Days of Calvin, in the Sixteen Century.*

* Bull. Apolog. Contr. Tull. p. 7.

† Bull. Apol. Contr. Tull. p. 50, 51.

The P R E F A C E.

3. Besides this, He demonstrated, very clearly, that the most antient and valuable Confessions of the Reformed Churches Abroad were intirely in his Sentiments. He examin'd them with great Care and Exactness, and answer'd the contrary Pretences largely and solidly.

4. To compleat All, He vindicated his Doctrine farther, from the concurring Sentiments of our own most early, and most judicious Reformers: As also from the Articles, Catechism, Liturgy, and Homilies of the Church of England: And this with great accuracy and strength of Reason, without the mean Arts of Equivocation or Sophistry.

5. I may add, fifthly, that his manner of Writing was the most convincing, and most engaging imaginable: Acute, strong, and nervous; learned throughout; and sincere to a scrupulous Exactness, without artificial Colours or studied Disguises, which He utterly abhorr'd. The good and great Man breaths in every Line: A Reader, after a few Pages, may be tempted almost to throw off his Guard, and to resign Himself implicitly into so safe Hands. A Man thus qualified and accomplish'd, having true Judgment to take the right Side of a Question; and Learning, Ability, and Integrity to set it off to the greatest Advantage, could not fail of Success; especially
consider-

The P R E F A C E.

*considering that the most judicious and learned of our Clergy, and Those best affected to the Church of England (such as Dr. Hammond, &c.) had been in the same Sentiments before; and Bishop Bull's bitterest Adversaries were mostly Systematical Men (properly so called) and such as had been bred up (during the great Rebellion) in the Predestinarian and Antinomian Tenets, as Mr. * Nelson observes. There was another Circumstance which Mr. Nelson also takes † notice of; namely, his writing in Latin: Which showed his thorough Judgment of Men and Things. He would not write to the Vulgar and Unlearned (which is beginning at the wrong end, and doing nothing) but to the Learned and Judicious; knowing it to be the surest and the shortest way; and that, if the Point be gain'd with Them, the rest come in of Course; if not, all is to no purpose. This became a Man, who had a Cause that He could trust to; and confided only in the strength of his Reasons. By such laudable and ingenuous Methods, that excellent Man prevailed over his Adversaries; Truth over Error, Antiquity over Novelty, the Church of Christ over Calvin and his Disciples: If any Man else has such a Cause to defend as Bishop Bull had, and is able to manage it in such a Method, by showing that it stands upon the*

* Nelson's Life of Bull, pag. 98.

† Nelson's Life of Bull, pag. 94.

The P R E F A C E.

same immoveable Foundations of Scripture and Antiquity, confirm'd by the concurring Sense of the judicious part of Mankind; then He need not doubt but it will prevail and prosper, in any Protestant Country, as universally as the other did. But if several of those Circumstances, or the most considerable of them, be wanting; or if Circumstances be contrary, then it is as vain to expect the like Success, as it is to expect Miracles. It must not be forgot, that the same good and great Prelate, afterwards, by the same fair and honourable Methods, the same strength of Reason and profound Learning, gain'd as compleat a Victory over the Arians, in regard to the Question about the Faith of the Ante-Nicene Fathers: And his Determination, in that particular, was, and still is, among Men of the greatest Learning and Judgment, as universally submitted to as the other. His admirable Treatise (by which He being dead yet speaketh) remains unanswer'd to this Day; and will abide Victorious to the End. But enough of this.

*I am obliged to say something in Defence of my general Title. (A Vindication of Christ's Divinity) because, I find, Mr. Potter, since deceas'd, was rebuked by an * Anonymous Hand for such a Title. The pretence is, that our*

* *Apology for Dr. Clarke Pref.*

The P R E F A C E.

Adversaries do not disown Christ's Divinity, as the Title insinuates. But to what purpose is it for Them to contend about a Name, when They give up the Thing. It looks too like Mockery (though They are far from intending it) and cannot but remind us of, Hail King of the Jews. No body ever speaks of the Divinity of Moses, or of Magistrates, or of Angels, though called Gods in Scripture. If Christ be God, in the relative Sense only, why should we speak of His Divinity, more than of the Other? The Christian Church has all along used the word Divinity, in the strict and proper Sense: If we must change the Idea, let us change the Name too; and talk no more of Christ's Divinity, but of his Mediatorship only, or at most, Kingship. This will be the way to prevent Equivocation, keep up propriety of Language, and shut out false Ideas. I know no Divinity, but such as I have defended: The other, falsely so called, is really none. So much for the Title.

In the Work it self, I have endeavor'd to unravel Sophistry, detect Fallacies, and take off Disguises, in order to set the Controversy upon a clear Foot; allowing only for the Mysteriousness of the Subject. The Gentlemen of the New way have hitherto kept pretty much in generals, and avoided coming to the pinch of the Question. If they please to speak to the Point, and put the Cause up-

The P R E F A C E.

on a short Issue, as may easily be done, that is all that is desir'd. I doubt not but all Attempts of that kind will end (as they have ever done) in the clearing up of the Truth, the Disappointment of its Opposers, the Joy of good Men, and the Honour of our Blessed Lord; whose Divinity has been the Rock of Offence to the Disputers of this World, now for 1600 Years; always attack'd by some or other, in every Age, and always Triumphant. To Him, with the Father, and the Holy Ghost, Three Persons of the same divine Power, Substance, and Perfections, be all Honour and Glory, in all Churches of the Saints, now and for evermore.

T H E

THE CONTENTS.

Compare the following TEXTS.

I am the Lord, and there
is none else; There is
no God besides me, *Isa.*
45. 5.

Is there a God besides
me? Yea, there is no
God, I know not any, *Isa.*
44. 8.

I am God and there is
none like me; Before me
there was no God form'd,
neither shall there be after
me, *Isa.* 46. 9.

The Word was God,
Joh. 1. 1.

Thy Throne, O God,
Heb. 1. 8

Christ came, who is o-
ver all God blessed for ever,
Rom. 9. 5.

Who being in the Form
of God *Phil.* 2. 8.

Who being the Bright-
ness of his Glory, and the
express Image of his Per-
son. *Heb.* 1. 3.

QUERY I.

*Whether all other Beings, besides the one Supreme God, be
not excluded by the Texts of Isaiah (to which many
more might be added) and consequently, whether Christ
can be God at all, unless he be the same with the Su-
preme God? p. 2.*

QUERY II.

*Whether the Texts of the New Testament (in the second
Column) do not show that He (Christ) is not excluded,
and therefore must be the same God? p. 6.*

QUERY III.

*Whether the Word (God) in Scripture, can reasonably be
suppos'd to carry an ambiguous meaning, or be us'd in
a diffe*

The CONTENTS.

a different Sense, when applied to the Father and Son, in the same Scripture, and even in the same verse? (See Joh. 1. 1.) p. 47.

Q U E R Y IV.

Whether, supposing the Scripture-Notion of God to be no more than that of the Author and Governor of the Universe, or whatever it be, the admitting of Another to be Author and Governor of the Universe, be not admitting another God; contrary to the Texts before cited from Isaiah; and also to Isa. 42. 8.—48. 11: where he declares, He will not give his Glory to Another? p. 73.

Q U E R Y V.

