
This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

<https://books.google.com>



A

SUPPLEMENT

TO THE

C A S E

OF

Arian SUBSCRIPTION

CONSIDERED.



In ANSWER to a Late PAMPHLET:

ENTITLED,

*The Case of Subscription to the XXXIX
Articles considered.*

By *DANIEL WATERLAND*, D. D.
Master of Magdalen-College in Cambridge, Rector
of the United Parishes of *St. Austin* and *St. Faith*,
London, and Chaplain in Ordinary to His Ma-
jesty.

L O N D O N :

Printed for *W. and J. Innys*, at the *Prince's-Arms*
at the West-End of *St. Paul's*. MDCCXXII.

Handwritten text, possibly a signature or name, appearing upside down and mirrored.



A
SUPPLEMENT
TO THE
CASE
OF
Arian SUBSCRIPTION
CONSIDERED.



However new to the *Case of Arian*
Subscriptions &c. as apprehensive
that *Supra* *Cl.* and so home
press'd, might exasperate the Per-
sons concern'd: Though I took care
to treat them with all the Mild-
ness and Tenderness that the Subject would bear;
confining my self to the reasoning Part, naming
no particular Men but such as I was oblig'd to
quote, and candidly exempting the principal Man
of Them, that the Charge might be as general, and
inoffensive as possible; falling rather upon the Thing

it self, than upon This, or That particular Person. If the Argument be provoking, I cannot help it: The same Objection lies against the detecting, or reproving any *Vice* or *Immorality* whatever. It is the proper Business of a *Divine* to state *Cases* of *Conscience*, and to remonstrate against any growing Corruptions in *Practice*, and especially in *Principles*. If *Arian* Subscription be really *fraudulent* and *immoral* (which no considering Man can doubt of) it may concern Those Gentlemen rather to testify their sincere *Repentance*, than to acquaint the World with their causeless *Resentments*. I shall here say nothing to the abusive Flirts of the nameless Author, who has been pleased still to persist in the Defence of *Arian* Subscription: Except it be to remind him that Those assuming Strains very ill become either so *weak* a *Cause*, or such a *guilty Practice*. I was once inclinable to take no Notice of so mean a Pamphlet; concluding that I had said enough, when I had said enough for Men of Sense and common Ingenuity; and it is often not advisable to press Things to the utmost. But since This is a Cause of very great Moment, wherein the very Foundations of *moral Honesty*, as well as of *Christian Sincerity*, are deeply concern'd; I think it incumbent upon me to proceed somewhat farther in it: And if Those Gentlemen resolve to go on in maintaining an *Open Fraud* as long as it is possible to amuse or deceive, tho' only the weakest and most ignorant Readers; I also must resolve (by God's Assistance, and for God's Glory) to go on in the Defence of *Sincerity* and *Probity*, till the very meanest Readers may sufficiently understand it. To come to the Business.

The Pamphlet lately publish'd, is entituled, *The Case of Subscription to the XXXIX Articles consider'd; occasion'd*

occasion'd by Dr. W's Case of Arian Subscription. The Author is but just, as well as modest, in not calling it an *Answer* to Mine: For indeed, he has left the most material Points untouched, without so much as attempting any Thing like an Answer. If you will take his bare Word for it, the Articles of our Church, so far as concerns the Trinity, are *general, indefinite, undeterminate*; not *particular, special, or determinate*. He takes This for granted, and reasons all the Way upon That Supposition; which is very unaccountable: Unless it were because I had *demonstrated* the contrary, beyond all reasonable Reply; and so there was no other Way left but to *stifle the Evidence*, to protest against *Fact*, and to bear the Reader down with a *false* Presumption. Such a Management as This, is, in effect, little else but a more untoward Way of giving up the Cause; where a Man does the Thing, but loses all the Grace and Credit of it, by his Manner of doing it. But let us see how he goes on, to give some colour, at least, to his Pretences. I had press'd the *Arian* Subscribers with the *Athanasian* Creed, the *Liturgy*, and the *Articles*; to prove that our Church was *particular, and determinate* in the Points disputed. Not a single Word has This *Writer* to show, either that the *Athanasian* Creed, or *Liturgy* is not *determinate*, as I represented: And as to the *Articles*, he seems to make no Account of Any but the *First*: of which he often intimates, that he has some Way of evading it, but he does not care to tell us what; for fear he should be found faulting even there, and lie open to Rebuke for it. The *First Article*, alone, is, I am very certain, more than He can fairly deal with: But I must remind Him farther, that the 2^d and 5th Articles do also require his Consideration; and then there is the *eighth*,

eighth, which, unfortunately for Him, carries all the *Three Creeds* in the Bowels of it: Creeds which, as the Article says, (and as This *Writer* says, if He subscribes to it) ought thoroughly to be received and believed; for They may be proved by most certain Warrants of Holy Scripture.

Well then, we have the *Creeds* wrapp'd up in the *Articles*: And the Subscriber must be content to take in all, or none: Let us next see to the *Liturgy*. This Gentleman thinks he has a Fetch for That: He Subscribes not to the *Truth* of every particular, but to the *Use* only, and that it contains nothing contrary to the *Word of God*. Now, sayshe, I must freely own that I see no contradiction, no necessary Absurdity in the Use of what a Man may wish to have in some Things corrected*. I would be as favourable to This *Writer* as possible. I do allow of his Distinction, and that it may be proper, and pertinent, in some Cases: But I can never allow that a Man may use a solemn formal Lie in his Prayers, and often repeat it, under pretence that we may admit the Use of some things which might be corrected. This is arguing from *Gnats* to *Camels*, and widening the Rule beyond all Measure and Proportion. This will best be understood in the Sequel, when the Reader comes to see what kind of Things thoe are which This Gentleman desires to use, without believing a Syllable of them. I must observe farther, that the Subscriber is tied up to believe that the *Liturgy* contains nothing contrary to the *Word of God*. Does not This pinch a little closer than This *Writer* might wish? Has He nothing to object against any Expressions in the *Liturgy*, but that They contain Things

* *Case of Subscription*, &c. p. 46.

seemingly

seemingly contrary to *natural Reason*? Have they nothing contrary to *Scripture*, to what He calls *Scripture*? I should be thankful to Him for so obliging a Concession. After all, I would advise this *Writer*, not to pretend to be Wiser than *Dr. Clarke*. The *Doctor* had considered These Matters much, and long: And I have not yet found any *Disciple* of his that has endeavour'd to *refine* upon him, but what has exposed himself in doing it. The wary *Doctor* was sensible that *Articles*, *Creeds* and *Liturgy* must all come into account, and all be reconciled (if possible) to his own *Hypothesis*. He made no distinction between admitting the *Truth* of This, and the *Use* only of That; well knowing, that *Truth* and *Use* are coincident in a Case of This high Moment; and that he could not submit to the *Use* of Those Prayers but in such a Sense as He thought *True*. He took the only Way of settling That Matter for his purpose, had there really been Any: But as *his* fail'd, the Flaw in the Architecture is never to be made up by common Hands.

Having shown that *Creeds*, *Articles*, and *Liturgy* must all come in, to determine in our present Question; I would now proceed to cite Passages from our *publick Forms*, and confront Them with select Sentences drawn from the Writings of the *New Sect*, that every common Reader (for to such I now write) may have *Ocular Demonstration* of the Truth of what I affirm, that the Expressions of our *publick Forms* are *special*, *precise*, and *determinate* against the *New Scheme*; not *general*, or *indefinite*, as This *Writer* wishes, I can hardly say *believes*. But I must first take notice of a Remark which He has Page the 8th, that we are obliged to Subscribe only the *English Articles*, not the *Latin*. I know not what uses He intends by it; tho' He intimates there may be

be some ; keeping upon the Reserve, as usual, when he suspects an Advantage may be taken. Dr. Clarke, to do Him justice, openly declared what Evasions, or Salvo's he had to justify his Subscribing. He considered, I suppose, that without This, it would be Subscribing with *mental Reservations* ; which is perfect *Jesuitism*. But This *Writer* perhaps thinks there's no harm in it, that it is an innocent Practice ; and that so long as He can but invent some secret Evasion to Himself, He need have no concern about satisfying the World. To return to the Matter in hand. As to the Articles, *English* and *Latin*, I may just observe, for the sake of such Readers as are less acquainted with These Things : *First*, That the Articles were pass'd, recorded, and ratified in the Year 1562, and in *Latin* only. *Secondly*, That those *Latin* Articles were revised and corrected by the *Convocation* of 1571. *Thirdly*, That an authentick *English* Translation was then made of the *Latin* Articles by the same *Convocation*, and the *Latin* and *English* adjusted as nearly as possible. *Fourthly*, That the Articles thus perfected in *Both Languages* were published the same Year, and by the *Royal Authority*. *Fifthly*, Subscription was required, the same Year, to the *English* Articles, called the Articles of 1562, by the famous Act of the 13th of *Elizabeth* ^b.

These things considered, I might justly say, with Bishop *Burnet* ^c, that the *Latin* and *English* are *Bothequally authentical*. Thus much however I may certainly infer, that if in any Places the *English* Version be ambiguous, where the *Latin* Original is

^b See the Particulars proved at large in Dr. Bennet's *Essay on the 39 Articles*.

^c *Burnet, Pref. to the Articles, p. 10,*

clear and determinate; the *Latin* ought to fix the more doubtful Sense of the other (as also *vice versa*) it being evident that the *Convocation*, *Queen*, and *Parliament* intended the same Sense in Both. For instance, in *Article* the *First*, the Three Persons are declared to be of *one Substance*, in the *Latin*, *ejusdem Essentia*, that is, of the same *Essence*: From hence it is manifest, that *one Substance* is equivalent to *same Substance*, or *Essence*. Again, in *Article* the second, the *English* Version runs thus: *The Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one Substance with the Father, &c.* Now, in the *English*, the Words *the very and eternal God* may possibly be referr'd to the Father just before mention'd: But the *Latin* *Article*^d plainly shows that the Words are to be referred to God the Son, and could not have been intended of God the Father, in that Place. From hence we see how useful it may be to compare the *English* and *Latin* together, in any doubtful Cases: For, there cannot be a more demonstrative Proof than This is (where it can be had) of the true Sense and Meaning of *Compilers* and *Imposers*. And let This *Writer* pretend what He pleases, when once the true and full Sense of the *Imposers* is fix'd and certain, That very Sense, and That only, is bound upon the *Conscience* of every *Subscriber*. This I have abundantly proved in my former Papers: To which I shall only now add This plain Reason; that, since Words are designed to convey some *Meaning*, if we take the Liberty of playing upon Words after the *Meaning* is fix'd and certain, there can be no Security against

^d Filius, qui est Verbum Patris, ab æterno à Patre genitus, verus & æternus Deus, ac Patri Consubstantialis, &c. *Art. 2.*

Equivocation, and Wile, in any Laws, Oaths, Contracts, Covenants, or any Engagements whatever: All the Ends and Uses of Speech will hereby be perverted; and there can be no such Thing as Faith, Trust, or mutual Confidence among Men.

I proceed now to set before the Reader the Tenets of our *new Guides*, in one *Column*, with the Tenets of our Church in another, opposite *Column*; that from thence we may form a judgment of their Agreement, or Disagreement. I shall take my Citations of the first *Column* from Dr. *Clarke* and his profess'd Disciples; not from Mr. *Whiston* and his, who are known to be less reserved, and who abhor this kind of fraudulent Subscription as much as I do. I shall not scruple citing some Passages out of the first Edition of *Scripture Doctrine*, which are left out in the second; because, tho' the Doctor does not own them, yet his Disciples must, till they either give better, or yield up the Cause of Subscription.

The Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity, according to Dr. Clarke and his Followers.

The Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity according to the Church of England in her publick Forms.

Dr. *Clarke's* Scheme makes the Unity of the Son and Spirit with the Father to be only figurative, not (necessarily^d)

In the Unity of This Godhead there be Three Persons of *one Substance*,
Art. 1.

an

The

^d Note that the two Words necessarily, and individual, here stand for nothing but to soften the Expression. Necessarily is of no Moment, because the Subscriber is so acknowledge that the Doctrine of one Substance is warranted by Scripture.

Case of Arian Subscription. II

an Unity of Essence, or individual Substance, but of Authority and Consent. Modest Plea, p. 7.

The Son — of one Substance with the Father. *Art. 2.*

The Holy-Ghost of one Substance with the Father and the Son. *Art. 5.*

It may be proved by most certain Warrants of Holy Scripture (*Art. 8.*) That the Son is of one Substance with the Father, (*Nic. Creed*) and that He is God of the Substance of the Father; and that we ought not to confound the Persons, nor divide the Substance. *Athan. Creed.*

The Father alone is, absolutely speaking, the God of the Universe.

Clarke, Prop. 8.

The Scripture, when it mentions the one God, or the only God, always means the supreme Person of the Father.

Clarke, Prop. 9.

In the Unity of This Godhead there be Three Persons. *Art. 1.*

It may be proved by most certain Warrants of Holy Scripture (*Art. 8.*) that the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy-Ghost is all one, that they are not three Gods, but one God. *Ath. Creed.*

The

B 2

O

ture, and therefore necessarily to be believed. And as to individual it signifies nothing here; the Doctor, it seems, denying all Unity of Substance, and admitting only Unity of Authority, and Consent.

The Apostle says, *God is the Father*, which is the direct contradictory to your Notion, whose Definition of God is, that He is — *the Three Persons*.

Modest Plea, p. 150.

Demonstration that *one God is one Person only* — otherwise impossible for one Person to be God. *Collect. of Queries*, p. 108.

There are *not* Three *Uncreated* Persons.

Clarke, Script. Doct. p. 429. Edit. 1st.

The Father (or First Person) *alone* is self-existent, underived, unoriginated, independent, *made of none*[†], begotten of none, proceeding from none.

Mod. Plea, p. 5.
If

O holy, blessed and glorious Trinity, *Three Persons and one God*. Lit.

Nothing contrary to the Word of God contain'd in this Form.

O Lord, Almighty, everlasting God; who art one God, one Lord, *not one only Person*, but *Three Persons* in one Substance, &c. Comm. Off.

Ever one God World without end, frequently applied to all the three Persons in our Church's Collects.

It may be proved by most certain Warrants, &c. (Art. 8.) that The Son is *Uncreate*, and the Holy-Ghost *Uncreate*: The Son *not made, nor created*: The Holy-Ghost *neither made, nor created*.

Athanasian Creed.

One Lord Jesus Christ — *begotten not made*.

Nicene Creed.

The

[†] Note that the Father alone is here said to be made of none; which is directly saying that the other Two Persons are made. I had observed the same of Dr. Clarke's 5th Proposition, but had it intimated to me, that the Doctor had put a Semicolon at independent; to show that alone reach'd

If any thing, 'tis most natural to infer that He (the Son) is not the very God, because He is here so expressly contradistinguished from Him.

The Word when he appear'd in the Form of God, and as God, was *no more than the Minister and Angel of God.*

Mod. Plea, p. 30.

It is without any colour from Scripture, that you affirm each of the Three Persons to have the same right of Dominion.

