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THE HISTORY OF OPINIONS CONCERNING CHRIST.

BOOK III.

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITARIAN DOCTRINE.

INTRODUCTION.

AFTER the view that has been given of the rise and progress of the doctrine of the trinity, which sprung from the absurdity and mystery of Platonism, and terminated in a mystery still more unintelligible and absurd, in which every thing that is simple and excellent in Christianity was wholly swallowed up and lost, and a polytheism little better than that...
of the heathens took its place (for the worship of Christ led to that of the virgin Mary, and a thousand other persons, called saints) it is with peculiar satisfaction that I proceed to give an account of the doctrine of the divine unity, or the History of Unitarianism.

If I had not given what I imagine will appear to be a satisfactory account of the rise of Christian idolatry, it might have appeared a very extraordinary and unaccountable thing; considering that the Jews, from whom the Christians sprung, were all zealous unitarians in the time of our Saviour, and that they have continued such to this day. It even appears to have been the great object of the Jewish religion, as contained in the books of Moses, to preserve in the world the knowledge and worship of the one true God, notwithstanding the universal tendency to polytheism among all nations, in the early ages.

The doctrine of one great omnipresent being, the maker, and the immediate governor of all things, was too great and sublime, I do not only say, to have been discovered
covered by mankind, but even to be retained by any of them, after it was revealed, without particular provisions for that purpose. Though, I have no doubt, but that the first parents of the human race were instructed in the knowledge of the divine unity, their posterity soon adopted the notion of different gods, to whom they imagined the government of the world was delegated; and their attention to these inferior deities, on whom they thought that they more immediately depended, withdrew their attention, as it naturally would, from the supreme God, under whom they at first supposed that these lesser gods had acted. Then, being left to their own imaginations with respect to the characters of these gods, and having no models by which to frame them besides beings like themselves, they presently conceived them to be of very different dispositions, some of them cruel and base, and others lewd; and of course delighting in cruel, base, and lewd actions. To procure the favour, or to avert the displeasure, of these gods, they would,
would, therefore, practice many abominable, horrid, and atrocious rites.

The religious ceremonies, and the general character and practice of the heathen world, abundantly prove, that idolatry was not a mere speculative mistake, a thing only foolish and absurd, but of a very serious and alarming nature; and that it was therefore nothing that could be called *jealousy* in the true God, to take such extraordinary measures as the history of revelation represents him to have taken, in order to cure mankind of their proneness to idolatrous worship. It was a part which it became the supreme God, the benevolent parent of all his offspring, to take, and what a regard to their own happiness required. The mischief was of so alarming a nature, that the greatest severities were necessary, and therefore *proper*, to be employed for this purpose; and they must know nothing of the nature and tendency of the ancient idolatry, who find any thing to censure in the severity with which the Israelites were ordered to act, with a view to the extirpation of
of it from among themselves, or the nations inhabiting the district that was destined for them.

It is not possible to imagine any instructions, or regulations, more proper to effect the extirpation of idolatry, and to guard the people from it, than the laws of Moses, interpreted by his repeated and earnest remonstrances on the subject with respect to the Israelites. Let the reader only peruse the book of Deuteronomy, and then form his judgment. And yet, so seducing were the idolatrous customs of those times, that their whole history shews how prone the Jews always were to abandon their own purer religion, and more simple rites, though, to appearance, sufficiently splendid, and having little of austerity in them. For they had only one fast day in the whole year, and three great festivals.

But the intention of the Divine Being, was equally answered by the obedience or the disobedience of that people; and after a series of discipline, they returned from the captivity of Babylon, with a new heart and
and a new spirit, in this respect. For they never discovered the least proneness to idolatry afterwards; but, on the contrary, always shewed the most scrupulous dread and jealousy on this subject. Nay, to a neglect of their religion, there succeeded the most superstitious attention to the smallest punctilios relating to it.
CHAPTER I.

That the Jews in all Ages were Believers in the Divine Unity.

It is impossible to read the sacred books of the Jews (with minds freed from the strongest prejudices) without perceiving that the doctrine of the divine unity is most rigorously inculcated in them. It is the uniform language of those books, that one God, without any assistant, either equal or subordinate to himself, made the world, and all things in it, and that this one God continues to direct all the affairs of men.

This is so evident from the bare inspection of the books, and the well known principles of the Jews in our Saviour's time, that even the christian Fathers, desirous as they were to find advocates for their doctrine of the trinity, and pressling even Platonism into the service, could not but allow it. They ransacked every part of the Old Testament,
The Jews believed Testament, as we have seen, for proofs, or intimations, of the doctrine of the trinity, or of the divinity of Christ; but, though they imagined they found many such, yet they always acknowledged that the doctrines were delivered so obscurely, that the bulk of the Jewish nation had not perceived them.

They thought, indeed, that Moses himself, and the prophets, were acquainted with these doctrines; but that there were good reasons why they did not endeavour to make them intelligible to the rest of their countrymen; partly, lest it should have hindered the operation of their religion to divert them from idolatry, and partly, because the doctrines were too sublime to be communicated at so early a period, and before men's minds were properly prepared for them.
CHAP. I. in the Divine Unity.

SECTION I.

The Fact acknowledged by the Christian Fathers.

As these concessions are of considerable consequence to my argument, I shall produce a number of them, from the earliest christian writers to a pretty late period, to shew that it was the uniform persuasion of all those who were the greatest friends to the doctrine of the trinity.

I shall begin with Justin Martyr, the first who advanced the doctrine of the personification of the logos. What the Jews thought of their Messiah in his time, appears very clearly from a passage in his dialogue with Trypho, which will be produced hereafter. In the mean time, I shall give his opinion with respect to the doctrine of the Jews in general on the subject. 

"The Jews," he says, "thinking it was "the Father of all who spake to Moses, "when it was the Son of God, who is "also
The Jews believed

also called an angel, and an apostle, are
"justly censured by the Spirit of God, and
"by Christ, as not knowing either him or
"his Father*."  

Clemens Alexandrinus considered the
doctrine of the œconomy (or that of the
incarnation of the logos) to be the doctrine
of the perfect, alluded to by Paul in his
epistle to the Colossians, where he speaks
of their being filled with the knowledge of his
will, and of the mystery which was hid from
ages and generations, but now made manifest
to the saints, "so that there are other mys-
teries," he says, "which were hid till
the times of the apostles, and delivered
by them as they received them from the
"Lord†." In another passage he speaks

* Ἡδαιον ἐν ἐγκαθαιμενοι αἰεί τὸν παλαιὰ τῶν ολῶν λειλαμμέναι τῷ
Μωσί, τῷ λαληθάναι τῷ ἀνήλικῳ ὡς τῇ δεκαυ, ὡς αὐτῷ ἐγγέγονεν τῷ
ἀποστόλῳ λειλαμμένῃ, διότι διελέγατο αὐτῷ διὰ τὰ προφητεῖα ἀνενήθηνεν, ὡς ἐν
αὐτῷ τῇ κείνῃ, ὡς ἐν τῷ παλαιᾷ, ἐν τῷ παλαιᾷ ἀνασκοπάσαι. Ἀπ. 1,
P. 94.
† Τὸ μυαταῖον τὸ ἀποκεφαλαμέναν ἀπο τῶν αἰωνῶν ὑπὸ ἀπὸ τῶν γε-
νών, ὡς ἐν αὐτῷ ἐν τοῖς αἰωνῖς ἀφανές· τὸ καθώς ὁ Θεός ἀναλύειται, τὸ
ἀπὸ τοῦτο τὰ χρόνα τῆς μυαταίος τῆς ἐν τοῖς ἐποχαῖς· ὡς ἐν αὐτῷ ἐν τοῖς
μυαταῖος τὸ ἀποκεφαλαμέναν εἰρήν τῶν ἀποστόλων, ὡς ἐν τῷ παλαιᾷ
παραδο-
σείᾳ ὡς ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ φαραπρασίῳ. Στρομ. Ἰβ. 5: p. 576.
of this economy as what christians only were acquainted with.*

Tertullian had the same ideas. "I adore," says he, "the fulness of the scriptures," meaning those of the Old Testament, "which manifest the maker and the things made; but in the gospel I find the minister, or the person by whom it was made, and the judge, viz. the word of the maker †." "It is the faith of the Jews so to believe in one God, as not to acknowledge the Son, or the Spirit.—What is the difference between us and them, but this? What need is there of the gospel, which is the substance of the New Testament (saying, that the law and the prophets were until John) if from that period the Father, Son, and Spirit, being three, are not believed to make one God.

"So God would renew his covenant, that, "in a new manner, he should be believed "in, together with the Son, and his Spirit; "that God may be known in his proper "names and persons *."

"The Jews," says Hippolytus, "hos-
"noured the Father, but they did not give "thanks; for they knew not the Son †.

Origen also says, "the Jews were not "acquainted with the incarnation of the "only begotten Son of God ‡."

Eusebius speaks of the christians as dif-
"fering from the Hebrews, in that the latter

* Judæae fidei ista res, sic unum deum credere, ut filium adnumerare ei nolis, et post filium spiritum. Quid enim erit inter nos et illos, nisi differentia ista? Quod opus evangeli, quæ est substantia novi testamenti, statuens legem et prophetas usque ad Ioannem, si non exinde pater et filius et spiritus, tres crediti, unum deum sifunt? Sic deus voluit novare sacramentum, ut nove unus crederetur per filium et spiritum, ut coram jam deus in suis propriis nominibus et personis cognosceretur, qui et retro per filium et spiritum predicatus non intelligebatur. Ad Praxeam, sect. 30. Opera, p. 518.


did not acknowledge the divinity of Christ*. He considered the doctrine of the divinity of Christ as peculiar to christians, and distinguishing them from Jews. "If any "Jew," says he, "be asked, whether God "has a *logos*, he will say, certainly. Every "Jew will say, that he has one, or more of "them; but if he be asked whether he has "a *Son*, he will not acknowledge it †."

Cyril of Jerusalem says, "In this respect "our doctrine is more sublime than that of "the Jews, in that they acknowledge one "God the Father, but do not admit that he "is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, "in which they contradict their own pro-

phets, who say, in the scriptures, The "Lord said unto me, thou art my Son, this "day have I begotten thee ‡." Cyril of


† Εἴ γεν τις Ἰουδαῖων ἐρωτοῦσα τοῦν, εἶ λογον ἔχοι ὁ Θεός; παρείσανεν ἐν αὐτῷ ἐπει δὲ καὶ λόγον, καὶ λόγος αὐτούς ἔχειν αὐτῶν, ὁμολογοῦσαν, αὐτόν Ἰουδαίων αὐτός, ἀπάντας, ἐγώ δὲ καὶ ὑπὸν ἐπεί ἐσεί σαμ ὑμοι τοῖς ὁμολογοῦσιν ἐποιήθης. Contra Marcellam, lib. 1. p. 4.

‡ Ταύτη γὰρ αὐτῷ τῶν Ἰουδαίων αὐθεροφορῆς φρονήσεως, οὐ μεν γὰρ εἰκασί εἰς Θεον αὐθερόφορον καθαρεύοντας τοὺς δούλους — τὸ δὲ καὶ αὐθεροφορεῖ εἰς τὰ κυρία ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν, τὸν δὲ καθαρεύοντας, τοὺς οἰκεῖος προφητίζοις.
Alexandria also says, "the Jews believed that there was a God who was before all things, and after him the creatures, but nothing intermediate between them." Basil ranks the unitarians with Jews. "If any one," says he, "suppose the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit to be one, one Being under different names, and that they are but one hypostasis, under three denominations, we rank him with the Jews." "The Hebrews," says Leontius, "have only one hypostasis, or person, and one nature of God; plainly admitting no trinity, nor saying that God is Father, Son, or Spirit, except that they call God Father, as the father of all men. They prove this one hypostasis from the words of Moses:


† Etis autem saepe legi, ή μην, χαίρεται, και καταργείται, ου διδομένην υποδιδέει, και μαν υποτάσσειν υπό των τριών αφορμών ειρωνευτήν τον τούτων καινίον εν τῷ μετα τῶν Ἰουδαίων τααλθεμέν. Epist. 73. vol. 3- p. 123.

"Hear."
Chap. I. in the Divine Unity. 15

"Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one Lord*." Lastly, Theophylact says, "in the Old Testament God was known to the Jews only, but not as Father; he was afterwards revealed by the gospel to all the world with the Son †." This is a series of testimony, sufficiently extensive for my purpose, as it clearly shows what was the general opinion among christians concerning the ancient faith of the Jews; and it is uncontradicted by any other evidence whatever. Some writers of yesterday have maintained, that the Jews always believed in a trinity, and that they


The Jews believed that their Messiah would be the second person in that trinity; but the Christian Fathers, who say just the contrary, were as much interested as any men could be, in finding that doctrine among the Jews, and they were nearer the source of information.

It was, indeed, imagined, as I have observed, that Moses and the prophets were themselves acquainted with the mystery of the trinity; but that they thought it was not a proper time to make a full discovery of that doctrine for the satisfaction of the body of the Jews. Eusebius says, that "Isaiah knew that there was a God in "God *" "The prophets," says Chrysostom, "who foretold concerning Christ, "concealed their treasure in obscure "words †;" which implies that, in his opinion, they knew it themselves. "Adam," says Epiphanius, "being a prophet, knew

* Ησαίας θεοφύλος μεγίστος σαφες ειδε θεον ηθελεν ειναι. Demonstratio, lib. 5. cap. 4. p. 225.
Chap. I. *in the Divine Unity.*

"the Father, Son, and Spirit, and knew
"that the Father spake to the Son, when he
"said, *Let us make man*." *\[\text{\textcopyright}\]*

Pope Gregory likewise represents the people of the Jews as ignorant of the trinity, though the prophets might teach it†.

* Kai ἰδοὺ τὸ ἅ θεόν ὑμῖν ἐρχεῖται οὐκ ἁγιόν πνεύμα, ἀποφθηγμόν τερήτῳ.
Lib. i. p. 6.

Vol. III.
SECTION II.
Of the Reasons why, according to the Christian Fathers, the Doctrine of the Trinity was not discovered to the Jews.

As the ignorance of the Jews, concerning the doctrine of the trinity, was an objection to the truth of it, which the Christian Fathers, who defended it, could not be quite easy under, and they were often urged with it, as we shall see, by the unitarians; it may be amusing to know more particularly in what manner they accounted for the fact.

That there should be a gradual revelation of so great a mystery as that of the trinity, the Fathers thought to be an argument of great wisdom on the divine dispensations, as they were by this means better adapted to the different states of the world.

Chrysostom represents Moses as saying, "that the world was made by God, and not by Christ, as accommodating himself to the stupidity of his hearers. Paul himself," he says, "was contented to teach the same doctrine at Athens. But he afterwards"
Chap. I. in the Divine Unity.

"terwards held a different language in the "epistle to the Colossians; and says, that "God in Christ created all things that are in "heaven and in earth. And John, the son "of Thunder, cried, saying, All things were "made by him, and without him was not "any thing made that was made. But not so "Moses; and justly, because it would not "have been proper to give those meat who "had need to be fed with milk "As Moses," says Cyril of Alexandria, "was slow of speech, so the law of Moses "was slow to explain the reason of it, and "to open the theology of the holy trinity."


† Sicut Moses erat tardioris lingue, ita etiam lex Mo-

sica eft tardioris lingue ad explicandam ejus quod eft rationem, et aperiendam sanftae trinitatis theologiam. Co-


C 2 "Observe,"
"Observe," says Job the monk, "the wisdom of divine providence, that to the ancients the Father appeared superior; in the new, the Son appeared in some places to be inferior to the Father, but in many equal to him; the holy Spirit in many inferior, but in some equal; that what is unequal in human apprehension, might be brought to a perfect equality." According to this writer therefore, the doctrine of the divinity of the Spirit was not fully revealed even in the time of the apostles, but was reserved for a later period.

However, Epiphanius thought that the divinity of Christ was taught by the prophets, though not that of the Spirit. "One "God," says he, "was chiefly preached by Moses, a duality by the prophets, and a trinity by the evangelists; this being suited to a more advanced state of know-


"ledge."
"ledge." He says the same thing in his Ancoratus, Sect. 73. Opera, vol. 2. p. 78.

The reason that is generally given by the Fathers why the Jews were not instructed in the doctrine of the trinity is, lest it should afford them a pretence for relapsing into polytheism; and certainly there was great danger of its operating in that manner. "The multitude of the Jews," says Eusebius, "were in ignorance of this hidden mystery, when they were taught to believe in one God only, on account of their being frequently drawn into idolatry; they did not know that he was the Father of the only begotten Son. This mystery was reserved for the Gentile church, out of special favour to them."

* Θεοτής δὲ μια εν Μνωση μαλακα καταβεβλησα, δυσα δε εν

Προφητικας σφοδρα μπροσταται. Τριας δε εν ευαγγελιοις φανερουσα,

πλειον κατα λιμπς και γενιας αρμοζεια τω δυαιω, εις γνωσιν και σεισιν.


† Το δε σπλαγς τι Ιουδαίων ειδους εν αγνωστα ετοιχαν τι μυσραν, εθεν θεου μεν ειδακασατο εις ειδειν, δια το τη πολυθεσι

αλαισ συνεχος υποσυρσδου. ἀπατηα δε ουτα τω θεου μεν τι μμμεν

νους ιπηοι· τω παρ εφολατιστο τη εις ειδους ευκλετο εις μυσραν,

καλα την αειαρητον χαριν αυτον δεδομενου. Contra Marcel.

lib. i. cap. 20. p. 99.
Gregory Nazianzen, therefore, representing the propriety of Judaism being abolished by degrees, says, “the Father was preached “in the Old Testament, and the Son obscurely; in the New, the Son clearly, and “the Spirit obscurely, he revealing himself “more clearly to us. For it was not safe “to preach the divinity of the Son clearly, “while that of the Father was not under- “stood, nor that of the Spirit, while that “of the Son was not received, left too great “a burden should be laid upon us, or left “we should be dazzled with too much “light, &c.” And Chrysostom farther observes, that “the precept, Hear, O Israel, “the Lord thy God is one Lord, was not “given till after the sin of the golden calf†;”

† Or. 37. Opera, p. 608, 609.

* Exe. 20. 4, 5. 
† Or. 37. Opera, p. 608, 609.
as if it had not been the intention of providence to give them any such precept, if they had not previously shewn a disposition to abuse more perfect instruction.

Job the monk, of whose writings we have a particular account in Photius, comparing the great revolutions in the state of religion to earthquakes, says, "As the first earth-quake had cured the world of idolatry, by contrary remedies, but concealed the difference of hypostases; so in the last times, the Jewish opinion of one person having gained strength in time, and by the law, and having destroyed idolatry; the Son then, in a manner worthy of God, and friendly to man, took flesh, and revealed the mystery of the trinity by degrees." He likewise says, "the Saviour very wisely spake lowly of himself, and withheld the beams of his divinity, and prepared to let it shine forth in works *."
It was customary, as we shall see, to represent the doctrine of the trinity as something sublime, and of difficult apprehension; and therefore fit for persons of ripe understanding, and deep reflection; of which on that account, even the christians of the first ages were allowed to be ignorant, and the common people in general, till a much later period. It was natural, therefore, to alledge this, also, as another reason why the Jews, living in the infant age of the world, should not have this sublime and difficult lesson taught them. "The Jews," says Eusebius, "were not taught the doctrine of the trinity, on account of their infant state." Basil gives the same account. Cyril of Alexandria, says, "The doctrine..."
Chap. I.  in the Divine Unity.  25

"doctrine of the trinity was taught in "types only, and not clearly. For what "reason? Because the light of divine "vision is not easily accessible to those who "are but lately called to the knowledge "of the truth, and have not their minds "exercised to those speculations*."

Our Saviour said that divorces had been allowed to the Jews on account of the hardness of their hearts. This also is given as a reason by Eusebius, why the Jews were not taught the doctrine of the trinity†.


SECTION III.
The Sentiments of the Jews, as expressed by themselves, on the Subject.

HAVING seen what the christian Fathers say in general of the ignorance of the Jews concerning the doctrine of the trinity, let us see what the Jews themselves have said on the subject, as far as we are able to collect it, either from the writings of the christian Fathers, or their own.

As the christian Fathers found the doctrine of the trinity obscurely hinted at in the Old Testament, and particularly in the account of the creation, in which God is represented as saying, Let us make man, we may wish to know what the Jews replied, when they were urged with this argument; and it is remarkable, that their answer was in general the same with that of the unitarian in the Clementines, in reply to Simon, who had urged that very circumstance, as a proof that there were more gods than one. However, there is a variety in the answers given by the Jews to this question, but all of them sufficiently
Chap. I. in the Divine Unity. 27

iciently natural, and not improper. Theodorit says, "the Jews say that when God said let us make man, he used the kingly style*;" and this seems to be the most natural interpretation. But according to Tertullian, the Jews said that God addressed himself to the angels. "Did he speak to angels, when he said, let us make man, as the Jews say, who do not acknowledge the Son; or, as if he himself was Father, Son, and Spirit, did he, say they, make himself more than one, and speak in the plural number†." This also is the answer which Basil reports. "The Jews say God spake to the angels, when he said, let us make man," addressing himself to an unitarian, who he said was "a Jew pre-
tending to be a christian‡." Cyril of

‡ ἄνει ὑπὸ ὃ ἐν οἷς νέως καθελομεν, ο τον Ἰουδαίονον προε- σενον εν Χριστιανῶς ἀφοσπομεν. τινὶ λέγει κατ' ἐκδομα

Jerusalem
Jerusalem says, that the Jews acknowledged only one God the Father *

We may form a very good judgment of the sentiments of the Jews on this subject, from the account of a solemn conference between Gregentius, a Christian bishop, and Herbanus, a learned Jew, in the presence of an Arabian prince, in the fifth century. As it is the only work of the kind that remains of so early an age, I shall quote several extracts from it, to shew how the Jews of that age felt and reasoned.

The Jew expresses his dread of idolatry in very strong terms. "The prophet "Moses," he says, "if you read the penta-
touch, pronounces a dreadful curse upon "the children of Israel, from God, the an-
gels, and saints, calling in all the ele-
ments under heaven, if we should ever "receive any other god beside the God of "our Fathers. Why then should you make "any words on the subject; for God him-
self by the prophets strictly orders us,

* Οἵ το μὲν εἰναι ενα τεν πατερα καταδεχομεν τοις λογιμασί. Cat. 7. p. 102.  
"saying,
"saying, there shall be no other god in thee, nor shalt thou worship a strange god; I am the Lord thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt. "What think you of this?"

"It is grievous to me to desert the God of the law, whom you acknowledge to be a true god, and to worship a younger god, not knowing whence he sprung."

"Whence do you derive your faith in the Father, Son, and Spirit, and introduce three strange gods?" "Where did any prophet foretell that Christ was to be God man, as you say?" "Why

* Μουσάς ὁ προφήτης, εἰ τινὶ σειραίαν ἀνέφερε, μηρείην καταραὶν τῆς Καιταρίς ἐν τῷ Ἱεροταύρα, απὸ τὴν ἑτήν τῶν αὐγάλων, ἕταν ὅτι ἦν τῶν αἰγίων, ἐν τῇ παν θανάτῳ τοῦ χριστοῦ καταράει πρὸς καθάρει, εἰκὸ τὰς ἑτέρας ἑπέφωνεν τὰς αὐτάς τε ἐν τῇ παρεξήγησί τε ἐν τῷ παρατειν. Τῇ ἐν καὶ τοὺς πανταπαραγόντες; ἐγὼ γὰρ αὐτὸς ὁ Θεὸς θανατεύτων σπουδάζων μεν λέγων ὡς τοιοῦτον ἑαυτόν καταραίμενον, καὶ προσκυνήσεις θεῶν αἰλοτρίων ἔγειρον εἰμι κύριος ὁ Θεὸς σοὶ, ὁ ἀναγάγων σε εἰς τῆς γῆς διόρθωσεν τε τῇ ἐπὶ δοκεῖ σοι πρὸς ταύτα. Π. 36.

† Οἶκεν βαφύ μετὰ κατάληψιν τὼν Θεοῦ τοῦ ναόν, εἰ σύ μερετρεῖς, στῇ εἰς θεῖας ἀληθείας, ἐπειδὴ ἐνεπάγαγεν ἐν κρίσιν, καθὼς ἐπιτάχθηκεν εἰς εἴρησιν. Ibid. p. 115.

† Πάνταν ἐξελάδεσθε πατήρα ὁ ὁ θεὸς ἐπειμά χειροποιήσεις, ἐγὼ ἐξερευνήσομεν ἐπὶ μετα τρεῖς θεῶν εἰλικροτες. Ibid. p. 6.

|| Καὶ σὺ ὑμῖν τῷ τῶν προφητῶν, οτι ὁ Θεός εἰσιν εἰς τὸν καθὼς ἐνεπάγαγεν εἰς θεἶνος, εἰς τῷ ταῦτα λελαλήκας. Ibid. p. 112.
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"did not God order Moses and the prophets to believe in the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, but yourselves only, who have lately discovered it, as you pretend."

"How do you call your Christ God, if my God has chosen him, &c. He cannot be a god, of whom you acknowledge it is said in the prophet, I have made thee strong. How can you call him your God and Saviour, who, as the prophet witnesses, can do nothing without my God +?"

Lastly, having quoted the words of the prophet, "I have heard thee in an acceptable time, I have formed thee," he says, "How dare you then make him equal to him that formed him?"

* Τῷ Μωυσὶν ὑ τοῖς συμφώνοις τα εἰς ἐξέστο ς Ἕλες πιστευειν εἰς πατερά κυνοὶ καὶ αγγελινοὶ δυνάμει, ἀλλ' ἡ μονεὶς μὴν ἔχας τατο ἔχουσιν αὐτοὶ εὐσεβοῖς, ως μὲνεις φάτε. Gregent. p. 7.

† Καὶ εἴ οὐκ εἴς τον Χριστὸν τον χριστὸν τον Ἰησοῦν προσαργοθείς, εἰς χριστὰν εἰς εὔσεβεῖς, καὶ τα ἐφες; καὶ κεις Ἰησοῦς. ως λεγεις, οτι φασκει εἰς αὐτη δια τα προφητείς, οτι εὖς γερ εἰμι εὐσεβεῖς τον Ἰησοῦν. ἀλλ' οὕτως καὶ αὐτος αὐτοῦ ἔχεις καὶ σωτηρίαν καὶ ἄλλα ὅσα ἀργον τοιαύτα, αὐτοὶ εἰς εὐσεβεῖς τον Ἰησοῦν. Gregent. p. 111.

† Παρὰ συντομάς ιδοὺ τῷ πλαγίῳ καὶ τῷ θρώνον εἰς ὅμοιον αὐτοῦ Ἱησοῦν. Gregent. Ibid. p. 151.

"The
Chap. I. in the Divine Unity.

"The doctrine of the trinity," says the Rabbi Isaac, in his Munimen Fidei, "as held by learned christians, rests on the slightest evidence, and is contrary to the doctrine of the prophets, the law, and right reason, and even to the writings of the New Testament. For the divine law gives its sanction to the unity of God, and removes all plurality from him." This writer shews, in many places, that the doctrine of the trinity is not taught in the New Testament. See p. 397. 403. 418, &c.

The contempt which the author of a Jewish treatise, entitled, Nizzachon Vetus, expresses for the christian doctrine of God being confined in the womb of woman, is peculiarly strong. As to those who said

* Accedit his, quod dogma de trinitate falsum est, et quibusdam eruditis Nazarenorum, rebus levissimis, sine ullo vero prophetico fundamento recens superfluum, quodque legi divinae, verbis prophetarum, humanae rationi, distilque plurimis scriptorum novi testamenti repugnat. Quippe lex divina comprobat dei unitatem, omnemque pluralitatem ab eo segregat. p. 113.

† Quomodo igitur iste deus esse possit, qui feminem plenum immunditiis ventrem habentem, ingressus est? Et quem
that Mary was not rendered unclean by the birth of Jesus, he says the contrary is evident, from the offering that she brought for her purification*.

Having seen what the christians, both unitarians and trinitarians, and also what the Jews, thought of the doctrine of the Old Testament concerning God, it may be some farther satisfaction to know in what manner the heathens decided in this case. We have the opinion of the emperor Julian on this subject, and it is decisively in favour of the Jews, and the unitarian christians. He says, "Moses not only once, or "twice, or three times, but many times


"commands
"commands to worship only one God, "who, he says, is over all. He mentions "no other God, but only angels, and lords, "and many gods," that is, the heathen gods. "This great Being he made to be "the first, but he made no second, like him, "or unlike him, as you have done. If you "can produce a single expression in Moses "to this purpose, do it. That saying of "his, A prophet shall the Lord your God "raise up unto you, of your brethren, like "unto me, bear him, is not said of the son "of Mary. But if this be granted to you, "he says that he shall be like to himself, "and not to God, a prophet like himself, "of man, and not of God*."

* Ο τοιού Μωυσῆς οἱ απαθείς, οὐδέ γε, οὐδὲ τρις, ἀλλὰ πλείονες επὶ ἐν τοῖς μνημονείοις, εἰς τὸν μονός αὐτὸς τιμάω, οὐ δὲ τῇ εἰς τὸν ομαλόν νομαζεῖ, Θεοῦ δὲ θεοῦ θεοῖς, αἰθέρες δέ οὐνομαζεί, Εὐαγγελίας καὶ κυριεῖς, καὶ μετοιχὶς πολειονας, εὐχαρίστης τῶν αὐτούς, αὐθεντικὴ δὲ τὸν θεόν, ὥσπερ τὴν ὑπενθύμισιν. Ὑπὸ ρῆμα, ὑπὸ αὐθεντικήν, καὶ παράρειν οἵως ἀπεφεύγατε. Εἰ δὲ εἰς τὸν παρὰ μνημονεύς τῶν μετα-μνημονεύς, εὔχεσθαι τοῖς τοίς παραφρέσκαις. Τὸ γὰρ, αὐθεντικήν ὑμᾶς ἀναγγέλλοντες κυρίος ὁ Θεός ὑμᾶς, εἰ τῶν αὐθεντικῶν ὑμᾶς, ὡς ἐμοί. τὸ αὐθεντικὴν ὑμᾶς ἐρχομένους ἀναγγέλλοντες κυρίος. Ἑως τοῦ παραφρέσκαις τοῖς τοίς, ὡς τὸ αὐθεντικον ὑμᾶς ἀναγγέλλοντες κυρίος. Ἑως τοῦ παραφρέσκαις τοῖς τοίς, ὡς τὸ αὐθεντικον ὑμᾶς ἀναγγέλλοντες κυρίος. Ἑως τοῦ παραφρέσκαις τοῖς τοίς, ὡς τὸ αὐθεντικον ὑμᾶς ἀναγγέλλοντες κυρίος.
The Jews believed

Book III.

It has been seen that Philo personified the logos as much as the christian Fathers, and that they probably learnt of him the doctrine of a divine logos being the medium of all the communications of God to the patriarchs, and of this principle occasionally assuming a visible form. But Philo had no idea that this doctrine had any connexion with that of the Messiah, as he gives no hint that this was a character to be assumed by the logos; nor does it appear that the Jews in any age had such an expectation; though this has been pretended by some modern christians.

