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

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

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

Part the First.

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

The Charge was contained under Two Heads.

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


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

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

* See my Defense, p. 399.
your Reply, you admit (p. 5.) that the same numerical intellectual Essence is, with you, equivalent to same Person: So that the Fact charg’d upon you stands good, by your own Confession.

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

† Disquisit. Mod. p. 12.
‡ Disquisit. Mod. p. 25.
without so much as attacking Him; while the main weight and force of your Reasonings (when They really have any) falls not upon any Thing which He has asserted, but upon quite another Thing which you have been pleas’d to invent for Him.

It is now Time to hear what you have to say in Defense of this peculiar Piece of Management. Your Excuses for it are reducible to Three Heads, 1st. That you did not know what Bishop Bull meant. 2dly, That you had interpreted numerical Essence as all the Present Orthodox do, whose Cause Bishop Bull is supposed to have espoused. 3dly, That numerical Essence does, and must signify what you pretend, and nothing else. Tho’ I have not taken your own Words, yet, I think, I have here given your full Sense; and more distinctly and clearly than you have done. I am next to examine your Excuses, one by one.

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

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

“As concerning the Specific Unity of Persons, in the Blessed Trinity, such as is the Union of Supposita, or Persons, among Things created (for Instance, of Three Men, Peter, Paul, and John, which are separate from one another, and do not any way depend upon each other as to their Essence,) This the Fathers of the first Ages never dream'd of. They acknowledged a very different Union of the divine Persons, such as there is no Pattern of, no resemblance perfectly answering to it, whereby to illustrate it, among created Beings. They explain the Matter thus: That God the Father
Father is, as I said, the Head and Fountain of Divinity, from whom the Son and Holy-Ghost are derived, but so derived as not to be divided from the Father's Person, but They are in the Father, and the Father in Them, by a certain *ἐξιχθησις or Inhabitation*, so called, as I have shown at large. Defens. Fid. Nic. Sect. 4. lib. 4. Petavius Himself contends that from This *ἐξιχθησις*, Inhabitation, a numerical Unity may be inferred, Petav. l. 4. c. 16. It is certainly manifest that this Explication can no way consist with the Arian Hypothesis: And it is also manifest that Tri-theism is excluded by it, and the Unity of the Godhead made consistent with a real Distinction of Persons.

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

From this Account of Bishop Bull, it is evident

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

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

*Whitby, Disqu. Mod. p. 32. Pref. Reply, p. 4.*
Orthodoxy, as towards Bishop Bull. Towards the Latter, because it is a certain Truth that He has by no means served the Cause of Sabellianism, or of Numerical Unity, in your Sense: Towards the Former, because it might have given Them an opportunity of explaining Themselves upon this Head; And They might take their Choice, either to give up Bishop Bull and all the Fathers at once, or else (which is most likely) declare what you say of them to be pure Calumny and Defamation. For my part, I make no doubt but it is a Slander upon them; and that you will be found at length to understand as little of the Moderns, as you do of the Antients. I have good Reason for what I say, from one particular Instance which I meet with in your Reply, p. 102. I am there represented, as having departed from the general received Doctrine of the Church, from the Fourth Century to this present Age, for no other reason but for saying, I mean a real Person and no Mode. Is it then really so, that All the Orthodoxy, from the fourth Century down to the present, have believed a Person to be a Mode, that is, in plain English, a Manner; and three Persons to be three Manners? Believe it that can: I have a much better Opinion, nay, certain Knowledge of them. The Catholics, indeed, down from the fourth (I may say from the first) Century, have believed that there is no Disparity of Nature, no Division of Substance, no Difference in any Perfection between Father and Son; but that They are equally Wise, equally Infinite, equally Perfect in all Respects; differing only in this, that one is a Father, and the other a Son, one Unbegotten, and the other Begotten, as a Third is proceeding: And these three different Manners, or Modes, of Exisltence distinguishing the Persons one from another, perfectly alike and equal in all other respects. The Phrase therefore of Modes of Existing.
Existing, was not design'd to denote the Persons Themselves, but their distinguishing Characters. This is what Dr. South's Authorities sufficiently prove, and all that They prove; and, I presume, all that He meant. For, tho' you are pleased to quote Him against Me, He is expressly for Me, where He utterly denies * that the Three divine Persons are only Three Modes of the Deity. However that be, I take my Accounts of the Antients from the Antients themselves. If you can find any one, I do not say of the fourth, but even of the sixth, or eighth Century, to go no lower, laying it down for Catholick Doctrine that a Person is a Mode, it will be kind to oblige us with the Discovery. As to the Antients, I will be bound to answer for Them, that what you say of them from the fourth Century, is pure Invention and Romance: And as to Moderns, I am very Inclined to hope, I make no Scruple to believe, that you have misreported Them as much as you have done the other.

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

* South Animadw. c. 8. p. 290, 291. versary.
versey, in such a Case, should make Allowance for Words, and attend to the Thing. To make the best of it, it is very unkind and unfair, industriously to mistake an Author's meaning, in such a Case, and to go about to confute what He certainly never intended to maintain; nay, what He is known to have denied and disclaimed. But to come a little closer to the Point; How do you prove, after all, that your's is the only proper Sense of Numerical? What if you should fail here, in the main Point of all, wherein your great Confidence lies, and for the sake of which you have rais'd all this Dust upon Bishop Bull, and thrown Scandal at large both upon Antients and Moderns? It is very certain, that Numerical, or Individual Unity has been, and is, maintain'd by Catholicks, and Catholicks that abhorred Sabellianism. Could you prove that your Sense of Numerical Essence is the only proper Sense, yet you can never prove that it is the only Sense it has been used in: So that, at length, the Dispute about it would be nothing more than a Dispute about Words.

But I will give you a plain Reason why you can never prove your Sense of the Words to be the only proper Sense: It is because you can never fix any certain Principle of Individuation. It is for want of This, that you can never assure me, that three real Persons, may not be, or are not, one Numerical, or Individual Substance. In short, you know not, precisely, what it is that makes one Being, or one Essence, or one Substance. Here your Metaphysics are plainly defective; and This it is that renders all your Speculations upon that Head, vain and fruitless. Tell me plainly, is the divine Substance present in every place, in Whole, or in Part? Is the Substance which is present here upon Earth, that very Individual Numerical Substance which is present in Heaven, or is it not? Your answer to these Questions may
may perhaps suggest something to you, which may help you out of your Difficulties relating to the Trinity; or else the Sense of your inability to answer Either, may teach you to be less confident in Matters so much above you, and to confess your Ignorance in Things of this Nature, as I freely do mine.

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

The Sum then of what I have pleaded to make good my Charge of the first general Fallacy, is, that you have let out wrong, mistook the very Point in Question, pursued your Mistake all along, and followed your own Wandrings, instead of opposing Bishop Bull: That you have no excuse for understanding numerical Essence as you do, either from Bishop Bull's Book, who never so understands it, or from the Catholic Sense of it, Antient or Modern, which is different from your's, or from the Propriety of the Phrase it self, which may, for any
thing you know, admit of another Sense, and which you have no way of confuting but by begging the Question; which is not confuting, but rather tacitely acknowledging that it is not capable of any Confutation. So much for the first Article: Only here I must be so just to you as to observe, that you do not always wander from the Point in Question. You do sometimes, indeed often, attempt to prove that the Ante-Nicene Fathers were of Those Principles which were afterwards called Arian. So far is pertinent, and is directly opposing Bishop Bull. But then I must observe farther, that left you should happen, at length, to fail in your first point of proving the Fathers to have been Arians, you reserve the other point as what you can prove and can never fail of, namely, that They were not Sabellians: And This is what the Result of your Arguments generally comes to, after you have carried Them on as far as They can go. The first Point is what you seem most desirous of proving, were it possible to do it: But if you cannot do That, you are content however to prove the Latter, rather than seem to have done nothing. I should here conclude this Article, but that two or three incidental Things should be taken notice of, which must come in here, or no where. I had observed * several Guards which you had put in, in the general State of the Question, as it were with design to secure a handson Retreat. You say, all the Ante-Nicene Fathers; when the most, or the generality might be sufficient. I had reason