Whether Dr. Clarke's pretence, that the Authority of Father and Son being One, tho' they are two distinct Beings; makes them not to be two Gods, As a King upon the Throne and his Son administering the Father's Government, are not two Kings; be not trifling and inconsistent? For, if the King's Son be not a King, he cannot truly be called King; if he is, then there are two Kings. So, if the Son be not God in the Scripture-Notion of God, he cannot truly be called God; and then how is the Doctor consistent with Scripture, or with Himself? But if the Son be truly God, there are two Gods upon the Doctor's Hypothesis, as plainly as that one and one are two: and so all the Texts of Isaiah cited above, besides others, stand full and clear against the Doctor's Notion. p. 79.

TEXTS, proving an Unity of divine Attributes in Father and Son, applied.

To the one God,

To the Son.

<p><i>Thou, even Thou only knowest the Hearts of all</i></p>	<p><i>He knew all Men &c. Job. 2. 24. Thou knowest all the</i></p>
--	--

The CONTENTS.

the Children of Men, *1. Kings* 8. 39.

I the Lord search the Heart; I try the Reins, *Jer.* 17. 10.

I am the first, and I am the last, and besides me there is no God, *Isa.* 44. 6.

I am A and Ω, the beginning and the end, *Rev.* 1. 8.

King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, *1. Tim.* 6. 15.

The mighty God, *Isa.* 10. 21.

Lord over all, *Rom.* 10. 12.

Things, *Joh.* 16. 30. which knowest the Hearts of all Men, *Acts* 1. 24.

I am he that searcheth the Reins and the Heart, *Rev.* 2. 3.

I am the first, and I am the last, *Rev.* 1. 17.

I am A and Ω, the beginning and the end, *Rev.* 22. 13.

Lord of Lords, and King of Kings, *Rev.* 17. 14—19. 16.

The mighty God, *Is.* 9. 6.

He is Lord of all, *Acts* 10. 36.

Over all God blessed, &c. *Rom.* 9. 5.

QUERY VI.

Whether the same Characteristicks, especially such eminent ones, can reasonably be understood of two distinct Beings, and of one Infinite and Independent, the other Dependent and Finite? p. 89.

QUERY VII.

Whether the Father's Omniscience and Eternity are not one and the same with the Son's being alike describ'd, and in the same phrases? p. 100.

QUERY VIII.

*Whether Eternity does not imply necessary Existence of the Son; which is inconsistent with the Doctor's Scheme? And whether the * Doctor hath not made an elusive,*
* Reply. p. 227.

equivocal

The CONTENTS.

equivocating Answer to the Objection, since the Son may be a necessary Emanation from the Father, by the Will and Power of the Father, without any Contradiction? Will is one thing, and Arbitrary Will another.
p. 121.

Q U E R Y IX.

Whether the divine Attributes, Omniscience, Ubiquity, &c. those individual Attributes, can be communicated without the divine Essence, from which they are inseparable? p. 164.

Q U E R Y X.

*Whether, if they (the Attributes belonging to the Son) be not Individually the same, they can be any thing more than faint Resemblances of them, differing from them as Finite from Infinite; and then in what Sense, or with what Truth can the Doctor pretend that * all divine Powers, except absolute Supremacy and Independency, are communicated to the Son? And whether every Being, besides the one Supreme Being, must not necessarily be a Creature and Finite; and whether all divine Powers can be communicated to a Creature, Infinite Perfection to a Finite Being?* p. 174.

Q U E R Y XI.

Whether if the Doctor means by divine Powers, Powers given by God (in the same Sense as Angelical Powers are divine Powers) only in a higher Degree than are given to other Beings; it be not equivocating and saying nothing: Nothing that can come up to the Sense of those Texts before cited, † or to these following? p. 181.

Applied.

<p><i>To the one God.</i> Thou, even Thou, art Lord alone; Thou hast</p>	<p><i>To God the Son.</i> All things were made by him, <i>Joh. 1. 3.</i> By him</p>
--	---

* Scripture Doctr. p. 298.

† Query 6, p. 89,

were

The CONTENTS.

<p>made Heaven, the Heaven of Heavens with all their Host, the Earth, and all things that are therein &c.</p>	<p>were all things Created; He is before all things and by him all things Consist, Co- los. 1. 16. 17.</p>
---	--

Neb. 9. 6.

In the Beginning, God
Created the Heavens and
the Earth, *Gen. 1. 1.*

Thou, Lord, in the Be-
ginning, hast laid the Foun-
dation of the Earth; and
the Heavens are the Work
of thy Hands, *Heb. 1. 10.*

Q U E R Y XII.

*Whether the Creator of all Things was not himself Uncreat-
ed; and therefore could not be ἐξ ὧν ὄντων; made
out of nothing? p. 194.*

Q U E R Y XIII.

*Whether there can be any Middle between being made out
of nothing, and out of something; that is, between being
out of nothing, and out of the Father's Substance; be-
tween being essentially God, and being a Creature?
Whether, consequently, the Son must not be either essen-
tially God, or else a Creature? p. 202.*

Q U E R Y XIV.

*Whether Dr. Clarke, who every where denies the Consub-
stantiality of the Son as absurd and contradictory, does
not, of Consequence, affirm the Son to be a Creature
ἐξ ὧν ὄντων, and so fall under his own censure, and
is Self-condemn'd? p. 212.*

Q U E R Y XV.

*Whether he also must not, of Consequence, affirm of the
Son, that there was a time when he was not, since
God must exist before the Creature; and therefore is
again Self-condemn'd (See prop. 16. Scrip. Doctr.)*

The CONTENTS.

*And whether he does not equivocate in saying * elsewhere that the second Person has been always with the first; and that there has been no time, when he was not so: And lastly, whether it be not a vain and weak attempt to pretend to any middle way between the Orthodox and the Arians; or to carry the Son's Divinity the least higher than they did, without taking in the Consubstantiality? p. 214.*

Divine Worship due

<i>To the one God.</i>	<i>To Christ.</i>
Thou shalt have no other Gods before me, <i>Exod.</i> 20. 3.	They worship'd him, <i>Luk.</i> 24. 25.
Thou shalt Worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve, <i>Matt.</i> 4. 10.	Let all the Angels of God worship him, <i>Heb.</i> 1. 6.
	That all Men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father, <i>Joh.</i> 5. 23.

Q U E R Y XVI.

Whether by these (of the first Column) and the like Texts, Adoration and Worship be not so appropriated to the one God, as to belong to him only? p. 229.

Q U E R Y XVII.

Whether, notwithstanding, Worship and Adoration be not equally due to Christ; and consequently, whether it must not follow that he is the one God, and not (as the Arians suppose) a distinct inferior Being? p. 252.

Q U E R Y XVIII.

Whether Worship and Adoration, both from Men and Angels, was not due to him, long before the Commencing of his

** Script. Doctr. p. 438.*

Medis

The CONTENTS

Mediatorial Kingdom, as he was their Creator and Preserver (See Col. 1. 16, 17.) And whether that be not the same Title to Adoration which God the Father hath, as Author and Governor of the Universe, upon the Doctor's own Principles? p. 267.

Q U E R Y XIX.

Whether the Doctor hath not given a very partial Account of Joh. 5. 23. founding the Honour due to the Son, on this only, that the Father hath committed all Judgment to the Son; when the true Reason assign'd by our Saviour, and illustrated by several Instances, is, that the Son doth the same things that the Father doth, hath the same Power and Authority of doing what he will; and therefore has a Title to as great Honour, Reverence, and Regard, as the Father himself hath? And it is no Objection to this, that the Son is there said to do nothing of himself, or to have all given Him by the Father; since it is own'd that the Father is the Fountain of all, from whom the Son derives, in an ineffable manner, his Essence and Powers, so as to be one with him. p. 278.