Mod. Plea, p. 159.

When Dr. Clarke excepted Supremacy, and Independency, He plainly, in reason and Consequence, excepted absolute & infinite Powers, so that

The Son — the very and eternal God.

Art. 2.

Very God of very God;
Nicene Creed.

The whole three Persons are co-eternal together and co-equal — equal to the Father as touching his Godhead.

Ath. Creed.

It may be proved by most certain Warrants of Holy Scripture, (*Art. 8.*) that such as the Father is, such is the Son, and such is the Holy-Ghost — The Father is Lord, the Son Lord, and the Holy-Ghost Lord, and yet not Three Lords, but one Lord.

Ath. Creed.

There is but one living and true God, everlasting — of infinite Power, Wisdom, and Goodness — and in Unity of This Godhead there be

no farther, the rest being to be understood of Father without the Restriction of alone. But, it seems, the modest Pleader was not aware of the Significancy of the Semicolon, but puts a Comma only: Wherefore I may justly charge him with making two of the Persons Creatures.

§ Note the Word absolute is only to soften the Expression. The Author, in reason and consequence, plainly intimates that

the

2

that the Objector might well have spared asking in the 6th Query, Whether *infinite* Perfection can be communicated to a *finite* Being.

Collect. of Queries, p. 57.

The divine Attributes of the Son are *not individually the same* with those of the Father ———

As to their *differing as finite and infinite*, there can be but one intelligent Being^h absolutely *infinite* in all respects. *Collect.*

of Queries, p. 54, 55.

God, when he is stiled Father, must always be understood to be (*αἰτία*) a true and *proper Cause*ⁱ, really and efficiently giving Life: Which consideration clearly removes the Argument usually

be three Persons of *one Substance, Power and Eternity.* *Art. 1.*

That which we believe of the Glory of the Father, the same we believe of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, *without any difference or inequality.*

Comm. Offi.

It may be proved by most certain Warrants of Holy Scripture (*Art. 8.*) that the Son is God of the Substance of the Father, ——— and Man of the Substance of his Mother; *perfect God, and perfect*

the Powers of the Son and Holy-Ghost are not infinite, and that They are finite Beings.

^h Note that Intelligent Being is with This Writer, and the whole Party, equivalent to Person: So that here Two of the Persons are declared to be finite Beings.

ⁱ Dr. Clarke's Notion of a true and proper Cause is of a Person acting upon Choice, or rather Acting (for acting, with Him, implies Choice): So that his Meaning here is that the Father might chuse whether the Son should exist or no. The latter Part of the Citation insinuates, that the Son is not as truly equal in Nature to the Father, as one Man is to another.

Case of Arian Subscription. 15

usually drawn from the *Equality* between a Father and Son upon Earth.

Clarke, *Script. Doctr.*

p. 239, 273. Ed. 2^d.

The Father *alone* perfect in Himself.

Script. Doctr. p. 273.

Necessary-existence is as inconsistent with being begotten, as to have no Cause of Existence, and to have a Cause.

Mod. Plea, p. 17.

Self-existent, unoriginate, or underived properly express'd by *necessary existence*.

Mod. Plea, p. 216, 217.

The Son is *not Self-existent*. Clarke, Prop. 12. comp. *Reply*, 162, 230, 231.

— avowedly maintain, that the Son is *not necessarily existing*^k.

Phileleuth. 2^d Letter to *Mangey*, p. 27.

An *Angel* might strengthen *Him*^l, who was now in

perfect Man. — *Equal* to the Father as touching his Godhead.

Ath. Creed.

The Son begotten, *not made*, of one Substance with the Father.

Nic. Creed.

The Son — *not made, nor created*, but begotten.

Ath. Creed.

The Son — the *very* and *eternal God*. Art. 2. *Very God* of *very God*.

Nic. Creed.

It may be proved by most certain Warrants of Holy

^k N. B. To deny the Son's necessary Existence is the same as to assert Him to be a precarious Being, depending as much on the Will of the Father, for his Existence, as any Creature whatever, and therefore a Creature.

^l Note, This is said of the Son of God, even in his divine Nature, and whole Person, nor does this Author ever allow the

in That State of Humiliation, made a little lower than the Angels.

Modest Plea, p. 93.

The grand Principle (of Dr. Bennet) was, that the Word *is the very God*. When this was once establish'd, 'twas rightly thence inferred, that *The Word can't be exalted* — Nay, This Supposition will indeed justify those Questions, *Was the very God exalted thereby? Is it not Blasphemy to suppose it?* — Our Saviour was *highly exalted*, as the Reward of his Sufferings — From the Doctor's Principle, 'tis a just inference that the *Word never was exalted*. But on the other Hand the Scriptures are clear, that He who was the *instrument* of his Father *in the Work* of Creation, yet had not a *Kingdom*, and *Judgment*, and *Dominion* then committed to Him — But after

Holy Scripture (*Art. 8.*) that the Son is *Almighty, perfect God, — equal to the Father*, as touching his Godhead.

The Son — The very and *eternal God*.

Art. 3.

Very God of very God.

Nic. Creed.

the Distinction of divine and humane Nature, but rejects it as implying a division of Person. See p. 97.

ter his Sufferings and Death, &c.

Mod. Plea, p. 97, 98.

This Power and Dominion to which Christ is advanced at the right Hand of God, is not only the highest Character and Prerogative of his Sonship, spoken of in Scripture, but is the Foundation of his personal Godhead, and Adoration.

Collect. of Queries, p. 75.

The Son hath a relative Omniscience communicated to Him from the Father; I mean that He knoweth all Things relating to the Creation and Government of the Universe: But yet He himself confesseth *Mat. xxiv. 36. of that Day and Hour, &c.* By which all the ancient Antenicene Writers ^m understand that

The Son which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, The very and eternal God, of one Substance with the Father.

Art. 2.

God of the Substance of the Father, begotten before the Worlds.

Ath. Creed.

Only begotten Son of God, begotten of his Father before all Worlds, God of God, very God of very God. *Nic. Creed.*

One living and true God, of infinite Power, and Wisdom: In the Unity of This Godhead there be Three Persons, &c.

Art. 1.

That which we believe of the Glory of the Father, the same we believe of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, without any difference, or inequality.

Com. Off.

It

^m Note that This Writer every where professes his agreements with the Antenicene Writers: And tho' He is insincerely false in reporting their Sentiments, yet it cannot be doubted but He here gives us his own.

that our Lord, as the *λόγος*, or Son of God, did not then know the Day of Judgment.

Collect. of Queries, p. 48,

49. See also *Unity of God not inconsistent*. p. 8.

There are not Three eternal Persons.

Clarke, *Script. Doctr.* p. 433. 1st. Ed.

The *Eternity of God* the Father is revealed in the Old Testament — in the New Testament, it is emphatically express'd, *Rom. i. 20*. But, in neither, is there any mention of the Son's.

Coll. of Queries, p. 50.

The *Word* incarnate *passible* according to the express Declaration of *St. John* and *St. Paul*. — Whether they who — make only the *humane Nature* *passible*, do not show too little Regard to the plain Evidence of Scripture?

Coll. of Queries, p. 143.

If *Dr. Clarke's* Scheme be right, it seems to follow — that all Worship ought to be directed to

It may be proved by most certain Warrants of Holy Scripture (*Art. 8.*) that the Son is eternal, and that the whole Three Persons are *co-eternal together*, and their *Majesty co-eternal*, and that They are *one eternal*.

Ath. Creed.

One living and true God without Body, Parts, and *Passions* (*impassibilis*) — in the Unity of *This Godhead* there be three Persons, &c.

Art. 1.

The Son — The *very and eternal God* — *very God* and *very Man*.

Art. 2.

It may be proved by most certain Warrants, &c. (*Art. 8.*) that *The Unity in Trinity*, and the *Trinity*

Case of Arian Subscription. 19

to the Father thro' Christ: *Trinity in Unity* is to be excepting only that such *worshipped.* *Ath. Creed.* Worship may be paid to Christ as Mediator, for which we have express Warrants from Examples in Scripture.

Absolutely Supreme Honour due to the *Person of the Father singly*, as being *alone* the Supreme Original Author of all Being and Power.

Clarke, Prop. 43.

O holy, blessed and glorious Trinity, &c.

Lit.

O Lord, Almighty, everlasting God, who art one God, one Lord, *not one only Person, but three Persons in one Substance, &c.*

Com. Off.

From this View of the Doctrine of our Church, compared with That of our *New Teachers*, it appears that They are intirely opposite to each other, and are no more to be reconciled than Light and Darknes. And yet I have not took the Advantage of pursuing the Doctrine of Those Gentlemen through its direct, immediate, and inevitable Consequences, in order to make the contradiction between That and our Church's Forms, still more glaring and palpable. No Body can doubt of their believing the Son and Holy-Ghost to be *Creatures*, if either *Arius*, or *Eunomius*, or even Mr. *Whiston* ever believed it. They undeniably believe Them to be what every Body means by *Creature*, in common Speech and Language. This is demonstrable, many Ways, from their Writings, and from Those very Passages which I have here selected.

1. If the Father *alone* be *made of none*; then it follows that the other Two Persons are *made*, that is, are *Creatures*. The Premises are theirs, the Conclusion makes it self.

2. If the Father alone be *necessarily existing* (as Those Gentlemen expressly teach) then is the Son a *precarious* Being, which is only another Name for *Creature*. The same will follow of the *Holy-Ghost*.

3. If the Son, even as Son of God, wanted an *Angel* to *strengthen* Him, He must of course be a *weak frail* Being, that is, a *Creature*.

4. If the Son, as the *λόγος*, or *Word*, was properly *exalted*, and in such a Sense as cannot without *Blasphemy* be asserted of the *very God* (as These Men teach) then it is evident that the Son is an *imperfect*, and *mutable* Being, that is, a *Creature*.

5. If God the Son was once *ignorant*, in his highest Nature (as these Men teach) and *ignorance* can belong to nothing but *Creatures*, He must of consequence be a *Creature*.

6. If neither the Son, nor Holy-Ghost is the *one true* God, but excluded from the *one True Godhead* (as These Men assert), They must of course be *Creatures* only.

7. If neither the Son nor Holy-Ghost be the *one infinite* Being, nor have *infinite* Powers (as These Men pretend) They can be only *finite* Beings; and every *finite* Being is, of course, a *Creature*.

8. If Christ's *Exaltation*, after his Resurrection, be the sole *Foundation* of his *personal Godhead*, (as These Men say) then He was not *God* before That *Exaltation*; nor since, in any just and proper Sense, but a *Creature* only.

9. If Christ be *passible*, in his highest Nature (as These Men teach) and nothing is *passible* but a *Creature*; it evidently follows that He is a *Creature*.

Thus

Case of Arian Subscription. 21

Thus may it be demonstrated, nine several Ways, (and more might be added) from their own Writings, that the Abettors of the *new Scheme* make God the *Son*, (and so the *Holy-Ghost* of course) as very a *Creature* as ever did *Arius*, or *Eunomius*, or any *Arian* whatever.

They must not here pretend to run into general Declamations against charging Men with *Consequences* which they do not own. I allow such a Plea to be reasonable in some Cases, but not in This. For instance, When a *Calvinist* is charged with the Disbelief of God's *Holiness*, *Justice*, or *Goodness*; or an *Arminian* with the Disbelief of God's *Prescience*, *Sovereignty*, &c. Both Sides charging each other with *Consequences* respectively, as if They were truly their *Tenets*; Such Conduct on either Side is justly condemn'd. But why justly condemn'd? Because it is certain that Those *Consequences*, which they draw for each other, are really not their *Tenets*; since They, respectively, *disavow*, and *abhor* any such *Tenets*; and because they are, respectively, ready, upon every occasion, to declare their full and intire Belief of Those *Attributes*, which They are said to deny; and would rather give up their main *Hypothesis*, than be really guilty of any such *impiety* against God's Perfections. But now as to the *Consequences* which I charge upon our modern Revivers of *Arianism*; let it be observed:

1. That they are many of them so direct, plain, and immediate from their *Tenets*, that They are hardly so properly *Consequences*, as the very *Tenets* themselves, differently express'd.

2. Those Gentlemen, when press'd with Those *Consequences*, give but too plain Suspicion, that They both see and own them, and only *Verbally* disclaim

disclaim Them. For they express no abhorrence or detestation of the Supposition of the *Son* and *Holy-Ghost* being *finite*, being *precarious* in their Existence, being *dependent* on the *Will* of another. Nor do They ever declare (except when They *Subscribe*) That either of those Two Persons is *infinitely perfect*, is *strictly omniscient*, is *all-sufficient*, or *independent*, as to *existence*, on the *Will* of another. Instead of taking off the suspicious *Consequences*, They do all They can to insinuate Them into their Readers; avoiding nothing but the Name of *Creature*; all the while inculcating the *Thing*. And if they are farther press'd, They must at length allow, that They do admit the *Son* and *Holy-Ghost* to be *Creatures*, in our Meaning, in the *common* Meaning of *Creature*; only in some particular Meaning of their own, They think they may deny it, of the *Son*, hardly of the *Holy-Ghost*. For the *Holy-Ghost* must be a *Creature* with Them, even upon Their own Definition of a *Creature*; as being one of Those Beings brought into *existence* by the Power of the *Son* of God, in Subordination to the *Will* and Power of the *Father*ⁿ. I say then, since the *Consequences* wherewith we charge those Gentlemen, are plain, certain, and irrefragable; since They are not able to show where they fail, or that They are no *Consequences*; since they are not solicitous to ward Them off by expressing any *abhorrence* of them, or by any Acknowledgment of the *divine Perfections* of the *Son* or *Holy-Ghost*, in their full Extent, as understood of the *Father*; since They appear only to avoid offensive *Names*, in the mean while insinuating and inculcating, in other Words, the very *Things* with which we charge

ⁿ See *Collection of Queries*, p. 60.

Them

Them: Such being the Case, it is just to charge Them with Those *consequences*, as being really their *Tenets*: I say, *just*, in the Way of *Disputation*; as to *Legal Censure*, I concern not my self with it.

Having shown how oppositethe *new Scheme* is to our Church's *Doctrine*, it may now be proper to represent, in its true Colours, the Case of *Arian Subscription*; that every such Person, when He presumes to *Subscribe*, may understand how mean, and vile a Part He is therein acting. Let his own *real Sentiments* be here specified, together with his *Professions*, in the Words of our Church, and his *Evasions* to satisfy his Conscience, in This *Sacred Engagement*.

“ My Faith is that the Three Persons are *Three Beings*, and *Three Substances*; Two of them differing from the First, as *finite*, and *infinite*: Yet I profess with *Article the First*, that They are of *one Substance* (*ejusdem Essentia*) because the Words of *one Substance* may either signify I know not what, (See the Case, p. 40.) or may be interpreted as *Eusebius* did the *ὁμοούσιον*, to signify that the *Son*, and *Holy-Ghost* have no *Likeness* at all to the *Things* which are made (therefore not made) but are like the *Father* in every respect (See the Case, p. 17.) therefore not differing *infinitely*, or as *finite* from *infinite*.