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

Whether All the Ante-Nicene Fathers professed the very same Doctrine which We ascribe to the Nicene Council; that is, whether all acknowledged the same Numerical Essence of the Father to have been communicated to the Son and Holy Ghost, and that therefore Both are one God in Number with the Father. Whitby. Proem. p. 2.
to observe this, because Bishop Bull, had, in a manner, given up Laetantius: Besides, that it is not necessary to assert that every Writer (suppose Clemens of Rome, or Barnabas) has said enough in a short Epistle, from whence it might certainly be inferred that their Principles were the same with those of the Nicene Fathers. It is sufficient if as many as speak plainly either way, are on our Side; and that none of the earlier Writers contradict it, but are in the main favourable to us, and probably, if not demonstrably ours. Another Guard inferred was, which we ascribe to the Nicene Council, instead of, which was asserted by the Nicene Council. The reason I had to take notice of this, is apparent from what hath been said. Numerical Essence, rather than same Essence, was another Guard: And what use you make of it is visible enough. That this Essence, the same Numerical Essence (or Person as you understand it) was communicated to two other Persons, is what you demand to have proved: And you have some pretence for Cavil at the word communicated. This I observed before: And your Reply* is, that what I call a Pretence to quarrel at the Word Communicated, is indeed Arguments produced against it, as it is stated by the Bishop, and which I durst not meddle with nor pretend to answer. The Reason of my not answering your Cavils against the Expression, was because it was foreign to my purpose, and because we were inquiring, whether Bishop Bull had truly and justly represented the Antients, not whether His Doctrine (the same with the antient Doctrine) is liable to the Charge of Contradiction. If you are able to prove any thing of that kind (as you are not) against Bishop Bull, it will hold equally against the Antients, and Him too; and is of distinct Consideration from the Point which we are now upon. However, if our Readers

* Reply, p. 5.
will pardon a small Digression, I shall here examine
those weighty Arguments, which before, it seems,
I durst not meddle with.

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

You object farther; That if the same numerical
Essence of the Father be communicated, then it is the
same numerical Essence in Both, only existing in a diffe-
rent Manner. To which I answer, if you mean by
numerical Essence, the same numerical Person, it is not
communicated at all: For the Person of the Father
only communicates, the Person of the Son is commu-
nicated: And these two Persons, or Hypostases con-
stitute the same numerical Essence; which consequen-
tialy, as personalized in the Son, is begotten, as persona-
lized in the Father, unbegotten, that is, exists in a
different Manner. The two Persons exist after a
different Manner; which two Persons constitute one
numerical Essence; and therefore I admit that the
same numerical Essence does exist in a different Man-
ner, in the two Persons.

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

* Pref. p. 21.

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

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

* Disquisit. Mod. p. 23. Pref.
† Disquisit. Mod. p. 23. Pref.

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

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

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

* See my Defense, p. 403, 404.
perfectum, which Author you pronounce an Arian. You proceed to observe from Bishop Bull Himself, that the Arians scrupled not any of the Catholick Forms of Speech, save only the Term Consubstantial. They would say, for Instance, that the Son was begotten out of the Father Himself, and was true God; and They rejected with Indignation the Charge of making the Son a Creature. Now, what could be your meaning in these Remarks, but to insinuate to your Reader, that let Him meet with ever so High Expressions of the Son's Divinity among the Ante-Nicene Writers; yet unless They have the very word Consubstantial, They might possibly, or probably, mean no more than the Arians did after by the same or the like Expressions? This is the Fallacy which I complain'd of, and which you often occasionally recur to, both in your Book and Prefaces, to weaken the Force of Bishop Bull's Authorities. Some of the Places where you do this, I refer'd to *, in my Defense, which the Reader that has a mind to it may turn to; and I do not yet see that I have suggested any thing but what is both fair and true.

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

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

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

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

* Ut verum fatear, multa sunt quæ me impedient quo minus a sententia de Vera Christi Deitate recederem, id folum contendo &c. Whitby. Disqu. Mod. p. 3. Praef.
Things which hinder Him from receding from the Belief of Christ's true Divinity: And it is well known what He once meant by Christ's true Divinity, when He wrote a Treatise with that Title, in Defense of it. Who would not charitably believe, from hence, that He still retain'd the same Faith, in the same true Divinity? But see what He means by Christ's true Divinity (Disqu. Mod. p. 25. †) where He commends Justin Martyr for maintaining Christ's true Divinity, making this an Argument of it, that Justin's Sentiments were clearly opposite to the Doctrine of the Nicene Council. Hence it is manifest, that the Doctor equivocates in the Phrase true Divinity. The Fact I maintain; but if from thence you'll infer that He is an equivocating Knave, remember that the Inference is your's, and not mine.

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

* Whitby. de vera Christi Deitate: Tractatus, Ann. 1601.
to be what They were not, and so were received as Orthodox. You will remember that the Principal of those Holy Men, and able Judges, that promoted Arius's Interest in the Synod of Bithynia, was Eusebius of Nicomedia: The same Man that afterwards profesi'd his Assent and Consent to the Nicene Creed, as the true Catholic Faith; and excused his not consenting to the Anathematizing of Arius, upon this Foot, that He thought Arius had been much misrepresented, and that He knew from Arius's own Letters, that He was not the Man that the Council took Him to be. Now if Eusebius, the principal Man of the Synod of Bithynia, was thus imposed upon by Arius's fair Pretences, no doubt but He represented Arius's Case to the Synod, as favourably as He Himself had conceiv'd of it: And then no wonder if a Man was receiv'd as Orthodox, who was really believ'd to be Orthodox. If you think that Eusebius, all the while, knew that Arius was not Orthodox, in my Sense of the Word; Admitting That, yet He might, for any Thing I know, represent Him as such Then, as well as He did After: If so, the only equivocating Knave might be Eusebius of Nicomedia; the rest might be imposed upon by his Representations and Colourings. Holy Men and able Judges can Judge no otherwise of Facts, but as They are reported: And how could it be remedied, if Arius happen'd to get good Testimonials, tho' Himself an Ill-Man? But enough of this Matter: As to the Arian Custom of equivocating, and thereby imposing upon Honest Men, The Fact being plain, I shall insist no longer upon it, only referring to a few Authors who give a summary Account of it.

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

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

* Disqu. Mod. p. 16.
many Arguments against Clemens his believing Christ to be Consubstantial with Him whom alone He calls God, and from whom He distinguishes Christ? But I insist upon it, that there is no weight at all in this Argument. Nothing has been more common with Writers, who have fully believed the Doctrine of a Co-eternal Trinity, than this Manner of speaking; especially when They have been thinking on another Subject, and had no occasion to speak of Christ's Divinity. And what if Clemens, or Polycarp, or any other Writer, in a short Epistle, or Tract, has spoke of the Father only, under the Title of God, and of the Son as Lord, or Saviour, or High-Priest? How often might the same Thing be observed in modern Treatises, or Sermons of very Orthodox Men? I see no Consequence that can be justly drawn against our Principles, from these Premises. And if Clemens called the Father the only God, or only true God, tho' That be a distinct Argument from the former; yet neither does it prove any thing more than the other, as I have shewn in another Place *.

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

* Sermon 4th.
† Pref. de S. Script. Interpr. p. 34, 35.
‡ See the Testimonies in Mills. And my Sermons p. 221.
ticks too for the most part) both before and after
Origen's Time, as well as Origen Himself, understood
Rom. 9. 5. of God the Son, there stiled ἐπὶ πάντων Ὑιόν, or God above all. Yet there is a certain
Sense in which the Antients have denied Christ to be
the God above all; namely, when so understood as to
make Christ the very Person of the Father, as the Sa-
bellians understood it *, or to set Him above the Fa-
ther †, or above the Creator ‡ of the World, as some
other Hereticks pretended. In this latter Sense it is
that Origen denies the Son to be God above all; as He
had reason to do, because it would have been denying
His Subordination and Sonship, and inverting the Or-
der of the Persons, to have asserted that Christ was
in any Sense above the Father, or so God above all,
as to have the Creator, or Father, subordinate to
Him.