Q U E R Y. XX.

Whether the Doctor need have cited 300 Texts, wide of the purpose, to prove what no Body denies, namely a Subordination, in some Sense, of the Son to the Father; could He have found but one plain Text against his Eternity or Consubstantiality, the points in Question? p. 298.

Q U E R Y XXI.

Whether he be not forc'd to supply his want of Scripture-proof by very strain'd and remote Inferences, and very uncertain Reasonings from the Nature of a thing, confessedly, Obscure and above Comprehension; and yet not more so than God's Eternity, Ubiquity, Prescience, or other Attributes, which yet we are obliged to acknowledge for certain Truths? p. 303.

The CONTENTS.

QUERY XXII.

Whether his (the Doctors) whole performance, whenever He differs from us, be any thing more than a Repetition of this Assertion, that Being and Person are the same, or that there is no Medium between Tritheism and Sabellianism? which is removing the Cause from Scripture to natural Reason; not very Consistently with the Title of his Book. p. 326.

QUERY XXIII.

Whether the Doctor's Notion of the Trinity be more clear and intelligible than the other?

The Difficulty in the Conception of the Trinity is, how Three Persons can be One God.

Does the Doctor deny that every One of the Persons, singly, is God? No: Does he deny that God is One? No: how then are Three One

Does one and the same Authority, exercised by all, make them one, numerically or individually one and the same God? That is hard to conceive how three distinct Beings, according to the Doctor's Scheme, can be individually one God, that is, three Persons one Person.

If therefore one God necessarily signifies but one Person, the Consequence is irresistible; either that the Father is that one Person, and none else, which is downright Sabellianism; or that the three Persons are three Gods.

Thus the Doctor's Scheme is liable to the same Difficulties with the other.

There is indeed one easy way of coming off, and that is, by saying that the Son and Holy-Spirit are neither of them God, in the Scripture-sense of the Word. But this is cutting the Knot, instead of untying it; and is in effect to say, they are not set forth as divine Persons in Scripture.

Does the Communication of divine Powers and Attributes from Father, to Son and Holy Spirit, make them one God, the Divinity of the two latter being the Father's Divinity?

The CONTENTS.

Divinity? Yet the same difficulty recurs: For either the Son and Holy-Ghost have distinct Attributes, and a distinct Divinity of their own, or they have not: If they have, they are (upon the Doctor's Principles) distinct Gods from the Father, and as much as Finite from Infinite, Creature from Creator; and then how are they one? If they have not, then, since they have no other Divinity, but that individual Divinity and those Attributes which are inseparable from the Father's Essence, they can have no distinct Essence from the Father's; and so (according to the Doctor) will be one and the same Person, that is, will be Names only.

Q. Whether this be not as unintelligible as the Orthodox Notion of the Trinity, and liable to the like Difficulties: A communication of Divine Powers and Attributes, without the Substance, being as hard to conceive, nay, much harder than a communication of Both together? p. 343.

Q U E R Y XXIV.

Whether Gal. 4. 8. may not be enough to determine the dispute betwixt us; since it obliged the Doctor to confess that Christ is * by Nature truly God, as truly as Man is by Nature truly Man.

He equivocates, there, indeed, as Usual. For, he will have it to signify, that Christ is God by Nature, only as having by that Nature which he derives from the Father, true Divine Power and Dominion: that is, he is truly God by Nature, as having a Nature distinct from and inferior to God's, wanting † the most Essential Character of God, Self-existence. What is this but trifling with Words, and playing fast and loose? p. 370.

Q U E R Y XXV.

Whether it be not clear from all the genuine remains of Antiquity, that the Catholick Church before the Council of Nice, and even from the beginning, did believe the Eternity and Consubstantiality of the Son; if either the

* Reply p. 81.

† Reply p. 92.

THE CONTENTS.

eldest Creeds, as interpreted by those that recite them; or the Testimonies of the earliest Writers, or the publick Censures pass'd upon Hereticks, or particular passages of the Antientest Fathers, can amount to a proof of a thing of this Nature? p. 378.

QUERY XXVI.

*Whether the Doctor did not equivocate or prevaricate strangely in saying * The Generality of Writers before the Council of Nice, were, in the whole, clearly on his side: when it is manifest, they were, in the general, no farther on his side, than the allowing a Subordination amounts to; no further than our own Church is on his side, while in the main points of difference, the Eternity and Consubstantiality, they are clearly against him? That is, they were on his side, so far as we acknowledge him to be right, but no farther. p. 389.*

QUERY XXVII.

Whether the Learned Doctor may not reasonably be suppos'd to say, the Fathers are on his side with the same Meaning and Reserve as he pretends our Church-Forms to favour him; that is, provided he may interpret as he pleases, and make them speak his Sense, however Contradictory to their own: And whether the true Reason why he does not care to admit the Testimonies of the Fathers as Proofs, may not be, because they are against him? p. 422.

QUERY XXVIII.

Whether it be at all probable, that the primitive Church should mistake in so material a Point as this is; or that the whole Stream of Christian Writers should mistake in telling us what the Sense of the Church was; and whether such a Cloud of Witnesses can be set aside without weakening the only Proof we have of the Canon of Scripture, and the Integrity of the Sacred Text? p. 456.

* Answer to Dr. Wells pag. 28.

QUERY

The CONTENTS.

QUERY XXIX.

Whether private Reasoning, in a matter above our Comprehension, be a safer Rule to go by, than the general Sense and Judgment of the primitive Church, in the first 300 Years; or, supposing it doubtful what the Sense of the Church was within that time, whether what was determin'd by a Council of 300 Bishops soon after, with the greatest Care and Deliberation, and has satisfied Men of the greatest Sense, Piety and Learning, all over the Christian World, for 1400 Years since, may not satisfy wise and good Men now? p. 460.

QUERY XXX.

Whether, supposing the Case doubtful, it be not a wise Man's part to take the safer Side; rather to think too highly, than too meanly of our Blessed Saviour; rather to pay a modest deference to the Judgment of the Antient and Modern Church, than to lean to one's own Understanding? p. 475.

QUERY XXXI.

Whether any thing less than clear and evident Demonstration, on the side of Arianism, ought to move a wise and good Man, against so great Appearances of Truth, on the side of Orthodoxy, from Scripture, Reasons and Antiquity: And whether we may not wait long before we find such Demonstration? p. 481.

ERRATA.

ERRATA.

Pag.	Lin.	Read.
10	1	not. <i>Irenæus.</i>
17	15	not. <i>ἡμπίχεται.</i>
27	1	<i>Gregories.</i>
30	4	not. p. 123. Ox. Ed.
	ult.	not. Patient.
46	1	perplex.
54	5	not. <i>Credendus.</i>
59	21	expressly.
86	4	not. <i>γεννητῶν</i>
128	16	delete comma after <i>Marinus.</i>
183	8	not. <i>τῶν.</i>
293	11	elaborately
329	2	not. <i>ἀγίας</i>
363	24	<i>τὴν</i>
430	7	not. <i>ἀπ' αὐτῶν</i>
431		not. <i>εἰπὼν</i>

A
D E F E N S E
O F S O M E
Q U E R I E S

R E L A T I N G T O

Dr. C L A R K E's

S C H E M E of the H. T R I N I T Y:

I N A N S W E R T O A

C L E R G Y - M A N in the C O U N T R Y.