“ My Faith is that the *Father only*, in opposition to all other Persons whatever, is *The very and eternal God*; and consequently, that the *Son* is not the *very and eternal God*: Yet I make no Scruple to profess, with *Article the Second*, that *The Son is the very and eternal God*: Not the *same God*, but another *God*; Two very and eternal *Gods*, the *Divinity* of the latter being *derived* from the former.

“ I be-

“ I believe that the *Holy Ghost* is no where set
 “ forth in Scripture as God, and that He is not
 “ included in the one *infinite* Substance, but *finite*
 “ of Course: Yet I readily profess with *Article* the
 “ 5th, that *the Holy-Ghost is of one Substance, Majesty,*
 “ *and Glory, with the Father and the Son, very and*
 “ *eternal God*: Not the same God, but another; in
 “ all, *Three very and eternal Gods*^o, by ineffable Com-
 “ munication of divine Powers and Dignity from
 “ one to the other Two.

“ My Faith is, that to say, *God is three Persons*;
 “ is the direct contradictory to the Doctrine of St.
 “ *Paul*. Nevertheless, it may be proved by most cer-
 “ tain Warrants of Holy Scripture, that the Godhead
 “ of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy-Ghost
 “ is all one, and that They are not Three Gods, but
 “ one God. This I scruple not to profess, because
 “ I can understand *there are not*, when I read *they*
 “ *are not*.

“ My Faith is, that the Creed called *Athanasian*,
 “ composed in a very dark and ignorant Age, has af-
 “ firm'd more than is necessary, and more than is
 “ true^p, according to the Compiler's Sense: Yet I
 “ willingly Subscribe to *Article* the 8th, asserting
 “ that it ought thoroughly to be received and believed,
 “ and may be proved by most certain Warrants of Ho-
 “ ly Scripture; because I hope, some way or other,
 “ to wrest it to a meaning suitable to my own Hy-
 “ pothesis.

“ I do not believe it at all necessary to Salvation, to
 “ *Worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity*;
 “ or to profess *perfect God and perfect Man*^q united.

^o See my Defense, p. 337, 347.

^p See Clarke's *Scripture Doctrine*, p. 418. First Edit. *And*
 my Case of *Arian Subscription*, p. 50, &c.

^q See my Case of *Arian Subscription*, *ibid*.

Case of Arian Subscription. 2 §

“ in one Person: Yet I readily acknowledge, with
“ Article the 8th, that it may be proved by most cer-
“ tain Warrants of Holy Scripture, that whosoever
“ does not keep this Faith whole and undefiled,
“ shall, without doubt, *perish everlastingly*.

“ My Faith is, that there is but one Godhead
“ Supreme, *viz.* the Godhead of the Father; and
“ that the Godhead of the Son is not the same
“ Godhead, but inferior, and the Godhead of the
“ Holy-Ghost still more inferior: Yet I willingly
“ allow, with Article the 8th, that it may be pro-
“ ved by most certain Warrants, &c. that *The God-*
“ *head of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy*
“ *Ghost is all one*, the Divinity of the Two latter
“ being derived from the former.

“ My Faith is, that *There are not Three eternal*
“ *Persons*, and that particularly as to the *Eternity* of
“ the Son, there is *no mention* at all of it in Scrip-
“ ture: Yet it may be proved by most certain War-
“ rants of Holy Scripture, that *The whole Three Per-*
“ *sons are co-eternal together*; that is, so far as an
“ Existence before *Times*, or *Ages*, necessarily im-
“ plies *co-eternal*^r.

“ I do by no means allow that the Three Per-
“ sons are, or can be, *one eternal*: Yet I readily
“ profess it may be proved, &c. that *They are not*
“ *Three Eternals, but one Eternal*, because I can put
“ *There for They*, tacitely supposing one, when I
“ read the other.

“ My Faith is that God the Son is *precarious* in
“ his Existence, that He has *no Foundation* of his
“ personal *Godhead*, but his *Exaltation*, that He
“ is no more than *an Angel of God*, that an *Angel*
“ might *strengthen* Him, that He was once igno-

^r See my Case of Arian Subscription, p. 53, &c.

“ *rant* in his highest Nature, and was *properly exal-*
 “ *ted* (all which it would be *Blasphemy* to ascribe
 “ *to the very God*, or to any Thing but a *Creature*, ac-
 “ *cording* to the common Acceptation of *Crea-*
 “ *ture*) Yet I scruple not to assert that He is *very*
 “ *God of very God*, and that He is *The very and*
 “ *eternal God*, neither *made*, nor *created*; that is
 “ *to say*, neither *made* nor *created by Himself*,
 “ *but by the Father only.*

“ My Belief is, that to say, *Three Persons are*
 “ *one God*, is contrary to Scripture: Yet I scruple
 “ not to declare that the *Book of Common-Prayer*,
 “ which frequently asserts and inculcates That very
 “ *Thing, contains nothing contrary to the Word of God.*

“ I do not believe that the Father, Son, and
 “ *Holy-Ghost* are *one God*; it is *contradictory* to
 “ *St. Paul*: Yet I am content to say, O holy, bles-
 “ *sed*, and glorious Trinity, *Three Persons and one*
 “ *God*, &c. And frequently, in my yearly Course
 “ of Prayers, I call upon *all the Three*, under the
 “ *Stile and Title of One God*: For, tho’ it be de-
 “ *livering a formal Lie*, before God and Man,
 “ and in a Point of the highest Consequence; yet
 “ I make no Scruple of it, because *I must freely*
 “ *own, that I see no Contradiction, no necessary Ab-*
 “ *surdity in the Use of what a Man may wish to have*
 “ *in some things corrected.*

“ To conclude, I do not believe that the *Glory*
 “ of the Son, or of the *Holy Ghost*, is any way
 “ comparable to the Glory of the Father; yet I
 “ scruple not to be the Mouth of the Congrega-
 “ *tion*, in saying, *That which we believe of the Glory*
 “ *of the Father, the same we believe of the Son, and*
 “ *of the Holy-Ghost, without any Difference or inequa-*

* See *Collection of Queries*, p. 60.

† See *Case of Subscription to the XXXIX Articles*, p. 46.

“ *lity.* This solemn Mockery, in the Face of God
“ and Man, may *lawfully be used*; because, again,
“ I see no Absurdity in the *Use* of what a Man
“ may wish to have in some things corrected.

This Representation of the Import of *Arian* Subscription, I take to be fully supported by what hath been above cited; tho’ I have not every where used their very Words; thinking it sufficient to give their *certain* Sense. I might easily have drawn it out into a much greater Length, but that I am unwilling to be tedious, and incline to think that the very meanest Readers may now fully apprehend what a Grimace and Banter our *Arian* Reconcilers make of their solemn *Subscription*. Yet They stand up for it, even in printed Books; as if the first Elements of *Sincerity* were almost lost; or *common Sense* were extinct among us. This it is that has oblig’d me to be so particular, and to lay these things plain and open before the *Eyes* of the Readers, that They may even *see* how The Case stands, almost without the Pain of any Thought, or Reflexion.

I might here take leave of This *Writer*, having abundantly confuted his confident Assertion about the *generality*, or *latitude* of Expression, supposed in our Church’s Doctrine of the *Trinity*. It is, now at least, clear and manifest, that the Expressions of our *publick Forms*, (so far as concerns the Points in Dispute) are *fix’d*, *special*, and *determinate* as possible: Nor could the Wit of Man invent any more particular, or stronger Expressions against the *new Scheme*, than are already in our *Creeeds*, *Liturgy*, and *Articles*.

This *Writer*’s main Pretence being thus taken off, other occasional, or incidental Passages may deserve the less Notice. But since I have begun,

I shall now go through with him, and answer every little Cavil, which may either seem to require it, or may give me an opportunity of farther illustrating any Part of our present Argument.

Object. If the Meaning of the Articles be in such a Sense one Meaning, that They can be subscribed honestly only by such as agree in That one Meaning; all, or all but one of Those great Men, Bishop Bull, Dr. Wallis, South, Sherlock, Bennet, &c. must have been guilty, &c. p. 5.

Answer. If This Writer can show that any of Those great Men contradicted any Point of Doctrine plainly determin'd by our Church, as I have shown of Him and His Party; then I condemn Those Men, be They ever so considerable, as well as the *Arian Subscribers*: But if They differed in ever so many Questions relating to the *Trinity* (as there may be a great many) and none of those Questions decided either Way by our Church; Their differing in such, *undetermined* Points, does not affect their *Subscription*, any more than their differing about the *Inhabitants* of the *Moon*. Let This Gentleman show what Positions of those great Men plainly confront the Positions of our Church; that so They may be condemn'd, as they ought to be, and their *Subscription* with them. Or if This cannot be shown, how *impertinent* is the Objection?

Object. When any Church requires *Subscription* to its own Sense of particular Passages of Scripture, which do not contain the Terms of Salvation, and refuses Communion with Those who cannot conform to That, it is confess'd that such a Church does That which it ought not to do, p. 5.

Answer. This is intirely foreign. *Subscription* is not a Term of *Lay-Communion*, but of *ministerial Conformity*, or *Acceptance of Trusts and Privileges*:
So

So that This Gentleman here seems to have forgot what He was upon. Besides that, had the Dispute really been about the Terms of *Communion*, his Pretence is not *pertinent*; because the Doctrine of a *co-eternal Trinity* is really a *Fundamental Article*, and such as our Church declares to be *necessary* to *Salvation*.

Object. *The Articles are so composed, that some of them are on all Hands allowed to be left at large, the Composers intending a Latitude, &c. p. 8.*

Answer. I admitted This, in my Papers before, and sufficiently showed how impertinent The Plea is to the Point in hand. Undoubtedly, it never was the Intent of our Church to determine all *Questions* relating to every Subject whereof it treats. Yet she intended to determine, and has determin'd many *Questions*; particularly the main *Questions* between *Protestants* and *Papists*, between *Catholics* and *Arians*. When *Franciscus a Sancta Clara* took upon Him to reconcile our Articles to *Popery*; what did He else but play the *Jesuit*, and render Himself ridiculous? The like has been since done by our *Arian* Reconcilers, with as much wrestling and straining, and with as little Success. It might be diverting enough, (were not the Thing too serious, and full of sad Reflexions) to compare the *Papist* and the *Arian* together, and to observe which of Them has been the greater Master in This exercise of Wit, and has found out the most ingenious and surprizing Comment upon an *Article*. Our Articles however will stand, in their own native Light, in defiance to Both; so long as Gravity, Sobriety, and manly Thought shall be esteem'd and valued

^c The Title is *Expositio paraphrastica Articulorum Confessionis Anglicæ. Published A. D. 1634.*

upon

above the little Arts of equivocating, and playing upon Words. The Articles are not *general*, so far as concerns our present Debate; and we need not inquire farther. There is a *Medium*, I suppose, between determining *All* Questions, and determining *None*: One might justly Wonder how This *Writer* could be insensible of it, and fall into so unaccountable a Way of reasoning.

Object. *We must have some Criteria by which we may judge which these particular Articles are, &c.*

Answer. The *Criteria*, in the present Case, are *plain* Words, not *capable* of an *Arian* Meaning. In other Cases, any *certain* Indication of the *Imposer's* Meaning is a *Criterion* to fix the Sense of a Proposition. When there are neither *plain* Words, nor any other *certain* Indication of the *Imposer's* Meaning; The Article, so far, is left at large, and the Point left undetermin'd.

Object. *One Man subscribes to the Truth of This general Proposition, in the Unity of This Godhead — there be Three Persons: Meaning by this, that each divine Person is an individual intelligent Agent, but as subsisting in one undivided Substance, They are all together, in That respect, but one undivided intelligent Agent. — Another Man, who does not understand This Notion, say that sees a Contradiction in it, is convinced that each of the Three Persons is an intelligent Agent, whereof the Son and Holy Ghost is subordinate to the Father: What hinders that He cannot Subscribe honestly and fairly to the general Proposition? p. 12.*

Answer. Here are several of Mistakes. In the first Place, That *Proposition* of the first Article is not *general*, but *special*, in respect of the *Arian* Controversy. This *Godhead* plainly denotes The one *divine* Nature, *The one living and true God,*
before

before described in That Article. *In the Unity of this Godhead there be Three Persons*; therefore the Three Persons are the *one living and true God*; directly contrary to the *Arian Doctrine*, and to the *New Scheme*; which is nothing else but *old Arianism* reviv'd. As to the *Explication* which this Gentleman carps at, it is not properly an *Explication* of the Article, (which meddles not at all with the Question of *Intelligent Agents*) but it is determining a Point relating to the Subject, more particularly than the *Article* hath done; and This in answer to an *Objection* raised out of Men's over *Curiosity* in Those Matters. I know no reason This *Writer* has to find fault with That *Solution*, more than This, that it fully answers an *Objection* which the Party are apt most to triumph in. *Intelligent Agent* is understood either of *Person*, or *Being*. *Unus intelligens Agens*, or *unum intelligens Agens*, may be equally render'd *one intelligent Agent*: The former signifying *intelligent Person*, the latter *intelligent Being*. In the former Sense, every *Person* is an *intelligent Agent*; in the latter, all the Three are *one intelligent Agent*: Therefore *intelligent Agent*, and *Person*, are not reciprocal. He that teaches This *Doctrine* *Subscribes* honestly, because He believes all that the *Article* teaches; and besides, guards it from *Objections*. But He that interprets the *Article* to mean no more than that there are *three Persons*, two of which are *subordinate* to one, is, worthy of *Censure*: first, for giving us, at least, a *lame Interpretation*, short of the true and full Meaning of the *Article*: Or, secondly, for doubling upon the Word *Subordinate*, understanding by it *inferior*; excluding the Two Persons from the *one supreme Godhead*, and thereby running directly counter to the true Sense of the *Article*, which *supposes* all
the

the Three to be the *one living and true God*, and expressly asserts that They are of *one Substance; Power, and Eternity*. This *Writer* may now be able to distinguish between an *honest*, and a *fraudulent* Subscriber; if He does but know the difference between one who fully believes the *whole* of what He *professes*, and one who either believes it but *in part*, or really *disbelieves* the greatest part of it.