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

c. 5. Ad Philip. c. 7.
p. 476. Huic.

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

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

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

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

"Eve έν θόν, ός άναθέληκεν, τόν πατέρα & τόν ήν θεοπαρα-

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

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

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

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

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

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

E 2 But
But when, instead of this, you set out upon a wrong foot, and wander wide and far from the Mark you should have aimed at: When instead of attacking Bishop Bull directly, you encounter for the most part a Phantom of your own, and Fight with your Shadow: In such a Case as this, we have no need to be solicitous about the Bishop. Those formidable Preparations, which might be otherwise apt to strike Terror into us, are happily diverted another way: All we have now left to do, is to stand by unconcern'd, look on, and smile. These are my Reasons why I hold my self excused from making any more particular Answer to your numerous Arguments, as you are pleased to call Them. You may give Us leave to judge how far our Cause may be endanger'd by what you have done: And if We who are Friends to the Bishop and his Cause, are in no pain about Either, nor at all afraid of leaving Them in the Lurch, You may be very easy. Now I proceed to make good the Particulars of the Charge upon you. Misquotations, Misconstructions, Misrepresentations, Reviving of old and trite Objections concealing the Answers, &c. These, I think, reach to about twenty Particulars, which shall all be considered in the same Order as laid down in my Defense.

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

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

* The Readings of the Passage.

Δεθεν σοι αυτῳ, in πνευματι άξιω, Euseb. E. H. l. 4. c. 15.

Δεθεν σοι, in πνευματι άξιω, Whitby. Diffq. Mod. p. 22.

Μεθεν σοι κε πνευματι άξιω, Ufner, Coteler.

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

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

† Defence p. 406.
‡ \( \pi \gamma \delta \varepsilon \alpha \upsilon \tau \omega \nu \), & \( \Delta \) \( \alpha \upsilon \tau \delta \) πιστεύειν ἐναντίον. Athen. p. 38. Ox.
or so probably, out of \( \pi\gamma\zeta\alpha\upsilon\tau\varepsilon \), as the latter, out of \( \pi\gamma\zeta\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu \). Besides that by changing \( \pi\gamma\zeta\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu \) into \( \pi\gamma\zeta\alpha\upsilon\tau\varepsilon \), you took from us one Sense of the Words which we might think it proper to insist upon, namely, That of an efficient Cause. \( \Pi\gamma\zeta\alpha\upsilon\tau\varepsilon \), if it may be construed your way, may also be construed another way, and perhaps more naturally: And therefore we take it not well to be deprived of any Advantage which the Text gives us. I must however observe, that whatever your design was from these Words, They will not answer your purpose, even tho' we should admit your Construction. For no Consequence can be drawn against our Principles, from the Consideration of the Son's being the Exemplar, after which all Things were made; unless you can imagine that He was an Exemplar to Himself.

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

† \textit{Disquisit. Mod.}, p. 75, 76.

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

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

* See my Defense, p. 139, &c.
None. What Catholic would ever scruple to assert the same Thing? No one ever doubted but that the Father alone was ἀνάρχος, the Son not ἀνάρχος in this Sense.*

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

arphe, the Principium, Foundation, or Head over all Creatures. This kind of Construction of that Place of the Proverbs, appears to have been known and received in the Church, some Time before Methodius; as is plain from Dionysius of Rome *, his Comment upon the Text: which was afterwards countenanced by Eusebius †, and other Catholick Writers ‡. Athanagoras, much earlier than any of them, must have understood the Text nearly in the same Sense. For, after He had declared expressly against the Son's being made, or created, aserting his Procesion from the Father to be a kind of Substratum, or Support for the World of Creatures to subsist in, receiving from thence their proper Forms, Order, and Perfection; He immediately cites this Text out of the Proverbs, as confirming his Sentiments **.

To return to Methodius: He barely cites the Text to prove that Christ was prior to the Creation, and that all Creatures had their Subsistence in Him. He is not so particular in explaining the Sense of ηστιος, as Dionysius of Rome, or Eusebius: But it is more than probable that He understood it much in the same Sense. Certain it is, that your Construction of Him is intirely unwarranted; and not only so, but contradictory to the Author's known Principles elsewhere. Upon the

---

‡ Non enim ita Sapiencia Suam condidit, quasi aliquando fine Sapiencia fuerit —— Hoc Initial habet Sapiencia Dei quod de Deo procefsit ad creanda omnia tam celestia quam terrena; non quo caperit esse in Deo. Cresta eft ergo Sapiencia, imo genita, non sibi quæ temper erat, sed His quæ ab ea fieri opportenbat. Pseuf-Ambrof. de Fid. Or. c. 2. p. 349.
** Vid. Athenag. c. 10. p. 38, 39, 41.

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

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

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

‡ Cave. \textit{Hist. Liter.} Vol 1. p. 112.

F 2 of
of the *Ante-Nicene Writers*, I appeal to the Passages appearing in the *Margin*. You may there see that Dr. *Cave* look’d upon the *Eternity* of the Son as part of the Christian Faith from the very *Infancy* of the *Church*; that it had been *constantly* taught by the *Catholic* Fathers; and that none but mere *Strangers* to *Antiquity* could make any Question of it: That the most *effectual* way to confute *Arians*, &c. is,

... *Eternitatem Filii, eujusque συνειρρυμον ἐκ ἀρχῆς τὸ ἑαυτῷ (quem-admodum non infcrite loquitur Cyrilus Alexandrinus) concurretuem cum paterno principio existentium, constanter docuiisse Catholicos Patres, Antiquitatis Ecclesiasticæ rudis plane *sit oportet* qui necisse poerte; nec pluribus jam probare opus est quod cumulate praetiterunt Aliii. Hanc Ecclesiæ Fidem ab ipsis *Christianismi Primordiis tradi tam, & perpetuo conservatum*, omni quo potuerunt nihil totisque viribus oppugnarunt Ariani. *Cav. Diff. 3. ad Calc. Hift. Lit.* p. 79.


Vid. etiam p. 7.


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

To this you reply that Laetantius says of God, that He is the Father of all Things, whose Beginning cannot be comprehended: As if This were all that Laetantius had said. Does He not plainly assert that God had a Beginning, and that He made Himself? You obverse farther, that This is fully explain'd by Himself 1. 2. c. 8. where He says, God only who is not made, is from Himself, as we showed in the first Book. And what if He speaks right here? Does it follow that He has not said what He really has said in another Place? Besides, if you please to admit the same Candor of interpreting one place by another, I can show you also where He has spoke very Orthodoxy of God the Son; and can as easily acquit Him of the Charge of Herefy with respect to God the Son, as you can acquit Him of the like Charge in respect of God the Father. In a word, His Errors and Contradictions in both Points are visible enough: And give me leave to think that Dr. Cave might see Them; and might allude to one in the Article de Divinitate, and to the other in the words, de aeterna Filii existentia. For, surely, otherwise He would not have put de and de, but would rather have express'd it as one Article thus; de Divinitate atque aeterna existentia Filii, and then have proceeded with another de, to a new Article. Upon the whole, you can never make good your point from this Passage of Dr. Cave, which is not only capable of a different Construction from your's, but most naturally and most probably requires it.