It is unquestionable that, in our Saviour's time, the Jews expected no other than a man in the character of their Messiah. Mary, the mother of Jesus, evidently expected that the Messiah was to be born in the usual way, of two human parents. For when the angel informed her that she should conceive and bear a son, who should be called the son of the highest, and to whom God would give the throne of his father David, she replied, Luke i. 34. How shall this
this be, seeing I know not a man. Our Saviour could not possibly have puzzled the Jewish doctors as he did, by asking them how David could call the Messiah his lord, when he was his son, or descendant, on any other principle. For if they had themselves been fully persuaded that the Messiah, though descended from David, was the maker and God of David, a satisfactory answer to his question was very obvious. Origen reproaches Celsus for his ignorance, in not knowing that the Jews never believed that the Messiah would be God, or the Son of God *. Facundus very properly says, that "Martha and Mary would never have "said to Christ, if thou hadst been here, had "they thought him to be God omnipresent." This writer also says, that the Jews always had expected, and that, in his time, they did expect, a mere man for their Messiah. "They did not know," he says, "that "Christ, the Son of God, was God; but "they thought that Christ would be a mere

* Οὐκ οίδα μετόχε, ὃ ὁ παῦς ὁ Ἰσαὰκ ἠγάπη τὸν εὐς ὁ αὐτον Ἰωσὴφ, καὶ ὁ Ἰωσὴφ ὁ Ἱσαάκ, καὶ Ἰωσὴφ ὁ αὐτον. Κον. Celsum, lib. 4. p. 162.
"man, which any one may perceive that "the Jews at this time also think *.

Many christians imagine, that the child called Immanuel by Isaiah (chap. vii. 8.) must be God, because the word signifies, God with us. But the Jews understood their scriptures, and their own ideas with respect to giving names, too well to draw any such inference from this circumstance. Eusebius says, that they asserted it was not even the Messiah that was intended by Immanuel, but only some common child †.

Basinghe, who studied the history and opinions of the Jews more carefully, perhaps, than any other modern writer, and who has written largely on this very subject, though a trinitarian himself, has exploded all the pretences of Cudworth, and others, to find the doctrine of the trinity,

* Sed non propterea Chriftum dei filium, deum scie-bant; hominem autem purum arbitrati sunt Chriftum.— Quod etiam nunc putantes Judæos quilibet videbit. Lib. 9. cap. iii. p. 139.

either among the ancient or the modern Jews. "The christians and the Jews," he says, "separate at the second step in religion. For after having adored the one God, absolutely perfect, they find immediately after the abyss of the trinity, which entirely separates them. "The Jew considers three persons as three Gods, and this tritheism shocks him. "The christian who believes the unity of one God, thinks that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, should all be called God, and have the same worship. It is impossible to reconcile opinions so contrary."


This
This writer also says, that "the Jews consider themselves as bearing their testimony to the unity of God among all the nations of the world." How far the Jews of late years are from admitting the divinity of the Messiah, we may judge from what Orobio said in his controversy with Limborch, viz. that, admitting what is impossible, that the Messiah whom they expect should teach that doctrine, he ought to be stoned as a false prophet.

It has, however, been imagined by some, that the Jews had a knowledge of the doctrine of the trinity, that it spread from them among the Gentiles, and that traces of it may be perceived in the mysteries of heathen religions. But if this be the case, it is obvious to ask, why are no traces of this doctrine to be found in the Jewish scriptures, and the Jewish worship? Or, if the

* "Les témoins de l'unité de dieu dans toutes les nations du monde." Hift. des Juifs, lib. 7. cap. 33. sect.

† Dato impoffibili quod Messias, quem expectamus, eam doctrinam [v. g. fe equalem esse deo] Israelém edoceret, jure foret, ut pseudopropheta, lapidandus. Limberch's Amica Collatio, p. 111.

Jews
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Jews had once been in possession of this knowledge, but had lost it in the time of our Saviour, why did not he, who rectified other abuses, rectify this, the most important of them all.

If an expectation of a Messiah had been prevalent among the Gentiles, we should certainly perceive some traces of it in their writings. It might have been expected, both on account of the interesting nature, and the obscurity of the subject, that there would have been different opinions about it, that it would have been a common topic in their philosophical schools, and that their historians would have given some account of the origin of such an expectation.

The sixth eclogue of Virgil may be alleged as a proof of such an expectation. But I do not imagine that any person now thinks that Virgil himself ever expected such a personage as he describes. The use that a poet might make of a vague report of a prophecy (brought probably from the east, and ultimately from the Jewish scriptures) but seriously believed by no person that
that we know of, merely to embellish a poem, is one thing; but the actual and universal expectation of such a person, is another

SECTION IV.

Of the Jewish Angel Metatron, &c.

In the third of Ben Mordecai's Letters, written by the late Rev. Mr. Taylor of Portsmouth, p. 72. I find the following extraordinary paragraph: "Among the notions of the more modern Jews, we must also observe, that the Cabbalists believed El Shaddai to be the same person as the angel Metatron, whom they supposed to be the instructor of Moses, and the Messiah, i. e. as Dr. Allix expresses it, He was, according to the Christian phrase, the logos before his incarnation, or, according to the Jewish phrase, the soul of the Messiah, whom they look upon as something between God and the angels, whom
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"whom nothing separates from God."
Allix, p. 456 *.

"Bishop Pearson, in proving, by several arguments, that Christ is called Jehovah, says, the Jews themselves acknowledge that Jehovah shall be clearly known in the days of the Messiah, and not only so, but that it is the name which doth properly belong to him, for the proof of which he quotes the book Sepher Ikkarim, ii, 8.

"The scripture calleth the name of the Messiah Jehovah our righteousness, and Midrash Tillim, on Pf. xxi. God calleth the Messiah

* Here Mr. Taylor inserts the following note in French, but I shall give it in English; Calmet, on the word Metatron, says, "The Hebrews give this name to the first of the angels, him who conducted them in the wilderness, and of whom it is said, in Moses, I shall send my angel to go before you. He acted towards the Israelites the part of the officer whom the Romans called Metator. He marked out the encampments, traced the form of them, the dimensions, extent, &c. He is thought to be the archangel Michael, who was at the head of the people in the wilderness, that it was he who wrestled with Jacob, who is called the face of God, in Exod. xxxiv. 14; and who is the mediator between God and man; that he writes down good actions, and keeps a register of them."
"by his own name, and his name is Jehovah,
"as it is, Ex. xv. 3. The Lord is a man of
"war, Jehovah is his name. And it is writ-
"ten of the Messias, Jer. xxiii. 6. And this
"is the name which they shall call him, Jebo-
"vah our righteousness. Thus Echa Rab-
"biti, Lam. i. 6. What is the name of the
"Messias? Rabba said, Jehovah is his
"name, as it is said, Jer. xxiii. 6. The
"name he reports of Rabbi Levi; and the
"Bishop concludes, that the Rabbins then
"did acknowledge, that the name Jehovah
"did belong to the Messias."

Consulting Dr. Allix's own work on the
subject, I find the following reference to
authorities for what he advances: "See
"Reuchlin, L. i. De Cabala, p. 651. where
"he proves Metatron to be the Messiah
"from their writings; or, in short, take
"the confession of Manasseh Ben Israel,
"Q. 6. In Gen. i. 2." The former of
these authors I have not, and in the
latter I find no such passage as Dr. Al-
lix quotes. But as there is abundant
evidence that the Jews in general, and
in all ages, from the time of our Saviour to the present, considered their Messiah as a mere man, and a proper descendant of David, I own that I am disposed to examine, with some rigour, any pretended evidence to the contrary; though the speculative opinions of some of the Cabbalists among them is a thing of little consequence, when they can be proved to be different from those that were entertained by the nation in general.

What Calmet says concerning the angel Metatron in Ben Mordecai's note, has no relation to the Messiah; so that the most that I should be disposed to infer from what the Jewish Cabbalists may have said on the subject would be, that this Metatron was something similar to what Philo represents the logos as being, namely an esflux of the divinity, but no being, or person, permanently distinguished from him. And it is highly improbable, that any Jew should have supposed that their Messiah, a man descended from David, would have no proper human soul, besides this Metatron, or logos, supplying the place of it; though they might suppose the Messiah
The Jews believed Messiah to be distinguished by the presence and influence of this divine efflux.

The Jewish Cabbalists might easily admit even that the Messiah might be called Jehovah, without supposing that he was any thing more than a man, who had no existence before his birth. That it must have been the mere name, and not the nature of God, that the Jews supposed their Messiah to partake of, is all that can be admitted in the case. Several things in the scriptures are called by the name of Jehovah, as Jerusalem, in the passage above quoted, is called Jehovah our righteousness; but this never led the Jews to suppose, that there were two Jehovahs, a greater and a less. Nothing can be more expressly declared, than that there is but one Jehovah; and in the passages quoted by Bishop Pearson, there is no intimation of there being two Jehovahs; so that if the Messiah be Jehovah, there must have been no other Being above him, which Mr. Taylor would not suppose.

From reading the above quoted passage from Mr. Taylor, the reader would conclude, that it was the universal opinion of the
the Jewish Cabbalists, if not of the Jews in general, that this great angel Metatron was the soul of the Messiah. But this would be a mistake; for Beaumont quotes some of them, who said, that the soul of the Messiah was the same that had been the soul of Adam, and likewise that of David. The Cabbalistic proof of this mystery, he says, is the letter A in Adam, meaning Adam, the D David, and the M the Messiah. Histoire de Manichæisme, vol. 2. p. 492. So little dependence is there on the whimsical and uncertain notions of these Jewish Cabbalists. However, when they are quoted, they ought to be quoted fairly. Mr. Taylor probably saw nothing of them, but what he found in Dr. Allix.

Bainage gives a large account of the Jewish angel Metatron, shewing that he is the same with the angel Michael, concerning whom the Jews had many absurd fancies. He particularly shews, that the name of God being in this angel, means nothing more than that the letters of the words Metatron, ותרטת, and those of Shadai, אשי, considered as numerals express the same number
ber, viz. 314. lib. 4. cap. 19. vol. 3. p. 137.

Many mistakes on this subject have been occasioned by its being taken for granted, that what is said of the logos may be applied to the Messiah, because the generality of Christians have supposed them to be synonymous. But this was not the case with the Jews; and there is a passage quoted by Baugnagé, in his History of the Jews, L. IV. c. xxiv. f. 9. which shews, that some of their writers considered them as quite distinct from each other. "Jonathan says, that the Messiah "and Moses will appear at the end of the "world, the one in the desert, and the other "at Rome, and that the word, or the logos, "will march between them."

Till I see much more evidence than I have yet met with (and I have not spared any pains to come at it) I cannot admit that any Jew ever supposed that their Messiah either pre-existed, or was, properly speaking, God.

With respect to all these pretences to make the Jews favourable to the doctrine of the trinity, Mr. Baugnagé says, "They "cannot
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"cannot be advanced without the authors " of them deceiving themselves. The " Jews will never," he says, " be con- " vinced by endeavouring to persuade them " that they believe what they do not believe, " and that they do not oppose the doctrine " of the trinity, which is the principal ob- " ject of their blasphemies."

He mentions a Jewish writer, Jacob, the son of Amram, who laughs at the pretensions of christians to bring proofs of the trinity from the cabbala. "The cabbalists," says he, "under several of the letters conceal " mysteries which the vulgar cannot dis- " cover, they only meant to teach the unity " of God, and to explain his attributes, and " they were very ignorant who looked into " their writings for the trinity."

* Mais peut-on avancer, cela sans vouloir se tromper, puis que l'unite d'un dieu le dogme capital de Juifs, et que la pluralité des personnes fait le plus grand obstacle à leur conversion.—On ne convaincera jamais les Juifs, lors qu'on s'entêtera de leur persuader qu'ils ont cru ce qu'ils ne croient pas, et qu'ils ne s'opposent point au dogme de la trinité, qui est le principal objet de leurs blasphèmes. —— Jacob, fils d'Amram, dans un ouvrage manuscrit qu'il intitule la porte de la vérité, se moque des chrétiens qui tirent de la cabbale des preuves pour la trinité. Car, dit
How far Manasseh Ben Israel was from supposing that there was any trinity in the divine nature, appears from the very section that Dr. Allix has quoted, which contains his interpretation of Gen. i. 26. And God said, Let us make man. After reciting a variety of interpretations, he concludes as follows, "Or shall we say that, what seems to be of greater consequence, we generally undertake with more study and deliberation, and therefore that the scripture, in describing the creation of man, makes use of the plural number, Let us make, which is the language of a person commanding and exciting himself to undertake and do any thing; so that God would shew that all other creatures were made for the use of man. But whether God be supposed to speak to all second causes, or to intelligencies only, or to the elements, or to souls, or to use the style of a king, or lastly, whether he be sup-

dit il, les cabalistes enferment sous l'ecorce de la lettre des mystères que le vulgaire ne découvre pas. Les théologiens n'ont dessein que d'enseigner, l'unité de dieu, et d'expliquer ses attributes; et il faut être ignorant pour chercher chez eux la trinité. L.7. c.31. vol. 4. p.2159. &c. "posed
"posed to excite or command himself, all
"ground of controversy is removed. For
"it does not follow, that there is any mul-
tiplication of the first cause, which is
"most simple, and one, because the phrase,
"let us make, is used. For Moses might
"very safely make use of this language,
"since he every where most clearly teaches,
"that there is but one God; and, there-
"fore, he only will defend his error by
"these words, who knowingly and wil-
"ingly errs *.

* Aut dicemus, plerumque id, quod majoris momenti
videtur, majori quoque studio et deliberatione nos aggregi:
ideoque scripturam in creatione hominis peculiari modo
loqui in plurali, faciamus: quod verbum videtur impe-
rantis fibi ipfi, et ad sulcipiendum ac faciendum aliquid
incitantis: eaque re offendere dominus vult, omnes reli-
quas creaturas suo beneficio creatas. Sed five cum om-
nibus secundis, causis loquatnr deus, five cum intelligentiis
tantum, five cum elementis, five cum animis, five regio more
haec dicat, feu denique incitet femetipsum, sibiique imperet,
conciliatione ejusmodi tota tollitur-controversia. Etenim
non quia faciamus dicitur, inde sequitur multiplicationi ali-
quae prae cause, que simplissima eft et unica. Moses
vero causam cur ita scriberet, justam habuit, quia clarif-
fime passim docet unicum numer efl; eoque solus is,
qui sciens volens errat, his verbis errorem suam defenfurum
CHAPTER II.

General Considerations relating to the supposed Conduct of Christ and the Apostles, with Respect to the Doctrines of his Pre-existence and Divinity.

The whole nation of the Jews having been so well grounded in the great doctrine of the divine unity, ever since their return from the Babylonish captivity, and their attachment to it having strengthened continually, as the whole of their history shews, especially in consequence of their persecution by Antiochus Epiphaæs, and during their subjection to the Romans (in which their utter abhorrence of every thing that had the appearance of idolatry, is seen upon all occasions) and this being well-known to, and allowed by all the Christian Fathers; it could not but, even in their idea, require the greatest caution and address to teach them any doctrine that could be construed into an infringement of it.

That
That the doctrine of the divinity of Christ had this appearance, those Fathers acknowledged; when they supposed that Moses and the prophets could not teach it, lest it should have given the Jews a pretence for relapsing into the worship of many Gods.

They could not imagine that this difficulty would be at all removed by the christian doctrine of Jesus being the Messiah. Because it was well known to them that the Jews expected nothing more than a man for their Messiah; and even a man born in the usual way, a proper descendant of David. Their highest expectation concerning the Messiah was, that he would be a great prince, a conqueror, and a legislator, and perhaps that he would not die. The probability is, that they imagined that the race of their kings descended from David would be revived in him, and continue to the end of time. But all this is far short of the deification of the Messiah, or the idea of his being a great pre-existent spirit, the maker of the world under God, and who, in the name of God, had intercourse with the patriarchs. Such notions as these do not appear
pear ever to have entered into the head of any Jew, extravagant as their expectations were concerning the dignity and power of their Messiah.

Here then was a great dilemma in which the christian Fathers, advocates for the doctrines of the pre-existence and divinity of Christ, found themselves. They were under the necessity of maintaining that they were doctrines taught either by Christ or the apostles, or they must have abandoned them themselves. Doctrines of this great extent and magnitude, and so revolting to the minds of all Jews, they could not but suppose would alarm them very much; and therefore, that it was necessary to introduce them with the greatest caution. Still, however, they must have been taught them fully and explicitly at one time or other.

Accordingly, we find, in their accounts of the preaching of our Saviour and his apostles, that they did suppose that the greatest possible caution was used, and that this cautious proceeding was continued even till after the death of most of the apostles; so that the doctrines of the pre-existence and divinity
divinity of Christ were not fully discovered till the publication of the gospel of John, which was one of the last of all the books of the New Testament. But at that time they thought it to be absolutely necessary; as otherwise there would hardly have been any besides unitarians in the church; the knowledge of those great doctrines having, in their opinion, been confined to the apostles and the leading christians only.

A more improbable hypothesis was perhaps never formed by man, to account for any fact whatever; and yet I do not know that the christian Fathers could have done any better. Let their successors, who are equally interested in the solution of the problem, do better if they can. But certainly they who were nearer to the times of the apostles, were in a situation to form a better judgment in this case than any persons at this day can pretend to be; and therefore, I cannot help concluding, that they were well aware, that the supposition of this discovery having been made at an earlier period in the gospel history would have been liable to still greater objections than the
hypothesis which they did adopt. It is most probable that the state of opinions in their own time made it absolutely necessary for them to have recourse to this hypothesis, lame and wretched as it is.

The primitive Fathers were not prevented by the supposition above-mentioned, from attempting to prove the pre-existence and divinity of Christ from those books of the New Testament which were published before the gospel of John; but neither were they prevented from attempting to prove the same doctrines, as we have seen, from the books of the Old Testament, though they acknowledged that the body of the Jewish nation never learned them from those books. In like manner though they supposed that the apostles left sufficient traces of these sublime doctrines in their writings, they thought that the common christians, for whose use they were written, did not perceive them, or make the proper inferences from them. That they should not have done this will not be thought extraordinary, if we consider the extreme caution with which, according to the account of these
these Fathers themselves, those doctrines were taught in these books.

Such a revolution has time made in our apprehensions of things, that the doctrines of the pre-existence and divinity of Christ are now taught to children, as some of the first elements of christianity; but formerly the case was very different. They were considered as most sublime and difficult doctrines, and therefore, not to be taught till after every thing else relating to the gospel had been admitted and well understood. That these doctrines were actually considered in this light, appears from a great number of passages in the writings of the Fathers, many of which I shall introduce in other parts of this work, and especially some very striking ones from Origen. But not to advance a thing of this consequence without some evidence, in a place where it will be particularly wanted, I shall produce a few passages of this kind here.

Eusebius, after demonstrating the divine mission of Christ as a prophet, introduces his discourse concerning his pre-existence and divinity
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divinity as a "mysterious and recondite doctrine*.”

Austin compares the doctrine of the humanity of Christ to milk, and the doctrine of the divinity to strong meat, fit for men†.

"The doctrine of the incarnation," Chrysostom says, "was very difficult to be received‡;" and then describing the great condescension of the maker of all things in submitting to be carried nine months in the womb of a woman, he says, that on this account the prophets announced it very obscurely. Again, observing that it was necessary to preach the humanity before the divinity of Christ, he says, "this was the order respecting his deity

* Καίρες τινὶ ὑπὶ αὐτὸς νεών εὐπροσδότησαν λόγους, τοις ἕφες της καὶ ἀπὸ μυστικῶν θεολογίας. Demonstratio, lib. 4. cap. 1. p. 144.


"and incarnation, though it is introduced " by John in a different manner from the " rest, but in perfect agreement with them. " But how? I say, that the doctrine not " being taught at first, it was proper to " dwell upon the incarnation, and to exer- " cise them in the doctrine of the flesh; " teaching them, from things gross and " sensible; but when the doctrine was fix- " ed, and the preaching received, it was " then proper to ascend higher *."

Cyril of Alexandria, explaining a passage in Isaiah, says, " here he mixes a great and " profound mystery, which required a mys- " tical initiation; for so it was revealed to " the divine Peter †."


Agobard
Agobard considered what John taught concerning the divinity of Christ as being so difficult to be understood, that, in order to it, the same inspiration was necessary that he himself had.

"Perfection," says Ecumenius, "is the doctrine concerning the divinity of Christ, as far as the human understanding can comprehend it." Again, he says, "by first elements the apostle means the incarnation. For, as with respect to letters, so in the divine oracles, what relates to the incarnation must be learned in the first place; for these were capable of being received by unbelievers and children; but to philosophize concerning the divinity of Christ, is left to grown men. Do you see why he rests so long in these low things? It is on


"account
account of the weakness of his hearers, who were not able to receive the perfect doctrine. For which reason, having in the beginning of the epistle philosophized but a little concerning the divinity of Christ, he presently changed his dif-
course, and the epistle is full of low things*. This he gives from Photius. Again, after having observed that the author of the epistle to the Hebrews had spoken of the naked word of God, he says, that he returned to the incarnation, lest he should confound his reader with the sublimity of his doctrine†.

We see then, that, in the opinion of these Fathers (and some of them who write in

* Στοιχεῖα αρχής, τὴν εὐαγγελιστὴν λεγεῖ. ἀπερ οὐκ ἐπὶ τῶν γραμμάτων προέητα τὰ Γοῦχεια μακάμαεμεν. ὡς ὁ οὐκ ἐπὶ τῶν θείων λόγων εἰς προέητα τὰ αἰσθήματα τῆς εὐαγγελιστῆς διδασκαλεῖ. τοιαύτα γὰρ τοὺς αὐτούς οὐκ ἐπὶ κατάνοιας αὐξανᾶς χαρδίας, ἡς τοῖς αὐτοῖς τὴν διδασκαλίαν. τοιάδ' ἐπὶ τῆς ἐνσυνείας. ἐν ἀρχαίων τὰ τελεῖα διδάσκαλοι. Διὸ τоῖς αὐτοῖς τὴν εἰσίν τινας διδασκαλίας ὑπάρχει, καὶ τὸν ἐνεποιημένον λόγον. τοῖς μεταίτων ἐπιστολῶν γεγονέν. Ibid. p. 352:

† Εἴριχος τεταρτάγμον τὴν διδασκαλίαν, καὶ τὴν εὐαγγελιστὴν, οὕτως τῷ υἱῷ τῶν εἰρημενῶν οἰκουμένων. In Heb. cap. 1. vol. 2. p. 320.
this manner lived pretty early, though others of them wrote in a later period) there were very mysterious and difficult doctrines to be revealed, of which no person to whom christi- tianity was preached had the least concep- tion, and to which it was apprehended they must be exceedingly averse. Let us now see in what manner they supposed that our Saviour and the apostles conducted them- selves in this nice circumstance, and what period it was that they thought to be the most proper for making the great discovery.

To give some idea of the nature of this question, I would observe, that, if it should appear that a discovery of so great magni- tude, as the Fathers represent this to have been, made no noise at all at the time fixed for the discovery, if it excited no particular attention; neither occasioning any doubt or controversy among christians themselves, nor bringing any objection to their doctrine from their enemies, it will afford a strong reason to suppose that no such discovery was made at that particular time. The Jews, to whom the gospel was first preach- ed, as the Fathers admitted, expected no-
thing more than a man for their Messiah. They were fully sensible that no Jew had any idea of his having pre-existed at all, and much less of his having held any office of importance before he came into the world. When was it, then, that the Jews, to whom the gospel was preached, were taught that Christ had pre-existed, that he was the logos of God, the maker of the world under God, or properly God himself? Was it in our Saviour's own life-time? Was it at the descent of the Spirit at Pentecost? Or was it in a later period of the gospel history? If no traces can be perceived of any such discovery, in any period of the gospel history, an argument may be drawn from the consideration of it, highly unfavourable to the doctrine of Christ having any nature superior to that of man; and when this circumstance shall be sufficiently attended to (as I suspect it never has been yet) the Arian hypothesis must be greatly shaken, but especially that of the perfect equality of the Son to the Father.

Considerations of this kind, if they occur to him, no person, who thinks at all, can absolutely
absolutely neglect, so as to satisfy himself
with having no hypothesis on the subject.
We certainly find the apostles, as well as the
rest of the Jews, without any knowledge of
the divinity of Christ, with whom they lived
and conversed as a man; and if they ever
became acquainted with it, there must have
been a time when it was either discovered
by them, or made known to them; and the
effects of the acquisition, or the communi-
cation of extraordinary knowledge, are, in
general, proportionably conspicuous.

Had we no written history of our Savi-
our’s life, or of the preaching of the apost-
tles, or only some very concise one; still so
very extraordinary an article as this would
hardly have been unknown, much less
when the history is so full and circumstan-
tial as it is.

Had there been any pretence for imagin-
ing, that the Jews, in our Saviour’s time,
had any knowledge of the doctrine of the
trinity, and that they expected the second
person in it in the character of their Mess-
siah, the question I propose would have
been needless. But nothing can be more
evident
evident than that, whatever some may fancy with respect to more ancient times, every notion of a trinity was obliterated from the minds of the Jews in our Saviour's time: It is therefore not only a curious, but a serious and important question, When was it introduced, and by what steps? I have answered it on my hypothesis, of its being an innovation and a corruption of the Christian doctrine; let others do the same, on the idea of its being an essential part of it. Let us then see, what it is that the Christian Fathers, who themselves believed the pre-existence and divinity of Christ, and who were much nearer than we are to the time when the gospel was promulgated, have said on this subject.
CHAPTER III.

Of the Conduct of our Saviour himself, with respect to his own supposed Pre-existence and Divinity.

If we look into the gospel history, we shall find, that all that our Saviour himself taught, or insinuated, were his divine mission in general, or his being the Messiah in particular; with the doctrine of the resurrection, and that of himself coming again to raise the dead and judge the world. These doctrines, accompanied with moral instructions, and reproofs of the Pharisees, for corrupting the law of God, made up the whole of his preaching. He never told his disciples that he had pre-existed, or that he had had anything to do before he came into the world; much less that he had made the world, and governed it; and there is abundant
dant evidence that this was admitted by the Christian Fathers.

Athanæius expresses his sense of the difficulty with which the Jews admitted that Christ was any thing more than a man very strongly in the following passage: "He calls his humanity the son of man; for the Jews, always opposing God, held a twofold blasphemy with respect to Christ; for some of them being offended at his flesh, viz. the son of man, thought him to be a prophet, but not God, and called him a glutton and a wine-bibber; who were forgiven, for it was then the beginning of the preaching, and the world could not yet believe him to be God, who was made man; wherefore Christ says, Whosoever shall speak a word against the son of man, viz. his body, it shall be forgiven him. For I will venture to say, that not even the blessed disciples themselves were fully persuaded concerning his divinity, till the holy spirit came upon them at the day of Pentecost. For when they saw him after his resurrection, some wor-
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"shipped, but others doubted, yet they " were not on that account condemned *."  

The Fathers say, that whenever our Saviour said any thing that might lead his disciples to think that he was of a nature superior to that of man, they were offended, and that he conciliated their esteem when-ever he represented himself as a mere man, such as they expected a prophet, and the Messiah to be. Chrysoftom represents John the Baptist likewise as gaining proselytes to Christ, when he spake of him in low terms, but as deterring them when he seemed to speak of him in a higher capacity.

* Τευ δε αὐτὸστιν αὐτὸς υιὸν αὐτοῦτο, ἵνα γραφῆν αὐτῷ εἴρηται οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ. οἱ εἰς αὐτὸν τοῖς θεοῖς αὐτοὺς ἰδοντες, περὶ τοὺς οἰκονομοὺς αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' οὐκ εἶναι εἰσορίζοντες, οὐ γὰρ αὐτὸς εἰκότων ἐκκλησίας, δεικνύειν αὐτὸν, ἀλλ' ὅταν εἰσερχόμενοι, ἐπίσκεψις οὐκ ἐγένετο. ΄χρι ἀπαγό- 
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Observe," says he, "how, when he said, 
"He that cometh after me was before me, 
"and I am not worthy to loose his shoe 
"latchet; he took nobody. But when he 
"spake of his humanity, and used a lower 
"style, then the disciples followed him. 
"Nor is this the only case of the kind, for 
"the multitude were never brought to him 
"when anything high and lofty, as of a God, 
"was said of him, so much as when they 
"heard something mild and humble, and 
"more adapted to the salvation of men.*"

Accordingly Chrysostom speaks of our Lord's disciples as having regarded him as a man in their intercourse with him. Nathaniel, he says, "confessed Christ as a man, 
"when he addressed himself to him, by the 
"title of Son of God. John, i. 49. as ap-
"pears by his adding, thou art the king of

* Θεος δε μοι κακείνο στοι στι μεν ελεγεν, ο οποιον μεν 
ερχομενω εμπροσθεν με γεγονε, κι ακι εις εκει λυσα 
τον ομαλα τω υποδηματω αυτο, εφες ειλεν. οτι θε αφη 
της εικονιας διελεξην, κι επι το ταπεινοτερον τοι ιων 
νγεγε, τοι εκλεξεναι οι μαθηται. και τοτε δε μονεν εσι 
κατειναι, αλλ' οτι κι ευς οι ανθρωποι προσαγονται οτ αν τι 
νηγεν μπιλον σερι θευ λεγονται, οδ οτ αν χριστον θε 
καλη 
ον δομον ή εις την των ακωντων σωτηριαν ικον. In John i. 

"Israel"
"Isaiah." Ibid. p. 106. He says, that when Nathaniel was introduced to Jesus, his miraculous conception was not known*. As Chrysostom has written the most largely on this subject, I shall quote from him a passage or two of some extent, that we may more clearly perceive how he, and (as he was by no means singular in his ideas) how the Christian Fathers in general thought with respect to this question.

"Another reason," he says, "why Christ represented himself so much as a man, was the weakness of his hearers; and because they who first saw and heard him were not able to receive more sublime discourse. And that this is no mere conjecture, I will endeavour to shew from the scriptures themselves. If he delivered any thing great, sublime, and worthy of his glory; but why do I say, great, sublime, and worthy of his glory; if he said any thing above human nature" (something is here omitted in the Greek, but supplied in the Latin version) "they were thrown into

“tumult, and took offence; but if he said
“any thing low, and becoming a man, they
“ran to him, and received his doctrine.
“And where do we see this? In John
“chiefly. For when he said, Abraham, our
“father rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it,
“and was glad, they say, Thou art not yet
“forty years old, and hast thou seen Abra-
“ham. You see how they were affected to-
“wards him as to a common man. What
“then did he reply? Before Abraham was
“I am; and they took up stones to stone
“him. He spake more distinctly, saying,
“The bread which I shall give for the life of
“the world is my flesh. They said, this is a
“hard saying, who can bear it; and many of
“his disciples went backward, and walked no
“more with him.

“Tell me, then, what must he do? Must
“he always dwell upon these lofty topics,
“So as to drive away his prey, and deter all
“from his doctrine? But this did not be-
come his divine philanthropy. Again,
“when he said, He that heareth my words
“shall never taste of death, they said, Do we
“not say well, that thou hast a demon.—

Abraham,
"Abraham is dead, and the prophets are dead, and thou sayest, he that heareth my words shall not taste of death. And is it to be wondered at, that the common people were thus affected towards him, when their rulers had the same opinion.". He then proceeds to instance in Nicodemus.—How then must he discourse with persons who would hear nothing sublime. Is it to be wondered at that he said nothing great or sublime concerning himself, to men creeping on the ground, and so meanly affected. What he said is sufficient to shew this was the reason, and the excuse for such mean discourses.

"On the other hand, as you see men scandalized, thrown into confusion, flying back from him, railing at him, and deserting him, if he said any thing great and lofty; so will I endeavour to shew you that they ran to him, and received his doctrine, if he said any thing low and mean. For the very same persons who had fled from him, immediately ran to him, when he said, I can do nothing of myself but as the Father has taught me, so I speak."
Speak. And the evangelists, designing to shew us that they believed on account of the meanness of his discourse, said, When he spake these things many believed on him. You will, on many occasions, find the same thing happening. On this account he spake in many things as a man, but sometimes not as a man, but as became a god.*' He adds more to the same purpose.