Objection. *Should any one arise, and declare those men to be Prevaricators— who differ from the Doctrine He lays down as the Meaning of the Article; I ask, whether This be not to put his own Sense or Comment to be the Meaning of the Article?— The Fault which is condemned by the King's Declaration, and which K. Charles threaten'd with displeasure, was, the drawing the Article aside any way or either way, p. 13, 14.*

Answer. I perceive, This Author knows little either of the History, Design, or Meaning of K. Charles's Declaration. The Design was to put a stop to the *Quinquarticular* Controversy, then warmly agitated. The King to prevent, or quiet those Disputes, thought it the most prudent way to forbid either Party's being more *particular* than the Articles Themselves had been. And we find that, in Fact, both Sides were censured when They launched out beyond the *general* Meaning of the Articles, in That Controversy; The King looking upon any Meaning beyond the *general* one, to be a Man's *own* Meaning or Sense, not the Meaning or Sense of the Article. What is This to the Point we are upon, where the *Meaning* was never thought to be *general* only, either by That King, or any Other, or by any considering Man else? He that declares and demonstrates the
Sense

Sense to be *special*, and *determinate*, against ancient or modern *Arians*, does not put his *own* Sense upon the Articles, neither does He *draw the Articles aside any way*; but He secures to the Articles their *own true* and certain Meaning, and rescues Them from the fraudulent Comments of Those who really *draw them aside*, and most notoriously pervert them. The Royal Declaration orders every Man to submit to the Article *in the plain and full Meaning thereof*, which if it be understood to reach to our present Case, (tho' the King seems to have had an eye *chiefly*, or *solely*, to quite another Thing) is a clear Condemnation of This Gentleman, and of every *Arian* Subscriber.

Object. When Mr. Rogers publish'd his Comment upon the Articles, his Book, says Dr. Fuller, gave very great Offence, because He confined the Articles to too narrow a Meaning, p. 17.

Answer. Very right; and I take Mr. Rogers to have been blameable in so doing. But it is not said that Mr. Rogers confined *all* the Articles, or the Articles concerning the Trinity, to too narrow a Meaning: Nor can This Writer show that we do it, in condemning the *Arians* as fraudulent Subscribers.

Object. Such a Latitude of Subscription was allow'd by the Council of Nice, p. 16.

Answer. The Fact cannot be prov'd; but the contrary may, if there be a proper occasion. However, I have no need to insist upon it, at present, because our *Liturgy*, *Articles*, and *Athanasian Creed* are more particular and determinate than the Council of Nice: So that, now at least, the Sense of the *ὁμοῦσιον* is fix'd and determin'd, to every Subscriber, beyond all caviel, or exception.

E

Object:

Object. *Had the Compilers, or Imposers intended to have been more determinate upon any Point, They ought to have been more explicit and particular,* p. 17, 18.

Answ. I defy the Wit of Man to invent any expressions more *particular*, and *explicit*, than many of Those are, which appear in our *publick Forms*; so far as concerns the true Faith in the Trinity in opposition to the *Arian Doctrines*. They have guarded against every Thing but *Equivocation, mental Reservation,* and a violent *perverting* of their *certain Meaning*. This is enough among Men of *Sense and Probity*, which is always supposed. No Laws, Oaths, Covenants, or Contracts can ever stand upon any other Foot than This, that when They are plainly enough worded for every Man to understand that will be *Honest*, it is sufficient; tho' it were still possible for Men of Guile to *invent* some sinister Meaning. I desire no other Favour than to have our *publick Forms*, in this Case, tried by the same Rule.

I may observe, by the way, how unwarily This *Writer* has furnish'd us with an Argument (which his Party perhaps may give Him no Thanks for) in behalf of our Forefathers, for their *inlarging of Creeds*. He would have told them, even after the compiling of the *Athanasian Creed*, that *They ought still to have been more explicit, and particular*, if They would secure the Point They aim'd at. I do not altogether differ from Him, provided the Thing *could* be done; and upon the Supposition that we have been gradually departing, farther and farther, from the *primitive plainness, and Sincerity*. Nevertheless, I can hardly think of any additional Security

curity to what is already, except it were such as we have seen added to the *Abjuration Oath*; a *Caveat* against any *Equivocation*, *Evasion*, or *mental Reservation* whatsoever: Which yet would not bind up Those that can leap over any Thing; (And *honest Men* are the same, *without* it, or *with* it) only it might make Them ashamed of ever appearing after, in defence of any *equivocating Practices*.

Object. *Where a Man does all that He is commanded to do, and does it openly, and with all the circumstances enjoin'd, He cannot be taxed with any defect in, or breach of, Regard to his Superiors, p. 18.*

Ans. For the purpose; If a Man takes the *Abjuration Oath*, openly, with all the Circumstances enjoin'd, only *not believing* a Syllable of it; He is, no doubt, very *Faithful* to, very *ob-servant* of, his *Superiors*. There is only This *Circumstance* wanting (Which if it be not *enjoin'd*, is always *supposed* necessary, and to need no *enjoining*) that the Man be *Sincere*: And This one defect turns all his pretended *Regard* to his *Superiors* into a direct *Affront*, *Rudeness*, and *Iniquity* towards Them.

Object. *He that thinks the general words, Swear not at all, to be exclusive of all Oaths, and He that thinks it lawful to swear in some Cases, can subscribe to, or give an unfeigned Assent to St. Matthew's Gospel, p. 21.*

Ans. But if Either of Them as certainly *knows* that his pretended Sense of *Swear not at all*, is not the *True Sense* of *Christ*, as our *Arian* Subscribers *know* that their Sense of the *Articles* is not the *true Sense* of our *Church*; such a Person in professing an unfeigned assent to *St. Matthew's Gospel*, would give *Himself* the *Lie*, and be *guil-*

ty of a vile Hypocrisy, and Prevarication. This *Author* is forc'd to allow, in the next page (p. 22.) that He and his Party, *take the propositions* (of our Church) *in a Sense which They know was not the Sense of the Compilers, and Imposers*, p. 22.

Object. If *They* (the Compilers and Imposers) *happen so to have express'd Themselves that their words are consistent with Scripture, their Propositions may be assented to, tho' in a Sense different from what They were originally intended by the Compilers.*

Answer. They have not *happen'd* so to express Themselves as that their Words may be consistent with what This *Writer* calls *Scripture*; any otherwise than as a Man may *happen*, after using the plainest and strongest Words that can be thought on to express his Sense, to fall into ill Hands that will industriously pervert it. This indeed may *happen*, in any *Laws, Oaths, Contracts, or Engagements* whatever, however cautiously worded: Nor is there any Security against it (as before said) but the common Sense and Probity of Mankind; nor any *Rule* to go by in such Cases, if a Liberty be once taken of running against the *known, certain* meaning of the *Imposers*. Get loose from This, and the rest is wild Confusion, endless playing upon Words, and making a Jest and Banter of all Speech and Language.

Object. If *their Words* are fairly capable of a *Scripture Meaning*, then a Man may subscribe to *Those Words*: If *They* are not, 'tis not lawful to subscribe, p. 23.

Answer. By *Scripture Meaning*, This *Writer* understands his own *Arian Meaning*. I readily rest the Issue of the whole Cause upon this very Point. If the Words of our Church's Forms be *fairly capable of such a Meaning*, 'tis lawful to subscribe. But

But it is evident as the Light, that They are many of them neither *fairly*, nor *at all* capable of such a Meaning as the *New Scheme* requires; and therefore, by This Gentleman's own Confession, it is *not lawful* for Him or his Party to *Subscribe*. Indeed, Words are not *fairly* capable of a *false* Sense, if we are any way *certain* of the *true* one; that is, of the Sense *intended* by the *Speaker*, or *Writer*. We cannot *fairly* misconstrue any Words, if we are fully conscious of the *true* Construction; tho' the Words themselves might otherwise bear it. This I lay down as a Rule of Truth, which I think will hold in most, perhaps in all Cases. But I have no occasion for it in the present Dispute, because the Words themselves are by no means capable of an *Arian* Construction, consistent with *Grammar*, or *Custom of Speech*. This I have abundantly proved in my former Papers (*Chap.* the 5th) and now again in These: And This *Writer* Himself appears to be sensible of it, with respect to the *Liturgy*, and *Athanasian* Creed, at least, by his profound Silence on That Head; never attempting to confute That Part, tho' the most Material in our present Controversy. When therefore This Gentleman says, that He pleads not for *Subscription* with such reserves as, *so far as is agreeable to Scripture*, He only betrays his want of Reach. Dr. Clarke never yet *discarded* that Principle, so far as I know, tho' his Disciples have; and perhaps He is the Wiser in not doing it. However, I never directly *charged* the Doctor with *holding* that Principle, as this *Writer* falsely pretends, *Page* 24th; but I show'd that the Doctor must have That, or nothing, to retreat to at length; and that He had express'd Himself in such a Manner as to create just Suspicion that He really gave into it; having never expressly condemn'd it, and having
used

used such Arguments for *Subscribing*, as will either justify *Both* kinds of Reservation, or *Neither*.

Object. 'Tis a shallow Artifice indeed, in controverted Points, to assume that a Man's Interpretations of Scripture are Scripture, and that his Adversary's are not so: But 'tis the Artifice, shallow as it is, that runs thro' the Doct^r's Book, and makes Him treat his Adversaries with so much Insolence, p. 25.

Answer. This Writer appears here to have been much out of Humour: The reason is, I had unravelled a Piece of Sophistry whereon a mighty Str^ess was laid; which is very provoking. The Sophistry was This:

“ The Church of *England* permits the Subscriber to receive and believe whatever is agreeable to Scripture.

“ We of the *New Scheme* are ready to receive whatever is agreeable to Scripture, as by us interpreted.

“ Therefore the Church of *England* permits us to *Subscribe* in our own Sense of Scripture.

The Fallacy, I observed, lay here, that the Church of *England*, by *Scripture*, must mean her own Sense of Scripture, as to Points by Her determin'd: And therefore the Argument really concluded for the *Church's Sense*, which they made to conclude for the *Arian Sense*, tho' not the *Church's*. “ The Church surely, said I, has as good a Right “ to call Her Interpretations by the Name of “ *Scripture*, as the *Arians* have to call theirs so; “ and then her requiring Subscription to *That only* “ *which is agreeable to Scripture*, is requiring Subscription in her own Sense of Scripture, and none “ else. Let the *Arian Sense* of Scripture be *Scripture* to *Arians*; but then let Them *Subscribe* only

“ ly to *Arian* Expositions; which are nothing a-kin
 “ to Those of our Church ”.

Now, This *angry* Gentleman, either not understanding (for what is so blind as *Passion*?) what I was talking about, or industriously dissembling it, represents Me as not allowing the *Arians* to call their *own* Sense of Scripture *Scripture*: Notwithstanding that I had allowed it, in full and express Words. But I suffer Them not to think that They Subscribe according to the true intent and meaning of our Church, by Subscribing to their *own* Sense of Scripture, which is not the *Church's*, but *repugnant* to it. I suppose only that the *Compilers* of our Forms, and *Imposers*, were not bereft of *Common* Sense, were not downright Ideots; intending a *Subscription* to bind Men up, and at the same Time leaving every Man as much at Liberty as if there were *no Subscription*. They that can suppose the Governors of Church and State so *weak* and *silly* as This comes to, must not take it amiss, if we remove the undeserved Reproach from wise, great, and good Men, and return it to the proper Owners.

Object. *It is an unaccountable Method of arguing, in Dr. Waterland, that because State Oaths, which are contrived and penn'd without ambiguity, and on purpose to guard against some particular Things or Persons, ought not to be taken in any Sense but That of the Imposers — that therefore Subscriptions in Cases which are not parallel, are fraudulent. Such Arguments are only Arguments of Calumny and Slander; and only prove that He that urges such, wants nothing but Power to persecute, p. 19.*

Answ. This Gentleman is again press'd somewhere very hard, to make Him forget his Temper.

“ See my-Case of *Arian* Subscription, p. 25, 26.

I have told the World nothing but the plain Truth, that the Case of *Oaths*, and *Subscriptions* is parallel. I now appeal to the Passages above cited: And, let every Reader judge whether They be not as directly opposite to the *New Scheme*, as the *Abjuration Oath* it self is against a *Popish* Successor; Saving only the *Caveat* in the Close, against *Equivocations*. Which *Proviso*, however, is always to be understood, (tho' not particularly expressed) in all *Subscriptions*, *Contracts*, *Covenants*, *Oaths*, &c. Our *Courts of Justice* have not judged it necessary to add the like *Caveat* upon the taking of every *Oath*, because the Age is not, at present, thought wicked enough to want it: What it may be in a while, if such loose Principles as I am here confuting, prevail, I do not say. But to proceed: It will not be a harder matter to *elude* and *pervert* any *Oath* whatever, than it is to evade the many strong Expressions of our Church, in favour of a *co-equal* and *co-eternal* Trinity. This is what the Gentleman is so angry at, that He has no way to avoid the Force of the Argument but by a confident avowal of a *false* Fact; as if our *publick* Forms, as well as *State-Oaths*, were not penn'd, in This Case, without ambiguity, and on purpose to guard against some particular Things, or Persons. He that calls this plain Argument *Calumny* and *Slander*, commits the very Fault which He condemns, in calling *Good*, *Evil*: And as to the mean Insinuation about *persecuting*, I suppose it needs no Answer.

Object. *If the Arch-Bishops and Bishops, or even the Legislature itself cannot determine what shall be judged agreeable, or disagreeable to the Articles, The Insolence of a private Man must be intolerable, who shall presume to dictate to others, and to charge Men with Prevarication and fraudulent Subscription, &c.*

P. 32. Answ.

Case of Arian Subscription. 41

Answer. Softer Words might have served as well, and have never hurt the Argument, if it be any: The World will easily see the difference between *Reasoning*, and *Railing*. I take not upon me to determine what the *Bishops* or *Legislature* may do: Nor is it my Province to make *Authentick* Interpretations, *valid* in the *Courts* of *Law*. But, I humbly conceive, it lies within my *Compass*, to State a plain *Case of Conscience*, to detect *loose Casuistry*, and to remonstrate against it. I know of no *insolence* there is in determining, that co-equal signifies *co-equal*, or co-eternal *co-eternal*; that *one God* does not signify *Three Gods*, nor *one Substance* *Three Substances*; or that the Word *They* is something more than a different Spelling for *There*. These and the like plain Things, *Common Sense* had determin'd long ago; I only repeat: deciding for the *Court of Conscience*, not the *Courts of Justice*, as This Gentleman, by Mistake, seems to apprehend.

Object. Dr. W. indeed refers us to the *Writers of the Time when the Articles were compiled* — To send a Man to the *Writers of That Time* to know the *Meaning of the Articles*, when no Man wrote by *Authority*, is to make *Those Writers* the *Standard of the Church of England*, and not its own *Words or Declarations*,
P. 34, 35.

Answer. 'Tis pleasant to observe how This *Author* strains, to make me say something which He thinks He may tolerably answer, diverting the Reader from the main Point. I refer'd to the *Scope and Intention* of the *Writers*^x, in order to know the *Meaning* of their *Writings*; which I hope is *nounreasonable Method*: And I was there speaking of *Writings* in general. But as to the particu-

^x See my *Case of Subscription*, p. 12.

lar Case, now in hand, I no where *send a Man* to the Writers of That Time; nor does so plain a Matter require it. The Words Themselves are sufficient, and carry their own Interpretation with Them. I desire no farther *postulatum* than This, that our Language has not been quite *reversed*; that *Light* does not now signify *Darkness*, or a *Triangle* a *Square*. I can wave abundance of Niceties which might occur on the Subject of *Subscription*, and might be properly brought in, upon more doubtful Cases. In the mean while, I may observe, that This *Author's* Argument is *ridiculous* enough, that the *Writers* of The *Time* may not be useful to discover the *Scope* and *Intention*, (suppose of a *Law*, or an *Article*,) because Those *Writers* were not *Law-makers*, or Men in *Authority*. 'Tis well for the *Historians*, that They do not often meet with such hard Measure.