* Verum quia fieri non potest quin id quod fit, aliquando esse espirit; consequens est ut, quando nihil ante eum fuerit, Ipse ante omnia ex seipso sit procreatus. — — Deus ipso se fecit. Laetant. l. 1. cr. 7. p. 32.
† Vid. Laetant. l. 4. c. 9.
You would infinuate (Reply, p. 30.) from another Passage of Dr. Cave, where He is speaking of Origen, that Origen's supposed Errors relating to the Trinity, were not, in Dr. Cave's Judgment, contrary to any Article of the Church, or Apostolical Traditions: which again is doing That good Man a second Injury, instead of making Satisfaction for the First. Dr. Cave does not say that his supposed Errors relating to the Trinity were not contrary to any Article of the Church; but only that many of Origen's cenjured Opinions were not: And what sort of Opinions Dr. Cave meant, He Himself tells us in the very place referred to. Namely, Intricate Questions that had been canvass'd only in the Schools of the Philosophers, and some Notions of his own Invention that were minus commodæ, not so just or accurate as They should be. Now what is This to our present Purpose? See the Passages of Dr. Cave before cited, sufficiently showing that He thought the Doctrine of the Trinity to be a fundamental Article of the Church, and an Apostolical Tradition. But I am weary of attending you through so many trifling Pretences. To conclude this Head: The most that can be made out of Dr. Cave's Expressions here, or elsewhere, is no more than This, that some of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, in some Places of their Works, express'd themselves sometimes improperly, uncautiously, or it may be, now and then dangerously, in respect of the Doctrine of the Trinity, before the meaning of Terms was adjusted, and settled; and those Articles reduced to a more certain, and more accurate Form of Expression. In the Sum of the Matter, in the main Doctrine, the Ante-Nicene Fathers were agreed. This was Dr. Cave's real Judgment; as may be seen by his own Words before cited: And, I suppose, He may be allowed to be his own best Interpreter. He was not only in those Sentiments,
ments; but zealous for Them, being a true Lover and Admirer of the primitive Fathers. How would the good Man have been filled with Indignation to have found His Name, and His Authority made use of, to such purposes as you have done! But enough—

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

* Defense of Queries, p. 409.

† Ex quibus omnibus, ex Athenagore Sententia, Deum illum unum Quem Christiani prædicabant, non alium fuife quam Deum ingenium, æternum, τοῦ παντὸς ποιητῆς, ἦλθον δημιουργῶν, omnium Opificem, liquet. Quibus Epithetis illius Sæculi Scriptores Deum Patrem a Filio semper distinguendarunt, Deumque Filium ab Hoc omnium Opifice ex eo distinguui docuerunt, quod sit Ille per quem, aut cuius Ministerio Pater fecit omnia. Whitby, Disqu. Modest. p. 60.
such particular notice of per Quem, By Whom, which you lay was attributed to the Son, to distinguish Him from Him that was omnium Opifex, Maker of all Things. Does not your Sense here, and your Sense in what went before (as I have represented it) answer to each other, like Two Tallys, exactly? I defy any Man that reads your Words in the Latin, to understand you otherwise. But if you will needs have it that you intended only to say that the Epithet of one unbegotten and eternal Maker of all Things, was peculiar to the Father, in the second Century, you shall have the Honour of making a through Observation, when you tell me, in what Century downwards to this day, That Epithet has not been peculiar to the Father as much as Then. I before left you the Alternative, either of being found trifling in a peculiar manner, or making a false Report; and so I do still. One might think by what follows in your Reply to this Article, that you had a mind to own the Report, and to vindicate it from the Charge of Falshood.

You say, Justin Martyr made a difference between the word παντὸς and ὅμοιος, and a little after, that He always speaketh of the Son as being another, not from the ὅμοιος, but αὐτῷ τὸ πνεῦμα, οἱ ἄλλοι τῶν αὐτῶν, from the Maker of all Things, Reply, p. 17, 18. However that be, I showed you plainly, from three express Testimonies *, that Irenæus, of the same Century with Justin, made no such Difference. The Son is παντὸς ὁ παντὸς, Maker of all Things, according to Irenæus, over and over, in as full and strong words as the Father Himself can be: So that your Remark, as to the Writers of the second Century, has no Truth in it. What you observe of Justin, is not

* See my Defense, p. 189.
briefly true. He tells us * indeed; that Plato made a difference between ποιητὴς, and δημιουργός, understanding by the former one that makes a thing from nothing, and by the latter one that frames any thing out of pre-existent Matter. Justin takes notice of this, in order to show that Plato's inferior Gods must be corruptible, upon Plato's own Principles: For the great God is stiled by Plato, not ποιητής, but δημιουργός of the other Gods. Consequently They were made of Matter, which is corruptible, and therefore are corruptible Themselves. What is this to the purpose we are upon? Or how does it appear that Justin himself always observed Plato's Distinction? Besides that if He did, it is certain that Justin Martyr supposes God the Son to be ποιητής, or Maker of Man whom He calls the θεόμα, Creature of Christ †. And there is no reason to doubt, but that He supposed Him to be as truly ποιητής, Maker of all other Things, according to the constant Doctrine of the Church in that very Century, as appears from Irenæus, Clemens of Alexandria, and Others.

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

applied to the Son, except with a Distinction; quoting, I would say, misquoting Origen to countenance your Pretences. If you please to look again into Origen*, the Word is πρότος not πρώτος, signifying not that the Father is the First Worker, as if there were Two Workers, but that He is primarily Creator. And, what ruins all your fine airy Speculations at once, Origen, in that very place, asserts the Son πατήσω (not δημιουργεῖν) τον κόσμον t/o Make, not Frame only, the World: which is as much as if He had called Him τύ κόσμου, or τό θ' ο/λου ποιητ' s.

You quote Eusebius as stating the Father απ' Άντων δημιουργος, the Son αιτίος δευτερος. You should have remembered that the same Eusebius states the Son ὁ μεγας π ο/λων δημιουργος.† Had this been applied to the Father instead of the Son, what Speculations might we not have expected upon the Force of ὁ μεγας, the Great Creator? You forget also that Eusebius scruples not to use the Title of ποιητ' s θ' ο/λων, Maker of all Things, speaking of the Son; as I observed in my Defense‡. This is directly against you: And if there be some Expressions in Eusebius which We neither approve nor vindicate; so there are many others that You cannot approve, or make consistent with your Principles: Quotations therefore from Eusebius will signify little on either Side. What you produce (Reply p. 18.) out of Methodus has been solidly answered by Bishop Bull**.

You next cite Tatian, as a true Disciple of Justin Martyr, saying, that Matter is produced τ' πάνω δημιουργι, 'from the Maker of all Things, but

† Euseb. Eccl. H. l. 10. c. 4. p. 316.
‡ Defense of Queries. p. 189.
the Son was ἐαυτὸς τοῦ ὑλοῦ δημιουργὸς, Worker of this Matter. But sure the Disciple was strangely forgetful of his Master’s Distinction between ποιήτης and δημιουργός: Otherwise, when He was talking of God’s producing Matter, He should have stiled Him ποιήτης, not δημιουργός. And you are as forgetful of what you had said but the Page before: Otherwise you should have made the Father no more than Worker of the Matter, as well as the Son; because of the word δημιουργός. See how strangely you are bewildered in your Observations, confuting and contradicting your self. Nothing succeeds with you; and I will venture to predict that nothing will, so long as you are espousing the Cause of Herefy, in Opposition to the Faith of the Catholic Church.

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

As to Athanasius, I observed that you understood

* See my Defense, p. 409.
† Disquisit. Mod. p. 32. Preach.
what He had said against the ὁμοιότητα, as if it had been said against the ὁμοιότητα, betwixt which Two, that accurate Father always carefully distinguished. To this you reply, that you cited Athanasius to confirm this Proposition, that They who say the Essence of the Son is like, or equal, to that of the Father, do by that ascribe to Him another numerical Essence from That of the Father. I perceive, you do not yet understand a Syllable of what Athanasius was speaking about. See his meaning explain'd in my Defense, pag. 409. Athanasius is so far from supposing like, and equal, to be equivalent, or even consistent, that He denies That Essence to be equal, which is only like; and He is not observing that either an equal, or a like Essence must be another numerical Essence, but that an Essence which is only like to divine, must be an inferior Essence. It is very strange, that after a Key had been given you to that Passage in Athanasius, you should still go on, as before, to confound your Self, and your Readers. As to the other Misrepresentation of Athanasius, whom you suppose an Affer tor of numerical Identity (which is making Him a Sabellian, according to your Sense of Numerical) as to this Charge upon you, you are pleased to say never a Word. That therefore stands as it did.