Compare the following T E X T S.

*I am the Lord, and
there is none else ;
There is no God be-
sides me, Isa. 45. 5.*

*Is there a God be-
sides me? Yea, There
is no God, I know not
any, H. 44. 8.*

*I am God and there
is none like me ; Be-
fore me there was no
God form'd, neither
shall there be after
me, H. 46. 9.*

*The Word was God,
Joh. 1. 1..*

*Thy Throne, O God,
Heb. 1. 8.*

*Christ came, who is
over all God blessed
for ever, Rom. 9. 5.*

*Who being in the
Form of God, Phil. 2. 6.*

*Who being the
Brightness of his Glo-
ry, and the express
Image of his Person,
Heb. 1. 3.*

B

Q U E R Y

Q U E R Y I.

Whether all other Beings, besides the one Supreme God, be not excluded by the Texts of Isaiah, (to which many more might be added) and consequently, whether Christ can be God at all, unless He be the same with the Supreme God?

THE Sum of your Answer to this Query, is, that *the Texts cited from Isaiah, in the first Column, are spoken of one Person only, p. 34. The Person of the Father, p. 39. And therefore all other Persons, or Beings (which you make equivalent) how divine soever, are necessarily excluded; and by Consequence, our Lord Jesus Christ is as much excluded from being the one Supreme God, as from being the Person of the Father, p. 40.*

You spend some Pages, in endeavouring to show, that the *Person* of the Father *only* is the Supreme God; and that the Person of the Son is not Supreme God. But what does this signify, except it be to lead your Reader off from the Point which it concern'd you to speak to? Instead of answering the Difficulty propos'd, which was the part of a Respondent, you chuse to slip it over, and endeavor to put me upon the Defensive; which is by no means Fair. Your Business was to ward off the Consequence which I had press'd you with, namely, this: That if the Son be at all excluded by those
 Texts

Texts in the first Column, He is altogether excluded; and is no God at all. He cannot, upon your Principles, be the same God, because He is not the same Person: He cannot be another God, because excluded by those Texts. If therefore He be neither the same God, nor another God; it must follow that He is no God. This is the difficulty which I apprehend to lie against your Scheme; and which you have not sufficiently attended to.

I shall therefore charge it upon you once again, and leave you to get clear of it, at leisure.

I shall take it for granted, that the design and purport of those Texts, cited from *Isaiah*, was the same with that of the *first Commandment*: Namely, to draw the People off from placing any Trust, Hope, or Reliance in any but God, to direct them to the only proper object of Worship, in opposition to all Things or Persons, besides the one Supreme God. “Neither *Baal* nor *Ashtaroth*, nor any that are
“esteemed Gods by the Nations, are strictly and
“properly such. Neither Princes nor Magistrates,
“however called Gods in a loose Metaphorical
“Sense, are strictly or properly such. No religious Service, no Worship, no Sacrifice is due
“to any of them: I only am God, in a just
“Sense; And therefore I demand your Homage
“and Adoration. Now, upon your *Hypothesis*, we must add; that even the *Son of God* Himself, however *divine* He may be thought, is
B 2 really

really no God at all, in any just and proper Sense. He is no more than a *nominal* God, and stands excluded with the rest: All Worship of Him, and Reliance upon Him, will be *Idolatry* as much as the Worship of Angels, or Men, or of the Gods of the Heathen would be. God the Father He is God, and He only; and *Him only shalt thou serve*. This I take to be a clear Consequence from your Principles, and unavoidable.

You do, indeed, attempt to evade it by supposing that, when the Father saith *there is no God besides me*, the meaning only is, that there is no *Supreme* God besides me. But will you please to consider.

1. That you have not the least Ground or Reason for putting this Sense upon the Text. It is not said there is no other *Supreme* God besides me; but absolutely, *no Other*.

2. If this were all the meaning, then *Baal* or *Ashtaroth*, or any of the Gods of the Nations, might be look'd upon as *inferior Deities*, and be served with a subordinate Worship, notwithstanding any thing these Texts say, without any Peril of Idolatry, or any Breach of the first Commandment. *Solomon* might Sacrifice to *Ashtaroth*, and *Milcom*, to *Chemosh* and *Moloch*, provided He did but serve the *God of Israel* with *Sovereign* Worship, acknowledging Him *Supreme*. And this might furnish the *Samaritans* with a very plausible excuse, even from the Law it self, for *serving their own*
Gods

Gods in Subordination to the one *Supreme* God; since God had not forbidden it.

3. You may please to consider farther, that there was never any great Danger of either *Jew* or *Gentile* falling into the Belief of many *Supreme* Gods; or into the Worship of more than one as *Supreme*. That is a Notion too silly to have ever prevailed much, even in the ignorant Pagan World. What was most to be guarded against, was the Worship of *inferior* Deities, besides, or in Subordination to, one *Supreme*. It cannot therefore reasonably be imagined that those Texts are to bear only such a Sense, as leaves room for the Worship of *inferior* Divinities.

The Sum then is, that by the Texts of the Old Testament, it is not meant only that there is no other *Supreme* God; but absolutely *no Other*: And therefore our blessed Lord must either be included and comprehended in the one Supreme God of *Israel*, or be entirely excluded with the other pretended, or nominal, Deities. I shall close this Argument with St. *Austin's* Words to *Maximin*, the *Arian* Bishop, who recurr'd to the same Solution of the Difficulty which you hope to Shelter your self in.

“ * Repeat it ever so often, that the Father

* Clama quantum vis, Pater est Major, Filius Minor, respondetur tibi; duo tamen sunt Major & Minor. Nec dictum est Dominus Deus tuus *Major* Dominus unus est: sed dictum est Dominus Deus tuus Dominus unus est. Neque dictum est, non est alius *aqualis* mihi, sed dictum est, non est alius *præter* me. Aut ergo Confiteri Patrem & Filium unum esse Dominum Deum, aut aperte nega Dominum Deum esse Christum. *August.* l. 2. c. 23. p. 727.

“ is *greater*, the Son *less*. We shall answer
 “ you as often, that the *greater* and the *less*
 “ make *Two*. And it is not said, *Thy* greater
 “ *Lord God is one Lord*: But the Words are:
 “ *The Lord thy God is one Lord*: Nor is it
 “ said, *There is none other Equal to me*, but
 “ the Words are, *There is none other Besides*
 “ *me*. Either therefore acknowledge that Fa-
 “ ther and Son are one Lord God; or in plain
 “ Terms deny that Christ is Lord God at all.
 This is the difficulty which I want to see
 clear’d. You produce Texts to show that the
 Father *singly* is the Supreme God, and that
 Christ is excluded from being the Supreme God:
 But I insist upon it, that you misunderstand those
 Texts; because the Interpretation you give of
 them, is not reconcilable with other Texts;
 and because it leads to such Absurdities as are
 too shocking even for your self to admit. In
 short; either you prove too much, or you
 prove nothing at all.

Q U E R Y II.