* Eis x' elera melia tauidn aids, e asevna tov atoivon, x' to  

mu duxepadai tov paron avdos idous, x' tov paron aneivdas tov '  

uipsoxou tov dogmana dekasthai loyus. x' ovi x rosomos to legomein,  

ap avdon ou parastanai telo peirastmai tov yepafon, x' deixai. eute  

ti megai x' wiplos x' tis avous dekis aixon erdeghdo. ti lega  

megai x' wiplos, x' tis avois dekis aixon; ei etote ti [upere] tis  

aydroponis phous, eute, axleos edoruxeio x' evkapeallaidelo. ei de  

ti etote ti tautein x'  

aydropon, epesteferoxen, x' toun logon edechodo. x' tin tolo  

ti en iden封i7; papha toun leivun maicita. eutoiois gar avous.  

Abyaama o sathv  

nymou ygeiaxato, ma idi tivn ygeian x' evn emano, x' ide, x' ekav,  

levosi taatafanipla eli utpo exeiG, x' Abyaama eurvanxai; orpas ovi  

as peri aaydrote fule diekenu; ti en avous. preo t' tivn  

Abyaama ipametaxai  

phwos, evn emon. x' ypan leiby, ma Balydun avdon. x' toun  

myrvnweias makrws epinein logous, regov. x' o aixos de en  

eww dousi utpe tis tis  

koivn  

xou,  

Cape x' enov, elagun sklupos epi tivn ygeian avdos, tis duxud  

avd aixon; x' theori toun maivnon autu ayxidai ev tis oipso,  

x' xwv mi aixw periptwv, ti en etpi xovn, eute mou: tais  

wipso-  

xerous evdasevivev evmaves diapnkes, ote apevstexai tivn  

yepafon. x'  

pau-  

vas ayxidai diei tivn diakualias; all evn tvlo tis tis t'  

fava-  
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Again, he says, "if they took up stones to stone him, because he said that he was before Abraham, what would they have done if he had told them that he gave the law to Moses. Wherefore, when he said, it was said to the ancients, he did not say by whom it had been said."

Dio尼. 

* Εἰ γὰρ, επεὶ εἶπε, ἵνα ὁ Ἰσραήλ ἀρτοῦ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν ἐρημωθ. Σερ. 32. Opera, vol. 5. p. 696, 697.
Chap. III. his own Divinity.

"Our Saviour," he says, "did not always teach his own divinity in express words, leaving the fuller explication of it to his disciples. If," says he, "they (meaning the Jews) were so much offended at the addition of another law to their former, much more must they have been with the doctrine of his divinity."

Chrysostom frequently observes that Christ only intimated his divinity obscurely, and left the full discovery of it to his apostles. Thus he says, that "he himself never said plainly that he made the heavens and the earth, and the sea and all things visible and invisible. And why," says he, "do you wonder that others should have said greater things of him than he said of himself, when he explained many things by actions, but never clearly in words. That he made man, he shewed clearly enough.


"enough,"
enough, as by the blind man; but when
he was discoursing about the formation of
the first man, he did not say I made
them, but, he that made them, made them
male and female. And that he made the
world, he signified by the fishes, by the
wine, by the loaves, &c. but never clearly
in words.*” He even says, “that the
high dignity of Christ was more neces-
fary to be concealed from his disciples,
because they would immediately have told
every thing through an excess of joy †.”
“Christ,” he says, “did not reveal
his divinity immediately, but was first
thought to be a prophet, and the Christ,

* Καὶ τι Σαμαίοις εἰ δειρίσ τι εἰζονα πείρ αὐθ νω εἴρηκατιν αν αὐθ
εἰρηκεῖν. οτε γε ἔσσεν διὰ τοῦ πραγματον εἰπάκους αὐθ διὰ τῶν
φηματον σαφος ὑπ εἴηεν; οτι γερ τον αὐθρωτον αὐθ εἴποντεν
εἰρηκεῖ σαφος ὑ διὰ τα τυφλα. κινε δε ςείρ της εν σαρχι πολέτος
ὁ λογος τον αυτο, ὑ πτερευ οτι εγν εἴποκα, αὐτο το αὐτοκας αρθεν και
σώμα εἴποκεν αυτος. Παλιν οτι τον κοσμον εἴημεργευσεν και τα εν
αυτο δια τον ιχθεν δια τε εινα δια τους αρθους—εἴηκαι αὐθαυς
† Εδει γερ τοις λαοικας, και μαλις επι των μισθων και
γερ εις ψωλος ιδιος πιανα εκπαταγ. In Matt. cap. 8. Opera,
vol. 7. p. 274.

simply
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"simply a man, and it afterwards appeared "by his works and his sayings what he "really was * ."

Basil of Seleucia says, that " during the "storm, the disciples of Christ, judging by "appearances, did not know that the deity "was concealed in him; for they would not "have been terrified, if they had known "that the author of the creation was giving "orders to the work of his hands." He adds, that "the apostles themselves were as "ignorant of his being God as the rest of "the Jews, when some said that he was "Elias, or Jeremias, or some of the pro-

"phets;" and that Christ, "knowing the "ignorance of Peter, suggested to him the "answer that he made †."


† Το γὰρ φανομένῳ προστάσεως, τὴν κεκρυμμένην ἥγους Θεό-

θηλα. οὐ γὰρ αὖ ἐξεπλάγατον, κελευθεραὶ τὴν ἡσυχὴν θεοφρασίας εἰ δημιουργόν ἔσχησιν τὴν ἡσυχίαν εὐτυχοῦσαν.—Τοσαίοις εἰς αὐγοὶς τὰς τῶν αὐτῶν, "ψυχὰς ἐπερὶ αὐτὰ ὑποκέμενοι, καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων ὁ χορὸς αὐγοῖς εὐλο-

γος ἐρεμοῦν.—Εἰδος δὲ τῶν αὐγοίων, ὑποβαλλεῖ τῷ Πέτρῳ Θείον τὴν ἀποκρίσιν. Or. 25. p. 138, 139. 141.

Job
Job the monk observes, that "Christ did not teach " said, *thine sins are forgiven thee," without intimating that be himself forgave them, "by his own authority.*"

Photius says, "when our Lord said, "My Father is greater than I, the disciples were still imperfect, and thought the Father much greater. This they had learned from the Mosaic law, which taught the Father rather than the Son. "This also our Saviour himself had perpetually inculcated. This, therefore, being their fixed opinion, they said, Shew us "the Father, and it sufficeth us†." Afterwards, he says, "they knew him to be "God, after his sufferings and resurrec-
tion‡."

† Επει γαρ εις αιδοις ιδοις διεκενα την την θεου αποδεικνυσαν, μετεκονα τε σαλω του παλιερα ενομισουν. τελο μεν των μοσαιου νομων ερεφετερουν, αυτους του παλιερα η του υπνο καιλαγελλοντων. τελο δε τε σαλων αυτω και λω περιστεροντος αυτους του παλιερα· επει εις τοιαυτη νον αυτου ενεγκυμονι δοξα, δια γαρ την και ελεγον, διεζων ημιν τον παλιερα, και αρμει ημιν. Epift. 176. p. 263.
‡ Ibid. p. 270:

Theodoret
Theodoret says, that "before his sufferings all persons held such an opinion concerning him," viz. that he was a mere man, "but after his resurrection and ascension, the descent of the Spirit, and the various miracles which they performed by invoking his name, all the believers knew that he was God, and the only begotten Son of God." This is expressed in general terms, but it will appear hereafter, that it is to be understood with great limitations; the knowledge of the divinity of Christ being, according to Theodoret himself, far from universal among the christians, long after the death of Christ.

Sometimes the Fathers speak of Peter as knowing that Christ was God before his death; by immediate revelation from the Father. Chrysostom also says, that before our Lord's resurrection, the apostles had learned that God had a Son equal to the

* Προ μεν ην τα πάντας ποιήσες εἰχον δόξας περι αυτο. μετὰ δὲ τιν αποκαθιστήσει, κι ην τιν εις υπάρχην αποκαθιστήσει, λεγεται τις παραδότας θαυματουργίας ας επετελένη, καλεντες αυτο το σεβασμον ονόμα, εγκωσαν απαντες οι συνηχεωτες, οτι ηθες εστι, κι ης οι μνουγενης αυτος. Ad Rom. i. 4. Opera, vol. 3. p. 11.

Father.
Father*. But, in general, it was their opinion, that even Peter, as well as the other apostles, was ignorant of this great truth, till the descent of the Spirit at Pentecost; and they thought that this was one of the great truths alluded to, when our Lord said, that he had many things to teach his disciples, of which he could not inform them before his death.

Cyril of Alexandria, descanting on this text, says, they who were not renewed by the new rule of living, and the new doctrine, the Spirit, to them the recent preaching of the gospel, and the sublime mystery of the trinity, was not to be delivered. Justly, therefore, was the interpretation of higher things reserved to the future renovation of the Spirit. That before the resurrection of the Saviour, and the coming of the Spirit, the disciples were as Jews, is easy to prove.† Austin, however,

† Qui enim nondum nova vivendi norma, novaque doctrina per spiritum reformati sunt, iis prædicatio evangelii recens, et mysteriorium trinitatis sublime tradendum non est. Jure igitur renovationi per spiritum futuræ, altiorum rerum.
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Says, that "the doctrine of the divinity of Christ could not be one of the things that Christ would not reveal, because they were not able to bear it, though some had said so." And yet this writer himself, as we shall see, acknowledges that the divinity of Christ was not taught with clearness, till it was done by the apostle John. Origen supposed that the things which our Saviour referred to were what related to the abolishing of the Jewish law. But he thought that John was the person who first taught the doctrine of Christ's pre-existence and divinity.


† Ad Celsum, lib. 2. p. 57.

Before
Before I proceed to consider what the Fathers thought of the apostles' sentiments and conduct on the day of Pentecost, I shall take notice of another reason which they give for the care that was taken to conceal the knowledge of our Lord's divinity, which was to deceive the devil, left he, knowing him to be the Messiah, should not have ventured to encounter him, and so, not being conquered by him, and especially by means of his death, the great object of his mission would not have been gained.

This thought first occurs in epistles ascribed to Ignatius, who says, "the virginity of Mary, her delivery, and his death, were concealed from the prince of this world." Jerom says, that both the demons and the devil, rather suspected, than knew the Son of God. Chryσοτομ, speaking of the mystery of the incarnation being


concealed
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concealed from many, says, "Why do I say " many? Mary herself, when she carried him " in her womb, did not know the secret. And " why do I say men? The devil himself did " not know it, for if he had known it, he " would not afterwards have asked him upon " the mount, saying, If thou art the Son of " God; and he did this once, twice, and three " times. On this account he said to John, " who was beginning to reveal him, hold now; " that is, be silent now. It is not yet time " to reveal the secret of the incarnation; I " must yet deceive the devil; keep silence " now, for thus it becomes us.* Again, he says, " the devil was at a loss to know " whether Christ was God or not. †."
There is something pleasant in the manner in which the Fathers sometimes speak of the devil being deceived by the humanity of Christ. Cyril of Jerusalem says, "it was necessary that Christ should suffer for us, but the devil would not have come near him, if he had known this; for if they had known, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory. I Cor. ii. 8. The body, therefore, was the bait of death, that the dragon, thinking to swallow it down, might vomit up all that he had swallowed *."

Ruffinus also represents the divinity of Christ as concealed within his humanity, to catch the devil as with a bait; and to prove this, he adduces many passages of the Old Testament, especially that of Ezek. I will draw thee out with my book, &c.†.


† Ιτα et etsi qui habet mortis imperium rapuit quidem in morte corpus Jesu, non sentiens in eo humum divinitatis inclufum; sed ubi devouravit, hæsit ipse continuo, et dirup—
Theodoret says, that Christ concealed his divinity in his temptation by the devil; and says, that when the devil heard him speak as a man, he was encouraged to proceed with the temptation. He represents him as saying, "I heard the voice that came down from heaven, calling you the Son of God, but I shall not believe it till it appear by facts."

Job the monk also says, "it was necessary that the mystery of the incarnation of the logos should be concealed, both to make it more acceptable to the hearers, and also to deceive the devil."

Basil of Selucia says, that, "though the demons called Christ the Son of God, they did not know that he was God, because..."
cause all very good men are called sons of God, and Israel is called his first born.*"

It was objected, that it was wrong in God to conquer the devil by deceiving him, the divinity of Christ being concealed under his human nature; but Gregory Nyssen replies, that "it was fair enough to deceive the deceiver †."

If it was imagined to be necessary that the devil, whose cunning and penetration was never thought very lightly of, should remain ignorant of our Lord's divinity, he must, no doubt, have concealed it with the greatest care, and have conducted himself in the most cautious manner. If the devil was not able to discover anything of the matter, how could men find it out, and especially Jews, whose most sanguine expectations from the Messiah went no farther than to a man, born like other men? Certainly they

* Ἡτοι μὲν ἦν καλὸς, ἤτη δὲ τοιοῦτος τοῦ οὐκ ἐκπαινεται. οὐκ γὰρ ἦν καλὸς, χ' οἱ διαφέρεις αμφότερα τὴν πρὸς θεὸν ἐκτενεῖς ὁμοιότητα, ἀλλ' ἃ το πρωτοτόκος οὐκ ἐθανάτωσε Ισραήλ. Or. 23. p. 128.
† Ἡ μὲν γὰρ καὶ Ἰαχαίος αὐτὸς, δι' ὧν ἀπαλαμφανίζεται καὶ ἐν δικαίω αἰθίονον. Or. 2. Opera, vol. 2. p. 515.
who thought that the devil continued ignorant of the pre-existence and divinity of Christ till after his death, must have thought that all the Jews, and our Lord's disciples, were ignorant of those doctrines. If, as Chrysostom says, it was particularly necessary to conceal this great secret from our Lord's disciples, lest they should have published it through joy, and also from his enemies, and the devil, lest they should have counteracted the design of his coming, we may take it for granted, that, in the opinion of the writers who have given us these representations, it was no more suspected at the time of Christ's death, that he had even pre-existed, or that he had had any thing to do in the making or governing the world, than that he was to be so great a personage before he was born.

Let us now see in what manner the apostles were supposed to have conducted themselves in this respect after our Lord's ascension, and after the descent of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost.
C H A P T E R I V.

Of the Testimony of Athanasius to the Caution with which the Apostles divulged the Doctrines of the Pre-existence and Divinity of Christ.

As the Testimony of Athanasius, on account of his known orthodoxy, and of course his unwillingness to make any needless concessions to his adversaries, may be thought to have more weight than any other, I shall, in the first place, produce it; and as exceptions have been made to it, I shall shew that, independent of any concurrent testimony of others of the Fathers, who have mentioned the subject, and which I shall produce hereafter, it clearly proves that, in his idea, the apostles thought it necessary to use great caution in divulging to the Jews so offensive a doctrine as that of the divinity of Christ; though, in consequence of their caution on this head, the Jewish christians did in their age continue unitarians,
unitarians, believing Christ to be nothing more than a mere man, and also propagated the same doctrine among the Gentile converts. The passage itself is as follows:

"Will they affirm," says he, "that the apostles held the doctrine of Arius, because they say that Christ was a man of Nazareth, and suffered on the cross? or because they used these words, were the apostles of opinion that Christ was only a man, and nothing else? By no means: this is not to be imagined. But this they did as wise master-builders, and stewards of the mysteries of God; and they had this good reason for it. For the Jews of that age, being deceived themselves, and having deceived the Gentiles, thought that Christ was a mere man, only that he came of the seed of David, resembling other descendants of David, and did not believe either that he was God, or that the word was made flesh. On this account the blessed apostles, with great prudence, in the first place, taught what related to the humanity of our Saviour to the Jews, that having fully persuaded them, from his miraculous
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"miraculous works, that Christ was come, they might afterwards bring them to the belief of his divinity, shewing that his works were not those of a man, but of God. For example, Peter having said that Christ was a man who had suffered, immediately added, he is the prince of life. In the gospel he confesses, thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God; and in his epistle, he calls him the bishop of souls.*"

* Ouden γὰρ αὐτὸς ἀποστόλοι τὰ Ἀθείων εὐσεβῶν. ἀνήρατοι γὰρ αὐτὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ, καὶ πανεὐθὺς τὸν Χριστὸν ἀπαγγέλλων, εκείνην τοιαύτην τοιαύτῃ πονηραίζομεν, ἀρετεῖν τοῖς ῥήμασι τεῦχοι εὐχερεσια, μόνον αὐθαρίστων ἔδεισαν τὸν Χριστὸν αὐτοὺς ἀποστόλοι, ἵνα ἔλεος ὑδρίην, ἐὰν γεροστὶ ἐκεῖνοι εὐλογοῦν· ἐπείδη γὰρ οἱ τοῖς ἱδραις πλαγιὴν, ἵνα ἐν εἰδωλομαχίας ὡς ὑμῖν πληρωθῇ. ἦν οὖν αὐτῶν τὸν Χριστὸν λόγον αὐθαρίστων, μόνον εἰς θερμάτων Δακίων αρχιερεῖς, καὶ εἰς οἰκομηνίας τὰν εἰς τὸν Δακίῳ ἀλών γενομένας τηκών· εἰς δὲ Σίων αὐτῶν, ὡς οἱ πάντες γεροστὶ ἐνεκὸν εἰς ἱδραι. Τάτῳ πρὸς τὰς πάντας τῆς συνόδους τίς μακαρίως ἀποστόλοι τὰς ἀκροταῖν τὰς σωτηρίας εὐγενείᾳ προτὸν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, ἵνα ὁλοκληροῦντες τις, εἰς τῶν φανομένων ἵνα ἀρνηθήσονται τὸν χριστὸν, λατρεύοντις τὸν Χριστὸν λατρεύοντις, ἐπείδη τὰς ἑκάστους ἀκροταῖς ἑαυτοῦς ἀκαταχράσσεται, ἄγεινεινος ἐκ τᾶς γενομένης εἰς νᾶς οὐκ ἐπεῖδην, οὕτω δὲν ἀρχιερεῖς Πέτρος ὁ οἰκονομικὸς ἀνεξίπτωτος τὸν Χριστὸν, εὐθὺς συνιστέντες εἰς τὸ αρχηγός τοις Ζανναίοις, &c. &c. De Sententia Dionysi, Opera, vol. i. p. 553, 554.

There
There is a passage in the *Sermo Major de fide* of this writer, published in *Montfaucon's Collectio Patrum*, which bears some resemblance to this. Speaking of Peter preaching Christ as Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God, he says, "He calls him a man, and not God, with respect to the Jews, and others, who, like them, considered things according to the flesh, from that time to the present. And the apostles of our Lord, and our Lord himself, answered concerning himself as a man. Ye seek to kill me, a man who has told you the truth*.

It has been said, that Athanasius is here speaking of the unbelieving Jews. The expression is, *οι τῶν Ἰδαίων οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τοῦ ηλικίαν τῆς ἡμερῆς οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι*; which includes both the believing and unbelieving Jews. Had he been speaking of the Jews of his own time, it would, I own, have been probable that he meant the unbelieving Jews; but speaking as he

does of the Jews at the very first promulgation of Christianity among them, it is most natural to suppose that he meant all the Jews. Paul, long after his conversion to Christianity, called himself a Jew. However, it will be sufficiently evident from the whole tenor of the passage, that he must have meant the believing Jews principally, and in some respects, the believing Jews only, exclusive of the unbelieving ones. And in this construction of the passage, I am by no means singular, but have the sanction of trinitarians themselves, as that of the Latin translator and Beaufobre.

The Latin translator of Athanasius, a catholic, and certainly no unitarian, had so little suspicion of any other meaning, that he renders χριστός in this place by Ιησοῦς. The learned Beaufobre, a trinitarian, and therefore, an unexceptionable judge in this case, quoting this very passage, does not hesitate to pronounce that they were believing Jews who were intended by the writer, "Ces Juifs," he says, "ne sont pas les Juifs incrédules, mais cieux qui faient profession du christianisme. But admitting
admitting that the Jews here meant were unbelieving Jews, they were such as the apostles wished to convert to christianity, and many of them soon became christians.

But the circumstance which decisively proves that the Jews Athanasius is speaking of were christian Jews, is their drawing the Gentiles into the belief of the simple humanity of Christ. For certainly the gospel was preached to the Gentiles by the believing, and not by the unbelieving Jews. If it be supposed that the doctrine Athanasius speaks of was not concerning Jesus, but the Messiah in general, how could it interest the Gentiles? The doctrine, therefore, must have been that concerning Jesus, and consequently, the preachers must have been christian Jews, and their proselytes christian Gentiles. It is ridiculous to suppose that the question could be interesting to any others.

Supposing, however, the whole body of the Gentiles (little as they were concerned in the question) to have been previously taught by the Jews, that their Messiah, whenever he should come, would be nothing
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thing more than a man; if this was an opinion that they were as fully persuaded of as Athanasius represents the Jews, their teachers, to have been, the same caution must have been as necessary with respect to them, as with respect to the Jews themselves, and for the same reason.

It has been said, that Athanasius says nothing about the caution of the apostles, but only speaks of their prudence, in teaching what was more easy and necessary, before that which was more difficult and less necessary. But the term ἑκοτίς, in the connexion in which it stands, can bear no other sense than caution, and great caution, μελετῶν τις ἑκοτίς, and it appears from the whole tenor of the discourse, that Athanasius could have intended nothing else than to describe the prudence, or extreme caution of the apostles, and to account for it. He evidently does not represent them as deferring the communication of the doctrine of the divinity of Christ, on account of its being more conveniently taught afterwards, as part of a system of faith; but only left it should have given offence to the Jews.
of Athanasius.

If skill, or prudence, in these circumstances, be not the same thing with caution, I do not know what is meant by caution.

It has been said that Athanasius speaks of the rapidity with which Peter proceeded to teach the doctrine of the divinity of Christ. On the other hand, I find no trace of rapidity in this account of the apostles' conduct. All that approaches to it is that, immediately after any mention of the humanity of Christ (which he speaks of as necessary on account of the Jewish prejudices) he says the apostles subjoin some expressions which might have led their hearers to the knowledge of his divinity; but the instances he produces are such as plainly confute any pretensions to their being a distinct and full declaration of that doctrine.

The first instance he gives us is from the speech of Peter to the Jews on the day of Pentecost, in which he says (Acts ii. 22.) "Ye men of Israel, hear these words, Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you, by miracles and wonders, and signs, which God did by him in the midst
"of you, as ye yourselves also know." In this Athanasius acknowledges, that Peter preached the proper humanity of Christ, but says that, immediately afterwards (referring to his discourse on the cure of the lame man in the temple) he called him the prince of life (Acts iii. 10.) "and killed the prince of life whom God hath raised from the dead."

Had the apostle meant that his audience should have understood him as referring to the divinity of Christ by that expression, his prudence must have lasted but a very short time indeed; probably not many days. If, therefore, his intention was, as Athanasius represents it, to preach the doctrine of the humanity of Christ in the first place, and not to divulge the doctrine of his divinity till they were firmly persuaded of his messiahship, he could not mean to allude to his divinity in this speech, which was addressed not to the believing, but to the unbelieving Jews. At least, he could only have thought of doing it in such a manner as that his hearers might afterwards infer the doctrine from it; and it must have required great ingenuity,
ingenuity, and even a strong prepossession in favour of the divinity of Christ (the reverse of which this writer acknowledges) to imagine that this expression of prince of life, which so easily admits of another interpretation, had any such reference. Moreover, in all the instances which Athanasius produces concerning the conduct of the apostles in this respect, from the book of Acts, he does not pretend to find one in which the divinity of Christ is distinctly preached, though he quotes four passages in which his humanity is plainly spoken of.

Besides, had Athanasius thought that the apostle had preached the doctrine of the divinity of Christ with much effect, it is probable that he would have added this circumstance to his narrative; as, from the object of the work in which the passage is introduced, it may be inferred, that he could not but have thought that it would have been sufficiently to his purpose. For, certainly, if he could have added that, notwithstanding their caution in preaching this extraordinary doctrine (against which he acknowledges the Jews had the strongest prejudices)
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judices) the apostles nevertheless did preach it with effect, and that it was the general belief of the Jewish christians in their time, he would have done it. It would certainly have favoured his great object in writing the piece, viz. the vindication of Dionysius, in using a like caution with respect to the Sabellians, to have added, that this prudence, or caution, was not, in either of the two cases, finally detrimental to the cause of truth. I therefore consider the silence of Athanasius on this head as a negative argument of some weight; and, upon the whole, I think that Athanasius must have supposed that both the Jewish and Gentile churches were unitarian in the time of the apostles. At least, he enables us to infer that it must have been so, which is quite sufficient for my argument.

Now if this caution was requisite in the first instance, and with respect to the first converts that the apostles made, it was equally requisite with respect to the rest, at least for the sake of others who were not yet converted, unless the first should have been enjoined secrecy on that head. For whenever
whenever it had been known that the apostles were preaching not such a Messiah as they expected, viz. a man like themselves, but the eternal God, the difference was so great, that a general alarm would have been spread, and the conversion of the rest of the Jews (to a doctrine which must have appeared so highly improbable to them) would have been impeded. We may therefore presume that the apostles must have connived at this state of ignorance concerning the divinity of Christ, in the Jewish christians, till there was little hope of making any farther converts among the Jews, and till the gospel began to be preached to the Gentiles.

Indeed, this must have been the case according to Athanasius's own account; for he says, that these Jews, being in an error themselves, led the Gentiles into the same error. He must, therefore, be understood to say, that the Jewish converts, while (through the caution of the apostles) they were ignorant of the divinity of Christ, preached the gospel in that state to the Gentiles. And as he speaks of Gentiles in general,
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general, and without any respect to time, and also of their being actually brought over to that belief, it is impossible not to understand him of this caution, being continued till the gospel had been fully preached to the Gentiles as well as to the Jews. Besides, one of the instances that Athanasius here gives of the preaching of the simple humanity of Christ is taken from the discourse of the apostle Paul at Athens, which was about the year 53 after Christ; and, indeed, at this time the gospel had not been preached to any great extent among the Gentiles. For it was on this very journey that this apostle first preached the gospel in Macedonia and Greece.

If, according to Athanasius, the apostolical reserve with respect to the doctrine of the divinity of Christ continued till this time (and he says nothing concerning the termination of it) we may presume that this great doctrine, supposing it to have been known to the apostles, had not been publicly taught by them, till very near the time of their dispersion and death; and then I think it must have come too late, even from them. For
For it appears from the book of Acts, that their mere authority was not sufficient to overbear the prejudices of their countrymen. At least, the communication of a doctrine of so extraordinary a nature, of which they had no conception, must have occasioned such an alarm and consternation, as we must have found some traces of in the history of the Acts of the apostles. It could not have been received without hesitation and debate.

If we can suppose that the apostles, some time before their death, did communicate this great and unexpected doctrine, the effects of such communication must have been very transient. For presently after the death of the apostles, we find all the Jewish christians distinguished by the name of Nazarenes, or Ebionites, and no trace of the doctrine of the divinity of Christ among them.

When all these things are considered, viz. that Athanasius acknowledged that it required great caution in the apostles to divulge the doctrine of the divinity of Christ, and that the gospel was preached with success among the Gentiles, while the Jews were
were ignorant of it, it can hardly be doubted, but that he must himself have considered the christian church in general as unitarian in the time of the apostles, at least till near the time of their dispersion and death.

According to Athanasius, the Jews were to be well grounded in the belief of Jesus being the Christ, before they could be taught the doctrine of his divinity. Now, if we look into the book of Acts, we shall clearly see, that they had not got beyond the first lesson in the apostolic age, the great burden of the preaching of the apostles being to persuade the Jews that Jesus was the Christ. That he was likewise God, they evidently left to their successors, who, indeed, did it most effectually, though it required a long course of time to succeed in it.
CHAPTER V.

Of the concurrent Testimony of other Fathers to the caution of the Apostles, in teaching the Doctrines of the Pre-existence and Divinity of Christ.

I have no great occasion to lay much stress on the testimony of Athanasius, as there is that of others of the Fathers sufficiently full and clear to the same purpose.

Chrysostom having said, that Christ taught his divinity by his works only, says, that "Peter also, in the beginning, used the same method. For that, in his first discourse to the Jews, he taught nothing clearly concerning his divinity; and because they were then incapable of learning any thing clearly concerning it, he dwelt upon his humanity; that, being accustomed to this, they might be prepared for what they were to be taught afterwards. And if any person," he says, "will attend to the whole of their preaching,"
ing, he will see what I say very clearly.
"For he calls him a man, and dwells upon
his suffering and resurrection, and things
belonging to the flesh. And Paul, when
he speaks of his being the Son of David
according to the flesh, teaches us nothing
farther, that what belonged to the human-
ity might be acknowledged. But the
son of thunder discourses concerning his
mysterious and eternal existence; so that,
omitting what he did, he relates what he
was.*"

The same writer says, that the apostles
concealed the doctrine of the miraculous
conception on account of the incredulity of

* Δια τεύχον ή ο Πιθανόν εν 
ωρα πεθανείας και ψυχής των πρώτων: ἦν μια 
σωματείη [σωματικόν ἔργην] προς Ἰουδαίους ἐνδεικνύων 
ἐμπειρίας. Ή δεικνύων εὐθύς της θανάτου αὐξά 
τες σάφες, μαθεὺς ἱσχυοῦσι, διὰ τὸ τοὺς δείξει τις 
οἰκονομίας εἰσιτελεῖς λόγος. Ή δείξεις διὰ ταύτας 
γενναίας διαδραπέτεις λόγος. Ή Παύλου δε, οἶ 
ἀπὸ λεγο, τοὺς γενομένους ἐκ 
σπερματος Δαίδαλος καὶ σφρακά, ἐκ 
οἴρου ἡμας παραλίμνοι, ὅτι ἦν 
τοῦτος εἰς τις ὁμονοματικόν παρεισπέλτησεν ὁ καὶ 
ἰθαίρεις ὁμολογεῖται, ὅτι 
τοῦς διαστάσεις ταῖς σφρακάς 
διά τοῦτο τοῦτος ἑνετος, το ἐν ἐθνεῖ. In John, Hom. 
2. Opera, vol. 8. p. 20:
the Jews with respect to it, and that when they began to preach the gospel, they in-
sisted chiefly on the resurrection of Christ.
With respect to the former (and the same
may, no doubt, be applied to the latter) he
says, " he did not give his own opinion
"only, but that which came by tradition
"from the Fathers and eminent men. He,
"therefore, would not have his hearers to
"be alarmed, or think his account of it
"extraordinary*.

Thus, he says, that " it was not to give
"offence to the Jews, that Peter, in his
"first speech to them, did not say that
"Christ did the wonderful works of which
"he spake, but that God did them by him;
"that by speaking more modestly he might
"conciliate them to himself+. The same
caution he attributes to him in " not saying
"that Christ, but that God spake by the

* Ἀλλὰ μὴ διαφύλαξαν πρὸς τὸ παραδόθην τα λεγόμενα; ἃ δὲ γὰρ
ἔρχεται ο λόγος αὐτὸς παρὰ πατέρων ἡμῶν Θαυμάσιων ὡς ἐπιστήμων αὐτῶν.

† Οὐκείνει λέγει δὴ αὐτῷ, αλλ' ὃν δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ θεός, παρακληθεὶς ἡμῖν,
vol. 8. p. 491.
Of the Testimony

Book III,

"mouth of his holy prophets, that by these means he might bring them gradually to the faith."

After treating pretty largely of the conduct of the apostles, with respect to their insisting on the doctrine of the resurrection of Christ, rather than that of his divinity, immediately after the descent of the Holy Spirit, he says, "As to the Jews who had daily heard and been taught out of the law, Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one Lord, and besides him there is no other, having seen him (Jesu) nailed to a cross, yea, having killed and buried him themselves, and not having seen him risen again; if they had heard that this person was God equal to the Father, would not they have rejected and spurned at it." I want words in English to express the force of the Greek in this place. The latin translator renders it, nonne maxime omnes ab his verbis abhorruissent, ac refilissent et oblatrasent. "On this account," he adds, "they (the

"apostles) brought them forwards gently " and by slow degrees, and used great art in " condescending to their weaknesses *.