VII. In the next place, I blamed you for representing Barnabas's Epistle, ἐν νόμισμα, interpreting it Spurious, tho' That be not the Sense of ἐν νόμισμα, as it lies in Eusebius. To This you make answer (p. 20.) that you neither there, nor elsewhere interpret those Words at all. This is another Instance wherein you appear to be more unkind to your self, than I had been to you. You declare, page 19th of your Disquisitions, that Barnabas's Epistle was by the Antients held for Spurious. This false Affer tion appeared to have some Colour, supposing that you inter pret
interpret \( \epsilon \nu \nu \delta \nu \) in Eusebius, to mean Spurions: But without That, you have made a misreport of the Antients, and have no Pretence at all for it. Show me what Antients, or where They reckon'd Barnabas's Epistle Spurions *. If you chuse rather to have it thought that you have told us an Untruth without any Colour for it, than with any, be it so: I was willing to put the most candid Construction upon the Thing; and I shall do so still, if you will give me leave. For, I observe that after you had said † that Eusebius ranked this Epistle \( \epsilon \nu \nu \delta \nu \), you immediately subjoin these Words, Corele- rius confesses that He inclines to the Opinion of Those who think it is not the Apostle's. Now, this is so very like Commenting on the Phrase, \( \epsilon \nu \nu \delta \nu \), just going before, that hardly one Reader in a Hundred could ever suspect that you understood by \( \epsilon \nu \nu \delta \nu \), any thing else but Spurions; that is, falsely ascrib'd to Barnabas. In a word, It seems to me very much the same thing, whether you interpret a Passage thus, or whether you lead your Reader into such Interpretation: The Reader is equally deceived either way. However, if you insist upon it, that you neither interpreted the Words at all, nor intended to lead your Reader into any such Interpretation, I acquiesce; provided only that you give us any tolerable Account of your saying that this Epistle was look'd upon as Spurions by the Antients.

VIII. The next Thing which I found fault

* Certe quicquid de hac Epistola dicant recentiores Critici, eam Barnaba nostro constanter ascribunt veteres. Nemo certe fuit, inquit \( \sigma \epsilon \tau \) Ceftriensis noftrs, qui hanc Epistolam Barnabae non tribuerit; neque in ea quidquam apparet, quod eam statem non ferat. Cav. Hiftor. Literar. Vol. 1. p. 11.

† Disqu. Mod. p. 9.
with *, was your partial Account of the antient Doxologies †. To This, you reply (p. 19.) that you freely acknowledge your Account of the primitive Doxologies to be imperfect, as wanting the Doxologies of St. Paul and St. Jude, which are the best Rule and Standard of Doxologies. What? better than St. John's, or St. Peter's? But This it is to aim at Wit. You may please to remember that we were not talking of the Scripture-Doxologies, but of those which are to be met with in the Writings of the Fathers. You had told us in your Disquisitions a notorious Untruth, that the Fathers of the first and second Century never used that Form of Doxology, which has been especially called Catholick; but that the Arian Form had obtained among the early Fathers. This false Account, I softly called a partial Account; to be as tender of you as possible. It is well known that μετά, or συν, in Doxologies, is the same as if the particle καθ' be used to connect the Persons: And all such Forms come under the Name of Catholick, as opposed to such Forms as have only δια, or οὐ: Because, tho' Either of those Forms may indifferently be used, and have been used by Catholicks both in former and latter Times: Yet after the Arians had perverted One to an ill Sense, the Catholicks chose for the most part, to make use of the Other. Now of those called Catholick Forms, I refer'd to Polycarp's †, the Church of Smyrna's **, and Clemens's of Alexandria ††, all

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

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

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

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

† Defense of Queries. p. 410.
‡ Justin’s Martyr. Dial. p. 34. Jcb.
"Egypt with a mighty Hand, and stretched-out Arm: Nor do we rest our Hopes in any Other (for there is none Other) but in Him whom you Hope in, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. From hence may be seen how far Justin is from asserting two Gods. There is not, according to Him, nor ever was, nor will be ἄλλος Θεός, another God besides the God of the Jews, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Thus far He and Trypho were agreed.

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

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

* Justin Martyr. Dial. p. 147. 163.
the same as another Person besides the Father. Instead
of saying Father, He generally expresses it by the
Title of Creator of all Things; the reason of which
I conceive to be, that both He and Trypho received
Him under that Notion; but under the Notion
of Father, in Justin's Sense, He was not received
by Trypho, the Question betwixt them being chiefly
This, whether He was a Father in a proper Sense,
that is, whether He had really a Son. Hence, I con-
ceive it is that Justin so often denotes the Father
by the Title of Maker of all Things, rather than by the
Title of Father. Yet He does sometimes make use
of the Title of Father, instead of the other. He
says in one place ἐξ ὧν πατὴρ ἦν, * instead of saying
ἐγὼ πατὴρ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἦν: which, tho' not so ac-
curate while disputing with a Jew, serves however
to show that those two Titles were only different
Expressions, denoting the same Person. Justin, in his
first Apology, where He is again upon the same Ar-
gument, styles the Father ὁ πατὴρ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, Father of
all Things; in the same place censuring the Jews for
not acknowledging that He had a Son †, that is, not
acknowledging Him to be a Father, in a peculiar and
proper Sense. This I take notice of to confirm what
I have already observed, that it was not proper for
Justin, in dispute with a Jew, to call the Father by
a Title which the Jews did not own, but rather by
Another which was acknowledged on both Sides;
viz. Maker of all Things, or however, Father of all
Things, not Father simply. To proceed: Justin af-
fects and often inculcates that this Maker, or Father,
of all Things has a Son ‡, an only begotten Son **, be-

† Just. Apol. i. p. 122.
gotten before the Creation 1, begotten of Himself 2, (ἐν θεόν, and ἐξ εαυτοῦ) without Abscession or Division 3, strictly and properly 4 (ιδιως, and κυριως) a Son, and really (not nominally) distinct from Him 5. He asserts farther and proves at large, that this very Son is really God, not called God only, but is God 6: And Justin never says that He is God by voluntary Appointment, or as Representative of the Father; but as Son of God, He is God 7. The same is God of the Jews, God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, according to Justin. This last particular is what You and I chiefly differ upon; and therefore I must be the more full and copious in the Proof of it.

It is a Rule and Maxim with Justin that God the Father never appeared; which, I suppose, I need not prove to you, because you your self contend for it, and in the Title-Page of your Reply, recommend the Determination of the Sirmian Synod in Anathematizing any that should say, the Father appeared to Abraham. Please then to take notice, that Justin Martyr quotes 8 Exod. 3. 16. where it is said, The Lord God of your Fathers, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob appeared unto me, &c. These Words Justin, upon his Principles, must have under-
stood of Christ: He was the Lord God, the God of Abraham, &c. who appeared. And indeed Justin quotes the Text for that very purpose, to prove that Christ is God. Soon after He asks the Company, whether They did not yet perceive that He who appeared to Moses, had declared Himself to be the God of Abraham*, &c. This Passage I before cited in my Defense (p. 37.) to prove that, according to Justin, Christ Himself was God of Abraham. This you complain of, very ridiculously (Reply, p. 37.) calling it a Piece of Artifice, and I know not what, as if I had stopp’d where I ought not; whereas it is impossible that Justin’s Words should have any other meaning than That which I have given: The following Words in Justin are so far from confronting this Sense, that They do nothing more than repeat and confirm the same Thing. For after Justin had thus plainly asserted that Christ was God of Abraham, &c. proving it from the Text in Exodus; Trypho objects, that possibly it might be an Angel only that appeared, and God (that is God the Father) might speak to Moses by that Angel. To which Justin replies, “Admit that both God and an Angel were concern’d in that Appearance to Moses, as has been proved from the Text cited, yet (I insist upon it) that the Maker of all Things was not the God, (or that Divine Person) who told Moses that He Himself was God of Abraham, and God of Isaac, and God of Jacob; but it was He of whom I have proved to you, that He appeared to Abraham, and to Jacob, administering to the Will of the Maker of all Things†. Justin