Objct. Let *Dr. Waterland* vindicate the *Arminians*, from the Charge of *Unrighteousness* and *Deceit*, and I'll venture then to acquit even his *Adversaries* from the same Charge, by the same Arguments. ———
 All the *World* must own (our *Articles*) to be formed upon *Calvinistical Principles*; and to have been deem'd *Calvinistical Articles* by our own *Arch-Bishops*, and by whole *Convocations* in *England*, and *Ireland*. ———
 Has That *learned Bishop* (*Bull*) proved *unanswerably*, that the *Sense* of the *Compilers* of our *Articles* was not *Calvinistical*? 'Tis one *Thing* to say, that the *Articles* are so express'd, as not necessarily to oblige Men to profess *Calvinism*: But 'tis another to say, that the *Sense* of the *Compilers* was not *Calvinistical*. Did *Archbishop Whitgift* know the *Sense* of the *Compilers* of our *Articles*? Did *Archbishop Usher*? Did our *Universities* in *Whitgift's Times*? Did the *Irish Convocations* which

which settled their Articles? Did our Divinity Professors in Q. Elizabeth's Days?

Answer. Before I come directly to the Matter, I must observe that This *Writer* here seriously delivers his Persuasion, that our Articles are *Calvinistical*, and formed upon *Calvinistical* Principles; at the same Time, as I conceive, acknowledging Himself an *Arminian*; which I suppose may be true of the rest of the Party. If This be really the Case, I must come upon Them with a double Charge of *prevaricating* in their Subscription. The *Calvinists*, agreeably to their Principles, have indeed often pretended that the Articles are *Calvinistical*: The *Anti-Calvinists*, on the other hand, have as constantly pleaded that the Articles are not *Calvinistical*, but rather *Anti-Calvinistical*; that They are not against Them, but rather on their Side. And Thus the contending Parties have gone on, endeavouring to justify their Subscriptions, respectively, by their differing Persuasions. But here, it seems, is a *new Sett of Men*, believing the Articles to be *Calvinistical*, and subscribing in *Arminianism*; And They are the first that ever boasted of so unaccountable a Conduct. To excuse one Fault, They commit another, heaping Sin upon Sin, and proclaiming their own Condemnation. Let Them get off from the Charge as I hey can: As to others, who understand the Nature of our Articles too well to think them *Calvinistical*, They are very excusable in their avowal of *Arminianism*; so far as our Divines do really avow it: For, I know not that They have ever adopted the whole *Arminian* System. The Historical Hints, given by This *Writer*, carry so little of Argument in Them, that if He has not a great deal more to urge, He will never be able to prove that our Articles are *Calvinistical*. When He speaks of *all the*

World's owning it, He betrays nothing but his unacquaintedness with Books, and Men. Has He never seen Dr. *Benner's* Directions, or Bp. *Bull's* *Apologia*, or *Heylin's* *Quinquarticular* History, or *Plaisere's* *Appello Evangelium*, or *Mountague's* *Appello Casarem*, to name no more? Does *all the World* own that These *great Men* were mistaken; or that They have not sufficiently shown that the pretence of the *Calvinists* is entirely groundless?

For my own part, I think it has been abundantly proved, that our *Articles*, *Liturgy*, &c. are not *Calvinistical*; but I have no need to insist upon the *Negative*: Let this *Writer*, or any Man else, prove the *Affirmative*, that They are *Calvinistical*, as is pretended. What He means by whole *Convocations* in *England*, determining the *Articles* to be *Calvinistical*, I do not at all understand. When He tells me what *Convocations*, and when, the Thing may be considered: In the mean while, let it pass for a Slip of his Pen. His other historical Hints may be thrown into order of Time, and in such Order I shall here briefly consider Them. His *Vouchers* are

1. Archbishop *Whitgift*.
2. Our *Divinity-Professors* in Q. *Elizabeth's* Days.
3. Our *Universities* in *Whitgift's* Time.
4. The *Irish* *Convocations*.
5. Archbishop *Usher*.

These are the Particulars of the Evidence, hinted rather than produced, to prove that our *Articles* are *Calvinistical*, or form'd upon *Calvin's* Principles.

As to Archbishop *Whitgift*, the *Universities*, and their *Professors*, They all fall within the same Compass of Time; and their Judgment in this Matter was discovered chiefly in the Year 1595; in the

Two

Two famous Cases of Mr. Barret, and Dr. Baro. At That Time *Calvinism* appears to have prevail'd at *Cambridge*, beyond what it had formerly done, The Seeds had been sown by *Cartwright*, some Time before, while He was *Margaret* Professor there; and the learned *Whitaker*, who was made *Regius* Professor in 1580, very much promoted and furthered their Growth. Yet Dr. Baro, of *Anticalvinistical* Principles, was Professor (*Margaret* Professor) before *Whitaker*, about 1571. and had for many Years gone on in his *Lectures*, without any Censure or Disturbance. *Calvinism* however by Degrees prevailing, and especially under the Influence and Authority of *Whitaker*, The opposite Opinion, of course, lost ground. But there were several considerable Men, notwithstanding, who approved not the *Calvinian* Tenets; and among the rest, Mr. Barret, then Fellow of *Caius* College. In the Year 1595, he took the Freedom, in a Sermon *ad Clerum*, to censure the *Calvinian* Tenets, and even *Calvin* Himself, very smartly. This gave offence to the *Vice-Chancellor* (or Deputy *Vice-Chancellor*) and *Heads*, who proceeded against Him, and forced Him at length to sign a feign'd *Retraction*, which They had drawn up for Him. It appears from the Form of *Retraction*, that the *Heads* who drew it up, or enjoyned it, thought our 17th Article to favour Them. Within a while, This Matter was laid before Archbishop *Whitgift*, who, in a Letter to the Lord *Burghley*, expresses his great Dislike of the Proceedings against *Barret*, for that some of the Points which the *Heads* had caused Him to recant, were such as the best learned Protestants, then living, varied in

1 See Mr. Strype's *Life of Whitgift*, p. 435.

Judgment upon; and that the most ancient and best Divines in the Land were in the chiefest Points in Opinion, against their Resolutions, ^z the Resolutions of the Heads, in Barret's Case. Hitherto then we have little reason to believe that our Articles favour'd Calvinism, if Archbishop Whitgift was any judge of it. But besides This, The Archbishop had sent a Letter to the Heads, ^a wherein He tells Them that in some Points of Barret's Retraction, they had made Him to affirm That which was contrary to the Doctrine holden and express'd by many sound and learned Divines in the Church of England, and in other Churches likewise, Men of best Account; and That which, for his own part, He thought to be false, and contrary to the Scriptures. For The Scriptures were plain that God by his absolute Will; did not hate and reject any Man. There might be impiety in believing the one; there could be none in believing the other. Neither was it contrary to Any Article of Religion, establish'd by Authority in this Church of England, but rather agreeable thereto.

He goes on to ask, upon This, and That Point maintain'd by Barret, against what Article of Religion establish'd in this Church was it? And some Opinions of Barret which the Archbishop thought untrue, yet, he said, had no Article directly against them. Thus far the Archbishop. Next it is observable that Whitaker, in his Answer to the Archbishop, ^b specify'd no Article of the Church to justify the Proceedings against Barret. For the Points of Doctrine, saith He, we are fully persuaded

^z See Mr. Strype's *Life of Whitgift*, p. 450.

^a See Strype, p. 440.

^b See Strype's *Appendix*, p. 199.

that Mr. Barret hath taught *untristh*, if not against the Articles, yet against the Religion of our Church, publickly received; and always held in Her Majesty's Reign, and maintain'd in all Sermons, Disputations, and Lectures. This Plea of *Whitaker's* is false in Fact, tho' He might not be aware of it. For, to say nothing of *Harfenet's* Sermon at St. Paul's Cross, in 1584, and of *Hooker's* at the Temple in the Year 1585. Both condemning *absolute Reprobation*; Dr. Baro, at Cambridge, had held Lectures, preached Sermons, and determined in the Schools against the Calvinian Tenets, for the space of fourteen, or fifteen Years before: As may be infer'd from a Letter of the Heads to the Lord Burghley, their Chancellor, extant in *Heylin* ^c, bearing date March 8. 1595. But, however This matter be, it is observable, that tho' the Heads in *Barret's* Case, had appealed to Article the 17th, and the Archbishop had particularly demanded of Them to make good their Proceedings by any Articles of the Church; yet Dr. *Whitaker* then thought it the wisest, and safest way to drop farther Appeals to the Articles, and to rest his Cause rather upon the current Doctrine of Divines. Now, tho' it were ever so true that Calvinism had obtain'd many Years in the Pulpits, and Professors Chairs, it no more follows from thence that Calvinism was the Doctrine laid down in our Articles, than that the Cartesian Philosophy was there, for the Time it prevail'd. All that can be justly inferred from it, is, that the generality of our Divines thought the Calvinian Tenets to be consistent with our Articles; and They might mistake even in That also. But to proceed, in the Story of *Barret*.

^c Heylin's *Quinquarticular Hist.* p. 624.

The *Heads* of the University, afterwards, make their humble Suit to the Archbishop, to favour and countenance their Proceedings, against *Barret*:^d They alledge that several Positions of *Barret* were contrary to the *Articles*, *Catechisms*, and *Common Prayer*; but They neither specify Those Positions, nor at that Time point to any Article, or particular Passage of the *Catechisms*, or *Common Prayer*; so that This general Charge is of little or no moment. Some time after, *Dr. Whitaker* charged *Barret* upon the *Articles* of the Church, and particularly on the 11th, of *Justification*. But the Archbishop still declared that He did not yet perceive^e how such a certain Position of *Barret*'s, which He had been charged with as impugning the *Articles*, did really differ from any Article of our Church. And as *Dr. Whitaker* had particularly charged Him upon the Article of *Justification*, the Archbishop was not satisfy'd with it; but desir'd that farther Enquiry might be made of Those Points *wherein They thought He varied from the Book of Articles*.^f At last a favourable *Retraction* was by the Archbishop, appointed for *Barret*; and so This Matter ended. From the whole Proceedings nothing certain can be gather'd as to any *Calvinism* being taught by our *Articles*. The *Calvinists* were willing to claim them, and made some Pretences that way; but, at length, rather dropped than pursued it; not being able to make That Point good, tho' often insisted on by the Archbishop.

It may be said, that the Archbishop however, upon This Occasion, Countenanc'd and Autho-

^d See *Strype*, p. 450.

^e See *Strype*, p. 456.

^f *Strype*, p. 455.

riz'd the *Lambeth Articles*, drawn up by *Whitaker* on the Foot of *Calvinism*. This is very true, tho' it is not so certain that the Archbishop understood Them in so strict a Sense as *Whitaker* did: For that They were thought capable of a milder and softer Construction, appears by *Baro's* Orthodox Explanation & of them, which He sent to the Archbishop, vindicating his own Sentiments to be Consonant to the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, in her avowed *Articles*, and urging that the *Lambeth Articles* were not to be understood so as to thwart the *Old Articles* of the Church^h. However, admitting that the Archbishop was so far a *Calvinist*, at last, as really to countenance the *Lambeth Articles* in their most rigid Sense; yet This does not prove that He thought the same Doctrine to be taught in the *Articles* of our Church. For had That been the Case, what occasion was there for drawing up nine *new Articles*? Might not the *old ones* have served for quieting all differences? It is plain from hence, that The *old Articles* were not thought sufficient to end the dispute, or to condemn the *Anti-Calvinists*; but *new ones* were devised to supply that Defect: which *new ones* might indeed be thought, by some, *consistent* with the *old ones*; and That is all. We see however, that the *Lambeth Articles*, in their strictest Sense, appear'd to others not very consistent with the *Doctrine* of our Church. And it is well known that the *Queen* and *Court* disliked Themⁱ, that they

^s *Strype's Append.* p. 201. *Vid. etiam Hist. Artic. Lamb.*

^h *Strype Life of Whitg.* p. 466.

ⁱ See the Letter to the Duke of Buckingham in *Heylin's Life of Laud*, p. 131. and *Collier's Eccl. Hist. Vol. 2.* p.

thought Them destructive of *Piety*, and *Government*; and the Archbishop, for countenancing Them, narrowly escaped a *Præmunire*.

I have but just touch'd upon *Baro's* Prosecution, not thinking it necessary to relate That whole Affair, which may be seen at large in our Historians. He was an *Anti-calvinist*, and had been so for many Years in his Sermons and Lectures; was never called to account for it before the Year 1595, then defended Himself handsomely, and had the Favour and Countenance of Lord *Burghley*, who reprimanded the warm proceedings of the *Heads* against Him, told Them that *as good and as ancient were of another judgment*, and that *They might punish Him, but it would be for well-doing* ^k. This Discountenance from Court stopped the Prosecution; and *Baro* enjoy'd his Professorship some time longer, 'till his Resignation of it.

Mt. Strype ^l mentions four considerable Men of that University, that favour'd *Baro*, and his Cause: *Mr. Overal*, *Dr. Clayton*, *Mr. Harsnet*, and *Dr. Andrews*. *Overal* succeeded *Whitaker* in the *Regius* Professorship; soon after: So that I think the *Writer* of the Pamphlet had no occasion to boast of the *Divinity* Professors of that Time. *Baro*, an *Anti-calvinist* was *Margaret* Professor before *Whitaker* was *Regius*: And the immediate Successor to *Whitaker* was of the same Sentiments, in the main, with *Baro*. Here I may take leave of *Whitgift*, and the University in *Queen Elizabeth's* Time. Nothing yet appears to make our Articles *Calvinistical*.

^k *Strype's Life of Whitgift*, p. 473.

^l *Strype Life of Whitgift*, p. 473.

The next Thing pretended is the *Irish Convocations*. The Fact is This; *Calvinism* had got footing in *Ireland* before the Year 1615. In that Year, They drew up a *Confession* of their own (not approving of the *English Articles*) and They inserted the *Lambeth Articles* into Their *Confession*. Dr. *Usher*, then a professed *Calvinist*, drew up the *Confession*. I see nothing in This matter to prove our *Articles Calvinistical*; unless their being rejected, by the *Calvinists*, can amount to a proof of their being *Calvinistical*. In the Year 1634, the *Irish Convocation*, with *Usher*, now Lord Primate, received the Thirty Nine *Articles*, without formally laying aside the *Lambeth Articles*. This shows that Archbishop *Usher* and the Convocation thought Those Two kinds of *Articles consistent*: which they might be, tho' there were not a Syllable of *Calvinism* in ours, if they were not plainly *Anti-Calvinistical*. So that here is nothing like a proof of the pretended *Calvinism* in our *Articles*, either in the judgment of *Usher*, or of the *Irish Convocations*. *Usher*, some years after, renounced his *Calvinian Principles*, as is well attested by Three good Hands: But I do not find that He therewith renounced our *Articles*.