Chrysostom represents the apostle as be-
ginning his epistle to the Hebrews with saying, that " it was God who spake " by the prophets, and not that Christ " himself had spoken by them, because " their minds were weak, and they were " not able to bear the doctrine concern-" ing Christ †. He even says, that when

* Ποις δὲ αν Ισραηλιοι οι καθ εικασθι ημεραι, μαθεσανες υπο τα νομα, Αμε Ισρααηλ, μνημο σ τηθες α τι κεινοι εις ευκο, ε βολαι αυτη με ενι αλλοις, ετι ενων σαραυ εισ εσης ηρωεμον αυτω, μαλλον δε μνημοσυνης ας ακακαις, ε ανασαι ικεταις. ακακαις δη τη εκπληκτη ε ω Γετος τω παλαιυ κοσμω, κατα μαν η φησιν αντε-πυρα κα εις απερρηγησαιν. Δια δυτι εν ηγεμα, ε βολαι μνημο. αυτος αποτεληθηκεν, ας ποιην μεν κερηθηκην της συνακαθαστης οικουμην.

† Και θεα τι ενεις αυτο ειρπην. ε γαρ ειπεν ο θεε ελαθισθεν καινονται αυτου τη εκπληκτη εν η φησιν. αναληθη ο αυτου ε ουκ αναληθηναι αυτου την κερηθη σην την κερηθηκην. και την απερρηγησαιν. Δια δυτι εν ηγεμα, ε βολαι μνημο. αυτος αποτεληθηκεν, ας ποιην μεν κερηθηκην της συνακαθαστης οικουμην.

* See how prudently, he spoke: for he said God spake " though it was himself that spake ; but because their " minds were weak and they were not able to bear the " things concerning Christ, he says God spake by him."

N. B. The (§) in the second clause of this passage must be
"he there speaks of Christ as above the "angels," he still spake of his humanity. "See," says he, "his great caution, οτι ηιν ουσίαν ηιν ποιήσαν *, the very expression used by Athanasius on a similar occasion.

But we find no trace of either Jews or Gentiles having received these sublime doctrines that Chrysostom alludes to in the age of the apostles. Nay we see that he himself represents the apostle Paul as obliged to use the same caution with respect to the Jews, when he wrote the epistle to the Hebrews, which was so late as A.D. 62. about two years before his death.

Theodoret observes, that "in the genealogy of Christ given by Matthew, this writer did not add according to the flesh, because the men of that time would not bear it;" evidently meaning, that they would thereby have been led into a suspicion be inferred by mistake for (ς) or some other particle, as it contradicts what is said in the close of the sentence, and the obvious sense of the whole. Or perhaps, the first ισόι should have been ιςςςις.

cion that, in the idea of the writer, he had some higher origin, and that they would have been offended at it. "But the apostle Paul," he says, "could not avoid that expression in his epistle to the Romans." He adds that, "before his death, not only to the other Jews, but to the apostles themselves, he did not appear as a God, nor did his miracles lead them to form that opinion of him."

† His text that, in the idea of the writer, he had some higher origin, and that they would have been offended at it. "But the apostle Paul," he says, "could not avoid that expression in his epistle to the Romans." He adds that, "before his death, not only to the other Jews, but to the apostles themselves, he did not appear as a God, nor did his miracles lead them to form that opinion of him." This writer also

† H γαρ τα καλά σαρκα προσέθηκεν, αυτότιμε, ως τε ήλθεν ήπειροί ορθώς, εἰς τον θεόν ηλικία. ἦδε γαρ ἐπὶ τοῦ τὸν μαθητὴν οὐκ εἰπερ ὁμολογικά, εἰς τὴν ἑαυτὸν τα καλά σαρκα προσφειμένον. ἦ ημείς οἱ μακάρις Μαθηταὶ ο εὐαγγελιστής· εἰρήνεια γαρ Ἀβραὰμ εὐεργετεῖ τον Ἰσαὰκ. Ἰσαὰκ δὲ εὐεργείων οἱ Ἰακώβ, Ἰακώβ δὲ εὐεργείων τον Ἱδεσσάμ, ή τοποθετήσεως τῆς γενεαλογίας διεξενθάν, ἐκαμά το καλά σαρκα προσέθηκεν, ἦ ημείς τε καὶ οὐκ ἔστησαν τα ἀδικία τοὐτα. Εἰς τοποθετῆσας, οἱ εἰς τὴν στήλην τῶν Πατρών οἱ διδάκται, οὐκ ἦν τοιαύτα προσέθηκη. Εἰς τοποθητήθη δὲ, εἰς τοὺς οἰκοδόμους μονον οὖν εἰς τον θεόν, τοις οἰκοδόμοις τας ἁγία σαρκα ἀνακαλεῖν, σαρκάς τοις διδάκταις, πάντας μεν τοις εἰς τὸν θεόν, πάντας τοις τῇ Δαίδαι εὐχαριστῆσαι. — Πρὸ μὲν τοῦ ταγχῶς καὶ τοῦ παθῆς, τοῦ διὸ ἐπονομάζει τοῦτο τῆς καὶ του τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ τῆς κατακολούθησας ἷδε τοὺς Αρμένους τοις υἱοῖς τοῦ Ισαὰκ τοῦτος ἦν τοιαύτη τῆς δικαιοσύνης τοὺς οἰκοδόμους καὶ τοὺς διδάκτας τοὺς οἰκοδόμους τοὺς οἰκοδόμους.
says, that the apostles in mentioning the sub-
ject of Christ to the Father (1 Cor. xv.) spake of him more lowly than was ne-
cessary for their advantage." 

Œcumenius also says, that "Peter in his
" first speech, though by saying that Christ
" rose according to the flesh, he intimated that
" he was God, yet refers all to the Father,
" that they might receive his sayings." He
makes the same observation on Peter's say-
ing, the promise of the Spirit was from the
Father. " He refers things to the Father,


* O μεν en θεος αποστολος την εκ της εκκλησίας μοναδικας φυσι-
τον τον γόνατον μεταξύ των τιμων, τινα συνάδειν, ταπεινοφόροις χρησιμο-
νοις διά την εκκλησίαν αφεθείαν. In 1 Cor. xv. Opera, vol. 3.
p. 273.

† Καὶ μιρές ἐνδέξας εἰς τὸν χριστόν, εἰλα τοῖς εὐκομικα-
ζεῖαι τον Δαυίδ, δια τὰς θερόπιτις εἰς νυκτέον, ἵνα δέ την
περι τιμων καὶ το γένος το στειχεῖα, το ἡσίας δεξιώθη τον
περὶ τις αμασάς λογιον. ᾧ έν εἰσερ, ὅτι επισύξοιτο αὐτῷ
ὁ θεος αἰτί τοις καταγαθαίνει, το στειχεῖα το ὑπερ

" that
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"that he might draw his hearers .*" Again, he observes, that he said " the Father, and not " Christ, promised that appearance by Joel†." On another part of his speech, in which mention is made of God glorifying his Son Jesus, he says, "he spake humbly concern- ing him ‡." Quoting Theodoret, he "calls low dif-

courses concerning Christ the first ele-

ments. To those who were not capable of a perfect faith, the preachers of the gospel offered what relates to the human-

ity of Christ. Thus the blessed Peter preaching to the Jews, measures his doc-

trine by the weakness of his hearers. For he says, Jesus of Nazareth, a man " approved of God among you. And ye " have need, he says, from negligence, " not being such (i. e. perfect) of milk, " not of strong meat. He calls low dif-

‡ Εἰ τῶν ταπεινώδειων εχεῖται — διὰ τὸ εἰσείν ἐν ἑαυτῇ ἰδίᾳ ὑπακοή 

Thaumaturγος—το ἀποστολικὸν τὸν παραδίως γὰς τὸ αὐθινὸν εἰς ἀποστολὴν δοῦνα λαβεῖν. Ibid. p. 28.

courses
courses concerning Christ, those that relate to the flesh, milk, and strong meat for the perfect, discourses concerning the divinity of Christ. For those, therefore, who were babes in faith, there was need of low discourses, as milk is fit for babes; but for the perfect in faith, there was need of strong meat, the sublime philosophy concerning Christ. Every one, he says, who partakes of milk, that is, every one, who wants these low discourses concerning the humanity of Christ (for they are milk) is unskilful, and not a partaker of the word of righteousness. By the word of righteousness, he means the doctrine of the divinity of Christ, &c.*

* ΑΛΔΟ. τοιχεία τῆς αρχῆς τῶν λόγων τῷ θεῷ, τῆς ταπεινεῖσθεν αὐτῆς χρήσει λόγων εκκαθεσθε. τοις γάρ μείζον τῆς πίστεις εὐχαριστεῖ τελείαν, τα ωρινα τοῦ αυτοκεφαλοῦν αφοροθείρον μοιχεία, τῆς αληθείας εἰς μηνύμες. οὕτως ο μακάριος Πέτρος Ιδέας διηγομένῳ εμείρονε τὴν διδασκαλίαν τῆς θεοθεία τῶν αισθητῶν. Ἡπειρο γάρ, εφει, τον Ναζαρηνὸν, ἀνδρὰ ἀπὸ τῇ θεῷ αποδεδειγμένον εἰς ἑαυτόν. Καὶ γεγοναίς χρείαιν εχθροῖς. Αὐτοὶ γεγοναίς, φανε, εἰς καθεμας, εἰς οὕς τινις, γαλακτὸς γὰρ ἐπερείς τροφής, γαλακτὸς λόγως τὸς ταπεινεὶς πίεις χρήσει λόγως, τα ωρινα τῆς σαρκος: τερεσὶν δὲ τροφῆς, τῇ τελειᾳ τῇ ωρινα τῇ θεοθείᾳ αὐθεντοῖς τοῖς καὶ εἰς νικεῖς τῆς πίστεως, ἐδει λόγων ταπεινείν (καλαλυγον γὰρ τοῖς νικεῖς τὸ γαλακτὸς τοῖς τελείοις τῆς πίστεως, τα τερεσὶν τροφῆς γὰρ τῆς
Chap. V. of other Fathers.

"Having called discourses concerning the humanity of Christ, the first principles, and those concerning his divinity perfection, left they should despond, as not being worthy of the most perfect discourses, he endeavours to give them those that were perfect. And he says so, but not in the same sense in which he had used the word perfect before, for they were not able to bear it. But he disposeth his discourse in another manner, calling first principles, baptism, the imposition of hands, and the sign;" perhaps that of the cross, "and perfection, the philosophy of works."


* Αὐτοὶ εἰπον αἰχμὴν τοὺς περὶ αὐθεντικότητος τῆς κυρίας λόγους, τελειοθήκη δὲ τοὺς περὶ δεξιότητος. ιτα μὴ αδημοσίως αἶσθη, ὡς μὴ αξιωματικὸν τῶν τελειοθηκῶν λόγους λέγειν τὰς τελειῶσις περιφέρεια. λέγει δὲ, μὴ γὰρ αὐτὸ τελειοθήκη εκάλεσι, (καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν αἰκίσατο.) αὐτῷ ἑτέρας μεθοδεύει τὸν λόγον, αἰχμὴν τὸν παλατίσαμα καθώς, καὶ τὴν εὐσικήν τῶν κειρῶν ἐπιδεικνύον καὶ σφραγίδα, τελειοθήκη δὲ, τὸν δὲ εργαν ψηλεφορίαν. Photius in Οἰκουμενικ. in Heb. vol. 2 p. 354.

Commenting
Commenting on Heb. v. 7. he was heard, "in that he feared, Oecumenius says, "this he said on account of the weakness of his hearers." And again, speaking of God having raised up Christ, he says, "the divine Paul often speaks in a low style; saying, That the Father raised up Christ.

Theophylact, commenting on Heb. i. says, "Why did he not say that Christ spake to us? It was both because they were weak, and not yet able to hear concerning Christ, and to shew, that the Old and the New Testament have the same author."

I shall now proceed to shew, that, in the opinion of the same Fathers, the apostles thought it necessary to observe the same caution in teaching the doctrine of the divinity of Christ to the Gentiles, that had been requisite with respect to the Jews.

* Kαὶ εἰς αὐτούς δὲ εἶπε διὰ τὴν αἰσθησίαν τῶν ακούσαν, ὡς καὶ αὐτῆς τῇ δὲ αὐτοί διὰ τὴν αἰσθησίαν τῶν ακούσαν, τὸν μεγάλας ἐχθρόν περὶ χριστοῦ δεότας. Τών δὲ ταπεινῶν τῶν ῥημάτων δύο αἱματὰ τὸν Σαφῆς ἐνακούνει συν αὐτοῖς. In Heb. vol. 2. p. 349.

† Πολλαχι τοῖς ταπεινώσεθαι ο θεός Παῦλος ἐκθεωμενὸς, τον θεόλεγα φησιν ενακούσαι τῷ χριστῷ. Ibid. p. 310.

‡ Διὰ τί δὲ οὐκ εἶπεν, ἐξακούσαν οὐκ εἰς χριστὸν; Αμα μεν, διὰ τὸ αἰσθησίας εἰμι αὐτῶς, ἐκ μὴν δυνατῶς ακούσαν περὶ τὸν χριστὸν. αμα δὲ ἐνδεξαμένης, ὡς εἰς αὐτὰς τῇ νομίμῳ, ενος εἰς τῇ αὐτῆ. Vol. 2. p. 876.
CHAPTER VI.

Of the Caution observed by the Apostles in teaching the Doctrines of the Pre-existence and Divinity of Christ to the Gentile Converts.

The apostles found the Jews fully persuaded concerning the doctrine of the divine unity, and on that account they are represented by the Fathers as cautious how they taught the doctrine of the divinity of Christ, lest their hearers should have been staggered at it, as if they had preached two Gods. The Gentiles were in a quite different situation, believing in a multiplicity of Gods; on which account it might be thought to require less caution to teach this favourite doctrine to them. But then, for the same reason for which it was thought improper for Moses and the prophets to teach it to the Jews, in the former periods of their history, when they were in danger of falling into idolatry, it was equally improper to insist upon it with the Gentiles, lest they should have been encouraged to persevere in
in the same system. Also, after they were brought to the worship of one God, they would have been no less averse to such a doctrine as the trinity than the Jews. On this account it was not less hazardous, according to Chrysostom, to teach the doctrine of the divinity of Christ to the Gentiles than it had been to the Jews.

In the passage, part of which I have quoted above, after observing, that if the apostles had not conducted themselves in this cautious manner with respect to the Jews, their whole doctrine would have appeared incredible to them, he adds, "and at Athens Paul calls "'him" (Jesus) "simply a man, and nothing "'farther, and for a good reason. For if "'they often attempted to stone Christ him- "'self, when he spake of his equality with "'the Father, and called him on that account "'a blasphemer, they would hardly have re- "'ceived this doctrine from fishermen, espe- "'cially after speaking of him as crucified. "'And why do I speak of the Jews? when "'at that time even the disciples of Christ "'himself were often disturbed and scanda- "'lized at him, when they heard sublime "'doctrines
"doctrines; on which account he said, "I have many things to say to you, but ye are not yet able to bear them. And if they could not bear these things, who had lived so long with him, and had received so many mysteries, and seen so many miracles, how could men, who were then first taken from their altars, idols, and sacrifices, and cats, and crocodiles (for such was the worship of the heathens) and being then first brought off from these abominations, readily receive sublime doctrines?"

Theodoret, commenting on 1 Cor. viii. 6. To us there is one God the Father, and one


Lord
Lord Jesus Christ, says, “Here he calls the one God, and the other Lord, lest he should give those who were just freed from heathenism, and had learned the truth, a pretence for returning to their heathenism and idolatry.”

Oecumenius, on the same place, says, “The apostle speaks cautiously concerning the Father and the Son, calling the Father the one God, lest they should think there were two Gods; and the Son the one Lord, lest they should think there were two Lords. For if he had said God and God, the Greeks, from their ignorance, would have thought it had been polytheism; or if he had said Lord and Lord, they would have thought there were many Lords. This is the reason why he now says, that the Father was God, and the Son Lord. For he had premised that with us there was but one God. Had he called both the Father and the Son God, and

* Εὐλογεῖμεν τον μεν θεόν προσηγῷσετε, τον δὲ κυρίον ἵνα μὴ τοὺς εἰνακεῖς τις Ἑλληνικὸς πλανής απαλλαγεῖσι, εἰ τινὶ αἰχμαλώτῳ μεθαμάθησι, παρατηρὴσιν προφασίν εἰς τὸν πολυθεὸν εἰσαπατῶν πολυθρόντως, In Loc. Opera, vol. 3. p. 158.

“Lord
not preached early.

"Lord, he would have been found acting contrary to his own affirmation to the Greeks, and would have appeared to have introduced many Gods; and many Lords. Therefore he calls the Father God, and the Son Lord; condescending to the state of novices in the Greeks." Again, speaking of God having raised Christ from the dead, he says, "the apostle herein condescending to them as children, not that Christ was not able to raise himself." Theodoret also, in his exposition of 1 Cor. 15. in which the apostle says, that the Son was subject to the Father, says, "the divine apostle, fearing the evil that might arise..."
from the Grecian mythology, added these things, speaking in low terms for their advantage."

According to Æcumenius, those whom John, in his first epistle, addresses as children, were those who were acquainted with the humanity of Christ only, as the grown men were those who knew his divinity. Of the latter he says, that "they knew him that was from the beginning. But who is from the beginning, but God the logos, who was in the beginning with God?"

He represents him as explaining his own meaning in the following manner: "Since I knew that you will receive my writings according to the difference in your ages, I must measure my doctrine according to your ages, and discourse with some as children who know the Father," he means God the Father only; "but to others as fathers, who know more than the children, and not as the father only, but as without origin and unsearchable, for he was in the beginning. To these I must address more per-
"feet discourses *.” Inconsistently, however, with this, he says, that "by those who "deny the Son, in this epistle, are meant “they who say that Christ was a mere “man;” and yet he says, that "by those "who denied that Jesus was the Christ, were "meant the Gnostics."

Theophylact, commenting on 1 Cor. i. 8. says, “Since Paul was writing to the "Greeks, who worshipped many Gods, "and many Lords, on this account he "does not call the Son God, lest they "should think there were two Gods, as "being accustomed to polytheism. Nor "did he call the Father Lord, lest they "should think there were many Lords. "For the same reason he made no mention

* Οἷς καὶ εξείν τὴν γρασιν τε ἀπ' αρχώς μαρτυρεῖ τις δὲ ο ἀπ' αρχώς 5 εἰ μὴ ο θεος λόγος, ος τιν εν αρχή τοῖς τον Σεν. Επει δὲ φθανον τῶν υποί τῶν τοις τοις πατερεσ ἐν ἀρχέοντας ἐν ἀρχέοντας τα παρ' ἐμι γραφομένα, ἀναλίκη καμές αὐτομετρώσει τη διαθεσὶ της υποίς ὁμον τὴν διδασκαλίαν, καὶ τοὺς μὲν ὡς πατερείς ἐπεγνωκός την πατερα (λέγει δέ τον άνθρωπον) διαλεξομένη. τοῖς δὲ ως πατερείς, οι πάλιν εξαρι των πατερίων κατά την γραφήν, το μὴ ως πατερείς μεν ἐπεγνωκόντα, ἀλλὰ καὶ ως αρχαῖς καὶ ἀδιεξέτατος. τη γαρ εν αρχή. τῆδε δὲ καὶ τετελεῖων αὐτόν σαφαίς σώμασασθαι λόγω. In John, Opera, vol. 2. p. 570.

I 4. "of
of the Holy Spirit, sparing the weakness of his hearers; as the prophets do not mention the Son clearly, on account of the Jews, lest they should think of a generation with passion.

In his Commentary on 1 Col. i. 12. he observes, that Paul mentions giving thanks to the Father only. He does the same," he says, "in the epistle to the Corinthians, bringing them gradually to the doctrine concerning the Son.

The same writer, in his Commentary on 1 Tim. ii. 5. There is one God, and one mediator between God and Man, the man Christ Jesus, says, "he does not speak plainly concerning the deity of Christ, because polytheism then abounded, and left he

* Αυτ' εστιν αγός ελληνας εν ο λόγος αυτω, συνυθειν προσευχησαι εν τωλυκωτικα η δια τυπο, η ε ε των υπο Θεον ειτεν, ην μν ην Θεος νομισαια, ην συνυθεινειστομενοι ενε εν των θελεσ κυριον, μα μν σαλικς κυριος εκε εας ναι ειναι ποτειον. Δια ταυτην δε των ασιαν, καθε τω απευθυνη εμυσθεν ιελαυθα, φειδομενος τως αθεειας των ακονονων γονας εκε μα η νομισαι τους σαφεις και ομοιοις, δια τως Ιεων, μα μν εμπαιδη νομισωσι την γεννηιν. Opera, vol. 2. p. 226.

† Ουτοι αε εν τω σως Κορινθιους σωσι. Ηρεμα δε εμικαζει αυτος εις του σως ειν λογον, Vol. 2. p. 631.
"should be thought to introduce many "
"gods; where, though he says, one and "
"one, he does not put them together, and "
"say two, but only one and one. Such is "
"the caution of the scriptures. On this "
"account he makes no mention of the "
"Spirit, lest he should seem to be a poly-
"theist*.

Such abundant evidence as this, when
there is nothing to oppose to it (and many
more passages to the same purpose might,
I doubt not, be collected, if it could be
thought that they were at all wanting) must
surely satisfy all the impartial, that, in the
opinion of the christian Fathers, the doc-
trines of the pre-existence and divinity of
Christ were considered as being of such a
nature, as that it would not have been pru-
dent to risk the communication of them
either with Jews or Gentiles, on their first

* Όνα εἰσὶν ὃς εὐαγγελίζῃ τὴν ἔστιν τῆς Χριστοῦ, ἐκείνη παλαιότερα τοτὲ εἰρηνεύει, καὶ ἵνα μὴν τοιούτοις καὶ αὐτῶν
µοίρης Ἰους παρείδραγεν. οὔτε μὴ το, καὶ εἰς καὶ εἰς, στὰν λε-
γήτω, ορθὴν καὶ συντεχνείς, καὶ λέγειν δύο, ἀλλὰ εἰς καὶ εἰς
τοσαυτῷ γὰρ οὕτω εὐνοεῖαι τῆς γραφῆς. οἰκητικὸν ex εὐαγγελίζῃ
καὶ τὰ πνεύματος, καὶ ἵνα καὶ εὐαγγελίζῃ εἰναι. Vol. 2.
P. 757.
conversiōn
conversion to christianity. And the plain inference from this is, that the orthodox Fathers must necessarily have supposed, that the christian church, in general, was at first unitarian, and that it continued to be so a considerable time. For none of them say, or hint, when this caution on the part of the apostles ceased; and they represent them as using it in the very latest of their writings, as in those from Paul after his confinement at Rome, and therefore not long before the destruction of Jerusalem. At that time, therefore, they must have thought that the great body of christians were unitarians, and without being considered as heretics on that account.

But the most decisive proof of this is their universally concluding, that the doctrines of the pre-existence and divinity of Christ were never taught clearly and explicitly till it was done by John, in the introduction to his gospel, which they supposed to have been published among the last of the books of the New Testament, and after the death of the other apostles.
CHAPTER VII.

Of John being thought to have been the first who clearly and boldly taught the doctrines of the Pre-existence and Divinity of Christ.

As this is an article of considerable consequence, I shall produce a redundance of evidence in support of it; nothing being better calculated to satisfy us, that, in the opinion of the Christian Fathers, the doctrines of the pre-existence and divinity of Christ were not generally received in the life-time of the other apostles; and, therefore, that simple unitarianism could not have been considered as any heresy in the early ages. These authorities I shall produce, as I have generally done others, nearly in the order of time in which the writers flourished. I shall only first observe, that John seems to have got the title of Ἰησοῦς, divine, from this circumstance, of his teaching the doctrine of the divine logos, which was supposed to be peculiar to him. This appellation
appellation is given to him in the title to the book of Revelation. It is mentioned by Athanasius in his Sermo Major de Fide*, and also by Cyril of Alexandria†. For a similar reason Isaiah is stiled Theologus by Eusebius, in H. xxiv. 10.‡

I shall also remind my reader in this place, that this hypothesis of John having taught the doctrine of the divinity of Christ in the introduction of his gospel, does not occur in the earliest writers. These being nearer to the source of information, say that John had a view to the Gnostics only, both in his epistles, and the introduction to his gospel. This was the opinion of Irenæus, who wrote about the year 170; for which see this work, vol. I. p. 253. The first writer who says that John meant the unitarians, I believe, was Origen.

† Hom. Opera, vol. 2. p. 75.
‡ Montfaucon's Collectio, vol. 2. p. 450.
SECTION I.

The Acknowledgments of the Christian Fathers that John was the first who taught the doctrines above-mentioned.

ORIGEN, though a zealous defender of the doctrines of the pre-existence and divinity of Christ, yet, as will appear in its proper place, only considered them as more sublime doctrines, fit for the more perfect Christians. He says, that "John alone introduced the knowledge of the eternity of Christ to the minds of the Fathers." "John himself was transformed into God, and so became partaker of the truth, and then pronounced that the word of God was in God from the beginning."  

† Sanctus itaque theologus in deum transmutatus, veritatis particeps, domini verbum subfister in deo principio, hoc est deum filium in deo patre, pronunciavit. Ibid.
“No one,” says this writer, “taught the divinity of Christ so clearly as John, who presents him to us, saying, I am the light of the world, I am the way, the truth, and the life, I am the resurrection, I am the gate, I am the good shepherd, and in the Revelation, I am the alpha and the omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last. We may therefore boldly say, that as the gospels are the first fruits” (or the most excellent part) “of the scriptures, so the gospel of John is the first fruits of the gospels; the sense of which no person can conceive, except he who reclines on the breast of Jesus, and who receives from Jesus his mother Mary, and makes her his own. He must be another John, who was shewn by Jesus as another Jesus. For he who is perfect does not himself live, but Christ lives in him. And since Christ lives in him, he says to Mary concerning him, Behold thy Son, Christ himself*.”

* Ουτῶς γὰρ εἰσεῖναι ἀνεξής ἐγαναπέσεται ἀπὸ τὴν Ἰησοῦν ἡμᾶς Ἰωάννης, ἀπαρασπόσαι αὐτον λέγοντα, εγώ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τῆς κόσμου, εγώ εἰμι ὁ οἶδα, ἡ ἀληθεία, ἡ ζωή· εγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀναστασία.
The meaning of this is, that, to have the knowledge of the sublime doctrines of the pre-existence and divinity of Christ, as taught by John, a man must be a christian of the first class and rank, far above the ordinary sort. He must be a second John, and a second Jesus, imbibing their spirit, and entering into their most profound meaning.

Eusebius, says, that "John began the doctrine of the divinity of Christ, that being reserved for him, as the most worthy." 

But he who wrote the most largely, and the most eloquently on this subject is Chrysostom.
John first taught the Book III. And it will be seen that the greatness of the mystery, its alarming appearance to the Jews, and the extreme caution of the evangelists and apostles in divulging it, gave him great scope for magnifying the courage of John, in teaching what the other apostles had only ventured to hint at, and which was reserved for him, as the son of thunder, and whose emblem was the eagle, to express his soaring higher than any other that had gone before him.

"John," he says, "alone taught the eternal and super-celestial wisdom." "John first lighted up the lamp of theology; and all the most distant churches running to it, lighted up their lamps of theology, and returned rejoicing, saying, In the beginning was the logos."

Chrysostom represents all the preceding writers of the New Testament as children, who heard, but did not understand things, and who were busy about cheese-cakes.

† Προθυναφασαι των της Θεολογιες ελχον, οι δε των περαλων αι ενικησαι αρχε σε δραμαται, εκαστη την εαυτη λαμπαδα την Θεολογιαν αντη, και υπερεψε ραιφασαι, εν αρχη τη ο λογος. Ibid. p. 604.

"and
"and childish sports*, but John," he says, "taught what the angels themselves did "not know before he declared it†;" and he represents them as his most attentive au-
ditors. "Leaving the Father," he says, "he (John) discoursed concerning the Son, "because the Father, was known to all, if "not as a Father, yet as God, but the "unbegotten was unknown ‡.

Of the three first evangelists, he says, "they all treated of the fleshly dispensation, "and silently by his miracles, indicated his "dignity. The dignity of the logos of "God was hid, the arrows against the he-
retics were concealed, and the fortifica-
tion to defend the right faith was not "raised by the pious preaching. John, "therefore, the son of thunder, being the

† Α μεσα αναγκαίου πριν την τελον γενεσθαι νῦντον. μεν ημων γαρ η νυ πριν βαλε η ημων εμαθεν απερ εγνωσων. Ibid.
‡ Τι διπλων γα κει την τον παλικα αφεις, απερ τη νυ διαπηγεσθαι: δι εικονι μεν διαθεσιν απασων ην, ει κη μη απ σωμα, αλλα ας υδε, ο δε μονογενος γνωσθη. Ibid: p. 11.
last, advanced to the doctrine of the logos, or the divinity of Christ.

In the beginning was the word. This doctrine was not published at first, for the world would not receive it. Wherefore Matthew, Mark, and Luke (John is here added, but it must be an interpolation) began at a distance. When they began the preaching, they did not immediately say what was becoming his dignity, but what would suit the hearers.

Matthew, beginning his gospel, says,

The book of the generation of Jesus Christ,

the son of David, the son of Abraham.

Why does he not say the son of God?

* Παῦλος εἰς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς ὑπομονήν, η σημεία αὐτοῦ, διὰ τοῦ θαυματού, εὐθυμίαν τῷ αἰθαίον. Εὐρυτήριον δὲ ἐν τῇ δει λογεῖ ἀμφότερον. Εὐρυτήριον δὲ τὰ καλὰ τῶν συγγραφέων Κελλί, ἧ τὸ τῆς αρετῆς ἑον ἐπιλεκτικομένα ἠποτολο τῷ μηχανικῷ της ευσεβείας εὐγενείαν. Ισχυρὰς τοιαὶ, οὐ τις βρονθοῦ, τελείωνας, χαράδραν επὶ τὴν θεολογίαν. De Sigillis, Op. vol. 6. p 173. N. B. The sense of the passage absolutely requires εὐρυτήριον and not εὐρυτήριον in both the clauses, and in the latter it is so rendered by the Latin translator, though not in the former. The observation, that the first verses in the gospel of John are a refutation of all heresies is common with the Fathers. No person, except one who is pretty well conversant with them, can imagine how often those verses occur in their writings.

Why
Chap. VII. Divinity of Christ.

"Why does he conceal his dignity by poor language? Why does he conceal from men the things relating to his deity? He answers, I am preaching to the Jews, who do not even believe him to be a good man. They would not believe Christ to be the son of Abraham, and will they believe his being called the son of God?—The blessed Mark, also, when he applied himself to writing a gospel, taking courage from what had been done before" (meaning perhaps, by Matthew) calls him the Son of God; but he immediately contracts his discourse, and cuts short what he had intended to say, that he might soothe his hearers. He therefore, introduces what he had to say, concerning the Baptist, saying, The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, as it is written in Isaiah the prophet, &c."

"Luke follows in the third place, and goes a middle way. He touches upon the doctrine of the logos, but does not explain, or unfold his dignity; but says, "Since many have undertaken to give an account of what has come to pass among us, it seemed
John first taught the Book III.