*Whether the Texts of the New Testament (in
 the second Column) do not show that He
 (Christ) is not excluded, and therefore must
 be the same God?*

THE Texts cited, if well considered, taking
 in what goes before or after; are enough
 to show that Christ is not excluded among the
nominal

nominal Gods, who have no Claim or Title to our Service, Homage, or Adoration. He is God before the World was, *God over all blessed forever*, Maker of the World, and worship'd by the Angels; and therefore certainly He is not excluded among the *nominal* Gods whom to worship were Idolatry. But since all are excluded, as hath been before shown, except the one Supreme God, it is very manifest that He is the same with the one Supreme God. Not the same *Person* with the *Father*, as you groundlessly object to us, but *Another* Person in the same Godhead; and therefore the Supreme God is more Persons than one. You argue, p. 40. that *if Christ be God at all, it unavoidably follows that He cannot be the same individual God with the supreme God, the Father*. By *individual God*, you plainly mean the same *individual divine Person*, which is only playing upon a Word, mistaking our Sense, and fighting with your own Shadow. Who pretends that the Son is the *same Person* with the Father? All we assert is, that He is the same Supreme God; that is, partaker of the same undivided Godhead. It will be proper here briefly to consider the Texts, by which you attempt to prove, that the Son is excluded from being the one Supreme God: only let me remind you, once again, that you forget the part you was to bear. Your Business was not to *oppose*, but to *respond*: not to raise Objections against our Scheme; but to answer those

which were brought against your own. You observe * from *John* 8. 54. *Matt.* 22. 31, 32. and *Acts* 3. 13. that God the Father was the God of the *Jews*, the God of *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*. Very right. But how does it appear that the Son was not? Could you have brought ever a Text to prove, that God the Son was not God of *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*; I must then have own'd that you had argued pertinently.

You next cite, *Job.* 17. 3. *1 Cor.* 8. 6. *Eph.* 4. 6. to prove that the Father is sometimes stiled the *only true* God, which is all that they prove. But you have not shown that He is so called in opposition to the Son, or exclusive of Him. It may be meant in opposition to Idols only, as all Antiquity has thought; or it may signify that the Father is *primarily*, not *exclusively*, the only true God, as the first Person of the blessed Trinity, the Root and Fountain of the other Two. You observe † that *in these and many other Places, the one God is the Person of the Father, in Contradistinction to the Person of the Son*. It is very certain that the Person of the Father is there distinguish'd from the Person of the Son; because they are distinctly named: And you may make what use you please of the Observation, against the *Sabellians*; who make but one Person of two. But what other use you can be able to make of it, I see not; unless you can prove this *negative* Proposition, that

no sufficient reason can be assign'd for stiling the Father the *only* God, without supposing, that the Son is excluded. *Novatian's* Remark upon one of your Texts, *Job. 17. 3. (Thee, the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent)* may deserve your Notice. * He applies the Title of the *only true God* to both, since they are join'd together in the same Sentence, and eternal Life is made to depend upon the knowing of one, as much as of the other. He did not see that peculiar Force of the exclusive Term, (*only*) which you insist so much upon. He knew better; being well acquainted with the Language, and the Doctrine of the Christian Church. His Construction, to speak modestly, is at least as plausible as yours. If you can find no plainer or clearer Texts against us, you'll not be able to help your Cause. As to *1 Cor. 8. 6.* All that can be reasonably gathered from it, is, that the Father is there *emphatically* stiled *one God*; but without design to exclude the Son from being God also: as the Son is *emphatically* stiled *one Lord*; but without design to exclude the *Father* from being Lord also. Reasons may be assign'd for the *Emphasis* in both Cases; which are too obvious to need reciting. One Thing you may please to observe; that the Discourse there,

* Si nolisset se etiam Deum Intelligi, cur addidit, & quem misisti Jesum Christum, nisi quoniam & Deum accipi voluit: *Novat. Trin. c. 24.*

See the same Argument illustrated and improved by the great Athanasius: *Orat. 3. p. 558. Vol. 1. Edit. Bened.*

v. 4, 5. is about *Idols*, and *nominal* Gods and Lords, which have no claim or title to religious Worship. *These* the Father and Son are both equally distinguished from: which may insinuate, at least, to us; That the Texts of the Old or New Testament declaring the Unity and excluding others, do not exclude the Son, *by whom are all Things*: So that here again you have unfortunately quoted a Passage, which instead of making for you, seems rather against you. You have another, which is *Eph. 4. 6. One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.* A famous Passage, which has generally been understood by the * Antients of the whole Trinity. *Above all* as Father, *through all*, by the Word, and *in all* by the Holy Ghost. However that be, this is certain, that the Father may be reasonably called the *one*, or *only*, God, without the least Diminution of the Son's *real* Divinity: a fuller Account of which Matter you may please to see in Dr. *Fiddes's* Body of Divinity, Vol. I. p. 383, &c. As to the remaining Texts cited by you, some are meant of Christ as *Man*, or as *Mediator*: And those which certainly respect him in a higher Capacity, may be accounted for on this Principle, that we reserve, with the Antients, a *Priority of Order* to the Father, the *First* of the Blessed Three.

* *Irenæus* l. 5. c. 18. p. 315. Ed. Bened. *Hippolytus* Contr. Noet. c. 14. p. 16. Fabric. Ed. *Athanasius* Ep. ad Serap. *Marius Victorin.* B. P. Tom. 4. p. 258. *Hieronym.* Tom. 4. p. 1. p. 362. Ed. Bened.

This may serve for a general Key to explain the Texts mention'd, or others of like import. I cannot, in this place, descend to Particulars, without running too far into the *Defensive*; and leading the Reader off from what we began with. Had you pleas'd to observe the rules of strict method in dispute, you should not here have brought Texts to ballance mine: but should have reserved them for another place. All you had to do, was to examine the Texts I had set down in the second Column; and to give such a Sense of them as might comport with your own *Hypothesis*, or might be unserviceable to mine. You should have shown that *Job. 1. 1. Heb. 1. 8. and Rom. 9. 5.* may fairly be understood of a *nominal* God only; one that stands excluded, by the Texts of the first Column, from all Pretence, or Title, to religious Homage and Adoration: For, as I have before observed, He must either be entirely excluded, or not at all: and if He be not excluded, He is comprehended in the one Supreme God, and is one with Him: or, at least, you should have set before the Reader your Interpretation of those Texts, and have shown it to be consistent with the Texts of *Isaiah*. For example, take *Job. 1. 1.*

“ *In the Beginning was the WORD, and*
 “ *the WORD was with the ONE SUPREME*
 “ *GOD, and the WORD was ANOTHER*
 “ *GOD inferior to Him, a CREATURE of the*
 “ *GREAT*

“ GREAT GOD: All Things were CREATED by this CREATURE, &c.

This Interpretation, which is really yours, as shall be shown in the Sequel, is what you should have fairly own'd, and reconciled, if possible, with the Texts of *Isaiah*, (purposely design'd to exclude all *inferior*, as well as *co-ordinate* Gods) and particularly with *Isaiah* 46. 9. *Before me there was no God form'd, neither shall there be AFTER ME*: Words very full and expressive against any *Creature-Gods*. But, instead of this, you tell us, God could not be *with Himself*, as if any of us said, or thought, that was St. *John's* meaning. Thus you industriously run from the Point, misrepresent our Sense, and artfully conceal your own. In this slight manner, you pass over the three first Texts already mention'd; but you think you have some Advantage of the *Querist*, in respect of *Phil.* 2. 6. and *Heb.* 1. 3. and not content to say, that they come not up to the point; you are very positive, that *they prove the direct contrary to that for which they are alledg'd*; and express your wonder that *they should be offer'd*. Whether you really wonder at a Thing, which no Man who is at all acquainted with Books and Learning can wonder at; or whether only you affect that way of talking, I determine not; but proceed to consider what you have to offer against my Sense of the two Texts.