Having thus answer'd every Pretence of This *Writer* for his imaginary *Calvinism*; I may now, *ex abundantia*, throw in a few brief *Remarks* which seem to me to plead strongly on the opposite side.

It has been often pleaded by learned Men, and I think well prov'd, that our *Articles* (in the Year 1552.) were not drawn up by *Calvin's* Scheme, but, next to *Scripture* and *Antiquity*, upon the Platform of the moderate *Lutherans*, the *Augustan Confession*, *Melancthon's Doctrine*, and the

Necessary Doctrine and Erudition of a Christian Man, compiled about nine Years before the passing of our *Articles*, and by many of the same Hands ^m that concurred with these in 1552. Our *Articles* therefore, in their original Composition, were not *Calvinistical*: How They could come to be so afterwards, being still the same *Articles*, I cannot devise. I do not find that the *Calvinian* rigours had obtained here in *K. Edward's* Time, except among the *Gospellers*, (as they were then called) who were a Scandal to the *Doctrine* They profess'd, as *Bishop Burnet* ⁿ says of Them; and who were often smartly reflected on by *Hooper*, and other the most judicious Reformers. There were some Disputes upon Those Heads, among the *Confessors* in Prison, in *Q. Mary's* Time ^o. But none of Them yet appear to have run the lengths of *Calvinism* in all the *five Points*. The Refugees from *Geneva*, in *Q. Elizabeth's* Days, began to propagate *Calvinism* pretty early; but it does not appear that They then claim'd any Countenance for it from our *Articles*; which still continu'd the same in Those Points after the revisal in 1562, and again in 1571. In the Year 1572, The *Calvinists* Themselves complain of some of our Bishops, as also of the *Articles*. The Authors of the *Second Admonition*, as *Plaisere* ^p observes, do accuse some Bishops as suspected of the Heresy of *Pelagius*, and say, for *Free-will*, not only They are suspected, but others also: And indeed the *Book of Articles of Christian Religion* speaketh very dangerously of falling from

^m See Heylin *Quinqu.* Part 2. Ch. 13. Sect. 3.

ⁿ Burnet *Hist. of the Reform.* Vol. 2. p. 107.

^o Heylin *Quinqu.* Hist. Part 8. Ch. 17.

^p *Plaisere Appello Evang.* Part 3. Ch. 10.

Grace,

Case of Arian Subscription. 53

Grace, which is to be reformed, because it too much inclineth to their Error. We have the like Complaint of theirs, not long after, taken notice of by Dean Bridges ⁹, in the Year 1587. whereby it appears that the *Calvinists* then made no difference between the *justified* falling away finally, and the *elect*: Tho' the Doctrine of our Church is plain that the *regenerate*, or justified, may so fall. But as to the *Elect*, if That be strictly understood, it is a Contradiction to say, They shall finally perish. The *Calvinists*, at that Time, were very far from boasting of our *Articles* being clear on Their Side: They suspected the very Contrary, being sensible how the Doctrines of *Universal Redemption*, and of *departing from Grace*, bore had upon their Scheme.

In the Years 1584, and 1585, we find Mr. *Harner*, and the judicious *Hooker*, Both of Them condemning the *Calvinistical* Doctrine of *irrespective* Reprobation; and Both of Them receiv'd and countenanc'd by Archbishop *Whitgift*.

In the Year 1603. was the Famous *Hampton-Court Conference*. The *Calvinists* then mov'd that the *Book of Articles* might be explain'd in places obscure, and enlarged where some Things were defective; that the *Lambeth Articles* might be taken in, and that in the sixteenth Article, after the Words, *depart from Grace*, might be added *but not Totally, nor finally*; which would have defeated the whole intent and meaning of the Article ^r. It seems, The *Calvinists* were not yet confident of our *Articles* being plainly, or at all on their Side;

⁹ Bridges *Defence of the Government establi'd*, &c. p. 1308.

^r See *Plaisere Appello Evang. Part 3. Ch. 16.*

as indeed they had no reason. Yet nothing was done to satisfy their Scruples, or to relieve their Uneasiness on That Account.

In the Year 1618, our *Divines*, at the Synod of *Dort*, had Commission to insist upon the Doctrine of *Universal Redemption* as the Doctrine of the Church of *England* (tho' They were out voted in it) which one Doctrine, pursued in its just Consequences, is sufficient to overthrow the whole *Calvinian System* of the five Points.

In the Year 1624. Mr. *Mountague* (then Prebendary of *Windsor*) openly disclaim'd the *Calvinistical Tenets*, as being the Positions of *private Doctors* only, not of the Church in her *publick Forms*. His *Appello Casarem*, wrote in Vindication thereof, was approv'd by K. *James*; and Dr. *White* order'd to license it with this Approbation; that there was nothing contain'd in it but what was agreeable to the *publick Faith, Doctrine, and Discipline established in the Church of England*. This is a very considerable Testimony that our Articles are not *Calvinistical*. And it is very observable that when the *Commons*, the Year after, drew up their Charge against *Mountague*,^s They could find no Article of the Church to ground their Complaint upon (so far as concern'd the *five Points*) but the seventeenth: which yet They so understood as to make it, in Sense, directly repugnant to Article the sixteenth. For, They charge Him with maintaining and affirming, in opposition to Article the seventeenth, *that Men justify'd may fall away and depart from the State which once They had, and that They may rise again, and become new Men possibly, but not certainly, nor necessarily*: Which is

^s See it in *Collier Eccl. Hist. Vol. 2. p. 736, &c.*

the plain and manifest Doctrine of Article the sixteenth, which does not say *shall*, or *must* rise again, but *may* only; intimating plainly enough, that it is neither *certain*, nor *necessary*.

Such as desire to see more of *Mountague's* Case, may consult the Historians of That Time. I concern my self no farther than to relate such particulars as give Light to the present Question, about the Sense of our Articles in the *five Points*. And I would have it observed, that I am not inquiring whether *Calvinism* was the more prevailing Doctrine of Those Times, but whether it was generally thought to be contain'd in, and profess'd by our *Articles*, or other *publick* authoriz'd Forms of our Church. Many ran in with *Calvinism*, who did not pretend to find the *whole* of their Doctrine in our *publick* Forms; nay, who suspected that our Articles were not only *defective* in Those Points, but even *contradictory*, in some measure, to Them. This, I think, sufficiently appears from the Complaints of the Earlier *Calvinists* in Queen *Elizabeth's* Time; from *Whitaker's* Confession to *Whitgift*; from the Conduct of the *Heads*, in *Barret's* Ca'se; and from the Story of *Baro*; from *Whitgift's* Procedure in the *Lambeth* Articles, and his frank Confessions in favour of *Barret*; from Dr. *Reynold's* Proceedings at the *Hampton-Conference*, and the Resolutions taken thereupon; and lastly, from the *Irish* Convocation of 1615, and from the Case of *Mountague*.

I shall proceed a little farther into *Charles* the First his Reign, and then conclude this Article.

In the Year 1626. The King put out a *Proclamation* to quiet the Disputes on The *five Points*; forbidding *new* Opinions, and all *innovation* in the

the *Doctrines*, or Discipline of the Church; commanding all to keep close to the *Doctrines* and *Discipline* establish'd. This *Proclamation* seems to have been chiefly levelled against the *Calvinists*, who were then labouring to introduce *Innovations* in *Doctrines*, and *Discipline*.

In the Year 1628. the King prefix'd his famous *Declaration* to a new Edition of the *Articles*: Which *Declaration* was design'd chiefly to bridle the *Calvinists*, but indeed to silence the *Predestinarian* Controversy on both Sides. The *Calvinists* made loud Complaints against it: The King had confin'd Them to the *general* meaning of the *Articles*, the *plain* and *full* meaning; had prohibited any *new Sense*, and the *drawing the Article aside*. This They interpreted. to be laying a *Restraint* upon Them from preaching the *Saving Doctrines* of God's Free Grace, in *Election*, and *Predestination*. (see *Collier* p. 747.) But why so, if *Calvinism* had been before incorporated into our *Articles*; or if it were not a *new Sense*, and beside their *plain* and *full* meaning? This Complaint, from That Quarter, looks like a Confession that our *Articles* were not, in themselves, *Calvinistical*; and that *Calvinism* could not be taught without introducing a *new Sense*, and *drawing the Articles aside*; or however, not without being more *particular* than the *Articles* had been.

Soon after the King's *Declaration*, The *Commons* drew up a kind of *Anti-Declaration*, " avowing (as They say) " That Sense of the *Articles*— " which by the *publick Acts* of the Church of " *England*, and the general and *current Exposition* " of the Writers of our Church, had been deli- " ver'd to us; rejecting the Sense of the *Jesuits* and " *Arminians*.

For

For an Answer to which, I refer the Reader to Archbishop *Laud's* short Notes, or *Scholia*, upon This *Anti-Declaration*, recorded by *Heylin* in his *Life*. I may observe that the *Commons* laid no Claim to the *literal* or *grammatical* Meaning, in favour of *Calvinism*; and that They appealed only to *extrinsic* Evidence: First, to the *publick Acts* of the Church, when there were really none such, properly so called; next to the *current Exposition* of Writers, wherein They appear not to have distinguish'd between the *current Doctrine* of Writers, and the *current Exposition* of the Articles; as if it were necessary that the whole Body of the *current Divinity* should have been contain'd in our *Articles*. Besides that even the *current Doctrine* was not intirely on the Side of *Calvinism*. *Absolute Reprobation* had been generally condemned all along by our most judicious Divines: And the Doctrines of *universal Redemption*, and of *departing from Grace*, as generally approv'd: Which Doctrines if pursu'd in their Consequences (tho' many might not be aware of it) tend to other-throw the *Calvinian Doctrines* in the *five Points*.

I may farther hint, that even the Article of *Predestination* has been vainly enough urged in favour of the *Calvinistical Tenets*. For, not to mention the Saving Clause in the Conclusion, or its saying nothing at all of *Reprobation*, and nothing in favour of *absolute Predestination to Life*; There seems to be a plain distinction (as *Plaisere* ^t has well observ'd) in the Article it self, of Two kinds of *Predestination*, one of which is recommended to us, the other con-

^t *Plaisere's Analysis of the 17th Article*, p. 387. alias 198.

H

demned

demned. See That part of the Article in the Margin ^u. Predestination rightly and piously consider'd, that is, consider'd (not *irrespectively*, not *absolutely*) but with respect to Faith in Christ, Faith working by Love, and Persevering; such a Predestination is a *sweet* and *comfortable* Doctrine. But The Sentence of God's Predestination (it is not here said *in Christ* as before) That Sentence, *simply*, or *absolutely* consider'd (as *curious* and *carnal* Persons are apt to consider it) is a *most dangerous* *downfal*, leading either to *Security*, or *Desperation*, as having no respect to foreseen Faith and a *good Life*, nor depending upon it, but *antecedent* in order to it. The Article then seems to speak of Two Subjects, first of Predestination *soberly understood* with respect to Faith in Christ, which is *wholsome* Doctrine; secondly of Predestination *simply* consider'd, which is a *dangerous* Doctrine. And the latter part seems to be intended against Those *Gospellers* whereof Bishop Burnet * speaks.

Nor

^u *As the Godly consideration of Predestination and our Election in Christ is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable Comfort to Godly persons, and such as feel in Themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the Works of the Flesh, and their earthly Members, and drawing up their Minds to high and heavenly Things; as well because it doth greatly establish and confirm their Faith of eternal Salvation to be enjoy'd through Christ, as because it doth fervently kindle their Love towards God.*

So for curious and carnal Persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the Sentence of God's Predestination, is a most dangerous Downfal, whereby the Devil doth thrust Them either into Desperation, or into wretchedness of unclean Living (impurissimæ Vitæ Securitatem) no less perillous than Desperation.

* *The Doctrine of Predestination having been generally saught by the Reformers, many of This Sect (The Gospellers)*

Nor is it imaginable that any true and sound Doctrine of the Gospel, should, of it self, have any aptness, to become a downfal even to carnal Persons: But carnal Persons are apt to corrupt a sound Doctrine, and suit it to their own Lusts and Passions, thereby falsifying the Truth. This Doctrine, so depraved and mistaken, our Church condemns. That is, she condemns absolute, irrelative Predestination, not the other. This appears to be the most probable Construction of the seventeenth Article, for Vindication whereof, I shall refer to the Margin 7, and to *Plaisere* before cited; who accordingly, in the close of his *Analysis*, appeals to
This

lers) began to make strange Inferences from it; reckoning that since every Thing was decreed, and the Decrees of God could not be frustrated, therefore Men were to leave themselves to be carried by these Decrees. This drew some into great Impiety of Life, and others into Desperation. The Germans soon saw the ill effects of This Doctrine. Luther changed his Mind about it, and Melancthon openly writ against it. And since that Time, The whole Stream of the Lutheran Churches has run the other way. But both Calvin and Bucer were still for maintaining the Doctrine of these Decrees; only They warned the People not to think much of them, since They were Secrets which Men could not penetrate into. But They did not so clearly show how These Consequences did not flow from such Opinions. Hooper and many other good Writers, did often dehort the People from entering into these Curiosities; and a Caveat to the same purpose was put afterwards into the Article of the Church about Predestination.

Burnet *Hist. of the Ref.* Vol. 2, p. 107.

7 1. De æternâ Predestinatione rectè erudiri Ecclesiam summoperè necessarium est: Nam ut nulla Dôctrina Ueberiorem Consolationem, piis Conscientiis afferre solet, quam Dôctrina prædestinationis rectè Explicita, ita nihil periculosius est quam recta Prædestinationis ratione aberrare.

2. Nam qui à vera desectit, in Præcipitium fertur, unde se recipere non potest,

H 2

3 Sunt

This very Article of our Church, in favour of Conditionate Predestination. Nevertheless it is sufficient to my purpose, if neither Absolute, nor Conditionate be affirm'd, or denied in the Article; as hath been the Opinion of many, and as I have been before, (to prevent needless Disputes) willing to allow, Let it be supposed that Calvinism is not directly contrary to the Articles; which is civil enough in all reason.

3. Sunt quidam, qui cum audiunt nostram salutem in Dei electione & proposito, sitam esse, & modum vacuum haud observant, somnia stœica, & Fabulas Parcarum fingunt.

4. Modus autem prædestinationis Verissimus est, quem Paulus nobis commonstrat, cum ad Ephes. scribit, *Elegit nos in Christo.* In hoc Modo, *Conditio Fidei* includitur, nam cum Fide inferimur Christo, ejus membra effimur, & ideo electi quia Christi membra sumus.

Hemmingius apud Plaif.

Judicamus haud dubiè *Electos* esse eos, qui misericordiam propter Christum promissam Fide apprehendunt, nec abjiciunt eam fiduciam ad extremum.

Melancib. loc. Theol. de Prædest.

Here you see how you shall avoid the Scrupulous and most dangerous Question of the Predestination of God: For, if thou wilt enquire into his Councils, thy Wit will deceive Thee. — But if Thou begin with Christ, &c. This Simple Question will not hurt Thee. — Christ is the Book of Life, and all that believe in Him are of the same Book, and so are chosen to everlasting Life; For only Those are ordain'd that believe.