"seemed good to me also, who have attended
"to every thing from the beginning, to write
"in order as has been delivered to us, by those
"who were eye-witnesses and ministers of the
"logos. But though he mentions the lo-
gos, he did not say that the logos was
"God. What then does he do? Touch-
ing upon the subject, and considering that
"he was speaking in the ears of the dead,
"he conceals his dignity, and brings on
"the economy," i.e. the doctrine of the
incarnation or humanity of Christ. "There
"was a priest Zacharias, &c."

"John, therefore, the son of thunder,
"last of all advanced to the doctrine of his
"divinity, after those three heralds; and
"with great propriety he followed them,
"and they went before, lightening a little,
"as the lightning precedes the thunder, left
"bursting from the clouds at once it should
"stun the hearer.—They therefore lighten-
ed the economy, or the humanity of Christ,
"but he thundered out the theology," that
is, the doctrine of Christ's divinity*. 

* Ἐν αὐχαὶ τῷ λογῷ εἰς εὐθὺς τῶν ἀποστόλων. Οὐ γὰρ εἴχομεν ὁ
κόσμος. μᾶκαν οὖν οἱ εὐαγγέλισαν Μαθηταὶ Μαθαών, Μακεδονίας, Λυκίας, τῇ
Ἰωάννῃ.
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Again, he introduces John as holding a soliloquy with himself, and saying, after

Ioannis. Oie πράξαι τας μυρωμάδος, ου ευθύς εξακολούθειν τα φησίν της αξίας, αλλα τα σφραγίζον τας εκρασμασιν. ο Μεθύδανος, αρχήν εκποίησαι τον ευκρύβλον, λέγει. βίβλος γένεσιν ἱθα χρίσει νη Δασόν, καὶ Αέραυμ. διαθ, μὴ τοι δειν; διαθ ἵνα σανεί κρυφεῖ την αξίαν; διαθ τοις συνδρομαίς τα δεινα κατασκεύας; παρα Ισαακος φυτι εκρψά, τοις μη συνδρομαν δικην ειτι ενεργείς. Τον χριστον μοι Αέραυμεν ετω εὐδεξίαν, ἦ τοι δειν καταγιελλομενον ανεξαναι.—

Παλιν o μανθαρνος Μαριος καθὼς εαυτον εις το ευκρύβλον, κ' Θαρσιππας τοις προερυθομενοις, λέγει μεν τοι δειν, αλλ' ευθύς συνειδεις τον λόγον, εἰτ οεκοδομει την εννοιαν, καὶ μεραντει τον Αφροδην. Επαγεν εν εὐδεξίαις τα καλα την βαρύτητα λέγων, αρχει την ευκρύβλον Ισαακ χρισα, καθως γεγραφθαι εν Ησιαια τοις αφροδην.—Ο Λεωνις ακολουθει τρις, κ' μετος χαρις μελη ταλιν, κ' ατιθει μεν τοι δειν λογον, η μην ερμηνευει κ' εικονισε την αξιαν. αλλα ψυχι, επειδηντερ επονοει επεκρησα

σαν αναλαξαντας δηγηνεια περι τον παταλεξεφορμον εν ημιν πραγματος, εδοξα νομις παρακολοθησαι τοις παισιν επαρχις τριςδει; καθως παρεδομαν καιν' ης απο αρχης αυθενται, η υπηρεσε γενειμευς τοις λόγοις. αλλα λογον μεν ειπον, ην ειπε δε ου κ' δεος εν αυτος. τι εν ης αυτοις τωι: αληθειαν το ειπον, κ' εννοιανε. δι γερανως εικοσας εικοσα, κρυφει την αξιαν, κ' απορθερει την εικοναν. εγενειν ιερεις

Σαλαχρας, κ' τα εις το ευκρύβλον. Ιοαννης τευκον ο νους της βρον-

ης τελευτοντος σωμαθηνει επι την Θεολογιαν, μελα της τρις εκεινας κατα-

θειας, κ' εικοσας εν ης καλουρας, ηι δε αρσελον, τα μερα της εκατ-

ημοι, οπτε γαρ της βρονης σωμαθηλει αρσατων, και μη αρσων εκον

εν των γεραις παγεται ανατιν την αιωνια. Ουτως επειδη ειμιδε βρο-

νην ο Ιοαννης, αρσελον εις τρις ευκρυβλοσ εις αρσατων, κ', ηι οι κατα-


K 3 "considering
considering the progress of heresy, "Why do I delay? Why have I any longer patience? Why do I not bring forth the mystery hid from ages? Why do I hide in myself, the wisdom which was before the ages, which I derive from the immortal fountain on which I lean? Why do I not publish what angels are ignorant of? Why do I hide from the ends of the earth what no one knows, except the Father? Why do I not write what Matthew, and Mark, and Luke, through a wife and praise-worthy fear, passed in silence, according to the orders that were given them. How shall I speak what was given me freely from above? Matthew, according to what was granted to him, wrote according to his ability. Mark, and Luke, in like manner, according to the supply of the Spirit, have written their books in a becoming manner. I also will write, and add to those before, the fourth fountain of life. For there remains to the divine voice the discourses of the divinity, and the world is in danger.
"ger on this quarter. I will write a book which will stop the mouths of all, who speak unjustly of God. I will write a book which will hide all the wisdom of the world. I will write a book which shall not be confined to what concerns man. For the church is provided with what Moses wrote concerning these things, about the heavens and the earth, &c.

"But I, leaving all things which have come to pass from time, and in time, will speak of that which was without time, and is uncreated, about the logos of God, which was generated from the Father in an ineffable manner, about which Moses dared not to speak. But I am able to do all things, through Christ who strengthens me."

"The apostle John having reasoned thus within himself, and having the pen of a writer in his hand, and considering how to begin the theology, rejoicing in spirit, but with a trembling hand, is carried upwards, being in the body at Ephesus, but with a pure heart and holy spirit leaves K 4 " the
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"the earth," &c. Then representing himself as carried up into heaven, he says, that "fishing out of the Father's bosom the "doctrine of the divinity, he wrote in his "body on earth, In the beginning was the "logos, &c.*

* Εὐσεβῶν ἐν εὐαλω λόγων, τι αναδεδομαί; τι φησί μακροδύναμι ἐν; τι  ἐπροφέρει εἰς μέσον το ἀπό των αἰωνών κεκφαίμενον μυστήριον; τι ἀποκρύφω εἰσίν τινὶ τῶν αἰωνῶν σοφίαθν, νῦν ἐκ τῆς ἀδιαφόρου τυχῆς ἐκπεφωνεῖ εἰλικρινα; τι ἐ διδασκόμεθα, οὐ σοφίαμεθα; τι ἐν ἀπόκλαυσθαι τοις περαιτερών, οὐ διὰς εἰπεὶσθαι, εἰ μὴ διὰ τὴν οὐραν. τι ἡ γραφή, στήρι Μαθιαίως καὶ Μαρκίῳ καὶ Λευκίῳ δι᾽ εὐανεμένην διδασκαλίαν πορευόμενον, τελεσαθῆς τα προσελκυμένα αὐθεν, ἵνα ἴδητον καθὼς καλά τινὶ τὴν διδασκαλίαν μοι δώσῃς αὐθεν. Μαθιαίως μν ὑπὸν εἰσχωρεῖ, εὐγραφεῖ καλά τὴν ἴδιον δύναμιν, Μαρκίῷ δὲ καὶ Λευκίῳ ἐμμος καλά τιν τὴν τι αὐθεν πανεμοίως ἐλεηθῆς τας εἰςαλο βιβλίος ἐσπέρως ἐνεργεμένοις. γραφω καθο τῇ προσελκυμενον τοις εὑλισθέντος τὴν τιλερὴν των τίνων τὴν ἴδιος εἰς ἑυσεβέας φιλον το οπερ ἐπεισειθήκεσθαι λογος, ἵνα ἱδοῦνες ποτὶ κοσμὸν εἰς το μερεῖ τῇ. γραφω καθο, δι εἰς ἐμφασιαν παντὶ σομαν λακεν καλας ὑπὸν αὐθεν. γραφω βιβλιον, τὴν κα-

περιτεκταν πάσαν εἰς κοσμον σοφίαν. γραφω βιβλιον ἐν εὐαλων αὐθεν, δι εἰς ἐμφασιαν ἐν εὐαλω σοφίαν. γραφω βιβλιον ἐν εὐαλω αὐθεν, δι εἰς ἐμφασιαν ἐν εὐαλω σοφίαν.
Chrysostom introduces Matthew also reasoning on the subject of his saying so little, or rather nothing, of the divinity of Christ; and indeed, according to his account, it was a very dangerous and hazardous topic.—

"Now," says he, "let us awake, and arise, " Behold the gates are open to us, but let us " enter with great regularity, and with " trembling; first passing the outer court. "What is the outer court? The book of " the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of " David, the son of Abraham. What is " that you say?" (says the hearer) "You " promised to discourse concerning the "only begotten Son of God, and now you " talk of David, a man who lived a thou- "sand generations ago, and say, that he was " his father and ancestor? Hold" (says the evangelist) "and do not expect to learn " every thing immediately; but slowly, and " by degrees: For you are yet in the outer " court, and only near the gate; and why " are you in haste to get into the innermost

χειρι, μείλαρσις γινέσαι, καὶ τώ σωμάτι εν Εφέσω οίων, τι καθάρα κορίτσι τω συνυμβαλ μέλεως υπηρχε, καὶ εν τῷ πάλινον κολλαν τῇ θεολογίᾳ ανέλυσασ, τῷ σωμάτι καὶ εγγραφῇ, εσχάτη τοῦ λόγου. De Jo-\n
3 " recess?
"receifs? You have not yet well examin-
ed all that is without: For I do not as
yet relate to you the generation itself;
nor indeed shall I do it after this; for it
is inexplicable and ineffable." Then re-
citing the dread that the prophet Isaiah had
of the subject, which led him to exclaim, 
Who shall declare his generation, he says, "it
is not my business to treat of this genera-
tion, but of the earthly one, of which
there were ten thousand witnesses; and
concerning this I shall so discourse as the
gifts of the spirit shall enable me: for I
cannot even declare this with perfect clear-
ness: for even this is very fearful. Do not,
therefore, think that you hear a small thing,
when you hear even this generation; but
raise your whole soul, and be full of hor-
or when you hear that God is come
upon earth;" and then he proceeds to de-
scribe at large all the awfulness of the in-
carnation, and the miraculous conception.*

* Διακαταφείνειν τοῖνυ ἕν μὴ καθευδουμέν, οἵῳ γεγορ ὅρω τας αὐθας
ήμιν συνομομενάς εἰς ἑυταίας αὐτας ὅρωμεν, τοὺς
πρὸδυναμών αὐτῶν εὐθεῖας επιβαίνοντες. τινὰ δὲ εἰς ταῦτα τὰ ἀναθηκα; 
ἐπελθὸν γενεσεις Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ καὶ Δαβίδ καὶ Αβραάμ, τὰ λεγεῖς; εἰπὲ
τί
But this was far short of the eternal generation from the Father.

"Do not think," says this writer, "that you understand every thing, when you are informed that he was conceived by the Spirit; for there are many things of which we are yet ignorant, and which we have to learn; as how he who is infinite can be comprehended in a woman; how he who sustains all things can be carried

tn monogenesis, &c. te 9ex dialextadoi eptwseis, κ' te Δαβίδ μνημονευς, ανθρώποι μετα μιχρας γενεας γενομεν: κ' αυτοι εισα φης, και παθεραι και προγονοι: επισχες, και μη παθε` αδιαφανεις ζηλει μαθειν, αλι' ηρημα κ' και μιχραι. ει γαρ τους προδοτες ετυμας ει πως αυτα τα προπολεια. τι τοιουν σπευδείς προς τα ανθρα, και τα εξω καινας καινηπεινας απαντα, και γαρ εκεινη σα τεως διηγημα την γεννηση μαλακον δε ιδε των μελα ταιδα. ανεκφαινε γαρ κ' αποφηινος. Την γεννηση αυτη της διηγησει; και τους απει εκεινη ειμι ο λογος του, αλλα απει ταιοης της καινος την εαυτη την γεννηση, της μετα μιχρας μακροφανος, και περι ταυτη δε, ου ημιν δυσηλον ειπεν δεξαμενος την τα παιωνας χαριν, ιδια διηγησεισα. ιδε γαρ ταυτην μελα σαφηνας οιας παρα-ριστην ει νι εις κ' αυτη φεικεωσαθιν. ην ταυτω μελα νομιμη αικεν, ταυτην αικεν πνημων επι την διανοιαν κ' ευθεος φρειν, ακουειν εις τον εστι γης τελοθεν, ειν γαρ τελο δειμαθην και παρα-δεξαθην, οις κ' της αγγελιας χρησ των ταυτων ευεποθεια την υπερ της γεννησης ειπ τελος αιναφερειν ευερημαιν. In Matt. 1. Opera, vol. 7. p. 12.

" about
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"about by her; how a virgin can bring " forth, and remain a virgin *.""

On this subject, which affords so much scope for eloquence, Epiphanius writes as follows: "Wherefore the blessed John " coming, and finding men employed about " the humanity of Christ, and the Ebion- " nites being in an error about the earthly " genealogy of Christ, deduced from Abra- " ham, carried by Luke as high as Adam, " and finding the Cerinthians and Merin- " thians maintaining that he was a mere " man, born by natural generation of both " the sexes, and also the Nazarenes, and " many other heresies; as coming last (for " he was the fourth to write a gospel) be- " gan as it were to call back the wanderers, " and those who were employed about the " the humanity of Christ; and seeing some " of them going into rough paths, leaving " the strait and true path, cries, Whither " are you going, whither are you walking,

* Mi δε νομίσας το αυτο μεμαθηκέναι, εκ αιενατο αυξαν " ό γαρ πολλαγονμένης. Και το το μανθανοντες, αιων ποιαν " εντυφω και μπερα εσιν; και ο παντασωνεχον μοφεριται υπο " γυναικες; πας τινα την ταπεινον και μενει ταπεινον. In " Matt. i. Opera, vol. 7. p. 31.

" who
who tread a rough and dangerous path, leading to a precipice? It is not so. The God, the logos, which was begotten by the Father from all eternity, is not from Mary only. He is not from the time of Joseph, he is not from the time of Salathiel, and Zorobabel, and David, and Abraham, and Jacob, and Noah, and Adam; but in the beginning was the logos, and the logos was with God, and the logos was God. The was, and the was, and the was, do not admit of his having ever not been.*
Another passage in this writer, in nearly the same words, may be seen, p. 433, 434.

Jerom says, "John the apostle, whom Jesus loved, the son of Zebedee, and brother of James, who was beheaded by Herod after the death of Christ, wrote his gospel the last of all, at the intreaty of the bishops of Asia, again Cerinthus, and other heretics, and especially the doctrine of the Ebionites, then gaining ground, who said that Christ had no being before he was born of Mary, whence he was compelled to declare his divine origin."

Ambrose says, "If you enquire concerning his celestial generation, read the gos-

---

* Joannes Apostolus quem Jesus amavit plurimum, filius Zebedæi, frater Jacobi Apostoli, quem Herodes post passionem domini decollavit, novissimus omnium, scriptit evangelium, rogatus ab Asia episcopis, adversus Cerinthum, aliosque haereticos et maxime tunc Ebionitarum dogma confurgens, qui afferunt Christum ante Mariam non fuisse, unde et compulsus est divinam ejus naturam edicere. Opera, vol. 1. p. 273.

---

pel
pel of John *.” "If there be any other " things,” says Austin, " which intimate " to the intelligent the divinity of Christ, " in which he is equal to the Father, John " almost alone has introduced them into " his gospel; as having drank more fami- " liarly, and more copiously, the secret of " his divinity, from the breast of our Lord, " on which he was used to lean at meat †.” On this account he compares John to an " eagle ‡. " The other evangelists," he says, " who treat of the humanity of Christ, were " like animals that walk on the earth; but " John, contemplating the power of his " divinity more sublimely, flies to heaven

‡ Ibid. p. 528, 529.

" with
"with the Lord*." "But now, with an open voice, he says, that he is God, and was always with God, laying open the mystery of God†."

A very particular and copious account of the pre-eminence of John, in consequence of his teaching the doctrines of the pre-existence and divinity of Christ, which had been omitted by the other evangelists, may likewise be seen in the epistle of Paulinus, which I put in the notes ‡.

* Cæteri quippe evangelistæ, qui temporalem Christi nativitatem et temporalia ejus facta, quæ gestit in homine, sufficierent exponunt, et de divinitate paucæ dixerunt, quasi animalia gressibilia cum domino ambulant in terra: hic autem paucæ de temporaliibus ejus gestis edisserens, sed divinitalis potentiam sublimius contemplans, cum domino ad cœlum volat. In John Pref. Opera, vol. 9. p. 5. 275.

† Nunc autem aperta voce dicit eum esse deum et semper esse apud deum, sacramentum patefaciens dei. Questions Mixtæ, vol. 4. p. 858.

‡ Idem ultra omnium tempora apostolorum ætate producæ postremus evangelii scriptor suisse memoratur, ut sicut de ipso vas electionis ait, quasi columna firmamentum adjiceret fundamentis ecclesiae, prioris evangelii scriptores conforma auctorialitate confirmans, ultimus auctor, in libri tempore,
Cyril of Alexandria says, that "John was the first who taught more sublime things." Marius Mercator says, that the three former evangelists, having spoken of Christ as a man, John shewed him to be God."


† Post quam præfationem subdescendens, ut ostenderet quem illi tres evangelistæ hominem scripserant, esse etiam deum. Opera, p. 165.

Vol. III. L Cosmas
John first taught the Book III.

Cosmas Indicopleustes, describing John as *theologus*, and the chief of the evangelists, says, that "he wrote to supply the defects of the former evangelists, and especially in preaching clearly the divinity of Christ, making that the foundation of his work, all which had been omitted by the others. Wherefore, beginning at his divinity, he immediately passed to his humanity*.

"John," says Nicephorus, "did not give an account of the carnal generation of Jesus, but he first taught his divinity; this being reserved for him, as the most worthy, by the Holy Spirit†."

"Wherefore, John," says Theophylact, "began with the divinity of Christ. For whereas others had made no mention of his existence before the ages, he taught


"that
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"that doctrine, left the logos of God should have been thought to be a mere man, without any divinity*.” "Again," he says, "John wrote left men should never think highly concerning Christ, and imagine that he had no being before he was born of Mary, and that he was not rated from God the Father, which was the case with Paulus Samosatenlis †." "As John," he says, "has more lofty things of Christ than any other of the evange-
"lifts, so he has recorded some of a lower nature; to shew that, as he was God, so he was truly man‡."

Lastly, an account of John's teaching the pre-existence and divinity of Christ, may

† Δέος μὲν ὡς μικρὸς τοὺς χαμακατέλεις κύριον υἱὸν νοστὰ ἐνυπαντήσας, νομιζόμενοι τοὺς χριστοὺς τοῖς αὐτοῖς υπαρχον εἰκὼν ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ Μαρίας εὐνοικῆς, ἐγείρετο σαφῶς αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν παρθένου γεννηθήναι, ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ Παῦλος καὶ οἱ Σαμαστάεις. In John, cap. i. vol. i. p. 553.
‡ Ἐπεὶ γὰρ σαράντα περὶ σαράντα τοὺς εὐσεβεῖσις υἱολογεῖσαν ἔστω τοῖς κυρίοις φήσαγαν, ἵνα ἐσχάλτησαν διά τοῦ τοῦτο ἐν τοῖς σωματικοῖς τοῦτο τοῦ παποροῦ φθαρῆναι, ὁτιον ὡς εἰν τῷ περὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἶχεν φήσιν, ἀπὸ τῶν ἡμῶν ἀνθρωπόν ἐχειν φήσιν.
John first taught the Book III, be seen in the orations of Nicetas the Paphlagonian.*

The late introduction of the doctrine of the divinity of Christ is observed by the emperor Julian. He says, that "none of Christ's disciples, except John, said that he made the heavens and the earth, and that not clearly and plainly †."

SECTION II.

Reflections on the subject.

After reading these testimonies, so copious, and so full to my purpose, and uncontradicted by any thing in antiquity, it is not possible to entertain a doubt with respect to the opinion of the christian Fathers on this subject. They must have

Deioun vns Capros tvn aletheian ina su ma3hs oti ei de 3ios tv, alla 533 atdesvitos tv. In John ii. vol. 1, p. 726.


thought that the doctrines of the pre-existence and divinity of Christ had not been preached with any effect before the writing of John's gospel; and, consequently, that before that time the great body of christians must have been unitarians; and they are far from giving the least hint of any of them having been excommunicated on that account. On the other hand, the apprehension was, left those who preached doctrines so new and offensive, as those of the pre-existence and divinity of Christ, should have been rejected with abhorrence.

When we consider how late the three first gospels were written, the last of them not long before that of John, which was near, if not after, the destruction of Jerusalem, and that, in the opinion of the writers above-mentioned, all this caution and reserve had been necessary, till that late period, on the part of the christian teachers; how is it possible that, in their idea, the christian church in general should have been well established in the belief of our Lord's divinity? It could only have been great and open zeal on the part of the apostles
apostles, and not the timid caution and management which these writers ascribe to them, that could have effectually taught a doctrine which, according to them, the people were ill prepared to receive. And the history of both Peter and Paul sufficiently prove that the influence of mere apostolical authority was not so great at that time as many persons now take it to have been. Whatever power they had, they were not considered as lords over the faith of christians.

The christians of that age required something more than the private opinion of an apostle. They required some supernatural evidence that his doctrine was from God; and we have no account of the apostles proposing to them this additional article of faith, and alledging any such evidence for it. Chrysostom says, "if the Jews were so much offended at having a new law superadded to their former, how much more would they have been offended, if Christ had taught his own divinity." May it not be supposed, therefore, that they would have required as particular evidence of
of a divine revelation in the one case as in the other? And what remarkably strong evidence was necessary to convince them that the obligation of their law did not extend to the Gentiles? Would they, then, have received what Chrysostom considered as the more offensive doctrine of the two, without any pretence to a particular revelation on the subject?

It may be said, that all the caution of which we have been speaking was necessary with respect to the unbelieving Jews only, into whose hands these gospels, and the other writings of the New Testament, might fall. But how impossible must it have been to conceal from the unbelieving Jews the doctrine of the divinity of Christ, if it had been a favourite article with the believing Jews. If this had been the case, it could not but have been known to all the world; and, therefore, all the offence that it could have given would have been unavoidable. So that this supposed caution of the evangelists, &c. would have come too late, and would have answered no purpose whatever.
This caution, therefore, must necessarily have respected those persons into whose hands the gospels, &c. were most likely to come, and who would give the most attention to them; and these were certainly the believing Jews, and the christian world at large, and not unbelievers of any nation. We are authorised to conclude, that in the opinion of the writers who have spoke of it, of whatever weight that opinion may be, this caution in divulging the doctrine of the divinity of Christ was necessary with respect to the great body of christians themselves, and especially the Jewish christians. Consequently, they must have supposed, that at the time of these publications, which was about A. D. 64, the doctrine of the divinity of Christ was not generally held by christians, and that there would have been danger of giving them great offence if at that time it had been plainly proposed to them by the apostles themselves. At this period, therefore, it may be inferred, that, in the opinion of these writers, the christian church was principally unitarian, believing only the simple
simple humanity of Christ, and knowing nothing of his divinity or pre-existence.

From the acknowledgment which these orthodox Fathers could not help making (for certainly they would not do it unnecessarily) that there were great numbers of proper unitarians in the age of the apostles, it seems not unreasonable to conclude, that there were great numbers of them in the age immediately following, and in their own. And their knowledge of this might be an additional reason for the opinion that they appear to have formed of that prevalence in the apostolic age. Would these Fathers have granted to their enemies spontaneously, and contrary to truth, that the Jews were strongly prepossessed against the doctrine of the divinity of Christ, and that the unitarians were a formidable body of christians while the apostles were living, if it had been in their power to have denied the facts? The consequence of making these acknowledgments is but too obvious, and must have appeared so to them, as well as it now does to others, which makes them so unwilling to make it after them.

I cannot
I cannot conclude this chapter without observing, in how unworthy a manner, and how unsuitably to their real character and conduct, these Fathers represent the apostles as acting. They were all plain men, far from being qualified, or disposed, to act so cunning a part, as is here ascribed to them. There is nothing like art or address in the conduct of any of them, as related in the scriptures, except that of Paul; and this was only with respect to his preaching the gospel to the uncircumcised Gentiles, before it was generally approved of at Jerusalem; on which account, he informed the chief of the apostles only with what he had done. But this was no secret long, and indeed a thing of that kind could not, in its own nature, have been much of a secret at any time. On all other occasions he failed not to inform those to whom he preached of the whole counsel of God; as he says that he had done with respect to the church of Ephesus, Acts xx. 27. Much less can it be supposed that he would have concealed a doctrine of so great magnitude and importance as that of the pre-existent dignity of
of his master; and, communicating it only to a few, have left it to be taught after his death. For it is not to be supposed that the other apostles were in the secret of John's intending to do it after their deaths.

Besides, the instructions of the apostles enjoined them to teach all that they knew, even what their master had communicated to them in the greatest privacy. Whereas upon this scheme, they must have suffered great numbers to die in the utter ignorance of the most important truths of the gospel, left, by divulging it too soon, the conversion of others should have been prevented.

To these observations I would add, that as among the twelve apostles, there must have been men of different tempers and abilities, it is not probable that they should all have agreed in conducting themselves upon this plan, viz. of not divulging the doctrine of the divinity of their master till their hearers should be sufficiently persuaded of his messiahship. Some of them would hardly have been capable of so much refinement, and would certainly have differed about the time when it was proper to divulge
divulge so great a secret. Besides, the mo-
ther of Jesus, and many other persons of
both sexes, must have been acquainted with
it. For that this secret was strictly con-
fined to the twelve apostles, will hardly be
maintained. And yet we have no account
either of their instructions to act in this
manner, or of any difference of opinion, or
of conduct, with respect to it.

Never, sure, was a more improbable hy-
pothesis ever formed to account for any
thing, than this of the christian Fathers to
account for the late teaching of the doc-
trines of the pre-existence and divinity of
Christ. But their circumstances left them
no alternative. They must have had some
very cogent reason for admitting that the
teaching of these doctrines was so late; and
this could not have been any thing but the
want of that general prevalence, which they
would have had, if they had been taught
with effect in the life-time of the apostles,
and which would have continued to their
own times. They must, therefore, have
known that there were more unitarians in
the church in the early ages than they could
account for on any other hypothesis than that of the doctrines of the pre-existence and divinity of Christ, not having been taught till very late. At present, the facts which forced the Fathers upon this hypothesis are forgotten, and the orthodox themselves wonder that they should have adopted a scheme so absurd and improbable. But the different manner in which such an hypothesis is received, is a proof of a great difference in the circumstances and views of things in the different periods. We see nothing to make so strange an hypothesis necessary. They would not have had recourse to it, if it had not been necessary.
Of the Nazarenes and the Ebionites, shewing that they were the same People, and that none of them believed the Divinity or Pre-existence of Christ.

We have seen that, according to the unanimous and very express testimony of the christian Fathers (a testimony which is greatly against their own cause, and therefore, the more to be depended upon) there could not have been many persons who believed the doctrines of the pre-existence and divinity of Christ in the age of the apostles; one of the last books of the canon, viz. the gospel of John, being the first in which those doctrines were clearly published.

If we look into the gospels, and the book of Acts, we shall find that one part of their testimony is true, viz. that those sublime doctrines, as they call them, were not taught in an early period. For none of the three first gospels make the least mention of any thing
thing in the person or nature of Christ superior to those of other men. In like manner, all the preaching of Christ, of which we have an account in the book of Acts, is that Jesus was the Messiah, whose divine mission was confirmed by miracles, especially that of his own resurrection, and by the gifts of the Spirit. And all the controversies of which we find any account, either in that book, or in the epistles, respected either the Jewish teachers, who would have imposed the observance of the law of Moses upon all the Gentile converts, or else those who held the principles of the Gnostics.

The erroneous doctrines of these persons are distinctly marked, so that no person can read the New Testament without perceiving that there were persons who held these doctrines, and that they were the cause of great uneasiness to the apostles. But there is no trace of any other opinions at which they took the least umbrage.

As to the effect of the publication of John's gospel, from which so much seems to have been expected by the Christian Fathers, it is impossible that we should learn any
any thing concerning it in the New Testament, because that was one of the last of the books that was published. However, we have no account in ecclesiastical history that it produced any change at all in the sentiments of christians. Though it is said to have taught a new and a sublime doctrine, it does not appear to have been received with any degree of surprize. There are no marks of the publication having given any peculiar pleasure to some, or alarm to others; or that it occasioned the least division among christians on the subject.

We may, therefore, very safely conclude, that those christians for whose use this gospel was written, saw it in a very different light from those Fathers who gave the preceding account of it. We know, indeed, that to them it did not appear to teach any other doctrine than what was contained in the three former gospels. For by the logos of which John treats in this famous introduction, they never imagined to be meant Christ, and therefore they could see nothing of his personal pre-existence or divinity in it. In their opinion, the logos was that wisdom
wisdom and power of God, by which all things were made.

Though this gospel was written in Greek, there were not wanting among the Jewish christians men of learning who would not have failed to give an account of it to their more ignorant countrymen, or to translate it for their use, if it had been thought necessary. Yet, notwithstanding this, all the Jewish christians continued in the very same state in which the christian Fathers represent them to have been before the publication of this gospel, viz. believers in the simple humanity of Christ only, and acknowledging nothing of his pre-existence or divinity. The same was also the state of the Gentile christians in general, long after the publication of this gospel.

As no entire writings of any Jewish christians are come down to us, all that we know concerning them must be derived from the writings of the Gentile christians; and as these christians were trinitarians, and had very little communication with the Jewish christians, we can-
not expect any favourable, or indeed any impartial accounts concerning them. If, however, we may depend upon the earliest accounts that we have of them, and those given by persons who were the best qualified to give us good information, they were all unitarians, and were distinguished from the Gentile christians by the name of Ebionites, or Nazarenes. But as it has been pretended by those who, being trinitarians themselves, were willing to believe that there must have been a body of ancient Jewish christians who thought as they do, and that the Ebionites or Nazarenes must have been sects who broke off from their communion; and as some of these persons have even said that these Ebionites, or Nazarenes, were subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus; and others have fixed their origin so late as the desolation of Judea by Adrian, it may not be improper to shew that persons distinguished by the name of Ebionites and Nazarenes were supposed to have existed in the time of the apostles.

Irenæus,
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Irenæus, who gives no other name to any Jewish christians besides that of Ebionites, whom he always speaks of as both denying the pre-existence and divinity of Christ, and likewise the miraculous conception, objects to the Gnostics, that they were of late date, but he says nothing of the Ebionites in that respect*. Eusebius says, that "the first heralds of our Saviour" (by whom he must have meant the apostles) "called those Ebionites, which in the Hebrew language signifies poor; who, not "denying the body of Christ, shewed their "folly in denying his divinity†."

* Reliqui vero qui vocantur Gnostici, a Menandro Simonis discipulo, quemadmodum ostendimus, accipientes initia, uniusque eorum, cujus participatus est sententiae, ejus et pater, et antistes apparuit. Omnes autem hi multo posterius, mediantibus jam ecclesiæ temporibus, infurrexerunt in suam apostasiam. Lib. 3. cap. 4. p. 206.


M 2. Epiphanius
Epiphanius makes both Ebion (for in his time it was imagined, that the Ebionites were so called from some particular person of that name) and Cerinthus, cotemporary with the apostle John; and he could not tell which of them was the older*. He likewise makes the Ebionites cotemporary with the Nazarenes, at the same time that he says they held that Christ was the son of Joseph†. Also, in the passage before quoted from him, as well as in that from Jerom, we find the names of both the Ebionites and the Nazarenes among those who gave so much alarm to the apostle John. It must

* Naζαραίων καθείσης τυλίχθες επιθέον, αμα τε αυτοῖς αὑτές, η γάρ ανόξ αὐτῶν, η συν αυτοῖς, η μεῖ αυτές ομοίς συγχρονοί.