* Ω’ ἀλλ’ ἡθείς ἐνὴκάτε, λέγων, ὅτι ἐν λῃσί Μωσῆς Ἄγγελον ἐν τῷ φωνῇ λειλακάκην αὐτός, εἰτε αὐτός ὁ Θεὸς ὑπ’ οὐσίας τῆς Μωσῆς, ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ Θεὸς Ἀβραάμ, καὶ Ἰσαὰκ, καὶ Ἰακὼβ: Justin. Dial. p. 179.
† Ὅψε, ὅτι τοιτὶς ἐν ἀλών ἐνεκ Θεοῦ ὁ τῆς Μωσῆς ἐπὶ ταῖς αὐτῶν ἐναὶ Θεὼν Ἀβραάμ, καὶ Θεὸν Ἰσαὰκ, καὶ Θεὸν Ἰακώβ, ἀλλ’ ὁ ἀποδίχθεις;
goes on to prove this from the Absurdity of supposing that God the Father should appear in that manner: upon which Trypho is convinced that He that appeared to Abraham, and was called God and Lord, and was God, was not the Maker of all Things; not God the Father, but Another, who was also an Angel. Then Justin proceeds to give farther Proof, that none appeared to Moses in the Bush but He only, who is called an Angel, and is really God, namely Christ the Son of God. To these Testimonies I shall subjoin one more out of Justin’s first Apology, which in English runs thus. “Now what was said to Moses, out of the Bush, I am the I AM, the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, and the God of thy Fathers, denotes that “They, tho’ dead, are still in being, and are Men as of Christ Himself *. In this Passage, Christ is plainly asser ted to be the & o, the I am, or God of the Jews, God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. By four express Testimonies out of Justin, this momentous Point is establish’d; And the whole Tenour of this Father’s Writings confirms it. The Sum then of Justin’s Doctrines is This. That there is no other God besides the God of the Jews, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: That God the Father is God of the Jews, God of Abraham, &c. That there is Another besides the Father, who is also God of the Jews, God of Abraham, &c. and this Other is the Logos, or Christ, the proper and only Son of the Father, undivided and inseparable from Him, tho’ Begotten of Him. The Conclusion from all is, that Christ is

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

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

* See my Sermons, p. 299, 300.
† Disquis. Mod. p. 29.
tend to say that Father and Son were two Gods, but only that They were more than two Names of the same Thing; as some Hereticks taught, before Sabellius. In this Sense, none of the Post-Nicene Writers ever deny'd that the Son is διός ἐτεκός, or ἐτεκόν τοῦ ἄλλου, or another, or another Thing, really distinct from the Father *. The same way of speaking you will find in the Church, as low as Damascen †. But you say, (Mod. Disquis. p. 29.) that the Post-Nicene Fathers guarded their Expressions by the Word Hypothesis, which Justin does not. And what if the Disputes which happen'd after Justin's Time, made it necessary to guard such Expressions as having been used formerly without Offence, came at length to be perverted to an ill Meaning? There is nothing strange in This. It is well observed by the judicious and learned Du-Pin, speaking indeed of Theognostus, but the Remark is applicable to others of the Antients, who may claim the like Favour of Interpretation. "Photius, says He, has wrongfully accused Theognostus to have erred concerning the Divinity of the Son, upon the Score of a few Expressions that did not agree with those of his own Age; without taking notice that tho' the Antients have spoken differently as to this Point, yet the Foundation of the Doctrine was always the same; and that it is an horrid Injustice to require Them to speak as nicely, and with as much Precaution as Those that lived after the Birth and Condemnation of Hesekies. In a word, tho' Justin has not used the like Guards with the Post-Nicene Writers, since He had not the like Occasions; Yet His Sense, —

† Vid. Damascen. 1. 1. c. 6. lib. 3. c. 6.
without any such Guards, is plain enough to any Man that duly weighs and considers it.

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

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

4. You object (Disqu. Mod. p. 30. 33.) That Christ is no more than the Chief Power (πρωτης δυναμις) after the Chief God, μη του πρωτης Θεου. But Justin no where puts those Words together as you have done. He does indeed say, that the Son is the principal Power after (that is next in order to) the Father of all Things*: which is no more than to say, that He is the next Person to the Father, as all allow. What Inference can you draw from thence against our Principles? As to the Words πρωτης Θεου, Chief God, it is Plato's Expression, and, as such, cited by Justin.

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

* Just. Mart. Apol. i. p. 66.
† Just. Apol. i. p. 114.
all Catholics, before and after the Nicene-Council, from Justin* down to Damascen†.

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

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

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

† Πάντως εὐθυτε ἐν ὑμῖν ὑπὸ γενεσίας καὶ τὸ πνεύμα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκείνου, καὶ
αι ὑπὲ ὑπερ. Damasc. de Fid. Orth. lib. i. c. 10.
Men, and the out-cast of the People: and then the Reader would have seen plainly what Justin was talking about.

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

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

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

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

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

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

XI. I charged you farther (Defence, p. 411.) with
another Misconstruction of a Passage in Athenagoras;
a very famous one, and of Singular use in this Con-
troversy. You appeared to Me to construe the Words
εχ ως γενόμενον *, not as eternally generated; which
is a very new and peculiar Construction. You deny
the Fact, as indeed you may well be ashamed to
own it. But I shall literally translate that Paragraph
of your Book, and then the Reader may the more
easily judge of it. "Hence it appears that Athen-
agoras, with the Christians of the same Age, be-
lieved the Father only to be θεον ἀγέννητον καὶ
ἀείδων, God unbegotten and eternal, and the Son of
God the Father to be called πρότερον γέννημα,
The first Off-spring, εχ ως γενόμενον, not on the
account of any eternal Generation, properly so
called, such as might constitute the Son ζωτετε εὐ
φειτεως, living and subsisting by Himself, in, or

* Πρότερον γέννημα ευμεθα πατερ, εχ ως γενόμενον, εχ αρχης ο νο
θεος, νεκ αειδος αν, εχειν αυτον εν ζωτετῃ του λογου α ζωες λογισθν

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


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

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

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

* Defense, p. 412.
† Disqu. Mod. p. 168.
Son, that They are Both Spirits; which two Angels, and two Demons also are. Is there then no regard to be had to what an Author is otherwise known to believe? Or is it fair and just to construe an ambiguous Sentence (supposing this ambiguous, and not rather plain enough against you) in direct Opposition to his certain undoubted Principles? But what makes it the more unjust in this Case, is, that Tertullian, in that very Paragraph, within a Line or two of the Words which you ground your Remark upon, resolves the Unity of Father and Son into This, that They are, de Spiritu Spiritus, de Deo Deus, de Lumine Lumen; Spirit of Spirit, God of God, Light of Light. Can This be said of two Angels, or two Demons, that They are Light of Light, or Spirit of Spirit? Have They any such Relation to, or intimate Conjunction with, each other, as is here plainly signified of Father and Son? Well then; What is the Result? You have misunderstood Tertullian, or rather perverted his Meaning. He does not say that Father and Son are One, because They are Both Spirits; any more than He says they are One, because They are Both Gods: nor would it be sufficient for one to be Spirit, and the other to be Spirit, or one to be God, and the other God, unless one were also of the other, inseparably united to Him, and included in Him. Tertullian indeed observes that God the Father is Spirit, as He had before observed of God the Son:

And this was right, that so He might come to his conclusion, that they are Spirit of Spirit; which they could not be, unless each of them were Spirit. This therefore is mention'd, not because it makes them one, but because they could not be one without it. They must be Spirit and Spirit, to be Spirit of Spirit: But the latter contains more than the former; and it is into this that Tertullian resolves the formal reason of the Unity; or rather, both considerations are included in his notion of Unity of substance. This will appear from a bare literal rendering of his words. "We have learned that He (God the Son) is prolated, and by his prolation generated, and upon that score, He is styled Son of God, and God, from Unity of substance. For even God (the Father) is Spirit: And when a ray is produced from the Sun, a portion from the whole, the Sun is in the ray, because it is the Sun's ray; and the substance is not separated, but extended: in like manner, here is Spirit of Spirit, and God of God, as Light of Light. You see how Tertullian makes it necessary to Unity of substance, that the substance be not separate: And thus Father and Son are one, not merely because each of them is Spirit, but because both are undivided substance, or Spirit; Spirit of Spirit. When I wrote my Defence, I thought a hint might have been sufficient in things of this nature; little imagining I should ever have the trouble of explaining such matters as these, which appear by their own light, upon a bare inspection into the author.