Upon

Upon *Phil. 2. 6.* you press me with the Authority of *Novatian*; whom, I do assure you, I very much respect, as I do all the primitive Writers. As to *Novatian's* Interpretation of *Phil. 2. 6* it shall be consider'd presently; only, in the first place, let me observe to you, that as to the main of my Argument, built upon that and other Texts, He was certainly on my Side. He * cites *Isa. 45. 5.* and understands it of God the Father; not so as to exclude the Son from being comprehended in the *one God*, but in opposition to false Gods only. He proves the Divinity of Christ from his receiving Worship of the Church, and his being every where present, † besides many other Topicks; and makes Him ‡ *Consubstantial* with God the Father. This is as much as I mean by his being *one* with the *Supreme God*; and therefore I have nothing to fear from this Writer, who agrees so well with me in the main, and cannot be brought to bear Evidence against me, unless, at the same time, He be found to contradict Himself. This being

* Ego Deus, & non est præter me. Qui per eundem Prophetam refert: Quoniam majestatem meam non dabo alteri, ut omnes cum suis figmentis Ethnicos excludat & Hæreticos. C. 3. p. 708. See also the Citation above p. 9.

† Si Homo tantummodo Christus, quomodo adest ubique invocatus, cum hæc hominis natura non sit, sed Dei, ut adesse omni loco possit? C. 14. p. 715.

‡ Unus Deus ostenditur verus & æternus Pater, a quo solo hæc vis Divinitatis emissa etiam in Filium tradita & directæ rursùm per *Substantiæ Communionem* ad Patrem revolvitur. Father is here styled emphatically the one God, but still comprehending, not excluding the Son, consubstantial with Him. Ch. 31. p. 730.

premis'd,

premis'd, let us now see what He says to the Text above mention'd, *Phil. 2. 6. He saith of the Son* (I use your own Words, p. 35.) *that tho' He was in the Form of God, yet He never compared Himself with God his Father.* You have translated the last Words as if they had run thus; *Deo, patri suo.* The Words are, *Nunquam se Deo Patri aut comparavit, aut contulit.* Never compared Himself with God the Father. The Reason follows, *Memor se esse ex suo Patre: Remembring He was from his Father:* That is, that He was begotten, and not unbegotten. He never pretended to an equality with the Father, in respect of his *Original*, knowing Himself to be *second* only in Order, not the *first* Person of the ever Blessed Trinity. You may see the like Expressions in * *Hilary* and † *Phæbadius*; who can neither of them be suspected of *Arianizing* in that Point. You afterwards cite some other Expressions of *Novatian*, particularly this: *Duo æquales inventi duos Deos merito reddidissent.* Which you might have render'd thus: *Had they both been equal* (in respect of *Original*, both unbegotten) *They had undoubtedly been two Gods.*

See the ‡ whole Passage as it lies in the Au-

* *Hilary Trin. l. 3. c. 4. p. 816. Ed. Bened.*

† *Phæbzd. p. 304.*

‡ Si enim natus non fuisset, innatus comparatus cum eo qui esset innatus, æquatione in utroque ostensa, duos faceret innatos, & ideo duos faceret Deos. Si non genitus esset, collatus cum eo (qui) genitus non esset & æquales inventi, duos Deos merito reddidissent.

thor himself, and not maim'd and mutilated as you quote it, from Dr. *Clarke*. There is nothing more in it than this, that Father and Son are not two Gods, because They are not both *un-originated*: which is the common Answer made by the Catholicks to the charge of *Tritheism*; not only before, but after the *Nicene Council*; as might be made appear by a Cloud of Witnesses, were it needful. What you are pleas'd to call *a most strong Testimony against an absolute Coequality* (meaning this Passage of *Novatian*) is, if rightly understood, and compared with what goes before and after, a most strong Testimony of such a *Coequality* as we contend for. And therefore Dr. *Whitby*, having formerly cited the whole Paragraph as a full and clear Testimony of the Son's *real* Divinity, concludes thus. The Author, says He, in this Passage, “ * does in the plainest words imaginable, declare that Christ is God, *equal* to “ the Father in every respect, excepting only “ that He is God *of God*. The Doctor indeed has since chang'd his Mind; and now talks as confidently the other way, upon † this very Passage. Whether He was more likely to see clearly then, or since, I leave to others to

dissent non geniti; atque ideo duos Christus reddidisset Deos, si sine Origine esset, ut Pater, inventus, & ipse principium omnium, ut Pater, duo faciens principia, duos ostendisset nobis consequenter & Deos. C. 31.

* Ubi verbis disertissimis ostendit (Novatianus) Christum esse Deum, Patri æqualem paremque, eo tantummodo excepto, quod sit Deus de Deo. *Whitb. Tract. de Ver. Chr. Deitate, p. 67.*

† *Whitby, disquisitio Modest. p. 164.*

judge

judge, who will be at the Pains to compare his former with some of his latter Writings.

You have given us the Sum of the 31st Chapter of *Novatian*, as it stands collected by the Learned Dr. Clarke in his excellent *Answer to Mr. Nelson's Friend*. You may next please to consult the no less excellent Reply, by Mr. *Nelson's Friend*, p. 170, &c. where you may probably meet with Satisfaction.

But to return to our Text, *Phil. 2. 6.* The words, *ἐχ' Ἀπράσμιον ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ*, you translate; *He did not affect, did not claim, did not assume, take upon Him, or eagerly desire, to be Honoured as God.* Afterwards, p. 36. *He never thought fit to claim to Himself Divinity, or more literally, you say, He never thought the Divinity a Thing to be so catch'd at by Him, as to equal Himself with God his Father.* This you give both as *Novatian's* Sense, and as the *true Sense* of the Text. And you endeavor to confirm it from the Authorities of *Grotius, Tillotson, Whitby, and Clarke*; who, by the way, are very different from each other in their Interpretations of this Place, hardly two of Them agreeing together. * However not to stand upon Niceties, I may yield to you your own Interpretation of this Passage, *did not affect to be Honoured as God*; For the stress of the Cause does not seem

* I am persuaded that the Words may very justly be translated *He did not very highly value, did not insist upon, his equality with God, but condescended, &c.*

so much to lie in the Interpretation of those Words, as of the Words foregoing, *viz.* ὅς ἐν μορφῇ Θεῆς ὑπάρχων. “ Who being *in the Form* “ *of God*, that is, * *truly* God (which best “ answers to the *Antithesis* following, the “ *Form of a Servant* signifying as much as “ *truly* Man) and therefore might justly have “ assumed to *appear as God*, and to be always “ *Honoured as such*, yet did not do it, at “ the time of his Incarnation; but for a Pat- “ tern of Humility, chose rather to veil His “ Glories, and, in appearance, to empty Him- “ self of Them; taking upon Him human Na- “ ture, and becoming a Servant of God in that “ Capacity, &c. What is there in this Para- phrase or Interpretation, either disagreeable to the Scope of the Place, or the Context, or to the sober Sentiments of Catholick Antiquity, not only after, but before the Council of *Nice*; as may appear from the Testimonies cited in