† Ουτος γὰρ ο Ἑβιών συγχρονος μεν τοῖς υπηρχει, αὐτοῦ δὲ σὺν αὐτοῖς ὀρμαται. τὰ πρωτὰ δὲ εἰκαταρτικής γὰρ επερματὸς αὐτός, τυτείν τι Ἰωσήφ, τὸν χριστὸν γεγένοιτο, ἐλεγεν, ως γὰρ ημῖν σαφείροντο, οτι τα ἵσα τοῖς ἀλλοῖς εν αὐτοὶ φρονον, εν τοῖς μοῦ νιασέβετο, εν τοῖς νομοὶ τῷ Ἰησοῦμα σφασανεχειν, κατά σαβατισμοῦ, γὰρ κατὰ τινὶ σαβατισμὶ, γὰρ κατὰ τὰ ἅγια σαβατησαραντες Ἰησοῦς ομοίως τοῖς Σαραβείταις Ἰατρατήται. Ἡνρ. 30. p. 125, 126.
be owned, however, that, in no perfect consistence with this account, Epiphanius places the origin of the Nazarenes after the destruction of Jerusalem. After mentioning the places where they resided, viz. Peraea, Coele-Syria, Pella, and Cocabe, he says, "there was their origin, after the destruction of Jerusalem, when all the disciples lived at Pella; Christ having warned them to leave Jerusalem, and retire at the approach of the siege; and on this account "they lived, as I said, in Peraea. Thence "the sect of the Nazarenes had its origin*.”

Sophronius, quoted by Theophylact, says, that "John, besides having a view to Cerenthus, and other heretics, wrote more "especially against the heresy of the Ebionites, which was then very prevalent, "who said that Christ had no being before

"he was born of Mary; so that he was " under a necessity of declaring his divine " origin ."

Cassian calls Hebion "the first heretic, " laying too much stress on the humanity " of Christ, and stripping him of his di-
" vinity ."

There can be no doubt, therefore, but that both Ebionites and Nazarenes were existing in the time of the apostles; and that there was no real difference between these two sects. And that both of them were equally believers in the simple humanity of Christ, is no less evident.

The testimony of Origen is clear and decisive to this purpose. He says, that "the word Ebion, in the Jewish language, " signifies poor, and those of the Jews who " believe Jesus to be the Christ are called

† Quorum primus Hebion, dum incarnationem dominicam nimis asserit, divinitatis eam conjunctione nudavit. De Incarnatione, lib. 1. cap. 2. p. 962.

" Ebionites."
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"Ebionites*. Here is no room left for any difference between the Ebionites and the Nazarenes; for the Ebionites comprehended all the Jewish christians; and, according to Origen, none of them were believers in the pre-existence or divinity of Christ. He says, there were two sorts of Ebionites, of whom one believed the miraculous conception, and the other disbelieved it, while both of them rejected the doctrine of his divinity. "And when you "consider," says he, "the faith concerning our Saviour of those of the Jews who "believe in Christ, some thinking him to "be the son of Joseph and Mary, and "others of Mary only, and the divine Spirit," but not believing his divinity†.

He mentions the two sects of Ebionites in the following passage. "There are some

* Εἰσὶν τῷ γὰρ οἱ ἠλέχοις παρὰ Ἰουδαῖοι καλεῖται. Και Εἰσοινοι·

οἱ ἰχνημαλχώσι οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίων τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ὡς χρῖσθων, παραδεξαμενοί.

In Celsum, lib. 2. p. 56.

† Και ἐπεὶ τοις τῶν ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίων αὐτοεὐδοκις εἰς τὸν Ἱησοῦ τὴν σερ τα σωτήρας καίνεν, δεὶ μὲν ἐν μαρίας καί τὸ λατρημένος σαβὸν εἴναι,

heretics who do not receive the epistles
of Paul, as those who are called Ebionites,
of both sorts *

Eusebius gives the very same account of
the two sorts of Ebionites, and makes no
mention of any Nazarenes, as differing from
them. "Others," he says, "whom a ma-
lignant demon was not able to turn aside
to entirely from the love of Christ, finding
them weak in some respects, reduced into
his power. These by the ancients were
called Ebionites, as those who think
meanly concerning Christ — For they
think him to be merely a man, like
other men, but approved on account of
his virtue, being the son of Mary's hus-
band. Others called by the same name,
leaving the absurd opinion of the former,
do not deny that Christ was born of a vir-
gin, but say, that he was of the Holy Spirit.
However at the same time, they by no
means allowing that Christ was God, the
word, and wisdom, were drawn into the
rest of their impiety." He then says,

† Εἰσὶ γὰρ τοὺς αἱρετικοὺς τὸς Παύλου ἐπιστολὰς τὰς ἀποστολὰς μὴ
tικοσείματα, ὡσπερ Εβίωνας αμφιβολοῖ. In Celsum, lib. 6. p. 74. that
that "they maintained the observance of " the Jewish law, and that they used the " gospel according to the Hebrews." He says also, " that beggars are called Ebio-
" nites*." It may be clearly inferred, from a passage in a letter of Jerom to Austin, that though he was acquainted with the nominal distinc-

* Αλλας δέ εις ποινὰς δεχόμεν τινι του πασα του χριστου τοι διαθεσιν εστιναι, ἑθεραφικτης ευρως εσπεριθειθ Εὐσκοιος τινος ὅμοιος επερημικος εις παροις, ἠθικης χρη παπεναι τα σεμι τα κριτε ἀθεχολος. Κιδοι μεν γαρ αυτοι εδονοι υγεια κακα σαρκοπτην νοις αυτοι μενεν ανθρωπων διδυκασμενον εις ανδρος το κεφαλια κως της Μαριας γενεσθενον· δεις δε παραλις αυτοις της νομικης δεσποηης, ως και αν δια μονης της εις του χριστου αιτης εις τα κατ' αυτην βια σκηνομενοις.

αλλα δε παρα ταλες της αυτης ευτες σποσηγραφες, την μεν τον ειρημενιν ευθυν διδυκασιν αδριανε, εις πατερενεν εις τα αγια σταυματας μπειρη-

μενοι γεγονοι τον κοριον· τα μεν εδο εοιοις εις αυτοπαρηχειαν αυτοι.

θεν παιον ουλε χρη σφιχαν νομολογησες, της ταν χρεολογων εσπεριθετιον δυστετεια· μποιμα δι εις την σωματικην αιτη τον κοριν καληςιας εοιοις εκεινης αφηνητειν εσπεριθετον. Κινι δε τα μεν απογονα πατας τας εις τας εις τας, ἀρνηθης υγειον εις τας, απογονα αποκαλεβεις αυτοι τα

υρμα. ευαγγελια δε κατα καθ Εβραινις λεγομενον χρεομενοι, των λοιπων σμηρον εποιειν λεγον. κις το μεν Σατζελου κι την Ιουδαιοι

αλλαν αγιανες εοιοις εκεινης αφαραβασιον· ας αν κις κυριακαις

νομαι, μην τα σαραπινα σιας μηνας της τα μυρας αναστασιμες επη-

θεμεν· εδεν παρα ταινις αγιας επημενης της τακατε ακαριτης σπο-

σηγραφας, της Εβραιων ονομασι, της της διανοιας αιθηθειαν αυτοις υπο-

φανοις· ταυτην γαρ επιληπιν ω αιθηθει αυτοις ονομαζεθα. Hist. lib. 3. cap. 27. p. 121.
tion between the Ebionites and Nazarenes, he did not consider them as really, or at least as materially, differing from each other. "If this be true," he says, "we fall into the heresy of Cherintus and Ebion, who, believing in Christ, were anathematized by the Fathers on this account only, that they mixed the ceremonies of the law with the gospel of Christ, and held to the "new" (dispensation) "in such a manner as not to lose the old. What shall I say concerning the Ebionites, who pretend that they are christians? It is to this very day in all the synagogues of the east, a heresy among the Jews, called that of the "Minei, now condemned by the Pharisees, and commonly called Nazarenes, who believe in Christ the Son of God, born of the virgin Mary, and say, that it was he who suffered under Pontius Pilate, and rose again, in whom also we believe. But while they wish to be both Jews and christians, they are neither Jews nor christians."

* Si hoc verum est; in Cherinti et Hebionis haeresim dilabimus, qui credentes in Christo, propter hoc solum a patribus
That this account of the Nazarenes is only explanatory of the Ebionites, is evident from his saying, "What shall I say " concerning the Ebionites!" After such an expression as this, we naturally expect that he should proceed to say something concerning them, which this author most evidently does; observing, that the same people who were called Ebionites (by the Gentiles) were called Minei and Nazarenes by the Jews. Had he meant to describe any other class of people, he would naturally have begun his next sentence with Est et, or Est alia heresis, and not simply heresis est. As to his speaking of heresy in the second sentence, and not heretics, as in

patribus anathematizati sunt; quod legis cærimonias Christi evangelio miscuerunt, et sic nova confessi sunt, ut vetera non amitterent. Quid dicam de Hebionitis, qui christianos esse se simulant? Usque hodie per todas orientis synagogas inter Judæos heresis est, quæ dicitur mineorum, et a Pharisaicis nunc usque damnatur, quos vulgo Nazaraeos nuncupant, qui credunt in Christum, filium dei, natum de virgine Maria, et eum dicunt esse, qui sub Pontio Pilato passus est, et resurrexit, in quem et nos credimus: sed dum volunt et Judæi esse, et christiani, nec Judæi sunt nec christiani. Opera, vol. 1. p. 634.
the first, it is a most trifling inaccuracy in language, the easiest of all others to fall into, and of no consequence to the meaning at all. Besides, Jerom's account of these two denominations of men is exactly the same; the Ebionites being believers in Christ, but mixing the law and the gospel; and the Nazarenes wishing to be both Jews and christians, which certainly comes to the very same thing.

Stress has been laid on our author's saying, that the Ebionites pretended to be Christians; but Jerom calls them credentes in Christo, believers in Christ; and if they believed in Christ at all, they could not believe much less than he himself represents the Nazarenes to have done. It may be said, that they only pretended to be christians, but were not, because they had been excommunicated. But what had they been excommunicated for? Not for any proper imperfection of their faith in Christ, in which they were inferior to the Nazarenes, but only (solum) because they mixed the ceremonies of the law with the gospel of Christ; which, in other words, he afferts
of the Nazarenes also, when he says, they wished to be both Jews and christians. And though he does not say that the Nazarenes were *excommunicated*, he says they were *not christians*, which is an expression of the same import.

Had there been any foreign reason why we should suppose that Jerom meant to distinguish between the Ebionites and the Nazarenes, we might have hesitated about the interpretation of his meaning, easy as it is. But certainly there can be no cause of hesitation, when it is considered that in this he agrees not with Epiphanius only, but with the whole strain of antiquity, as is allowed by Le Clerc, and all the ablest critics; and to interpret his meaning otherwise is to set him at variance with all other writers.

It is asked, "Why were the Cerinthians omitted? Jerom places them with the Ebionites in the preceding sentence: and if the Nazarenes and the Ebionites were the same people, it may, with equal clearness of evidence, be inferred, that they were the same people with the Cerinthians likewise."
I answer, they were the same people, as far as Jerom then considered them, because they were equally zealous for the law of Moses.

It has been said, that Austin's answer to Jerom shews, that he considered them as different persons. But Austin only enumerates all the names that Jerom had mentioned, and whether the differences were real or nominal, great or little, it signified nothing to him. He himself, in his *Catalogue of heresies*, makes a difference between the Ebionites and Nazarenes, but by no means that which makes the latter to have been believers in the divinity of Christ, and the former not. And as it was a common opinion, especially in the West, that there was some difference between them (though the writers who speak of it could never be certain in what it consisted) it was very natural in Austin to mention them separately, whether Jerom had made them the same or not.

I find that Suicer, in his *Theaurus*, under the article *Ebion*, makes the same use of this passage of Jerom that I have done, and considers the Nazarenes as a branch of the Ebionites.
That the unbelieving Jews should call the Christian Jews Nazarenes, is natural; because that was the opprobrious appellation by which they had been distinguished from the beginning. According to Tertullian, they called them so in his time *. Agobard says they did the same when he wrote †. But it was not so natural that this should be adopted by the Gentile Christians, because they had been used to regard that appellation with more respect. When, therefore, they came to distinguish themselves from the Jewish Christians, and to dislike their tenets, it was natural for them to adopt some other appellation than that of Nazarenes; and the term Ebionites, given them likewise by their unbelieving brethren, equally answered their purpose.

† Quod autem dominum nostrum Jesum Christum et christianos in omnibus orationibus fuis sub Nazarenorum nomine cotidie maledicant. De Infolentia Judæorum, Opera. p. 63.

The
The term minei is from the Hebrew מִנֶּה́ (minim) which signifies sectaries, and is that by which the Jews, in all their writings, distinguish the christians.

It is something remarkable, that Justin Martyr does not use the term Ebionite, or any other expressive of dislike. Irenæus is the first who uses it, or who speaks of the Jewish unitarians with the least disrespect.

It is an argument in favour of the identity of the Nazarenes and Ebionites, that the former are not mentioned by name by any writer who likewise speaks of the Ebionites before Epiphanius, who was fond of multiplying heresies, though the people so called were certainly known before his time. The term Ebionites only occurs in Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, and Eusebius. None of them make any mention of Nazarenes; and yet it cannot be denied, that they must have been even more considerable in the time of those writers, than they were afterwards.

The conduct of all these writers is easily accounted for on the suppositions, that, in the time of Justin Martyr, the Jewish christians,
tians, though all unitarians, and even disbelieving the miraculous conception, were not known by any opprobrious appellation at all; that afterwards they were first distinguished by that of Ebionites; and that it was not till the time of Epiphanius (when such writers as he, who wrote expressly on the subject of heresy, made a parade of their learning, by recounting a multiplicity of heresies) that the term Nazarenes, by which the unbelieving Jews still continued to call the christians among them, was laid hold of, as signifying a sect different from that of the Ebionites.

Mosheim makes a doubt whether there was such a person as Ebion, or not. I have seen no evidence at all that any person of that name ever existed. There is no founder of a sect, of whose history some particulars have not been handed down to posterity; but this is vox et præterea nihil. The term Ebionite, was also long prior to that of Ebion. They who first used this term, say nothing about the man from others, and they were too late to know any thing of him themselves.
It must be more particularly difficult to account for the conduct of Eusebius, on the supposition either of there having been such a person as Ebion, or of there having been any distinction between the Ebionites and Nazarenes, since it was his business, as an historian, to have noticed both.

The opinion that the Ebionites and Nazarenes were the same people, is maintained by Le Clerc, and the most eminent critics of the last age. What Mr. Jones (who is remarkable for his caution in giving an opinion) says on this subject, is well worth quoting.

"It is plain, there was a very great agreement between these two ancient sects; and though they went under different names, yet they seem only to have differed in this, that the Ebionites had made some addition to the old Nazarene system. For Origen expressly tell us,

"καὶ Εβιοναὶ χρησιμοίζοντι οἱ ἀπὸ Ιακωβον τοῦ Ἰσαίου ως χριστον χαρά-
"δεξαμεναί. They are called Ebionites who "from among the Jews own Jesus to be the "Christ. And though Epiphanius seems to "make their gospels different, calling one
Chap. VIII. the same People. 179.

"ἀναγεγέρσαν, more entire, yet this need not move us. For if the learned Casaubon's conjecture should not be right, that we should read the same ἀναγεγέρσαν, in both places (which yet is very probable for any thing that Father Simon has proved to the contrary) yet will the difficulty be all removed at once, by this single consideration; that Epiphanius never saw any gospel of the Nazarenes. For though he calls it ἀναγεγέρσαν, yet he himself says, ἐν οίδα δέ η ἡ γενεαλογίας ἁπάντειαν, he did not know whether they had taken away the genealogy, as the Ebionites had done; i. e. having never seen the Nazarene gospel, for ought he knew, it might be the very same with that of the Ebionites, as indeed it most certainly was."

In my opinion, Jerom has sufficiently decided this last question. Could he have had any other idea than that these two sects (if they were two) used the same gospel, when he said, "In the gospel used by the Nazarenes and Ebionites, which is commonly called the authentic gospel of..."

* On the Canon, vol. i. p. 386.

N 2 Matthew.
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"Matthew, which I lately translated from " Hebrew into Greek, &c."

Farther, the peculiar opinions of the Ebionites and the Nazarenes are represented by the most respectable authorities as the very same; only some have thought that the Nazarenes believed the miraculous conception, and the Ebionites not. But this has no authority whatever among the ancients.

Epiphanius says, in the middle of his first section relating to the Ebionites, that Ebion (whom in the twenty-fourth section he makes to be cotemporary with the apostle John) "borrowed his abominable " rites from the Samaritans, his opinion " (γνωμή ) from the Nazarenes, his name " from the Jews, &c.*" And he says, in "the beginning of the second section, " he " was cotemporary with the former, and


† Σαμαρειαν μεν γαρ τα εξει το θειουριν, Ιουδαιων τε το ονοια, Οσσανων δε τα Ναζωραιων τα, Νασαραιων την γνωμη—τα κριτικων αξιων εξαν την προσωγειαν. Hær. 30. Ἰερ. 1. p. 125.

"had
had the same origin with them; and first he asserted that Christ was born of the commerce and seed of man, namely, Joseph, as we signified above," referring to the first words of his first section, "when we said that in other respects he agreed with them all, and differed from them only in this, viz. in his adherence to the laws of the Jews with respect to the sabbath, circumcision, and other things that were enjoined by the Jews and Samaritans. He moreover adopted many more things than the Jews, in imitation of the Samaritans*;" the particulars of which he then proceeds to mention.

In the same section he speaks of the Ebionites as inhabiting the same country with the Nazarenes, and adds that, "agreeing together, they communicated of their perverseness to each other †." Then, in

* See note, page 164, in this volume.
† Ευθεὶς αρχέλαι τὴς καυκός αὐθη διδασκαλίας, εἶπεν δὴ ἦν ἩΝαζαρηνοὶ οἱ αὐθῆναι προδέηνωμεν. Συναφθεῖς γαρ ἐλεον οἰκεῖος, ἐξ ἐκεῖνον τῶν, καθαροὺς απὸ τῆς εαυτῇ μοχθερίας τοῦ ἑαυτῷ μελετῶν. Hebr. 30. sect. 2. p. 125, 126.

N 3
the third section, he observes that, afterwards, some of the Ebionites entertained a different opinion concerning Christ, than that he was the son of Joseph; supposing that, after Elxæus joined them, they learned of him some fancy concerning Christ and the Holy Spirit*.

Concerning the Nazarenes, in the seventh section of his account of them, he says, that they were Jews in all respects, except that they "believed in Christ; but I do not "know whether they hold the miraculous "conception or not †." This amounts to no more than a doubt, which he afterwards abandoned, by asserting that the Ebionites held the same opinion concerning Christ with the Nazarenes, which opinion he expressly states to be their belief, that Jesus was a mere man, and the son of Joseph.

* Φαβλασιαν των ἀδερ χριστί δινείλαι, ἐκ αυτοι πνευματικος αγιος. Ἡρα. 30. sect. 3. p. 127.

† Περὶ χριστί δὲ εἰκ οἰδα εἰπειν εἰ καὶ αὐτοί τὴν αὐτὸς εἰπον γενεσιον μορφωθεὶς αὐτῆς, ψιλον αὐτόπων νομίζον, η μάθος η ἀλήθεια εχει, διὰ πνευματικος αγιος, γενεσιον Μαρίας, διαβεβαιει. Ἡρα. 29. sect. 7, vol. 1. p. 123.
As to any properly orthodox Nazarenes, i. e. believers in the pre-existence or divinity of Christ, I find no traces of them anywhere. Austin says, that the Nazarenes were by some called Symmachians, from Symmachus, who is not only generally called an Ebionite, but who wrote expressly against the doctrine of the miraculous conception. How then could the Nazarenes be thought to be different from the Ebionites, or to believe any thing of the divinity of Christ, or even the miraculous conception, in the opinion of those who called them Symmachians? Austin who mentions this, does not say that they were miscalled.

Theodoret, who, living in Syria, had a good opportunity of being acquainted with the Nazarenes, describes them as follows: "The Nazarenes are Jews who honour Christ as a righteous man, and use the gospel according to Peter." This account of the faith of the Nazarenes was evidently
evidently meant to represent them as differing from the orthodox with respect to the doctrine concerning Christ; and is to be understood as if he had said, "they believe him to have been nothing more than a righteous man, and a divine teacher" (for claiming to be such, he could not otherwise have been a righteous man) "but they do not believe in his pre-existence, or divinity." Orthodox persons, who believe these doctrines, are never described by any of the ancients as Theodoret has described the Nazarenes.

In the passage quoted from Epiphanius, in which he gives an account of the motives for John's writing his gospel, it is evident, both that he considered the Nazarenes as existing at that time, and also that they stood in as much need of being taught the pre-existence and divinity of Christ as the Ebionites. In another place this writer compares the Nazarenes to persons who, seeing a fire at a distance, and not understanding the cause, or the use of it, run towards it, and burn themselves; "So these Jews,"
he says, "on hearing the name of Jesus only, "and the miracles performed by the apostles, believe on him; and knowing that his "mother was with child of him at Nazareth, "that he was brought up in the house of "Joseph, and that, on that account, he was "called a Nazarene (the apostles stiling him "a man of Nazareth, approved by miracles, "and mighty deeds) imposed that name "upon themselves*." This can never agree with this writer supposing that the Nazarenes believed in the divinity of Christ, or indeed in the miraculous conception; much less with their having an origin subsequent to the times of the apostles. And he never mentions, or hints at, any change of opinion in the Nazarenes.

That Austin did not consider the Nazarenes in any favourable light, is evident

* Αυστίνης γαρ μενον ονομα τυ Ισσε. ου δεαταμενε τα δεσιμενα τα δια γερολον των αποστολων γρομενα, ιο αυτοι εις αυτον απικεωσι. γνωσις δε αυτοι εν Ναζαρει εν γατρι εγκυμοσυνης, ιεν ουκ Ισσε Άναγραφελα, ιο δια τοιο εν τω εφυσιμω Ισσε Ναζαραιον καλεσωσι, ιο οι αποστολοι φασιν Ισσεν του Ναζαραιον ανδρα, αποδεδωκυμενον εν του σημειου του τα εξης; τοιο το ονομα επικεωσιν αυτοι, το καλεσωσι Ναζαραιος. Haer. 29. sect. 5. Opera, vol. 1. p. 120.
from his calling them, in his answer to Jerom, heretics, "As to the opinion of those heretics, who, while they would be both Jews and christians, can neither be Jews nor christians, &c.*" It is in these very words that Jerom had characterized those whom he had called Nazarenes. What more could Austin have said of the Ebionites? Can it be supposed that he would have spoken of the Nazarenes in this manner, if he had thought them orthodox with respect to the doctrine of the trinity; especially considering that it was in an age in which the greatest account was made of that doctrine; so that perfect soundness in that article might be supposed to have atoned for defects in other things. That Jerom did not consider the Nazarenes as orthodox, even if he did make them to be different from the Ebionites, is evident from his calling them not christians.

If we consider the general character of the Jewish-christians in the time of the

* Quid putaverint hæretici, qui qum volunt et Judæi esse et christiani, nec Judæi esse nec christiani esse poterunt, &c. Opera, vol. 2, p. 75.
apostles, and particularly how apt they were to be alarmed at the introduction of any thing that was *new* to them, and had the least appearance of contrariety to the law of Moses, it will both supply a strong argument in favour of the truth of christianity, and against their receiving the doctrine of the divinity or pre-existence of Christ either then or afterwards. Their rooted prejudices against the apostle Paul (whose conversion to christianity must have given them great satisfaction) merely on account of his activity in preaching the gospel to the uncircumcised Gentiles (though with the approbation of the rest of the apostles) shows that they would not receive any *novelty* without the strongest evidence. Their dislike of the apostle Paul, we know from ecclesiastical history, continued to the latest period of their existence as a church, and they would never make use of his writings. But to the very last, their objections to him amounted to nothing more than his being no friend to the law of Moses.

The resemblance between the character of the Ebionites, as given by the early christi...
tian Fathers, and that of the Jewish christians at the time of Paul's last journey to Jerusalem, is very striking. After he had given an account of his conduct to the more intelligent of them, they were satisfied with it; but they thought there would be great difficulty in satisfying others. "Thou "seest brother," say they to him, Acts xxii. 20. "how many thousands of Jews "there are who believe, and they are all "zealous of the law. And they are in- "formed of thee, that thou teachest all the "Jews who are among the Gentiles, to for- "fake Moses; saying that they ought not "to circumcise their children, neither to "walk after the customs. What is it "therefore? The multitudes must needs "come together, for they will hear that "thou art come. Do therefore this that "we say unto thee: We have four men who "have a vow on them; them take, and pu- "rify thyself with them, and be at charges "with them, that they may shave their "heads, and all may know that those things "whereof they were informed concerning "thee are nothing, but that thou thyself
“also walkest orderly and keepest the law.”

So great a resemblance in some things, viz.: their attachment to the law, and their prejudices against Paul, cannot but lead us to imagine, that they were the same in other respects also, both being equally zealous observers of the law, and equally strangers to the doctrine of the divinity of Christ. In that age all the Jews were equally zealous for the great doctrine of the unity of God, and their peculiar customs. Can it be supposed then that they would so obstinately retain the one, and so readily abandon the other?

I have not met with any mention of more than one orthodox Jewish Christian in the course of my reading, and that is one whose name was Joseph, whom Epiphanius says he met with at Scythopolis, when all the other inhabitants of the place were Arians. Haer. 30. Opera, vol. i. p. 129.
CHAPTER IX.

Of the supposed Church of Orthodox Jews at Jerusalem, subsequent to the Time of Adrian.

MOSHEIM speaks of a church of trinitarian Jews, who had abandoned the law of Moses, and resided at Jerusalem, subsequent to the time of Adrian. Origen, who asserts that all the Jewish christians of his time conformed to the law of Moses, he says, must have known of this church; and therefore he does not hesitate to tax him with asserting a wilful falsehood. Error was often ascribed to this great man by the later Fathers, but never before, I believe, was his veracity called in question. And least of all can it be supposed, that he would have dared to assert a notorious untruth in a public controversy. He must have been a fool, as well as a knave, to have ventured upon it.

Bodies
Bodies of men do not suddenly change their opinions, and much less their customs and habits; least of all would an act of violence produce that effect; and of all mankind the experiment was the least likely to answer with the Jews. If it had produced any effect for a time, their old customs and habits would certainly have returned when the danger was over. It might just as well be supposed that all the Jews in Jerusalem began at that time to speak Greek, as well as that they abandoned their ancient customs. And this might have been alleged in favour of it, that from that time the bishops of Jerusalem were all Greeks, the public offices were no doubt performed in the Greek language, and the church of Jerusalem was indeed, in all respects, as much a Greek church as that of Antioch.

Mosheim produces no authority in his Dissertations for his assertion. He only says, that he cannot reconcile the fact that Origen mentions, with his seeming unwillingness to allow the Ebionites to be christians. But this is easily accounted for from the attachment which he himself had to the doctrine.
doctrine of the divinity of Christ, which they denied; and from their holding no communion with other christians.

All the appearance of authority that I can find in any ancient writer, of the Jewish christians deserting the law of their ancestors, is in Sulpicius Severus, to whom I am referred by Mosheim in his History. But what he says on the subject is only what follows: "At this time Adrian, thinking that he should destroy christianity by destroying the place, erected the images of demons in the church, and in the place of our Lord's sufferings; and because the christians were thought to consist chiefly of Jews (for then the church at Jerusalem had all its clergy of the circumcision) ordered a cohort of soldiers to keep constant guard, and drive all Jews from any access to Jerusalem; which was of service to the christian faith. For at that time they almost all believed Christ to be God, but with the observance of the law; the Lord so disposing it, that the servitude of the law should be removed from the liberty of the faith and of the church. Then
Then was Marc the first bishop of the Gentiles at Jerusalem*. Here the historian says, that the object of Adrian was to overturn Christianity, and that the Jews were banished because the christians there were chiefly of that nation. According to this account, all the Jews, christians, as well as others, were driven out of Jerusalem, and nothing is said of any of them forfaking the law of Moses. Eusebius mentions the expulsion of the Jews from Jerusalem, but says not a word of any of the christians there abandoning circumcision, and their other ceremonies, on that occasion. Indeed, such a thing was in the highest de-

* Qua tempestate Adrianus, exhistimans se christianam fidem loci injuria perempturum, et in templo ac loco dominicæ passionis daemonum simulachra constituit. Et quia Christiani ex Judæis potissimum putabantur (namque tum Hierofolymanon nisi ex circumcisione habebat ecclesia Sacerdotem) militum cohortem custodias in perpetuum agitare jussit, quæ Judæos omnes Hierofolymanœ aditus aceret. Quod quidem christianæ fidei proficiet; quia tum pene omnes Christum Deum sub legis observatione credebant, Nimirum id dòmino ordinante dispositum, ut legis servitus a libertate fidei atque ecclesiae tolleretur. Ita tum primum Marcus ex Gentibus apud Hierofolyman episcopus fuit. Hist. lib. 2. cap. 31. p. 245.
gree improbable. Speaking of the desolation mentioned, If. vi. he says, that "it was fulfilled in the time of Adrian, when the Jews, undergoing a second siege, were reduced to such misery, that, by the imperial orders, they were not suffered even to see the desolation of their metropolis at a distance*.”

Independent of all natural probability, had Sulpitius Severus actually written all that Mosheim advances; whether is it from this writer, or from Origen, that we are more likely to gain true information on this subject. Origen, writing in controversy, and of course subject to correction, appeals to a fact as notorious in the country in which he himself resided, and in his own times, to which therefore he could not but have given particular attention. Whereas Sulpitius Severus lived in the remotest part of Gaul, several thousand miles from Palestine, and

* Ἑπιλεγον δὲ ἵπποι καλά τῆς Ἀδριανῆς χρόνου, καθὼς δεξιόν υπομείνατος Τιτάκων αὐτομαχημαν, εἰς τὸ λόγον κακῶν περιεχόμενον, ὡς τομίν ὑπολογία ταὐτομοικοί, μὴ εἰς ἀποτίθε τὴν ερμηνείαν τῆς εαυτῶν μιντικολοσίων θεοριῶν εὑρετισθαί. Monfascon’s Colledio, vol. 2. p. 379; two
two hundred years after Origen, so that he could not have asserted the fact as from his own knowledge; and he quotes no other person for it. But, in reality, Sulpitius Severus is no more favourable to Mosheim's account of the matter than Origen himself; so that to the authority of both of them, of all ancient testimony, and natural probability, nothing can be opposed but a willingness to find orthodox Jewish Christians somewhere.