Latimer. Serm. on Septuages. p. 214.

Bishop Bancroft, at the Hampton-Conference, observes that many grew Libertines by relying too much on Predestination; that This Proposition, if I shall be saved, I shall be saved, is a desperate Doctrine, a Contradiction to orthodox Belief; and that Men ought not to rest their Happiness on any absolute, irrelative Decree; citing the latter part of the 17th Article relating to God's general Promises. All which shews that He thought That Article rather to condemn, than favour absolute Predestination.

Now,

Now, to return to our *Writer*. To justify *Arminian* Subscription, I plead first, That the *Words* Themselves, of our *publick* Forms, do not determine on the Side of *Calvinism*: Nor secondly, any *known* intention of *Compilers* or *Imposers*: Nor thirdly, any *Authentick* Interpretation of our *Superiors*. On the other hand, the *Presumption* rather lies against *Calvinism* from *express* Words in some *Articles*, (as particularly the 16th and 31st, besides several other Things in the *Catechism* and *Liturgy*) from the *probable* Construction of other *Articles*, from the *original* Composition and *Design* of the *Articles*, and from some considerable *Testimonies* of our most judicious *Divines*; besides the *Confessions* of the more early *Calvinists* Themselves. This *Writer* has promis'd me to defend *Arian* Subscription by the *same* *Arguments*, p. 38. If it might not look too like insulting, I would now call upon Him to make his Words good.

The Reader, I hope, will excuse the length of This Part, which could not easily have been crowded into a shorter compass. I have omitted a great deal, purely for the sake of Brevity; and because I would not enter farther into a *distinct* Controversy, than the *Objection* necessarily required. I may now pass on.

Object. Would an *Arminian* have expressed himself in the Language of the *Articles*, about *Predestination*, and *Original Sin*?

Answ. Would a *Calvinist* have expressed himself in the Language of the *Articles*, about the *five Points*? Compare the *Lambeth* *Articles*, or the *Decrees* of the *Synod of Dort*, or the *Assembly's Confession*; and see whether They, or any of Them speak the moderate Language of our *Articles*. As to *Original Sin*,

Sim, I know not whether Any of our Considerable *Divines* go the Lengths of the *Arminians* in That Article. As to *Predestination*, *Dr. Bennet* ² and *Mr. Plaifere* ³, have Both appealed to *Arminius* Himself; as teaching the very same Doctrine with our 17th Article: Which may well deserve This Author's Special Notice. But it is enough for me, if the Article has but been express'd in the middle, or moderate Way, in such general Terms as come not up either to *Calvinism*, or *Arminianism*: Which is a Supposition I have been willing to admit, for the waving of all needless Controversy; tho' I am rather of opinion that the Article leans to the *Anti-Calvinian* Perswasion.

I have heard it objected to the Supposition of the Article's being general, and indifferent to either side, that it would make the Article useless, as deciding and determining nothing. But I beg leave to observe that The Article, may be exceeding useful, notwithstanding such a Supposition.

1. To prevent the suspicion of our Church's running in with the *Gospellers* on one hand, or the *Pelagians* on the other; And so the Article is a Fence against Slander and Calumny.

2. Supposing the Article to be general, and indefinite, in respect of the Controversy between *Calvinists* and *Arminians*; it is yet Special and Determinate against the opinion of *Samuel Huber*, who taught an universal Election (which in reality is no Election) and that all Men by the Death of Christ, were brought into the State of Grace and Salvation. The Article confines the Election to

² *Bennet's Directions for Studying, &c.* p. 95, &c.

³ *Plaifere Appello Buang.* p. 38. alias p. 27.

Case of Arian Subscription. 63

Those that believe in Christ, and live up to That Belief, persevering to the end.

The Article is also *special* and *determinate* against the opinion father'd upon *Origen*, that all Men, even wicked Men, and Devils, shall at last be receiv'd to mercy. The Article is farther *special* and *determinate* against the *Socinians*, who deny God's *Prescience* of future *Contingents*, and admit no *special* Predestination from all *eternity*. There may be other false Opinions particularly condemn'd by this Article: But These now specified are enough to show the *use* of the *Article*; tho' we should suppose the main Points, between *Calvinists* and *Arminians*, to be left *in medio*, undetermin'd.

Objection. I know of no obligation upon any one to subscribe to This, That the Ideas which the Compilers of the 11th Article had of Justification and Faith, &c. were consonant to the true Ideas which were express'd by These Words in Scripture, p. 42.

Answer. The Subscriber must assent to the *Propositions* laid down by the *Compilers* and *Imposers*; which *Propositions* are made up of *Ideas*: and therefore, in subscribing to their *Propositions*, we subscribe so far to their *Ideas*. I do not say, that we subscribe to any of their *private* Sentiments, or *Ideas*, such as They have not express'd, or intended not to express, in the *publick* Forms. But their declared, *publick* Sentiments contain'd in our Forms, Those, so far as we are *certain* of them, we subscribe to.

As to the meaning of the eleventh Article, our Church refers us not to *Scripture* (for, such as disbelieve the Article might pretend *Scripture*) but to the *Homily* delivering the Church's Sense of *Scripture*, in regard to that Article.

Object.

Object. There are a great many Passages of Scripture interpreted in the Homilies; but yet our Church no where supposes, that whoever differs from its Explanations offers Violence to Scripture itself; p. 44.

Answ. Neither do I suppose it, however This Writer may love to mistake, or misrepresent plain Things. But wherever our Church has tied us up to the Profession of any Doctrine, The Subscriber, as such, must interpret Scripture conformably to That Doctrine, and not in opposition thereto. He must not, for instance, interpret Scripture in favour of Purgatory, Infallibility, worship of Saints, or the like; at the same Time condemning Those Popish Tenets by his Subscription; Neither must he interpret Scripture in favour of the Son's, or Holy-Ghost's inferiority, inequality, &c. while He subscribes to their Coequality, and Coeternity. He is tied up to the Church's Sense of Scripture, in all Points determin'd by the Church, so far as to believe that her Explanations are, in the general, just and true; that whatever she proposes as Scripture-Doctrine, is Scripture-Doctrine; and that no Sense of Scripture which runs counter to Her Decisions is the true Sense of Scripture, but a Violence offer'd to Scripture. This is all I ever meant, or now mean, by our being bound up to the Church's Explanations.

Object. No Law requires any Man to explain the Articles by the Liturgy, or to subscribe the Articles in the Sense of the Liturgick Expressions. p. 45.

Answ. The Law of common Sense obliges us to make the Articles and Liturgy consistent, at least, if we admit Both; and to believe that Both, in reality, mean the same Thing, being establish'd by the same Authority.

Object.

Case of Arian Subscription. 65

Object. *The Articles may be general—The Liturgy more special and determinate, p. 45.*

Answ. This might have been the Case; but in Fact it is not: For the *Athanasian Creed*, contain'd in Article the 8th, to say nothing of other Articles, is as *special* and *determinate* as the *Liturgy* itself. The same *Evasions* will not, it may be, indifferently serve for every expression to be met with in Both: But a Man that takes into that loose way, may when his Hand is in, find some *Evasion* or other for any thing whatever. It seems to be purely accidental, that the Doctor appear'd to be more confounded and non-pluss'd in the *Liturgy*, than in the *Creeds* and *Articles*: Invention will sometimes flagg, and even the keenest Wit cannot bear to be always kept upon the stretch.

Object. *What Advantage, real Advantage, would it be to the Church of England to eject out of its Communion such Men as Dr. W. plainly points at? p. 46.*

Answ. It is unfortunate for the Men who are to new model our *Divinity*, and to reform our *Faith*, that They should betray, at every Turn, a strange *Confusion* of *Thought* even in clear, and plain Things. This *Writer* cannot distinguish between *ejecting*, and *not admitting*; nor between *Church-Communion*, and *Church-Trusts*. I said not a word about *ejecting* any Man out of *Communion*: I pleaded only against *admitting* Any, into *Church Trusts*, that must come in by *Iniquity*, or not at all: And I am not sensible that I was either deceived in my reasoning, or out in my *Politicks*. However high an Opinion This Gentleman (or I) may have of the valuable Abilities of the *Arian* Subscribers;

I

what-

whatever Advantage, or Credit we might propose, by having so considerable Men amongst us; yet our Misfortune is, that we cannot have Them but by *Sinful means*, and at the expence of *Sincerity*; and we dare not promise ourselves any real, or lasting Benefit from so notorious a Breach of *God's Commandments*. On the other hand, since I am here *publicly* called upon to declare what *Advantage* it may be to us, to have a stop put to *This unrighteous practice of subscribing*, I shall briefly hint it in a few Particulars.

1. It will be much for the *Honour of God*, and of our most *Holy Religion*, to have no more such *Offences* seen, or once named amongst us.

2. It will be taking away one great *Reproach* from our *Country*, heretofore famed for its gravity, and good Sense; and for breeding up *Divines*, and *Casuists*, as judicious, solid, and accurate as Any upon the Face of the Earth.

3. It may be much for the advantage of the common People, not to be under such Guides as are *Themselves* remarkably deficient in the first Principles of *Morality*, and *Christian Simplicity*; and who may be presumed the less qualify'd to direct the *Consciences* of others, while so manifestly faulty in the Conduct of their *own*.

4. It may be a farther Advantage, for *Christian People*, to be under the Care and Guidance of none but *Orthodox Teachers*; such as will instruct Them in the *Fundamentals* of *Christianity*, and lead Them in the way everlasting.

These are some of the *Advantages* we may reasonably propose, along with *God's Blessing*; which must be had in *God's own way*, and in the doing of what is just, honest, and upright. If there be any greater *Advantages* on the other side, let

This

Case of Arian Subscription. 67

This Gentleman name Them, and They shall be considered.

Object. *They disclaim Arianism; yet notwithstanding That, They are injuriously and unchristianly called Arians, p. 46.*

Ans^w. God forbid that we should ever demean our selves *injuriously*, or *unchristianly* towards any Man. Here is a mistake somewhere; and it is no hard matter to perceive where it lies. This Gentleman should have said, that They disclaim the *Name of Arianism*: They do indeed disclaim the *Name*, but not the *Thing*. We think ourselves as proper, and as competent Judges of what *Arianism* is, as Others may be: And we cannot help judging, as long as we can read. When we have found the *Thing*, being plain and sincere Men, we immediately give the *Name*. For the purpose; if we meet with any Man teaching the Doctrines of *Purgatory*, *Transubstantiation*, and other distinguishing Badges of *Poper*y; we never stay for his leave; but we have, upon such Evidence, a very clear and undoubted Right to call such a Man a *Papist*, till He has purged Himself of Those Positions. By the very same Rule, we pretend to give the Name of *Arians* to as many as we find the *Arian* Tenets upon: And their denial of it signifies nothing, being only *protesting* against *Fact*; which, in all parallel Cases, is highly ridiculous. If They are *Arians*, and do not know it, They are indeed the more pitiable: But as their Ignorance is no Rule to Those that know better; so we hope there is nothing *injuriously*, or *unchristian*, in calling either Men, or Things, by their right Names.

Objection. *They are charged with Fraud and Prevarication, because They Subscribe: Which is*

the severest Reflexion on their Characters possible,
p. 46.

Answer. All the Severity lies in the Truth, and Evidence of the Charge. If the Charge cannot be fully proved, the Man that makes it is in reality the Sufferer, by exposing Himself. But I have took care to proceed upon none but the clearest and most evident grounds: And now I may lay claim to Those Gentlemen's Thanks, for kindly showing Them both their Sin, and their Danger. Principles are valuable, and precious, and must not be parted with, in Complement to any Man's Character. Besides, it is to be hoped that Men of their Education, and Abilities, do not want to be told, that there are Some Things which They ought to be infinitely more tender of than of a short-liv'd Character, (built upon Self-flattery, and delusive shows) and Those are, the Honour of God, the simplicity of the Gospel, and the Salvation of Men. One way still there is left, and indeed but one, whereby to retrieve their Characters; which is to *repent*, and *amend*. If They'll accept of this plain and frank Admonition, it may not perhaps be altogether unserviceable to Them: If not let it stand as a Testimony against Them, for the Benefit of Others, lest They also fall into the same Condemnation.

Object. Men who have never wrote a Word in the Trinitarian-Controversy, who have had no occasion, no design to write on that Subject, yet are represented to the World under the same invidious Name. Is This the Conduct of a Christian, and a Divine? --- What must every Man conclude when He sees the Running Title — The Case of Arian Subscription, &c. and Pleas for such Subscription examined; and yet the very first of these Pleas is partly taken out of the Book of One, who has never written any thing about Arian Sub-

Case of Arian Subscription. 69

Subscription! Is This becoming a Protestant Divine?
P. 47.

Answ. The Reader I hope will excuse it, if for want of *Arguments* to reply to, I am forced sometimes to condescend to take notice of mere *Declaration*. This Gentleman has before shown his over *officiousness* in defending Dr. Clarke against a *supposed* Injury done Him; tho' I dare be confident, the Dr. Himself knows that I have not injured Him at all. Now He is offering a helping Hand to a Person of an higher Character and Station in the Church; who, I doubt not, is too wise a Man to think that I have any where fail'd in point of strict Justice, or even of Decency, and Respect towards Him. My Business was to examine every the most plausible *Plea* that had been brought for That *Subscription* which I condemn, under the Name of *Arian* Subscription. I never represented That Person under the invidious Name of an *Arian*; nor was it ever in my Thoughts to do it. But it was my profess'd Design, not to dissemble Any thing that might look favourable to the Cause of *Arian* Subscription; not to conceal either the *strongest Pleas*, or the *greatest Names* that might appear to countenance it. And to me it seems that This *Writer*, had it been his manner ever to weigh Things with Candor, or Judgment, might have thank'd me for so *fair*, and so *unexceptionable* a Conduct; in allowing his Cause all the *Advantage*, or *Credit* that could possibly be given it. But enough: This Gentleman, should be advised, the next Time He is disposed to stand up an Advocate for greater Men than Himself, either to do it more *pertinently*, or to stay for their *Commission*: Otherwise He may happen, by his *officious* Zeal, and indiscreet Conduct, to do Them a *real* injury, while He is labouring to take off such as are purely *imaginary*.
Object.

Object. *The Principles which the ingenious Dr. Bennet contends for, are the same with those I have laid down, p. 49.*

Answ. I am very glad to hear so much from This Gentleman. To compleat the Character of a Careless Writer, He shall now be condemn'd out of his own Mouth. Dr. Bennet's Principle, relating to Subscription, is to allow no Liberty but where the Words themselves do allow it, where they are fairly capable of such a Sense as we take them in, without doing Violence to the Words, or contradicting what our Church has elsewhere taught, I desire no more than This, in our present Question. If this be our Writer's Principle, He has effectually condemn'd Himself, and every Arian Subscriber.