* Tertullian's recital of this Text, and Comment upon it, are worth Remark-
ing. Plane de substantia Christi putant & hic Marcionitæ Suffragari Apostolum sibi, quod Phantasma Carnis fuerit in Christo, quum dicit, Quod in Effigie Dei constitutus non rapinam existimavit Pariari Deo, sed exhaustit semetipsum accepta Effigie servi, non veritate; & similitudine Hominis, non in Homine; & Figura inventus ut Homo, non Substantia, id est, non Carne. — Numquid ergo & Hic quâ in Effigie eum Dei collocat? Æque non erit Deus Christus vere, si nec Homo vere fuit in Effigie Hominis Constitutus. Contr. Marc. l. 5. c. 20. p. 486. Non sibi magni aliquid deputat quod ipse quidem æqualis Deo, & unum cum Patre, est. Orig. in Epist. ad Rom. l. 5. Θεὸς μὲν κενώσας ἑαυτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς ἑῶναι ἴσα Θεῷ. Concil. Antioch. Labb. Vol. 1. p. 848. Ὁ μονογενὴς τῷ Θεῷ λόγος, Θεὸς ὑπάρχων ἐν Θεῷ, κεκένωκεν ἑαυτὸν καὶ τὴν ἀδόξον πτωχῶς σέβησιν ὑμπίχεται. Hippolytus, Vol. 2. p. 29. Fabric.

The rest of the Passage is excellently well worth the Reader's perusal.

the Margin? Now, if this be the Sense of it, which I might farther confirm by the Authorities of *Athanasius*, *Jerom*, *Austin*, *Chrysostom*, *Theophylact*, *Oecumenius*, and others of the Antients, besides * Bishop *Pearson* and † Bishop *Bull* among the Moderns, why should you wonder to find it again cited in the same Cause, being so full and pertinent to the Matter in Hand? Next, we may proceed to the other Text, which you as groundlessly pretend to be *directly contrary* to that for which it is alledged. It is *Hebr. i. 3. Who being the Brightness of his Glory, and the express Image of his Person, &c.* Here you are so obliging as to cite only one Passage out of *Eusebius*, against me, I would say, for me. *Eusebius*, writing against the *Sabellians*, presses Them with this Text, and argues thus from it. “ The Image, and that whereof it is the
 “ Image, cannot both be the same Thing (in
 “ the *Sabellian* Sense) but they are *two Sub-*
 “ *stances*, and *two Things*, and *two Powers*: from whence He rightly infers, or plainly means to do, that the *Father* is not the *Son*, but that they are *really* distinct. What is there in this at all repugnant to what the *Querist* maintains? The force of your Objection lies, I suppose, in this, that Father and

* On the Creed: Article 2.

† Def. Fid. N. 49. 70. Prim. Trad. p. 38. Qui unus locus, si recte expendatur, ad omnes Hæreses adversus Jesu Christi Domini nostri personam repellendas sufficit. D. E. p. 37.

Son are called δύο ὁμοῖαι, δύο πρῶτα, and δύο ὑπόμμεναι, inconsistently, you imagine, with *individual* Consubstantiality.

I will not be bound to vindicate every Expression to be met with in *Eusebius*: But, allowing for the Time, when it was wrote, before the sense of those Words was fix'd and determin'd, as it has been since; there may be nothing in all this, which signifies more than what the Catholick Church has always meant by *two Persons*; and what all must affirm, who believe a real Trinity. So ^a *Pierius* call'd Father and Son ὁμοῖαι δύο, meaning no more than we do by two distinct Persons: And *Alexander* Bishop of *Alexandria*, the first Champion for the Catholick Cause against *Arius*, in his Letter to *Alexander* Bishop of *Constantinople*, scruples not to call Father and Son ^b δύο πρῶτα; and *Tertullian* intimates that they are ^c *duæ res, sed Conjunctæ*; and *Methodius* uses ^d δύο ὑπόμμεναι, meaning two Persons. These or the like strong Expressions, occurring in the *Catholick* Writers, were only to guard the more carefully against *Sabellianism*, the prevailing *Heresy* of those Times. But after *Arianism* arose, there was greater danger of the opposite extreme: And therefore they began to soften this manner of Expression, lest any should be led to think, that the Persons of the Trinity were so distinct as to be

^a See Phot. Cod. 119. p. 300.

^b Apud Theod. l. 1. c. 4.

^c Contr. Prax. c. 8. p. 504.

^d Phot. Cod. 235. p. 137.

independent of, ſeparate from, and aliene to, each other. Thus, inſtead of $\delta\upsilon\omicron\ \phi\tilde{\omega}\tau\alpha$, which might be innocent before, and is uſed by * *Origen*, They choſe rather to ſay, † $\phi\tilde{\omega}\varsigma\ \epsilon\tilde{\nu}\ \phi\omega\tau\omicron\varsigma$: rather than ſay, *duæ eſſentia*, which might be liable to miſtakes; They would ſay, *Eſſentia de Eſſentia*, as *Deus de Deo*. The deſign of all which was, ſo to aſſert a *real* Diſtinction, as not to teach three abſolute, independent, or ſeparate Subſtances; ſo to maintain the *diſtinction* of Perſons, as not to *divide* the Subſtance. Three *real* Perſons is what I, what every *Trinitarian*, what all ſound Catholicks aſſert. Now let us return to the Text, *Heb.* i. 3. Having ſhown you that *Eusebius's* Comment is not pertinent to our preſent Diſpute, nor at all affects the Cauſe that I maintain, which, I aſſure you, is not *Sabellianism*: Now let me proceed a little farther, to vindicate my uſe of that Text; which, you pretend, is ſtrong againſt me. *Origen* perhaps may be of ſome Credit with you; and the more for being admired by the *Arians*, and much cenſur'd by many of the *Catholicks*, but after his own Times. ‡ His Comment, upon a parallel Text to this, together with this alſo, is pretty remarkable. “ If
“ He (Chriſt) be the Image of the *inviſible*,
“ the Image it ſelf muſt be *inviſible* too. I
“ will be bold to add, that ſince He is the Re-
“ ſemblance of his Father, there could *not have*

* Comment. in Joh. p. 70.

† See Athanaſ. V. i. p. 553.

‡ Apud Athanaſ. Decret. Synod. Nic. Vol. i. p. 233.

“ *been a Time when He was not.* He goes on to argue, that since God is Light, and Christ the Ἀπαύγασμα, or shining forth of that Light, quoting this Text, that They could never have been separate one from the other, but must have been *Co-eternal*.

^a *Dionysius of Alexandria*, another *Ante-Nicene* Writer, draws the very same Inference from the same Text. And *Alexander* Bishop of *Alexandria*, in his circular Letter, ^b extant in *Athanasius*, makes the like use of it. The latter part of the Text especially, the words, *express Image of his Person*, were very frequently and triumphantly urg'd by the *Catholics* against the *Arians*: by ^c *Alexander* of *Alexandria*, ^d *Athanasius*, ^e *Hilary*, ^f *Basil*, ^g *Gregory Nyssen*, ^h *Gregory Nazianzen*, ⁱ *Cyril*, and Others.