The passage of Origen, which is a full contradiction to all that Mosheim has advanced concerning this orthodox Jewish church, consisting of persons who abandoned the law of Moses, at the surrender of Jerusalem to Adrian, is as follows: "He who "pretends to know every thing, does not "know what belongs to the prosopopeia. "For what does he say to the Jewish be-
"lievers, that they have left the customs of "their ancestors, having been ridiculously "deceived by Jesus, and have gone over to "another name, and another mode of life; "not considering that those Jews who have "believed in Jesus have not deserted the
"customs of their ancestors; for they live according to them, having a name agreeing with the poverty of their legal observances. For the word *Ebion*, in the "Jewish language, signifies *poor*; and those of the Jews who believe Jesus to be the "Christ, are called Ebionites *." Can it be supposed that Origen would have ventured to write in this manner (even supposing that he had no principle of integrity to restrain him from telling a wilful lie) if he had known any such church of Jewish christians as Mosheim describes. Besides, Origen's account of things agrees with what all the ancients say on the subject. Eusebius says, that the bishops of Jerusalem were Jews till the time of Adrian †. The bishops

* Αὐτὰ μη ποτε ο ἄγαν επαγγελματίᾳ εὐδοκεῖ, το ἀπόκλειον εἰς οἴκει κατὰ τὸν τόπον τῆς προσωποποίησις τι φαν ἢ λέγει πρὸς τίς απὸ Ἰουδαίων πιστεύοντας, καταναλῶσαν. ήτῶν αὐτῶν καταλυστής τοῦ πατρίου νόμου, τῷ ἐνοχαγωγηθέντι εἰς τὸ Ἰουδαίων, κατανεείσαν παντὸς γελοίως. ἢ αὐτοπαυτομολίπησαν εἰς αὐτὸ ωμοί. ἢ εἰς οἴκον βιον. Μᾶλτα τοῦτο καταναλώσας, οὕτω μὲ τὸ Ἰουδαίων εἰς τὸν Ἰουδαίων πιστεύοντες καταλείπασαν τὸν πατρίον νόμον. Βιον γὰρ οὐ αὐτοῦ. επανομαζότα τὸ κατὰ τὴν εἰσέχον επιστήμην τοὺς νόμους γεγενείμενος. In Celsum, lib. 2. p. 56.

† Ὁ δὲ μετὰ τὴν ἰδία Ἀδριανοῦ Ἰουδαίων συλλογίας, περιεκαθιστά τὸν αἰσθήμας αὐτοῦ γεγονακάτω επιστήμην διαδόχαζε εἰς χιλιάδες Εβραίων φασιν οἶcdas, αὐτοκεφάλα τῷ γνώσει τῆς κρίσεις νόμος καταδεδειξαί. Hist. lib. 4. cap. 5. p. 143.
were Jews, because the people were so. It is natural, therefore, to suppose, that when the bishops were Greeks, the people were Greeks also. And this is what Nicephorus expressly affirms to have been the case. For he says, that "Adrian caused Jerusalem to be inhabited by Greeks only, and permitted no others to live in it.*"

Origen is so far from saying, that any Jews abandoned circumcision, and the rites of their religion, that he says some of the Gentile Christians conformed to them †.

Having consulted Eusebius, and other ancient writers to no purpose, for some account of these Jews who had deserted the religion of their ancestors, I looked into Tillemont, who is wonderfully careful and exact in bringing together every thing that relates to his subject; but his account

of the matter differs widely indeed from that of Mosheim. He says (Hist. des Empereurs, tom. 2. part 2. p. 506) "The Jews converted to the faith of Christ were not excepted by Adrian from the prohibition to continue at Jerusalem. They were obliged to go out with the rest. But the Jews being then obliged to abandon Jerusalem, that church began to be composed of Gentiles, and before the death of Adrian, in the middle of the year 138, Marc, who was of Gentile race, was established their bishop." He does not say with Mosheim, that this Marc was chosen by the Jews who abandoned the Mosaic rites. Hist. vol. 1. p. 172.

Fleury, I find, had the same idea of that event. He says (Hist. vol. 1. p. 316.) "From this time the Jews were forbidden to enter Jerusalem, or even to see it at a distance. The city being afterwards inhabited by Gentiles, had no other name than Ælia. Hitherto the church of Jerusalem had only been composed of Jewish converts, who observed the ritual of the law under the liberty of the gospel; but
"but then, as the Jews were forbidden to remain there, and guards were placed to defend the entrance of it, there were no other christians there besides those who were of Gentile origin; and thus the remains of the servitude of the law were entirely abolished."

I cannot help, in this place, taking some farther notice of what Mosheim says with respect to this charge of a wilful falsity on Origen. Jerom, in his epistle to Pammachius (Opera, vol. i. p. 496.) says, that Origen adopted the Platonic doctrine of the subserviency of truth to utility, as with respect to deceiving enemies, &c. the same that Mr. Hume, and other speculative moralists have done; considering the foundation of all social virtue to be the public good. But it by no means follows from this, that such persons will ever indulge themselves in any greater violations of truth, than those who hold other speculative opinions concerning the foundation of morals.

Jerom was far from saying, that "Origen reduced his theory to practice." He mentions no instance whatever of his having recourse
recourse to it, and is far, indeed, from vindicating any person in asserting, that to silence an adversary, he had recourse to the wilful and deliberate allegation of a notorious falsehood.

Grotius also says, that it is well observed by Sulpitius Severus, that all the Jewish christians till the time of Adrian held that Christ was God, though they observed the law of Moses, in the passage which I have quoted from him. But the sense in which Grotius understood the term God in this place must be explained by his own sentiments concerning Christ. As to Sulpitius himself, he must be considered as having said nothing more than that, "almost all the Jews at Jerusalem were christians, though they observed the law of Moses." This writer's mere assertion, that the Jewish christians held Christ to be God, in the proper sense of the word, unsupported by any reasons for it, is not to be regarded.
CHAPTER X.

Of the supposed Heresy of the Ebionites and Nazarenes, and other particulars relating to them.

I have observed that Tertullian is the first Christian writer who expressly calls the Ebionites heretics. Irenæus, in his large treatise concerning heresy, expresses great dislike of their doctrine, always representing them as believing that Jesus was the Son of Joseph; but he never confounds them with the heretics. Justin Martyr makes no mention of Ebionites, but he speaks of the Jewish Christians, which has been proved to be a synonymous expression; and it is plain, that he did not consider all of them as heretics, but only those of them who refused to communicate with the Gentile Christians. With respect to the rest, he says, that he should have no
no objection to hold in communion with them*. He describes them as persons who observed the law of Moses, but did not impose it upon others. Who could these be but Jewish unitarians? For according to the evidence of all antiquity, and what is supposed by Justin himself, all the Jewish christians were such. It is probable, therefore, that the Nazarenes, or Ebionites, were considered as in a state of excommunication, merely because they would have imposed the law of Moses upon the Gentiles, and refused to hold communion with any, besides those who were circumcised; so that, in fact, they excommunicated themselves.

This circumstance may throw some light on the passage in Jerom, in which he speaks of the Ebionites as anathematized solely on account of their adherence to the Jewish law. The Ebionites, at least many of them, would have imposed the yoke of the Jewish law upon the Gentile christians. They

* Ital. p. 231.
would not communicate with those who were not circumcised, and of course these could not communicate with them; so that they were necessarily in a state of excommunication with respect to each other. This would also be the case with the Cerinthians, as well as the Ebionites; and therefore Jerom mentions them together; the separation of communion with respect to both arising, in a great measure, from the observance of the law of Moses; though Jerom might write unguardedly, as he often did, in confounding the case of the Cerinthians so much as he here does with that of the Ebionites.

Rufinus makes the heresy of Ebion to consist in their enjoining the observance of the Jewish law*. The attachment of the Jews to their own law was certainly very great. Origen speaks of the Ebionites as

thinking that Christ came chiefly for the sake of the Israelites.*

There is something very particular in the conduct of Tertullian with respect to the Ebionites. He speaks of the heresy of Ebion (of which he makes but the slightest mention in his Treatise against heresy in general) as consisting in the observance of the Jewish ceremonies †; and yet he says, that "John in his epistle calls those chiefly "antichrists, who denied that Christ came "in the flesh, and who did not think that "Jesus was the Son of God;" meaning, probably, a disbelief of the miraculous conception. "The former," he says, "Marcion held, the latter Ebion ‡."

* Θυμαρεισαλλη ει μη εις τα προβελατα τα απολογηθα αιν Ισραηλ η η ευαγγελια εις τα πλοικα τη διαινη Εβιωναι απολογειας της διαινης εταιναι (Εβιω γαρ ο πλοικος οπερ Εβραιοις ονομαζεται) ου τον αντικρινης Εβραιως απογυμνης τον χριστων εναθη μικηκα. Philocalia, p. 16.


‡ At in epistola eos maxime antichrists vocat, qui Chriftum negarent in carne venisse, et qui non putarent Jesus
Upon the whole, the conduct of Tertullian very much resembles that of Irenæus, who, without classing the Ebionites with heretics, expresses great dislike of their doctrine. It is certain, that the Ebionites were a very different set of persons from the Gnostics, and that they were utter strangers to the principles of that philosophy which were the cause of the prejudice that was entertained concerning matter and the body, and which led the Gnostics to recommend corporeal austerities, and abstinence from marriage. Epiphanius says, that “the Ebionites, and all such sects, were enemies to ‘virginity and continence’.”

This writer’s hatred of the Ebionites, and of course his misrepresentation of them, are very conspicuous. But there is one thing which he lays to their charge, which, though absolutely incredible, it is not easy to ac-

Another most extraordinary and highly improbable allegation of Epiphanius, with respect to the Ebionites, is his charging them with the peculiar doctrines of the Gnostics, which is contrary to the testimony, I may safely say, of all other ancient writers; it being commonly said by them, that the heresy of the Ebionites was the very reverse of that of the Gnostics. He says, however, that "some of the Ebionites held that Adam, who was first formed, and into whom God breathed the breath of life, was Christ. But others of them say that he was from above, that he was a spirit created before any others, before the angels, that he was lord of all, was called Christ, and made the sovereign of that age; that he came from thence whenever he pleased, as into Adam, and that he appeared in the form

* Το οὐκ άν ηθεν οὔτε. Opera, vol. i. p. 53.

" of
of a man to the patriarchs, to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and that it was the same who in the latter days, being clothed with the body of Adam, appeared as a man, was crucified, rose from the dead, and ascended into heaven.*

Again, speaking of the Ebionites in general, he says, "they assert that there were two beings created, viz. Christ and the devil; that Christ took the inheritance of the future age, and the devil of the present, and that the Supreme Being made this appointment at the request of them both. On this account, they say that Jesus was born of the seed of man, and became the son of God by adoption, by Christ coming into him from above,

* των γαρ εις αυτων και Αδαμ τον χριστον εναι λεγουσι, του παιδιου πασηνειαν τε εις εμφανην εποτο τυ σε και επιτυχον : αλλα δε εν αυτοις λεγουσι αναστηνε μεν ουα, προ παιδιν δε ανθενεαι ανιφωσαν ουα, ει παρα αγγελωσον, παιδιν τε κυριουν, και χριστον λεγουσι, του εκειτε δε αυτοις ηκομηρασθαι ερχεσθαι δε ειλαυδε δε εξελεια, ως ει εκ των Adam ηθε, και τοις πατριαρχας εφαινει ενθυμειυθες το σωμα, προς Αδαμα ειλαυνε δε Ισαα α και Ιακωβον, ο αυτος επι εσπεραν των ημερων ηθε, και αυτο το σωμα τω Αδαμ επεδυσθαι, και αφεθη ανδροις, και επαιρωθη, και απεστη, και αναστηνε. Hær. 30. sect. 3. p. 127.

"in
in the form of a dove. But they say that he was not generated from God the Father, but created by him, as one of the archangels, though greater than they; for that he is lord of the angels, and of all things that were made by the Almighty; that he came and taught what is contained in their gospel, saying, I am come to destroy sacrifices, and if you will not cease to sacrifice, wrath shall not cease with respect to you. These and such like things are taught by them.

In another passage he ascribes these doctrines not to Ebion himself, but to his followers.
followers. "Ebion himself," he says, "held that Christ was a mere man, born "as other men are; but they who from "him are called Ebionites, say that God "had a superior power called his son, that "he assumed the form of Adam, and put "it off again".

That this representation, which is wholly Epiphanius's own, is founded on some mistake, cannot be doubted; and I think it most probable, that he has confounded the doctrines of the Ebionites with those of the Cerinthians, who agreed with them in some things, especially in Jesus being a mere man, born as other men are. But he most grossly misrepresented both the Ebionites and the Cerinthians, in saying that they rejected sacrifices, and taught that Christ preached against them. For according to the testimony of all antiquity, both these sects insisted on the observance of the Jewish law.

* Ποίε μεν ο αὐτὸς Εβιών λέγειν εκ παραβρέχης ψιλον ανθρωπὸν αυτὸν γενενθαναι. αλλοτε δὲ οἱ απ’ αὐτὸ Εβιώναις, αὐς δυναμιν εκ"νεκτικον ιτιν, και τιτοι ματα μαρων του Αδάμ ενδειχαι τε και έκδόθαι. Ηερ. 30. σεντ. 31. p. 162.

Vol. III. P This
This is all that I have been able to collect concerning the heresy of the Ebionites, excepting that Optatus charges them with maintaining that "the Father suffered, and not the Son." But it was no uncommon thing to charge all unitarians with being patripassians. No early accounts of the Ebionites say any such thing of them. Their doctrine was simply, that Christ was a man, but a man approved of God by signs and wonders, and mighty deeds, which God did by him.

I must here remark, that no person, I should think, can reflect upon this subject with proper seriousness, without thinking it a little extraordinary that the Jewish christians, in so early an age as they are spoken of by the denomination of Ebionites, should be acknowledged to believe nothing either of the divinity, or even of the pre-existence of Christ, if either of those doctrines had been taught them by the apostles. Could they so soon have deserted so important an article of their faith, and so

* Ut Hebion, qui argumentabatur patrem passum esse, non filium. Lib. 4. p. 91.
lately delivered to the saints; and having once believed Christ to be either the Supreme God, or a super-angelic spirit, have contrary to the general propensity of human nature (which has always been to aggrandize, rather than to degrade a lord and master, because it is in fact to aggrandize themselves) come universally to believe him to be nothing more than a mere man; and even the son of Joseph and Mary?
Chapter XI.

Of the sacred Books of the Ebionites.

The Ebionites being Jews, and in general acquainted with their own language only, made use of no other than a Hebrew gospel, which is commonly said to have been that of Matthew, originally composed in their language, and for their use. This I think highly probable, from the almost unanimous testimony of antiquity. But this is a question which I shall not make it my business to discuss.

"The Ebionites," says Irenæus, "make use of the gospel of Matthew only.*" Jerom had seen this gospel, and translated it from Hebrew into Greek, and without giving his own opinion, says, that "it was by most persons called the authentic gospel of

* Ebionitæ etenim co evangelio quod est secundum Matthæum solo utentes. Lib.3. cap. 11. p. 220.

"Matthew."
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"Matthew*." Theodoret says concerning both the kinds of Ebionites, that they received no other gospel than that of Matthew.†

But it is evident from Epiphanius, that the Ebionites did not consider the two first chapters of Matthew's gospel as belonging to it; for their copies were without them, beginning with the third chapter. "The gospel of the Ebionites began thus, It came to pass in the days of Herod king of Judea, in the time of Caiaphas the high-priest, a person whose name was John came baptizing with the baptism of repentance in the river Jordan.‡."

Here, however, there must be some mistake, as it was not in the time of Herod

‡ Οὐ γεγένη, φησιν, εἰς τοὺς ημέρας Ἡρῴδου βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἐπὶ Αρχαῖοι Καίαρα ἤδη τῆς ἑορτῆς οὐνομαί βασιλεῖον βασιλείων μελανωμαν εἰς τὸν ούλαμον Ἰορδάνην, καὶ τὰ εὕρει. Hær. 30. Opera, vol. 1. p. 138:
king of Judea, but of Herod the Tetrarch, or king of Galilee; and the inaccuracy is probably to be ascribed to Epiphanius himself. That this writer quoted only from his memory, and inaccurately, is evident from his giving the beginning of this gospel in another place somewhat differently, as follows: "It came to pass in the days of Herod king of Judea, John came baptizing with the baptism of repentance, in the river Jordan; who was said to be of the race of Aaron the priest, the son of Zacharias and Elizabeth; and all men went out to him*."

This writer, who was fond of multiplying sects, and who makes that of the Nazarenes to be different from that of the Ebionites, says concerning the latter, that "he did not know whether they had cut off the genealogy from the gospel of Matthew†."
Meaning, perhaps, the whole of the introduction, as far as the third chapter.—It must be observed, however, that in the copy of this gospel which Jerom translated, there was the second chapter, if not the genealogy. For in this gospel there was, *out of Egypt I have called my son, and he shall be called a Nazarene*.” This I am willing to explain in the following manner. Originally the Jewish christians did not believe the doctrine of the miraculous conception. Both Justin Martyr and Irenæus represent them as disbelieving it, without excepting any that did. Origen is the first who has noticed two kinds of Ebionites, one believing the miraculous conception.

conception, and the other denying it. Probably, therefore, their original copies of the gospel had not the two first chapters, which contained that history; but after some time, those of the Jewish christians who gave credit to the story, would naturally add these two chapters from the Greek copies; and it might be a copy of this kind that Jerom met with.

Epiphanius likewise says, that "the Ebionites made use of the travels of "Clement". This being an unitarian work, they might be pleased with it; but it is not probable that they would read it in the public offices of their churches, or consider it in the same light with one of the books of scripture.

It is agreed on all hands that the Ebionites made no use of the epistles of Paul, because they did not approve of the slight which he seemed to put upon the law of Moses, which they held in the greatest possible veneration.


Epiphanius
Epiphanius says farther concerning the Ebionites, that "they detest the prophets." This, however, I think altogether as improbable, as what he says of their revering water as a god. He is the only writer who affirms any such thing, and as far as appears from all other accounts, the Ebionites acknowledged the authority of all that we call the canonical books of the Old Testament. Symmachus, whose translation of the scriptures into Greek is so often quoted, and with the greatest approbation, by the learned Fathers, was an Ebionite; and Jerom says the same of Theodotion. They both translated the other books of the Old Testament, as well as the Pentateuch, and, as far as appears, without making any distinction between that and the other books; and can this be thought probable, if they had not considered them as entitled to equal credit? Besides, our Saviour's acknowledgment of the authority of the whole of the Old Test-

* ΑλΘ [Κλημ.]: γαρ εὐκομίας Ηλίαν, κυ Δαβίδ, καὶ Σαμ-

p. 139.

ament
tament is so express, that I cannot readily believe that any Christians, Jews especially, acknowledging his authority, would reject what he admitted.

Lastly, the authority of Epiphanius is, in effect, contradicted by Irenæus, who says, that "the Ebionites expounded the "prophecies too curiously." Grabe says, that Ebion (by which we must understand some Ebionite) wrote an exposition of the prophets, as he collected from some fragments of Irenæus's work, of which he gives some account in his note upon the place.


† Ipsum Ebionem ἐξηγησεν τοις προφητικοις scriptisse, colligo ex fragmentis hujus operis, quæ ante paucos dies Parisiis accepi, en MS. codice collegii Claromontani descripto, a viro humanissimo, R. P. Michaele Loquien, inter addenda ad specilegium haereticorum sæculi 1. suo tempore, deo volente, publicanda. Ibid.

C H A P -
CHAPTER XII.

Of Men of Eminence among the Jewish Christians.

Though it is probable, that the Jewish christians in general were poor, and therefore had no great advantage of liberal education, which might be one means of preserving their doctrine in such great simplicity and purity; yet it appears that there were some men of learning among them. Jerom mentions his being acquainted with such during his residence in Palestine; and there are three persons among them who distinguished themselves by translating the Old Testament from Hebrew into Greek, viz. Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus; though the last of them only was a native of Palestine, and born a Samaritan. Eusebius says, that "Theodotion and Aquila were both Jewish proselytes, whom the Ebionites follow-"
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"ing, believe Christ to be the son of " Joseph * ." According to Epiphanius, Theodotion was first a Marcionite, and then a Jewish convert †. Aquila is said to have flourished about the year 130, Theodotion about 180, and Symmachus about 200. Whatever was thought of the religious principles of these men, the greatest account was made of their versions of the Hebrew scriptures by learned christians of all parties, especially that of Symmachus, which is perpetually quoted with the greatest respect by Origen, Eusebius, and others. Jerom, speaking of Origen, says, that " besides comparing the version of the Septuagint, he likewise collated the versions of Aquila of Pontus, a proselyte, that of Theodotion an Ebionite, and that of Symmachus, who was of the same sect; who also wrote commentaries on the gospel of Matthew, from which he en-

* Μεν Θεοδοτόν ἐπιμνησεν ο Ερεσίος, καί Αμυλας ο Πολικος, αμφότεροι ἰδεινοι προσηλυτε. οις καλλιωδεσθεντες οι Εβιοικαι, εξ Ισαυρ καινον γεγενηθαι φασκει. Hist. lib. 5. cap. 8. p. 221.
† Θεοδότον τις Πολυεπιφανής τοις διδαξε αι Εβιοι Μαρινον τις αψεδαγχος τη Συμμαχος. De Menfuris, Opera, vol. 2. p. 172,

" deavoured
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"deavoured to prove his opinion*." In so great estimation was Symmachus held, that Austin says the Nazarenes were sometimes called Symmachians†.

I reserve the account of Hegesippus to the last, because it has been asserted that, though he was a Jewish christian, he was not properly an Ebionite, but orthodox with respect to his belief of the trinity. But that he was not only a Jewish christian, but likewise a proper Ebionite, or a believer in the simple humanity of Christ, may, I think, be inferred from several circumstances, besides his being a Jewish christian; though, since Origen says that none of them believed the divinity of Christ, we ought to have some positive evidence before we admit that he was an exception.


That
That Hegesippus was an Ebionite, may be inferred from his giving a list of all the heresies of his time, in which he enumerates a considerable number, and all of them Gnostics, without making any mention of the Ebionites.

He being a Jewish christian himself, could not but be well acquainted with the prevailing opinions of the Jewish christians, the most conspicuous of which, it cannot be denied, was the doctrine of Christ's being a mere man. Now can it be supposed, that if he himself had been what is now called an orthodox christian, that is, a trinitarian, or even an Arian, he would wholly have omitted the mention of the Ebionites in any list of heretics of his time, had it been ever so short a one; and this consists of no less than eleven articles? Also, can it be supposed that Eusebius, who speaks of the Ebionites with so much hatred and contempt, would have omitted to copy this article, if it had been in the list?

Their not being inserted in the list by such a person as Eusebius, must, I think, satisfy
satisfy any person, who has no system to support, with respect to this article. A stronger negative argument can hardly be imagined. As to Hegesippus himself, we must judge of his feelings and conduct as we should of those of any person at this day in a situation similar to his. Now, did any subsequent ecclesiastical historian, or did any modern divine, of the orthodox faith, ever omit Arians, or Socinians, or names synonymous to them (who always were, and still are, in the highest degree obnoxious to them) in a list of heretics?

Had the faith of the early christians been either that Christ was true and very God, or a superior angelic spirit, the maker of the world, and of all things visible and invisible under God; and had Hegesippus himself retained that faith, while the generality, or only any considerable number of his countrymen, had departed from it, it could not but have have been upon his mind, and have excited the same indignation that the opinions of the Arians and Socinians excite in the minds of those who are called orthodox at this day. Nay, in his circumstances,
such a defection from that important article of faith in his own countrymen, after having been so recently taught the contrary by the apostles themselves, whose writings they still had with them, must have excited a much greater degree of surprize and indignation, than a similar defection would have occasioned in any other people, or in any later times.

It is said to be as remarkable that Hegesippus should have omitted the Cerinthians as the Ebionites. But I see nothing at all extraordinary in the omission of the Cerinthians in this list of heretics by Hegesippus, as they were only one branch of the Gnostics, several of whom are in his list; and it is not improbable that these Cerinthians, having been one of the earliest branches, might have been very inconsiderable, perhaps extinct in his time. I do not know that they are mentioned by any ancient writer as existing so late as the time of Hegesippus; and as they seem to have been pretty much confined to some part of Asia Minor, and especially Galatia, which was very remote from the seat of the Ebionites, he
he might not have heard much about them. Whereas the Ebionites were at that very time in their full vigour, and though their opinions (being then almost universal in what was called the catholic church) had not begun to give offence, they were afterwards the object of the most violent hatred to the other christians, and continued to be so as long as they subsisted.

That Hegesippus, though an unitarian himself, should speak as he does of the state of opinions in the several churches which he visited, as then retaining the true faith, is, I think, very natural. The only heresy that disturbed the apostle John, and therefore other Jewish christians in general, was that of the Gnostics; and all the eleven different kinds of heresies, enumerated by this writer, are probably only different branches of that one great heresy. If, therefore, the churches which he visited were free from Gnosticism, he would naturally say that they retained the true faith. For as to the doctrine of the personification of the logos, held then by Justin Martyr, and perhaps a few others, it was not, in its origin, so very alarming.
Men of Eminence

Book III.

 alarming a thing; and very probably this
plain man had not at all considered its na-
ture and tendency, if he had heard of it.
The author of the Clementine Homilies,
though cotemporary with Hegesippus, and
unquestionably an unitarian, makes no men-
tion of it.

Hegesippus, as an unitarian, believed that
all the extraordinary power exerted by Christ
was that of the Father residing in him, and
speaking and acting by him; and he might
imagine that these philosophizing christians,
men of great name, and a credit to the cause,
held in fact the same thing, when they said
that this logos of theirs was not the logos of the
Gnostics, but that of John the evangelist, or
the wisdom and power of God himself.

And though this might appear to him as
a thing that he could not well understand,
he might not think that there was any he-
refy, or much harm in it. Had he been
told (but this he could only have had from
inspiration) that this specious personification
of the divine logos would, about two cen-
turies afterwards, end in the doctrine of the
perfect equality of the Son with the Father,
this plain good man might have been a little startled.

That Eusebius, and others, should speak of Hegesippus with respect (from which it has been argued that he could not possibly have been an Ebionite) appears to me nothing extraordinary, though it should have been known to them that he was one, considering that they quote him only as an historian; and supposing, what is very probable, that he did not treat particularly of doctrinal matters, but confined himself to the acts of the apostles, and other historical circumstances attending the propagation of the gospel; especially as he was the only historian of that age, and had always been held in esteem. A man who is once in possession of the general good opinion, will not be censured lightly, especially by such men as Eusebius.

Can it be supposed also that Eusebius, in expressly quoting ancient authorities against those who held the opinion of the simple humanity of Christ, would not have cited Hegesippus, as well as Irenæus, Justin Martyr, and others, if he could
could have found any thing in him for his purpose? This may be considered as a proof that there was nothing in his work unfavourable to the doctrine of the Ebionites. A negative argument can hardly be stronger than this.

Had there been any pretence for quoting Hegesippus as a maintainer of the divinity of Christ, he would certainly have been mentioned in preference to Justin Martyr, or any others in the list; not only because he was an earlier writer, but chiefly because he was one of the Jewish Christians, who are well known not to have favoured that opinion.

The manner in which Eusebius speaks of Hegesippus's quoting the gospel of the Hebrews, is such as led him to think that he was a Hebrew Christian. "He quotes some things from the gospel according to the Hebrews and the Syriac, and especially in the Hebrew tongue, shewing that he was one of the Hebrew Christians." We may, therefore, conclude, that he quoted it with respect; and this was not done ex-

cept by those who were Ebionites, or who favoured their opinions. As Hegesippus wrote in Greek, he must have been acquainted with the Greek gospels, and therefore must have quoted that of the Hebrews from choice, and not from necessity.

Lastly, the manner in which Hegesippus speaks of James the Just, is much more that of an unitarian, than of a trinitarian.

"James the Just," says Eusebius, "is presented by Hegesippus as saying, Why do you ask me concerning Jesus the son of man?" This looks as if both James and the historian were unitarians; the phrase son of man, being probably synonymous to a prophet, or a person having a divine commission, and certainly not implying any nature properly divine.

Valesius, the learned commentator on Eusebius, has intimated a suspicion, that the works of Hegesippus, as well as those of Papias and the Hypotyposes of Clemens Alexandrinus, were neglected and lost, on

* Τι μὲ επεροδιάτην ἤμερον ἔτη μεν τοι οὐδὲνα; Hist. lib. 2. cap. 23. p. 79.
account of the errors they were supposed to contain*. This I cannot help thinking highly probable, and those errors could hardly be any other than the unitarian doctrine, and the things connected with it. Indeed, there were no errors of any consequence ascribed to that early age besides those of the Gnostics, and of the unitarians. The former certainly were not those that Valeius could allude to with respect to Hegesippus, because this writer mentions the Gnostics very particularly as heretics. Though Clemens Alexandrinus was not an unitarian, yet he never calls unitarians heretics; and since, in his accounts of heretics in general, which are pretty frequent in his works, he evidently means the Gnostics only, and therefore virtually excludes unitarians from that description of men; it is by no means improbable but that, in those writ-

* Porro ii Clementis libri continebant brevem et compendiarium utriusque testamenti expositionem, ut testatur Photius in bibliotheca. Ob errores autem quibus scaterebant, negligentius habit, tandem perierunt. Nec alia, meo quidem judicio, causa est, cur Papiæ et Hegesippi, aliorum, que veterum libri interciderint. In Euseb. Hist. lib. 5. cap. 11.
ings of his which are lost, he might have said things directly in favour of unitarians.

In this passage Valerius also mentions the writings of Papias, as having, in his opinion, been lost for the same reason. Now Papias has certainly been supposed to be an Ebionite. Mr. Whiston has made this very probable from a variety of circumstances. See his Account of the ceasing of Miracles, p. 18. In the same tract he gives his reasons for supposing Hegesippus to have been an Ebionite, and he expresses his wonder, "that he should have had the good fortune to be so long esteemed by the learned for "a catholic," p. 21, &c. In this Mr. Whiston may be supposed to have been sufficiently impartial, as he was an Arian, and expresses great dislike of the Ebionites; as, indeed, Arians always have done.

It is to be lamented that we know so very little of the history of the Jewish Christians. We are informed, that they retired to Pella, a country to the east of the sea of Galilee, on the approach of the Jewish war, that many of them returned to Jerusalem when that war was over, and that they
continued there till the city was taken by Adrian. But what became of those who were driven out of the city by Adrian, does not appear. It is most probable that they joined their brethren at Pella, or Beraea in Syria, from whence they had come to reside at Jerusalem; and indeed what became of the whole body of the ancient christian Jews (none of whom can be proved to have been trinitarians) I cannot tell. Their numbers, we may suppose, were gradually reduced, till at length they became extinct. I hope, however, we shall hear no more of them as an evidence of the antiquity of the trinitarian doctrine.

A few of the Nazarenes remained, as Epiphanius says, in the Upper Thebais and Arabia. He also speaks of the Ebionites as existing in his own time, and joined by the Offens*. Austin says that they were in small numbers even in his time†.

* Μονοὶ δὲ τως εὑσ σταγει ευρισκομεν, η τε εις. η δυο Ναζαρηνος νπερ των ανω Θεβαιδα, η επεινεκα της Αραβίας, Ηαρ. 20. Opera, vol. i. p. 46.

† Ji sunt quos Faustus Symmachianorum vel Nazarenotrum, nomine commemoravit, qui ufque ad nostra tempora jam quidem in exigua, sed adhuc tamen vel in ipsa, paeicitate perdurant. Contra Faustum Man. Opera, vol. 6, p. 351.
CHAPTER XIII.

Unitarianism was the Doctrine of the primitive Gentile Churches.

HAVING proved, as I think I may presume that I have done, to the satisfaction of every impartial reader, that the great body of Jewish christians always were, and to the last continued to be, unitarians; believing nothing concerning the pre-existence or divinity of Christ, it may with certainty be concluded, that the Gentile converts were also universally unitarians in the age of the apostles, and that, of course, the great majority of the common people must have continued to be so for a very considerable time. There is no maxim, the truth of which is more fully verified by observation and experience, than that great bodies of men do not soon, or without great causes, change their opinions. And the common people among christians, having no recollection of the apostles having taught
taught the pre-existence or divinity of Christ; would not soon receive such strange doctrines from any other quarter.

In what manner the speculative and philosophizing christians came to receive these doctrines, and what plausible arguments they used to recommend them, I have fully explained. But such causes would affect the learned long before they reached the unlearned; though, in time, the opinions of those who are respected for their knowledge, never fail to diffuse themselves among the common people, as we see to be the case in matters of philosophy, and speculation in general.