Let the Reader only turn back, and review the Passages above cited from our publick Forms; and then try whether it be possible to reconcile Them fairly, and without Violence, or indeed at all, to the New Scheme. Now, since This Gentleman has here bound Himself to stand, or fall, by the same Rule of Subscription which Dr. Bennet contends for; I leave Him to apply it at leisure; And as He has thereby entangled Himself sufficiently, and beyond all recovery; it would be unmerciful, and even cruel, to press Him closer.

It may not be here improper to cite Dr. Bennet's Application of his own Rule, to This particular Case; addressing Himself to Dr. Clarke, in these Words.

“ As I am firmly persuaded, you are a Person of
 “ so great Integrity, that you will not venture (not
 “ withstanding your Attempt for Explaining) to
 “ repeat your Subscription, &c. till you have altered
 “ your Sentiments touching these Points (which
 “ I

“ I pray God may be speedily effected) so I hope,
 “ none of those Persons who espouse your pre-
 “ sent Sentiments, will be influenc’d by what you
 “ have written, to think your Sense of those Pas-
 “ sages tolerable. I really tremble at the Appre-
 “ hension of That Guilt, which such a Collusion
 “ must pollute Them with: And I cannot but ear-
 “ nestly intreat you to do what lies in your Power,
 “ in the most publick manner, for preventing such
 “ an Interpretation of our Liturgy, as must (I
 “ fear) necessarily lay wast the Consciences of the
 “ Compilers, and pave the way for a Man’s sub-
 “ scribing and using such Forms of Devotion as
 “ thwart the Sense of his own Mind.” Bennet on
 the Trin. p. 265.

Thus far the ingenious Dr. Bennet, who, I sup-
 pose, well understands both his own Principle,
 and the Application of it. Whether his Rule and
 mine differ, is a Question which concerns not
 our present debate: Either of Them effectually
 condemns Arian Subscription. My Rule appears
 to be rather the stricter of the Two: It is This,
 that wherever we are certain of the Imposer’s
 Meaning, That Meaning we are bound up to, by
 our Subscription. Perhaps, Dr. Bennet may think
 that we are never certain but where the Words
 Themselves necessarily require such a Meaning. I
 think, there are some possible Cases where we
 may be certain, tho’ the Words Themselves might
 otherwise admit of Two Senses; and that The Im-
 poser, in such Cases have sufficiently done their parts,
 tho’ there may be some ambiguity remaining in the Ex-
 pressions, so long as there is but any certain way left
 for a reasonable Man to come at their real and
 true Meaning. But I shall not dwell longer on
 this nicety, since our present debate about Arian
 Subscription

Subscription is in a great measure unconcern'd in it; and we need not go farther than the *Words Themselves* to confute, and condemn it.

I shall conclude with the honest Sentiments of Mr. *Whiston*, which are really and truly the same with my own: And his Testimony, in this Case, is the more considerable, because it comes from one, who lay under the same *Temptation* with others, to prevaricate in This Sacred Engagement. His Words in the first *Appendix* to his *fifth Volume*, are These,

“ The great Latitude Dr. *Clarke* allows, that
 “ every Person may reasonably agree to modern
 “ Forms, under a *Protestant* Settlement, which
 “ owns the *Scripture* as the Rule of Faith, when-
 “ ever He can in any Sense at all reconcile them
 “ with Scripture, if it be with a *Declaration* how
 “ He reconciles them; even tho' it be in a Sense
 “ which is own'd to be plainly forced, and un-
 “ natural; seems to me not justifiable, but contra-
 “ dictory to the direct *Meaning*, and *Design* of
 “ those *Forms*; and of the most pernicious Conse-
 “ quence in all parallel Cases. Nor do I see, at
 “ this rate, that the same Liberty can be whol-
 “ ly denied to a *Protestant*, as to the *Popish* Do-
 “ ctine and Practices; since there also, 'tis sup-
 “ posed that those *Forms* are intended to oblige
 “ Men to nothing but what is agreeable to *Chri-*
 “ *stianity*.

“ If to This observation the *Doctor* should re-
 “ ply, that complying with the Church of *Rome*,
 “ and joining with a *Protestant* Church, in the
 “ Manner and with the *Declarations* He does,
 “ are quite different Things on these two Ac-
 “ counts, (1.) Because the Church of *Rome* will
 “ not permit any of her Members to make such
 “ *Declarations*.

“ Declaration concerning her Doctrines, but positively insists upon every one’s *implicit* Submission to them, in the Sense that Church and her Councils receive them, without examining them by the Rule of Scripture. And (2) because many of the Doctrines of the Church of Rome, such as the Invocation of the *Virgin Mary*, and of *Saints*, &c. with the Worship of Images, can in *no Sense* be reconciled, but are directly contrary to it, as setting up other *Mediators* instead of *Christ*, and teaching Men to apply to such Beings as have *no Power or Dominion* over Them; whereas the Invocation of the Holy Ghost, and so of the whole Trinity, as used in the Church of *England*, (some of the most suspicious of all the Things allow’d by Him) may be understood, and *declared*, to be only a desiring Him to bestow those Gifts upon Us, in *Subordination* to the Father and the Son, which we are sure from Scripture it is his *proper Office*, and in *his Power*, to distribute: If, I say, The *Doctor* shall make this Reply, I must answer;

“ 1. That I doubt, our Church does not properly allow her Members to make any such *Declarations*, as is here intimated, but expects their Submission in that Sense she and her Synods have imposed her Doctrines and Devotions: And tho’ it be not under the Notion of *implicit Faith*, and *without Examination*, yet as acquiescing in her judgment, interpreting the Scripture according to the *Articles* and *Creeeds*, and submitting to her *Authority in Controversies of Faith*.

“ 2. That there are even in the Church of Rome few or no such Doctrines or Practices, but Persons well disposed to it can, in some Sense

“ or other, reconcile Them with Scripture; or at
 “ least *think* they can, which is here almost the
 “ same Case, without dreaming of setting up o-
 “ ther Mediators instead of *Christ*, or doubting of
 “ some degree of *Power* and *Authority* in the Be-
 “ ings so invocated. So that if We, without all
 “ sacred or primitive Command or Example, may
 “ follow our Church in the Invocation of the
 “ Holy Spirit, and so of the whole Trinity, from
 “ some uncertain reasonings of our own, I do not
 “ see how we can condemn the *Papists* for fol-
 “ lowing their own Church in the *Invocation* of
 “ *Angels*, nay hardly in That of *Saints* also, and
 “ of the *Virgin Mary* her self.

“ Nor can any *Explications* of *Forms* directly a-
 “ gainst the *known* Sense of *Words*, and of the
 “ *Imposers*, be other than *Protestatio contra Fa-*
 “ *ctum*; and so wholly *unjustifiable*.

“ Nor indeed, if This were somewhat tolera-
 “ ble in some particular Cases of *small moment*,
 “ can it be at all so in the most *sacred Articles* and
 “ *Offices* of Religion.

“ If This way be allowable, *then is the Offence*
 “ *of the Cross* ceased; then the *Martyrs* have com-
 “ monly lost their Lives without sufficient Cause;
 “ and those *Jews* who would die rather than
 “ eat *Swines Flesh*, and those Christians that
 “ would suffer the like punishment, rather than cast
 “ a little *Incense* on the *Heathen Altars*, were very
 “ unfortunate, as having *suffered without Necessity*.

“ What will become of all *Oaths*, *Promises* and
 “ *Securities* among Men, if the plain real Truth
 “ and Meaning of Words be no longer the Mea-
 “ sure of what we are to profess, assert, or Pra-
 “ ctise; but every one may, if He do but openly
 “ declare it, put his own *strained interpretation*, as
 He

“ He pleases, upon them? Especially if this be
“ to be allow’d in the *most sacred Matters* of all,
“ the signing *Articles* of Faith, the making *solemn*
“ *Confessions* of the same, and the offering up pub-
“ lick *Prayers, Praises, and Doxologies* to the great
“ *God*, in the solemn *Assemblies* of his Wor-
“ ship. This, I own, I *dare not do*, at the *peril*
“ of my *Salvation*: And if I can no way be per-
“ mitted to enjoy the Benefit of *Christ’s* holy
“ Ordinances in publick, without what I own
“ would be in my self *gross Insincerity* and *Preva-*
“ *rication*, I shall, I believe, think it my Duty to
“ aim to enjoy that Benefit some other way,
“ whatever *Odium, or Sufferings*, I may bring up-
“ on my self thereby.

I have transcrib’d this whole Passage from Mr. *Whiston*, being full and clear to my purpose, unanswer’d, and unanswerable: And it may appear from hence that the hardest Names which I have given to *Arian Subscription* are in reality no severer than had been before given, by a known Friend to the *Arian Cause*: So that This *Writer* may, with equal Justice, charge Mr. *Whiston* also with *Slander, Calumny, and persecuting Principles*, for his declaring such Subscription to be *gross Insincerity* and *Prevarication*. The pious and candid Mr. *Nelson*, and the very judicious and learned Bishop of *Oxford*, had Both expressed their Abhorrence of it, before I wrote; as the Anonymous Author of the *Case of Addressing*, &c. has also done since. And indeed, who is there of any tolerable Measure of *good Sense*, or breathing any thing of the true Spirit of *Piety*, that does not utterly detest it?

I have now done with This *Writer*, and, I hope, with This *Cause* too: It is high Time for those

those Gentlemen, at length, to see their Error, and correct it. They may succeed tolerably, for a while, in the *Trinitarian* Controversy, which few, in comparison, understand thoroughly; and They may go on, for a Season, in perverting *Scripture* and *Fathers*, without Rebuke from the *Generality*, who will not readily observe it, or be at the pains to search into it. But if They think to practise in like manner with our *Articles*, and *Liturgy*, where every *English* Reader can judge; or if They pretend to put off their *Sophistry* in a *plain Point* of *Morality*, where every Man, of any common Discernment, can both detect, and confute Them; They will disoblige and disserve their own *Characters* extremely; and will, at length, make but a very mean, not to say contemptible Figure, in so wise, and knowing an Age. We did not indeed expect that any greater *Geniusses* should rise up in the *Arian* Cause, than had imbark'd in the same Cause, many Ages upwards: But it was a reasonable Presumption, that None would undertake the *Reforming* of our *Faith*, and the *new stamping* our whole System of *Theology*, but such as would not (especially after notice given) betray a Weakness, and slowness of Apprehension, even in the *plain* and *self-evident* Principles of common Honesty.

F I N I S.

Eight Sermons preach'd at the Cathedral Church of St. Paul, in Defence of the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; upon the encouragement given by the Lady Moyer, and at the appointment of the Lord Bishop of London. With a Preface, containing Remarks upon two late Pamphlets; one entitled, *Modest Plea, &c. continued, &c.* The other, *Unity of God not inconsistent with the Divinity of Christ, &c.* By *Dan. Waterland*, D. D. Master of *Magdalen-College* in *Cambridge*, and Chaplain in Ordinary to his Majesty. The 2d Edition 8vo. 1721.

Dr. *Knight's* Sermons at the same Lecture, 8vo. 1721.

The Genuineness of the Text of the first Epistle of St. John, Ch. v. V. 7. *There are Three in Heaven, &c.* Demonstrated by Proofs which are beyond all Exception, taken from the Testimonies of the Greek and Latin Churches, and particularly from a Greek MS. of the *New Testament*, found in *Ireland*. By *David Martin*, Rector of the *French Church* at *Utrecht*. Translated from the *French*, 8vo. 1722.

A Critical Dissertation upon the seventh Verse of the fifth Chapter of St. John's first Epistle, *There are Three that bear Record in Heaven, &c.* Wherein the Authentickness of this Text is fully prov'd against the Objections of Mr. *Simon* and the Modern *Arians*. Written by the same Author, 8vo. 1719.

A second Dissertation by Mr. *Martin*, in Defence of the Testimony given to our Saviour by *Josephus*. Wherein the Paragraph in the fourth Chapter of the eighteenth Book of his *Jewish Antiquities* is prov'd to be authentick. Written originally in *French*, and now translated into *English*, 8vo. 1719.

An Examination of Mr. *Emlyn's* Answer to the Dissertation upon the seventh Verse of the fifth Chapter of St. John's first Epistle, &c. By Mr. *Martin* Pastor of the *French Church* at *Utrecht*, 8vo. 1719.

— the same in *French*, 12^{mo}, 1719.

A Discourse of Natural Religion, by Mr. *Martin*, 8vo. 1720.

Mr. *Bayly's* Sermons, 2 Vols. 8vo. 1721.

The Nature and Necessity of Religious Zeal consider'd, in a Visitation Sermon preached at *Kingston upon Thames*, by *Jos. Clarke*, D. D.

The Lord Bishop of *London's* Letter to his Clergy defend'd; wherein the constant Worship of Son and Holy Spirit,
with

with the Father, during the first Ages, is set forth; and the Antiquity of the Doxology used by the Church of England asserted; 8vo. 1719.

Plain Notions of our Lord's Divinity. Set forth in a Sermon preach'd upon Christmas-day, at the Royal Chapel of *Whitehall*. Publish'd at the Request of many of the Audience. By *Tho. Mangey*, LL. D. Prebendary of *Durham*, and Chaplain to the Right Reverend Father in God, *John*, Lord Bishop of *London*; the 2d Edition, 8vo. 1719.

— Practical Discourses upon the Lord's Prayer, preach'd before the Hon. Society of *Lincolns-Inn* The 3d Edition, 8vo.

— The eternal Existence of our Lord *Jesus Christ*. Set forth in a Sermon preach'd at the Lord Bishop of *Winchester's* Visitation at *Chertsey* in the County of *Surrey*, on Friday the 22d of *May*. Publish'd at the Request of the Clergy there present, 8vo. 1719.

— Sermon before the House of Commons on the 30th of *January*, 1719: 8vo.

— Remarks upon *Nazareus*, wherein the falsity of *Mr. Toland's* Mahometan Gospel, and his Misrepresentation of Mahometan Sentiments, in respect of Christianity are set forth; the History of the old *Nazareans* clear'd up; and the whole conduct of the first Christians in respect to the Jewish Law, explain'd, and defended. The 2d Edition, 1719.

The Conduct requir'd in Matters of Faith. A Sermon preach'd at the Ordination held by the Right Reverend Father in God *John* Lord Bishop of *London*, in the Cathedral Church of *St. Paul*, *March 13*. 1719. By *John Newcome*, B. D. Fellow of *St. John's* College in *Cambridge*, 8vo. 1720.

The Beauty of Holiness in the Common-Prayer, as set forth in four Sermons preach'd at the *Rolls* Chapel in the Year 1716. The 8th Edition. To which is added a Rationale on Cathedral Worship, or Choir Service. A Sermon preach'd in the Cathedral Church of *Hereford*, at the Anniversary meeting of the Choirs of *Worcester*, *Glocester*, and *Hereford*, *Sept. 7*. 1720. The second Edition. By *Thomas Bisse*, D. D.

A Practical Discourse concerning the great Duty of Prayer. By *Rich. Crossings*, B. D. Fellow of *Pembroke-Hall* in *Cambridge*, 1720.