XIII. In the next place, I charged you with a misconception of a noted passage in Irenæus. To this you make no reply at all; wherefore it stands as before; and I have, I suppose, your tacit allowance.

* Defence, p. 412.
lowance to Triumph here, as, in a former place, your express Permission.

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

* Defense, p. 414.
† Disquis. Mod. p. 147.
insinuate it only, to your Reader; and so you leave it with Him, trusting to his Weakness, or Partiality. However, instead of asking a Proof of you, I gave you a Proof of the Contrary; demonstrating from the Context (especially from the Words Exclamans quod se Deus reliquisset, which Tertullian in expresses Words interprets of the Human Nature) that the supposed Ignorance of Christ was understood by Tertullian of Christ's Humanity only. Now you say (p. 22.) that the Words, known only to the Father, exclude the Son in all Capacities. Very well then; I had the good fortune to hit your meaning before, though you made no Descant upon the Words. As to your Pretence from the Term only, there is no Ground for it. No Man of any Judgment, that is at all acquainted with Tertullian's way and manner of Explaining the Exclusive Terms*, relating to this Subject, would ever draw any such Inference from them. But you have a farther pretence, that all the Words preceding speak not of the Son of Man, but of the Son of God. The Reason is, because He was to prove that the Son of God was really distinct from the Father; and that the Father was not incarnate, as the Praxeans pretended. He proves it unanswerably from this Topic, among others; that in regard to the Son's Ignorance of the Day of Judgment, Father and Son are plainly spoken of, as of two Persons; one as knowing, the other as not knowing, tho' in a certain respect only: Wherefore the Father Himself was not the Person incarnate, which was to be proved. In this view, Tertullian's Argument is just and conclusive; and the Text relating to the Son's Ignorance pertinently alluded, tho' understood of Christ's Humanity. This I observed before, and explain'd more at large in my Defense,

* Vid. Tertull. Contr. Prax. c. 2. 5. 18, 19.
p. 415, 416, &c. You resolve, notwithstanding, to proceed in your own Way, and to make a show of saying Something, tho' you find your self already foreclosed, and every Objection obviated. You say thus: From this Mistake of Tertullian's citing Texts relating only to Christ's Human Nature, He saw this Objection would arise, that the Fathers argued impertinently against the Sabellians. I did indeed foresee, that there might be some Colour for such an Objection, among Those that take Things upon the first View, without looking any farther. I proposed the Objection fairly, and then fully answered it; as the Reader may please to see in my Defense. And now, what have you to reply? I had said that Catholicks and Sabellians, Both allowed that God was incarnate, and that the main Question (that is, so far as concerns the Incarnation, whereof I was speaking) was, whether the Father Himself made one Person with Christ's Human Nature, or no. In answer hereto, you make a show of contradicting me without opposing me at all, except in one particular wherein you are plainly mistaken. You run off for near a Page together, telling us only trite Things which every Body knows, concerning the Dispute between Catholicks and Sabellians. If by singular Essence, be meant the same with Hypostasis, or Person (as you understand it) That indeed was the main Article of Dispute between Catholicks and Sabellians, whether Father and Son were one and the same Hypostasis. But when the Principles of each Side were brought down to the particular Case of the Incarnation, then the main Point in Question was, whether the Hypostasis of the Father was Incarnate, or no. The Sabellians allowing but one divine Hypostasis, and yet admitting God to be Incarnate, were of Course obliged to assert it: And the Catholicks, on the other Hand, admitting more divine Hypostases than one, denied it. How the Catholicks
tholicks proved their Point, I showed you distinctly; and you have nothing of Moment to reply to it. Only you are pleased to acquaint us with an Invention of your own, that the Sabellians allowed in Jesus only Flesh; and by the Spirit of Jesus They understood the Godhead of the Father. But who, before your self, ever reckon'd it among the Sabellian Tenets, that Christ had no Human Soul? It is very peculiar of you to cite Tertullian in Proof of it, on account of these Words, dicentes Filium Carnem esse, id est Hominem, id est Jesus; Patrem autem Spiritum, id est Deum: when Tertullian, in the very Passage, interprets Flesh by Man, and Jesus; and interprets Spirit by divine Spirit, or God. As to the Belief of Christ's Human Soul, it was an established Article of Faith in Tertullian's Time, as appears from several Passages*; and before Tertullian, as is clear from Irenaeus †, and Justin Martyr ‡. How then comes it to pass that none of the Catholicks ever took notice of this Error of the Sabellians, their denying a Human Soul? I mention not how the Sabellian Hypothesis must have been very needlessly and stupidly clogg'd by such a Tenet: For They could never have given any tolerable Account of the Son's praying to the Father, of his increasing in Wisdom, of his being afflicted and sore troubled, and crying out in his Agonies and Sufferings, without the Supposition of a Human Soul. What? Was it only walking Flesh, or animated Clay, that did all this? Or was it the Hypostasis of the Father, the eternal God, as such, that did these Things? You allow only these Two; and not caring, it seems, how stupid and senseless you make all the Sabellians, one of these you must, of Course, father upon Them. It is true that They supposed the Father to have suffered, and

† Iren. l. 5. c. 7. p. 292. Ed. Bened.
They were therefore called Patiripassians: That is, They supposing the Father to suffer (as we believe of the Son) in the Human Nature. But They were never so gross and wild in their Imagination as to suppose the Godhead, as such, to suffer, to be sore troubled, to be in Agonies, to cry out, &c. And yet it is ridiculous to apply this to Flesh only without a Soul: Neither can it be reasonably imagined of the Sabellians, unless They believed of Men in general, that They have no such Thing as a Soul distinct from the Body. In short, their retreating at length to This, that there were two Hypoßiases * in Christ, a Divine and Human, in order to solve the Difficulties they were pres'd with, sufficiently discovers their Sentiments. For neither could that Subterfuge do them any Service, unless Jesus was supposed a distinct Person; nor could They be so weak as to imagine a living Carcass, a Body without a Soul, to be a Person. To conclude this Article, the Sabellians, when They retired at length to that Salvo, taking Sanctuary in two Hypoßiases, understood one of them to be God the Father, the other, the Man Christ Jesus †: which was afterwards the Doctrine of Paul of Samosata, and of Photinus, who thus refined upon the Sabellian Heresy. But I have been rather too long in confuting a Pretence, which has nothing to countenance it in History; besides that it is plainly repugnant to good Sense.

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

---

† See this expressly asserted in Athenæus. Tom. 2. p. 39. before refer'd to.  
‡ Defense, p. 117. referring
referring you to the Place where *. You now say
in your Reply (p. 24.) That which the Bishop has done
in that Section is fully answered and refuted, p. 197, 198.
I have turn’d to those Pages, in your Disquisitions,
and can see nothing like it; except it be your Fancy,
or Fiction, that the Ante-Nicene Fathers, when They
speak of the Logos as existing in the Father before
his coming forth, mean it of an Attribute only, and
nothing real. This groundless Surmise is at large
confuted by Bishop Bull †: And give me leave also
to refer you to what I have observed †, on that
Head. What you add, relating to Clemens Romanus,
is only gratis dictum, and wants to be proved.

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

† Bull. Def. Fid. Sect. 3. cap. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.
‡ Defensio, p. 148. &c. Sermonis, p. 244.
** Defense, p. 418.
†† Mod. Disquis. p. 84.