This may satisfy you that it was neither *strange*, nor *new*, to alledge this Text in favor of Christ's Divinity. When you have any thing farther to object, it shall be fairly examin'd. In the mean while, let it stand, to support the Second Query; which returns upon you, and expects a fuller Answer. That it may come to

^a Ἀπαύγασμα δὲ ὃν φωτὸς αἰδίῃ, πάντας καὶ αὐτὸς αἰδίος ἐστίν. ὅντος γὰρ αἰεὶ τοῦ φωτός, δῆλον ὅτι ἐστίν αἰεὶ τὸ ἀπαύγασμα. Apud Athanas. de Sent. Dionys. p. 253.

^b Πῶς ἀνόμοιόν τῃ ἑστίᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς, ὃ ὢν εἰκὼν πελεία καὶ ἀπαύγασμα τοῦ πατρὸς. Apud Athanas. Vol. 1. p. 299.

^c Epist. ad Alexand. Theodor. p. 17. ^d Orat. 1. p. 424. de Synod. p. 743. ^e De Trin. p. 975. 1085. 1159. ^f Contr.

Eunom. p. 28. 89. ^g Contr. Eunom. p. 460. ^h Orat. 36.

ⁱ Dial. 5. de Trin.

you recommended in the best Manner, and in the best Company, I shall here subjoin the Testimonies of the *Ante-Nicene* Writers, all declaring that the Son is not excluded from being the *one God*, but is included and comprehended therein: that is, tho' the one God *primarily* denotes the Father, yet not *exclusively*, but comprehends the Son too. Now, as often as the primitive Writers speak of Father and Son together, as the one God, in the Singular, they bear witness to this Truth. See the Testimonies of *Irenæus*, *Athenagoras*, *Tertullian*, *Clement of Alexandria*, and *Origen*, collected in ^a Dr, *Fiddes's* Body of Divinity, to which may be added ^b *Hippolytus*, ^c *Lactantius*, and even *Eusebius* Himself, who acknowledged ^d *one God in three Persons*, as *Socrates* informs us.

I proceed next to other Testimonies more expressly declaring, that the Son is not excluded from being the one Supreme God, by the several Texts of Scripture, which assert the unity; but is always understood or implied, as comprehended in the same one God. ^e *Irenæus* says “ that the Holy Scriptures declare the *one* and

^a Vol. 1. p. 387, &c.

^b Οἰκονομία συμφωνίας συνάγεται εἰς ἓνα Θεόν, εἷς γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ Θεός, ὁ γὰρ κελεύων πατήρ, ὁ δὲ ὑπακούων υἱός, τὸ δὲ συνεπίζον ἅγιον πνεῦμα. Ὁ ὢν πατήρ ἐπὶ πάντων, ὁ ὃς υἱὸς ἀπὸ πάντων, τὸ δὲ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐν πᾶσιν. Ἀλλως δὲ ἓνα Θεόν νομίσαι μὴ δυνάμεθα, εἰ μὴ ὅντως πατρί, καὶ υἱῷ καὶ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι πιστεύωμεν. Hippol. Contr. Noct. p. 15, 16. Fabric. Edit.

^c Lib. 4. c. 29.

^d Ἐνα Θεὸν ἐν τρισὶν ὑποτάσσει. Socr. E. H. l. 1. c. 23. p. 48.

^e Universæ Scripturæ ——— unum & Solum Deum, ad excludendos alios, prædicent omnia fecisse per Verbum Suum, &c. l. 2. c. 27. p. 155. Bened. Edit.

“ *only* God, excluding all Others, to have
 “ made all Things by HIS WORD. Others
 are excluded but not his *Word*, that is, *his Son*,
 by whom He made all Things, as *Irenæus*
 constantly understands it. At other times, He
 says, “ God * made all Things by *Himself*:
 “ interpreting *Himself*, by *His Word* and by
 “ *His Wisdom*; that is, *His Son*, and the *Holy*
 “ *Spirit*. Certainly, he could not think that
 God, in his Declarations of the Unity, meant
 to exclude what was so near to Him, as to be
 justly (not in a *Sabellian* Sense) interpreted
Himself. Many more Passages of the like Im-
 port might be cited from this primitive and ex-
 cellent Writer. I shall only add a † Passage or
 two to show, that He look’d upon the Son as
 the *only true* God, as well as the Father. He
 observes, that the Holy Scriptures never call
 any Person absolutely God or Lord, besides

* Fecit ea per semetipsum: hoc est per Verbum & Sapientiam suam. Adest enim ei semper *Verbum & Sapientia*, Filius & Spiritus, per quos, & in quibus, omnia libere & sponte fecit, Lib. 4. c. 20. p. 253.

† Nunquam neque Prophetæ neque Apostoli alium Deum nominaverunt, vel Dominum appellaverunt, præter *Verum & Solum Deum*. L. 3. c. 8. p. 182. Neque igitur Dominus, neque Spiritus Sanctus neque Apostoli eum qui non esset Deus, definitive & absolute Deum nominassent aliquando nisi esset *Vere Deus*. L. 3. c. 6.

Now see what follows.

Utrosque Dei appellatione signavit Spiritus & eum qui ungitur, *Filium*, & eum qui ungit Patrem. L. 3. c. 6. p. 180.

This Father goes on, in the same Chapter, to produce several other Instances from the Holy Scripture to prove that the Son is called (definitively and absolutely) God. That is plainly his meaning, as any Man may see by looking into the Chapter. I may add that He applies the Title of Solus Deus to Christ. L. 5. c. 17. p. 314.

the *only true God*; and yet presently after takes notice, that both Father and Son are by the same Scriptures *absolutely* so called. See the places in the Margin: For though *absolutely* be not there express'd, yet it is necessarily implied, and is undoubtedly the Author's meaning.

We may go on to *Tertullian*, who is so full and clear to our Purpose, that nothing can be more so. Out of many Passages which might be cited, I shall here content my self with one out of his Book against *Praxeas*. “ * There
 “ is therefore one God the Father, and there
 “ is none *Other* besides Him: By which He
 “ does not mean to exclude the Son, but *Ano-*
 “ *ther* God. Now the *Son* is not *Another*
 “ from the Father. Furthermore, do but ob-
 “ serve the drift and tendency of this kind of
 “ Expressions, and you will find, for the most
 “ part, that they concern only the Makers

* Igitur unus Deus Pater, & alius absque eo non est: Quod ipse inferens, non Filium negat, sed Alium Deum. Cæterum Alius à patre Filius non est. Denique, inspicere sequentia hujusmodi pronuntiationum, & invenias fere ad Idolorum Factitores atque Cultores Definitionem earum pertinere; ut multitudinem falsorum Deorum Unio divinitatis expellat, habens tamen Filium quanto individuum & inseparatum a Patre, tanto in Patre reputandum, etsi non nominatum. At quin si nominasset illum, separasset, ita dicens, Alius præter me non est, nisi Filius meus. Alium enim etiam Filium fecisset, quem de aliis excepisset. Puta Solem dicere: Ego Sol, & alius præter me non est, nisi radius meus; nonne denotasses Vanitatem; quasi non & Radius in Sole deputeretur. c. 18. p. 510. Compare *Irenæus*, l. 4. c. 6. p. 234, 235. Non ergo *Alius* erat qui cognoscebatur, & *Alius* qui dicebat *nemo cognoscit Patrem*, sed unus & idem, omnia subjiciente ei Patre, & ab omnibus accipiens Testimonium quoniam *Vere Homo*, & quoniam *Vere Deus*.——

and