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

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

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

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

* Defense. p. 418.
pretend it: But if the Logos appeared in a certain Manner and Form, and the Father never appeared in any Manner or Form; the Logos is not the Father: which was the Thing to be proved.

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

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

---

* Habes Filium in Terris, habes Patrem in Calis: non est separatio ista, sed Disposition divina. Ceterum scias Deum etiam intra Abyllos esse, & ubique consistere, sed vi & potestate: Fi-
Hum quoque ut individuum cum ipso ubique. Tamen in ipsa oikovouía Pater voluit Filium in Terris haberi, se vero in Calis.

Tertull. adv. Præm. cap. 2.
with your Dissertation, let us next come to Disquis.
Modest. p. 87. There, I must observe, you have
hardly one word to the purpose. All that you prove,
is, that Father and Son are not one Numerical Ef-
sence, in your Sense; that is, They are not one Nu-
merical Person, which is readily allowed: As also
that They have not one Numerical Will, Power, &c.
in your Sense, tho’ They have in Another. Volun-
tas de Voluntate, Potentia de Potentia is the Catholick
Doctrine, as much as Substantia de Substantia, or
Deus de Deo. In short, if you would do any thing
towards confuting Bishop Bull, you should anwer the
Authorities which He brought, to prove that those
very Ante-Nicene Writers (who argued that it could
not be the Father that appeared, and descended, and
was found in a place,) acknowledged, notwithstanding,
that the Son was, in his own Nature, invisible,
and omnipresent as well as the Father; and that the
same Writers (some of them) expressly interpreted
those Appearances, &c. of the οἰκονομία, Economy, or
Dispensation, which it pleased God the Son to run
through; transacting all Matters between God the
Father, and the World of Creatures. As to the
οἰκονομία, and what Bishop Bull intends by it, the
Reader may see in his Defense of the Nicene-Faith,
(p. 10.) What you mean by denying it is very hard
to conjecture, unless you have some weak Evasion
(Reply, p. 26.) in the Words, Beginning from the fall
of Adam: For you say, and seem to lay some Stress
upon it, that it began from the Beginning of the Crea-
tion. Does Bishop Bull deny That? See his own
Words, in the Margin *. But, it seems, you are
to construe Bishop Bull’s saying, that it was as high

* Deus Pater, quemadmodum per Filium suum mundum pri-
mitus condidit creavitique; ita per eundem Filium se deinceps
as the Fall of Adam, (in Opposition to such as sup-
posed it to commence at the Incarnation, and no
sooner) as if He had said it began from the Fall of
Adam: And This you are to do, only to find some
Pretence for contradicting Bishop Bull, and divert-
ing the Reader from the Point in Hand. I referred
you (Defence, p. 418.) to Authors *, Antient and
Modern, who asserted the οἰκονομία in Bishop Bull's
Sense. To which you have nothing of any moment
to oppose; only you discover a great Dissatisfac-
tion that Bishop Bull had so well guarded his Point, and
vindicating his Doctrine, that all your most pompous
and plausible Pretences fall before Him.

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

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

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

† Defence, p. 420.
‡ Defence, p. 303.
given me just occasion for; as I showed plainly in the place referred to. In Apology for your self (Reply, p. 56.) you cite a Passage of my Defense, (p. 433.) where I say, "A Writer is not to be blamed, in some Cases, for taking what is to his purpose, and omitting the rest. To which give me leave to answer in my own Words, as they follow in the same Page; " But, as the Case is here, the best, and indeed only light to direct the Reader to the true meaning of what is cited, is left out. You say, your design being only to prove from the Words of Justin, that Christ was God, καὶ θεὸν αὐτῷ, according to the Will of his Father, what Reason could you have to add that He was also styled an Angel? But, do you not yet perceive that the Question is, whether Christ be said to be God καὶ θεὸν αὐτῷ, according to the Will of the Father, in that Place of Justin, or no? The Words, literally rendered, run thus: "Who according to his (the Father's) Will, is both God, being his Son, and an Angel as ministering to his Father's Will. The meaning of the Passage is not, as you represent it, that Christ is God, by the Will of the Father (tho' even That might bear a good Sense) but that it pleased God that his Son, who was God already, as God's Son, should be an Angel also. That He was God, was a necessary Thing; but that He should be Both, was not so. This I took to be the true Sense of the Passage. For, Justin gives the Reason why He was God; it was because He was God's Son. He resolves his Dis-

* Τον κατὰ βασιλ. της εκκλης και Θεον ωστε, ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐγγ. ἐν τῇ κυριεύσει της γνώμης αὐτοῦ. Dial. p. 370.

Compare the Words of Novatian.

Vininity into Sonship here, as indeed every where; and Sonship into Communication of Substance, as I have observed above. Now, let us consider what you had done with this Passage. The Latin Version runs thus: 

Qui juxta Voluntatem ejus, & Deus est, Filius qnippe Ipsi, & Angelus ex eo quod sententiae illius est admissi. Instead whereof you give us This: Qui ex Voluntate Ipsi, & Deus est & Filius ipsin. Here, by putting in the Particle Et, before Filius, and leaving out & Angelus, you determine the Words to your own Sense, tho' capable of another Sense as they lie in the Author. This is what I had just reason to complain of, that you should take upon you to leave out, and put in, what you please, to tie the Words down to your own Meaning; when the Words otherwise may, or rather must, bear a different Construction, if you please to let them appear intire, and without any Interpolation.

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

God as being the Son of God. Now, these and the like Passages make against you, as showing that Justin resolved Christ's Divinity into his Sonship, that is, Communion of Essence, or Substance *, not into voluntary Appointment. If it be objected that He was a Son \( \chi^\varepsilon \ \rho\varepsilon\alpha\varepsilon\iota \lambda\eta \) according to Justin, and that therefore He must be God \( \chi^\varepsilon \ \rho\varepsilon\alpha\varepsilon\iota \lambda\eta \), if He be God as God's Son; I answer, that the Consequence is not just. For while Justin understands the Sonship of a Temporal and Voluntary \( \omega\gamma\varepsilon\iota\varepsilon\lambda\varepsilon\omega\iota\sigma\iota\ ), or coming forth, He supposes the Logos not to have been \( \varepsilon\zeta\ \omega\delta\varepsilon \ \omega\nu\tau\alpha\nu\ ), but from the very Substance of the Father; and therefore He was God, as having ever existed before his coming forth, in and with the Father. In a word, He came forth, was not created, and therefore He is God. Had He been produced from nothing, as Creatures are, He could not be God: But since He came forth as a Son, of the same divine Substance with the Father, therefore He is God.

This I take to be the true Account of Justin's Principles relating to this Head; as also of all the other Fathers that speak of a voluntary Generation. See my Defense, Qu. 8. You see then, how wide a difference there is between your Account of Justin and mine. I desire only to have Justin's Text fairly represented as it is. To put in, or leave out any thing here, and thereby to determine the Sense against us, in so critical a Place as This, is very unfair and unjust; and deserves the hardest Names that I could give it. Let us have no Tampering with Texts. You may argue and reason for your Sense of the Passage, if you please; as I do also for mine. Only let our Readers see plainly what the Words of the Author are.

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

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

1. In the first place, you have a strong Presumption, that Two, or more Persons cannot constitute one Individual, or Numerical Being, Substance, or Essence. You produce Testimonies of Fathers in great Numbers, proving Nothing but a real Distinction; and by Virtue of the Presumption laid down (which stands only upon Conjecture) you persuade your Self, that those Testi-
Testimonies are of some weight, and pertinently alleged, even against those who admit a real Distinction, as much as the Fathers do.

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

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

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

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

*See Nelson's Life of Bishop Bull, p. 345. &c. 388.*
any Injury done Him by the Bishop, or that He ever thought fit to vindicate Himself, or his great Oracle Petavius; to whose Judgment (as He Himself laments) He had once dearly paid too great a Deference.*

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

SIR,

Your most Humble Servant.

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

ERRATA.

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

p. 43. l. 12. for ἀπειρατω read ἀπειρατον.
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