Actual phenomena, I shall undertake to shew, correspond to this hypothesis, viz. that the Gentile christians were at first universally unitarians; that for a long time a majority of the common people continued to be so, being till after the council of Nice, pretty generally in communion with the trinitarians, without abandoning their own opinion. It will also appear, from the most indisputable evidence, that the Arian hypothesis, which makes Christ to have been a great
a great pre-existent spirit, the maker of the world, and the giver of the law of Moses, was equally unknown to the learned and to the unlearned, till the age of Arius himself. As to the opinion of Christ having been a pre-existent spirit, but either not the maker of world, or not the giver of the law, it is quite modern, being entirely unknown to any thing that can be called antiquity.

SECTION I.

Presumptive Evidence that the Majority of the Gentile Christians in the early Ages were Unitarians.

Both the strongest presumptions, and the most direct positive evidence, show that the common people among the Gentile christians, were unitarians, at least between two and three hundred years after the promulgation of christianity.

1. That unitarians must have been in communion with what was in early times called
called the *catholic church*, is evident from there being no *creed*, or formulary of faith, that could exclude them. And we have seen that a creed was formed for the express purpose of excluding the Gnostics, who, of course, could not, and we find did not, join the public assemblies of christians, but formed assemblies among themselves, entirely distinct from those of the catholics.

There was no creed used in the christian church, besides that which was commonly called *the apostles*, before the council of Nice, and even after that there was no other generally used at baptism. This creed, as has been seen, contains no article that could exclude unitarians; and there was nothing in the public services that was calculated to exclude them. The bishops and the principal clergy, zealous for the doctrine of the trinity, might, of their own accord harangue their audiences on the subject, or they might pray as trinitarians; but if the unitarians could bear with it, they might still continue in communion with them, there being no law, or rule, to exclude them.
Accordingly, we find that all the unitarians continued in communion with the catholic church till the time of Theodotus, about the year 200, when it is possible that, upon his excommunication, some of his more zealous followers might form themselves into separate societies. But we have no certain account of any separate societies of unitarians till the excommunication of Paulus Samosatenensis, about the year 250, when, after him, they were called Paulians, or Paulianists. Others also, about the same time, or rather after that time, formed separate societies in Africa, on the excommunication of Sabellius, being, after him, called Sabellians.

2. The very circumstance of the unitarian Gentiles having no separate name, is, of itself, a proof that they had no separate assemblies, and were not distinguished from the common mass of christians. Had the unitarians been considered as heretics, and of course formed separate societies, they would as certainly have been distinguished by some particular name, as the Gnostics were, who were in that situation. But the Gentile
Gentile unitarians had no name given them till the time of Epiphanius, who ineffectually endeavoured to impose upon them that of Alogi*. As to the terms Paulians, Sabellians, Noctians, or Artemonites, they were only names given them in particular places from local circumstances.

When bodies of men are formed, distinguished from others by their opinions, manners, or customs, they necessarily become the subjects of conversation and writing; and it being extremely inconvenient to make frequent use of periphrases, or descriptions, particular names will be given to them. This is so well known, that there can hardly be a more certain proof of men not having been formed into separate bodies, whether they were considered in a favourable, or an unfavourable light, than their never having had any separate name given them; and this was indisputably the case with the Gentile unitarians for the space of more than two hundred years after

the promulgation of Christianity. The Jewish unitarians using a different language, and living in a part of the world remote from other Christians, had little communication with the Gentiles, and therefore, of course, had assemblies separate from theirs; but for that reason they had a particular name, being called Ebionites.

The name by which the Gentile unitarians were sometimes distinguished before the separation of any of them from the Catholic church, was that of Monarchists, which was probably assumed by themselves, from their asserting the monarchy of the Father, in opposition to the novel doctrine of the divinity of the Son. Had it been a name given them by their enemies, it would probably have been of a different kind, and have implied some reproach.

As to the term Alogi, given to the unitarians by Epiphanius, it may be safely concluded, that it was imposed on a false pretence, viz. their denying the authenticity of the writings of the apostle John, and their ascribing them to Cerinthus, for which there is no evidence besides his own; and he
he does not pretend to have had it from the unitarians themselves. It is sufficiently evident that there could not have been any christians who rejected all the writings of John before the time of Eusebius, who considers very particularly the objections that had been made to the genuineness of all the books of the New Testament. And that the same people should reject these books after the time of Eusebius, and not before, is highly improbable. Epiphanius himself ascribes this rejection to the Alogi in general, and not to those of his time only; and he supposes the heresy of Alogi to have been an old one, of which that of Theodotus was a branch*.

The proof that Origen, Chrysostom, and the Fathers in general, give of their not being heretics, is that they had no particular name, besides that of christians. All therefore, that Chrysostom and others could allege, as a proof that themselves and their friends were of the orthodox faith, and no heretics, might have been alleged by the

whole body of unitarians before the time of Theodotus.

3. This argument will have double force, if we consider how exceedingly obnoxious the sentiments of the unitarians must have appeared, if they had been different from those of the generality of christians at that time. In what light they would have been regarded then, may be easily judged of by the treatment which they receive at present, wherever the trinitarian doctrine is established, and that of the unitarians is professed by the smaller number. In these circumstances, it is a fact which no person can deny, that unitarians have, in all countries, been regarded with the greatest possible abhorrence, and treated as impious blasphemers. It is considered as a great stretch of moderation to tolerate them at all. There are many instances in which even Arians would not allow that the unitarians were christians. This now would certainly have been the case in the primitive times, if the unitarians had been in the same situation, that is, if they had been the minority, and trinitarians, or even Arians, the majority.
rity. For, human nature being the same, the influence of the same circumstances will likewise be the same, as universal experience shews. For no sooner were the trinitarians the majority, and had the favour of government, than they took the severest measures against those who openly avowed themselves to be unitarians. The same also was their treatment from the Arians; when they were in power, as the history of Photinus testifies.

It is well known with what severity Calvin proceeded against Servetus, when the doctrine which he defended was far from being novel, and Calvin himself was exposed to persecution. Even in these circumstances he thought, that to write against the doctrine of the trinity was a crime for which burning alive was no more than an adequate punishment; and almost all the Christian world, not excepting even the meek Melancthon, justified his proceedings. Now, since the minds of men are in all ages similarly affected in similar circumstances, we may conclude, that the Unitarian doctrine, which was treated with so much
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respect when it was first mentioned, was in a very different predicament then, from what it was at the time of the reformation. The difference of *majority* and *minority*, and nothing else, can account for this difference of treatment.

4. Another, and no inconsiderable argument in favour of the antiquity of the proper unitarian doctrine among christians, may be drawn from the *rank* and *condition* of those who held it in the time of Tertullian. He calls them *simplices et idiotæ*, that is, *common* or *unlearned people*; and such persons are certainly most likely to retain *old* opinions, and are always far less apt to innovate than the learned, because they are far less apt to speculate. Whenever we endeavour to trace the oldest opinions in any country, we always enquire among the *idiote*, the common people; and if they believe one thing, and the learned another, we may conclude with certainty, that which ever of them be *true*, or the more probable, those of the common people were *the more ancient*, and those of the learned and speculative *the more novel* of the two.
In most cases the more novel opinions are most likely to be true, considering the gradual spread of knowledge, and the general prevalence of prejudice and error; but in some cases the probability is on the side of the more ancient opinions; and it is evidently so in this. The true doctrine concerning the person of Christ must be allowed to have been held by the apostles. They, no doubt, knew whether their master was only a man like themselves, or their maker. Their immediate disciples would receive and maintain the same doctrine that they held, and it must have been some time before any other could have been introduced, and have spread to any extent, and especially before it could have become the prevailing opinion. We naturally, therefore, look for the genuine doctrine of Christianity, concerning the person of Christ, among those who, from their condition and circumstances, were most likely to maintain the old opinion, rather than among those who were most apt to receive a new one. Surely, then, we have a better chance of finding the truth on this subject among these
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these *idiota*, the common and unlearned people, than with such men as Justin Martyr, who had been a heathen philosopher, Irenæus, or any other of the learned and speculative christians of the same age.

On the contrary, supposing the christian religion to have been gradually corrupted, and that, in a long course of time, the corrupt doctrine should become the most prevalent among the common people; the reformation of it, by the recovery of the genuine doctrine, is naturally to be looked for among the learned and the inquisitive, who, in all cases, will be the *innovators*. This is remarkably the case in the present state of things. The common people in the Roman catholic countries are bigots to the old established faith, while the learned are moderate, and almost protestants. In protestant countries the common people still adhere most strongly to the doctrine of their ancestors, or those which prevailed about the time of the reformation, while the learned are every where receding farther from them; they being more inquisitive, and more enlightened than the unenquiring vulgar
vulgar. But still, if any man should propose simply to enquire what were the opinions most generally received in this country a century ago (which was about the space that intervened between Victor and the time of the apostles) we should think him very absurd, if he should look for them among the learned, rather than among the common people. We have experience enough of the difficulty with which the bulk of the common people are brought to relinquish the faith of their ancestors.

Dissenters in England are well situated for judging of the truth of the general maxim, that large bodies of men do not soon change their opinions. Notwithstanding the dissenters have no legal bonds, but are perfectly free to adopt whatever opinions they please; yet, as they were universally Calvinists at the time of the reformation, they are very generally so still. The ministers, as might be expected, are the most enlightened, and have introduced some reformation among the common people; but a majority of the ministers are, I believe, still Calvinists.
No person at all acquainted with history can entertain a doubt with respect to the general maxim, that great bodies of men do not soon change their opinions. It appeared when our Saviour and the apostles preached the gospel with all the advantage of miracles; and it appeared in the christianizing of the Gentile world. How long did the ignorant country people, in particular, continue *pagans*, a word borrowed from their being chiefly the inhabitants of villages? Does not the history both of the corruption, and of the reformation of christianity prove the same thing? How many yet believe the doctrine of transubstantiation? and what I think as much a case in point, how many yet believe the doctrine of the trinity?

Is it then at all probable, that when the doctrine of the simple humanity of Christ is acknowledged to have been held by the *idiotæ*, or common people, and who are expressly said to have been the greater part of the believers (*major credentium pars*) this should not have been the general opinion a century before that time; but, on the contrary,
contrary, that of the deity of Christ, which
was held by Tertullian, and other learned
christians, and who speak of the common
people as being shocked (expavescunt) at
their doctrine? Sufficient cause may be
assigned why the learned in that age should
be inclined to adopt any opinion which
would advance the personal dignity of their
master; and the same causes would pro-
duce the same effect among the common
people, but it would be more slowly, and
acquire more time, as appears to have been the fact.

It may be said, that the testimony of Ter-
tullian is expressly contradicted by Justin
Martyr, who (in giving an account of the
circumstances in which the Platonic philo-
sophy agreed, as he thought, with the doc-
trine of Moses, but with respect to which
he supposed that Plato had borrowed from
Moses) mentions the following particulars,
viz. the power which was after the first
God, or the logos, "assuming the figure of
a cross in the universe, borrowed from the
fixing up of a serpent (which represented
Christ) in the form of a cross in the wil-
derness;
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derness; and a third principle, borrowed
from the spirit, which Moses said moved
on the face of the water at the creation;
and also the notion of some fire, or con-
flagration, borrowed from some figurative
expressions in Moses, relating to the anger
of God waxing hot. These things, he
says, we do not borrow from others, but
all others from us. With us you may
hear and learn these things from those
who do not know the form of the letters,
and who are rude and barbarous of speech,
but wise and understanding in mind, and
from some who are even lame and blind,
so that you may be convinced that these
things are not said by human wisdom,
but by the power of God *.

But all that we can infer from this passage
is, that these common people had learned
from Moses that the world was made by

* On τα αὐτα ἐν ημείς αὐτοίς δοθατόμεν, ἀλλ' ο παῖς τα ἁμέρα
μμαθαίον λεγομι. παρ ημιν ἐν τι ταῦτα αιτοται και μαθαί πιθα των
ἀκει τας χαρακήρας των οἰκείων επισταμαινιν, ἰδιών μεν ἦς 
παρθαραν
τὸ φθημα, οὑραν δὲ ἦ τινων των νυν οἴου, ή ταιραν ἦ χηραν τινων τας
οφεις ἐς συνεικε. κ σοφία αὐθρησθαι ταῦτα γελονσιν, ἀλλα δυναμεί
θεε λεγεοντι. Apol: p. 38,
the power and wisdom (or the logos) of God; that the serpent in the wilderness represented Christ; and that there was a spirit of God that moved on the face of the waters: in short, these plain people had been at the source from which Plato had borrowed his philosophy. It is by no means an explicit declaration that these common people thought that the logos and the spirit were persons distinct from God. Justin was not writing with a view to that question, as Tertullian was, but only meant to say how much more knowledge was to be found among the lowest of the christians, than among the wisest of the heathen philosophers.

Besides, Justin is here boasting of the knowledge of these lower people, and it favoured his purpose to make it as considerable as he could; whereas Tertullian is complaining of the circumstance which he mentions; so that nothing but the conviction of a disagreeable truth could have extorted it from him. The same was the case with respect to Athanasius.
That the common people in Justin's time should understand his doctrine concerning the personification of the logos, is in itself highly improbable. That this logos, which was originally in God the same thing that reason is in man, should, at the creation of the world, assume a proper personality, and afterwards animate the body of Jesus Christ, either in addition to a human soul, or instead of it, is not only very absurd; but also so very abstruse, that it is in the highest degree improbable, a priori, that the common people should have adopted it. The scriptures, in which they were chiefly conversant, could never teach them any such thing; and they could not have been capable of entering into the philosophical refinements of Justin on the subject. Whereas, that the common people should have believed as Tertullian and Athanasius represent them to have done, viz. that there is but one God, and that Christ was a man, the messenger or prophet of God, and no second God at all (the rival as it were of the first God) is a thing highly credible in itself, and therefore requires less external evidence.

5. Another
Another ground of presumption, that the unitarians were not considered as heretics, or indeed in any obnoxious light, and consequently of their being in very great numbers in early times, is, that no treatises were written against them. As soon as ever Gnostics made their appearance, they were censured with the greatest severity, and expressly treatises were written against them. Whereas the unitarians were first mentioned without any censure at all, afterwards with very little; and no treatise was written expressly against them before Tertullian's against Praxeas, with whom he was, on other accounts, much offended. About the same time, it is supposed, that Caius wrote the treatise called *The Little Labyrinth*, quoted by Eusebius. Before this time there were some voluminous writers among christians, and several treatises were written expressly against heresy, but all the heresies then noticed were those of the Gnostics. Irenæus's treatise against heresy shews, that the Gnostics only were considered as coming under that description. The Ebionites indeed are censured in it, but no mention is made
made of the Gentile unitarians, though they were the majority of the common people among christians a long time after this.

His censures of Gentile unitarians is, at least indirect, as they held the same doctrine concerning Christ that the Ebionites did; and it must always be considered, that Irenæus lived in Gaul, where there were no Ebionites, and perhaps not many unitarians, as they abounded most in those countries in which christianity was first planted.

Theophilus of Antioch, about the year 170, wrote against heresies, but only his book against Marcion is mentioned by Eusebius. Hist. lib. 4. cap. 24. p. 187. He also mentions many of the works of Melito, bishop of Sardis, but none of them were against the unitarians. Lib. 4. cap. 26. p. 188. Rhodon, he also says, wrote against the Marcionites. Lib. 5. cap. 13. p. 225. We have also the first book of a large work of Origen's against heresy; and it is very evident, as I have observed, from his introduction, that he had no view to any besides the Gnostics. Can it be doubted then, but that
that there would have been treatises written expressly against the unitarians long before the time of Tertullian, if they had been considered in any obnoxious light, or had not been a very great majority of the Christian world.

6. That the unitarian doctrine was very prevalent, even among learned Christians, in the age which followed that of the apostles, and was then supposed to be that which was taught by them, may, with considerable probability, be inferred from the *Clementine Homilies* and *Recognitions*, of which some account was given, vol. i. p. 113. What is particularly remarkable relating to this work (for the two were originally the same) is, that, though it was written by a philosopher, and upon subjects which related to the doctrine concerning the person of Christ, it contains no mention of that doctrine which made so great a figure afterwards, and which in time bore down all before it, viz. that of the personification of the logos. No person, I should think, could peruse that work with care, without concluding, that the orthodoxy of the subsequent period
riod had made but little progress then, and the same questions are discussed, and the same objections are answered, but on quite different principles, and without taking the least notice of any different principles.

If we cannot infer from this circumstance, that such a system as that of Justin Martyr, or the orthodoxy of the third century, did not exist, or was not much prevalent, so as to have attracted much notice, in the second; it must at least be allowed, as I observed before, that the writer of this work, being indisputably a man of genius and learning, would ascribe to Peter and Clement such opinions, and such a mode of answering the Gnostics, as he thought would pass for theirs. And as the work was probably a very popular one, from the different editions and modifications of it (being published afterwards, with Arian, and again with trinitarian adulterations) and used, as Epiphanius says, by the Ebionites as a sacred book, we may likewise infer, that the theological doctrines of it were generally thought to be those of the apostolic age, though with such additions as the
philosophy of the times could supply. A man must have had less knowledge and less judgment than the writer of this work was evidently possessed of, to have put into the mouths of Peter and Clement unitarian doctrines, and unitarian modes of answering the Gnostics, if it had not been supposed that Peter and Clement, though no philosophers, were at least unitarians.

To the passages quoted from this work before, I shall here add another, in which, contrary to the orthodox doctrine of the world not having been made by God himself, but by the logos, and without noticing any such doctrine, he gives a fine enumeration of the attributes of the one true God, and represents him as the demiurgus, the immediate maker of the world, and all the several parts of it, the heavens and the heavenly bodies, the earth and water, mountains and seas, fountains and fruits, &c. &c.*

* Διο, ο τεννων κλιβεσ, επηχε, μην αλλο τι φρονοντι περι τη θεο, εν οι ανοι μοι ευ ευς, κρηετος, κυριαετος, αγεδος, εκδικα, διναργος, μακαροδομος, ελεκμον, τρωφος ευριος, φιλαδροπιαι νομπον, αγεται αυρεθελον, αυτον, αυτως θεου, αυτον θεον, του των αγαλων πυξας εικοζεινος, αυτοτιτος, κυριοι διναργος, εν απειρο.
Dr. Lardner observes (Credibility, vol. 2. p. 819.) that the Clementine Homilies and Recognitions deserve a more particular examination than has yet been given to them. And indeed, in the view in which I have mentioned them, and also, in many others, they are justly intitled to it; as they contain a particular account of the opinions of those times, especially of the manner in which Christianity was treated and defended by philosophers. More may be learned concerning the theology and philosophy of those times, from this single work, than from many others. It is true that the philosophical doctrines in it are absurd enough; but the age afforded no better, and they are exhibited in a very pleasing dress.

Vol. III. S SEC-
SECTION II.

Direct Evidence in Favour of the Gentile Christians having been generally Unitarians.

But there is no occasion to argue in this manner from circumstances, and the nature of the thing, since it appears from the evidence of all history, so as never to have been questioned by any writer of reputation, that the unitarians had not any places of worship separate from those of other christians in early times. It was allowed by Mosheim, a zealous trinitarian, who says, (Hist. vol. i. p. 191) "However, ready many " have been to embrace this erroneous doc- " trine, it does not appear that this sect " formed to themselves a separate place of " worship, or removed themselves from " the ordinary assemblies of christians." But does it not also follow from the same fact, that these unitarians were not expelled from christian societies by others, as they certainly would have been, if they had been considered as heretics?

"In
“In former times,” says Nicephorus, “all who were called christians, though they held different opinions, being considered in the same light by the Gentiles, and suffering from them, made little account of their differences, while they were exposed to equal hardships, on which account they easily joined in the common assemblies; and having frequent intercourse, while they were few in number, did not divide into parties.” In these circumstances, however, the Gnostics held separate assemblies, and as the violence of persecution did not make the orthodox receive them into their assemblies, so neither would they have admitted the unitarians, if they had been at all obnoxious to them.

That unitarians were included among those who, holding different opinions, were

*S 2 considered*
considered by the orthodox as fellow christians, is evident from the following passage of Origen; but it will be more evident from other passages which I shall have occasion to quote from him hereafter. It is only to be observed, that the unitarians are here described as being patripasfi ans; but these were only the more philosophical of the unitarians, as I shall show in its proper place. "It is allowed," he says, "that as in the great multitude of believers, who admit of difference of opinion, there are some who say that the Saviour is God over all; but we do not say so, who believe him when he said, My Father is greater than I?"*

Eusebius, describing two sorts of heretics, one of whom denied the humanity of Christ, and the other his pre-existence and divinity, says, that the former were out of the church; but he is so far from saying the fame of the latter, that he particularly com-

---
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That Chrysostom considered almost all the christians as being unitarians in the age of the apostles has been shewn already; and yet he says, that in their time there was no heresy.

This, however, could not be strictly true, because there were Gnostics in the time of the apostles; but they were few compared with their numbers afterwards. On this account, it is said by several of the ancients, that heresy began in the time of Adrian, when the most distinguished of the Gnostics made their appearance. Cyprian says, that "the worst of the


† Τὸν τῶν, καθ᾽ ἐκείνην αὐτὸν καθαὶρεῖ τῷ οἰκειομένῳ αἰτίαν, εἰρεσίας ἐνδήμα τον Ser. 61. Opera, vol. 5. p. 809.

S 3 "heresies.
"herefies did not rise till after the time of "the apostles *.""

That the common people among christians were actually unitarians in the early ages, and believed nothing of the pre-existence or divinity of Christ before the council of Nice, we have as express a testimony as can be desired in the case. These sublime doctrines were thought to be above their comprehension, and to be capable of being understood and received by the learned only. This we see most clearly in the general strain of Origen's writings, who was himself a firm believer, and a zealous defender, of the pre-existence and divinity of Christ.

"This," says he, "we ought to understand, that, as the law was a shadow of good things to come, so is the gospel as it is understood by the generality. But that which John calls the everlasting gospel, and which may be more properly called the spiritual, instructs the

* Et hoc, cum nondum haereticæ pestes acriores prorupissent. Epist. i. Opera, p. 211. 219.

"intelligent
"intelligent very clearly concerning the "Son of God. Wherefore the gospel must "be taught both corporeally and spiritually, "and when it is necessary we must preach "the corporeal gospel, saying to the carnal, "that we know nothing but Jesus Christ "and him crucified. But when persons "are found confirmed in the spirit, bring-"ing forth fruit in it, and in love with "heavenly wisdom, we must impart to "them the logos returning from his bo-"dily state, in that he was in the begin-"ning with God *.

"Some are adorned with the logos itself, "but others with a logos which is a-kin to "it, and seeming to them to be the true

* Καὶ τῷ δὲ εἰδοθεὶ ἐχθρῷ, οὐ μὴν εἰ μοι ὁ λόγος· οἷον περιέχειν τῶν μελλόντων αγαθῶν, ὑπὸ τῷ γὰρ αἰωθείῳ καθαγγελλομένων νομί-

mα δηλομένων; τὸ γὰρ εὐαγγελίου σκιαὶ μυμάραν χρίσαι διδάσκει, τὸ νο-

μίζουμεν ὑπὸ σκιών τῶν εἰδοθείων νοσίδεσσα. Οὐ δὲν ἦν Ἰωάννης εὐαγ-

γελὼν αἰωθείῳ, οἷον καὶ ἐκ θεοσκιά τῶν σωματικῶν, σπειρὸς παρῆκται τοῖς νουσι τα παιδια εὐαπτίῳ σερι ὑπὲ τῷ Θεῷ.—Διαπερ ἀναγκαιον 

σωματικῶν, ης σωματικῶς κρατῶν τούτο δια τούτων κακοτεὶν εὐαγγελίων, 

φασινδὲ μικρὸν εἰδοθεὶς τῶν σωματικῶν Ἰησοῦν 

χρισὰ τῷ τελῶν ἐκαθορισμένον, ταῖς σωμήν ἔπερον. εὖ τεν δὲ εὐαγγεί-lo-

μενοι τα σωματικὰ, τὰ καιροτερειδεῖς ἐν αὐθίν, εἰρωνίᾳ τε εὐαγγεί- 

σιάς, μελιάντεον αὐδίος τα λόγα, εὐπαλιθεύων αὐτῷ το σεσαρμοθεί, ἐφ᾽ ό 

"logos; who know nothing but Jesus Christ,
"and him crucified, who look at the word
"made flesh "."

" There are," says he, " who partake of
"logos which was from the beginning, the
"logos that was with God, and the logos
"that was God, as Hosea, Isaiah, and Jer-
"miah, and any others that speak of him
"as the logos of God, and the logos that
"was with him; but there are others who
"know nothing but Jesus Christ and him,
"crucified, the logos that was made flesh,
"thinking they have every thing of the
"logos when they acknowledge Christ ac-
"cording to the flesh. Such is the multi-
tude of those who are called christians "."

* Oi mev yar a'dio to lo ga nekaqomihai. Oi de ypaxemwn tov

a'dio, h' donhni evnoi a'dio tov a'prou lova, oi yh' lenv
chrístov, h' tìdov esayafémwn, oi tov lo go yparoq oruqes. Com-
ment. vol. 2. p. 49.

† Oi tovov oin mev tives melechias a'dia to ev a'prou lova, h' a'prou

tov Seon lova, h' Seon lova, or tep e'f noqia h' yapwvemai, h' e tìs e'fpros.
ti'dov e'fpros apoxetaqen, as tov lo go yparoq, to tov lo go yparoq ooros
a'dio. E'fpros de oi mev e'idovs e'fmai Inseon chrístov h' tìdov esayafémwn,
tov yparoq yparq paroq, to wv pmìqos e'fnoi to lo go chrístov kéas,
paroq e'mon wparoq, to tov el th yparq twv apoxetaqen tìs-

yafémwn. Comment. in Johan. vol. 2. p. 49.

3

Again,
Again, he says, "the multitudes" (i.e. the great mass or body) "of believers are instructed in the shadow of the logos, and not in the true logos of God, which is in the open heaven*.

But nothing can be more decisive than the evidence of Tertullian to this purpose, who, in the following passage, which is too plain and circumstantial to be misunderstood by any person, positively asserts, though with much peevishness, that the unitarians, who held the doctrine of the divinity of Christ in abhorrence, were the greater part of christians in his time.

"The simple, the ignorant, and unlearned, who are always the greater part of the body of christians, since the rule of faith," meaning, probably, the apostles' creed, "transfers the worship of many gods to the one true God, not understanding that the unity of God is to be maintained but with the economy; dread this economy; imagining that

* Τάς δὲ αὐχένας τῶν σπειτοδεμένας νομιζόμενας τὴν σκιὰ τηλογίας, εἴ τι τῷ αἰϑέριῳ λόγῳ δεχόμενα εἰς τὸ αναγωγήν θρατμὸν τηγχανον, μακάριον ἔσονται. Comment. in Johan. vol. 2. p. 52.
"this number and disposition of a trinity is
"a division of the unity. They, there-
"fore, will have it that we are worshippers
"of two, and even of three Gods, but that
"they are the worshippers of one God
"only. We, they say, hold the monarchy.
"Even the Latins have learned to bawl
"out for the monarchy, and the Greeks
"themselves will not understand the œco-
"nomy *.

It is hardly possible in any words to de-
scribe the state of things more clearly than

* Simplices enim quippe, ne dixerim imprudentes et
idiotæ, quæ major semper credentium pars est, quoniam
et idem regula fidei a pluribus diis seculi, ad unicum et
deum verum transfert; non intelligentes unicum quidem,
se cum sua œconomia esse credendum expavescunt ad
œconomiam. Numerum et dispositionem trinitatis, divi-
sionem praefumunt unitatis; quando unitas ex semetipso
derivans trinitatem, non defruatur ab illa, sed adminis-
tur. Itaque duos et tres jam jactitant a nobis prædicari,
f æ vero unius dei cultores praefumunt. — Quasi non et
unitas inrationaliter collecta, hæresim faciat, trinitas ratio-
naliter expensa, veritatem confituat. Monarchiam, in-
quiunt, tenemus. Et ita sonum vocaliter exprimunt etiam
Latini, etiam opici, ut putes illos tam bene intelligere mo-
narchiam, quam enunciant. Sed monarchiam sonare stu-
dent Latini, œconomiam intelligere nolunt etiam Græci.
Ad Praxeam, sect. 3. p. 502.

Tertullian
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Tertullian here does. It is the language of strong feeling and complaint, the clearest of all proofs that he did not mis-state things on that side, as it would have been for the purpose of his argument to have represented the unitarians as being inconsiderable on account of their numbers, as well as despicable on account of their want of learning.

Whoever Tertullian meant by the simplices and idiotæ, for any thing that appears, he meant the whole body of them. His language is general and unlimited. However, I am far from being willing to construe him rigorously, and am ready to allow that some of the simple and unlearned persons he describes might profess to believe the doctrine of the trinity, though he says nothing of it. But, making all reasonable deductions on this account, he asserts a palpable falsehood, and against himself, if a very great majority of them were not unitarians.

On the whole, it is impossible not to infer from this passage, that, in the time of Tertullian, the great body of unlearned christians were unitarians. Common sense cannot
cannot put any other construction on this passage, and Tertullian is far from being singular in this acknowledgment. It is made, in different modes, by several of the Fathers, even later than the age of Tertullian.

That Tertullian considered the more simple and unlearned people as those among whom the unitarian doctrine was the most popular, is evident from his saying, that "the tares of Praxeas grew up, while many "slept in the simplicity of doctrine".

That the word idiota in Latin, or ἰδιότης in Greek, signifies a man simply unlearned, and not a fool, would be an affront to the literature of my readers to attempt to prove.

Athanasius also, like Tertullian, acknowledged that the unitarian doctrine was very prevalent among the lower class of people in his time. He calls them the ἰδιότες, the many, and describes them as persons of low understanding. "It grieves," he says, "those who stand up for the holy faith,


"that
"that the multitude, and especially persons of low understanding, should be infected with those blasphemies. Things that are sublime and difficult are not to be apprehended, except by faith; and ignorant people must fall, if they cannot be persuaded to rest in faith, and avoid curious questions."

This being the language of complaint, as well as that of Tertullian, it may be the more depended on for exhibiting a state of things very unfavourable to what was called the orthodoxy of that age. And it was not the doctrine of Arius, but that of Paulus Samosatenis, that Athanasius is here complaining of.

These humble christians of Origen, who got no farther than the shadow of the logos, the simplices, and idiote of Tertullian, and the persons of low understanding of Athanasius, were

* Λυπεί δὲ ἐὰν τις αἰθεχμαίνεις τις σαφίς τιστέως, ἵπτει των αὐτῶν βλασφήμων βλατῆσαι τις πόλεμος, μαλακτίς τις πλατωμαίνεις στέρει τις τισιν. Τὸ γὰρ μεγάλα ἡ δυσκαλλία τῶν πραγμάτων τισεί τις τις πόλος τοῦ Ἰσων καμπανίαν. Οὕνεκα οἱ περι τις τις ρώμεων αδικαθεῖς ἀποτανίδεως, εἰ μὴ πενθεῖς εἰμαινεῖς τὴν τισείν, ἢ τις σεπερραγες ὀδηγεῖς εἰκαπεσθεί. De Incarnatione verbi contra Paulum Samosatenem, Opera, vol. 1. p. 591.
probably the *simplices credentium* of Jerom, who, he says, “did not understand the scriptures as became their majesty.” For had these simple christians (within the pale of the church) inferred from what John says of the logos, and from what Christ says of himself, that he was, personally considered, equal to the Father, Jerom would hardly have said, that “they did not understand the scriptures according to their majesty,” for he himself would not pretend to a perfect knowledge of the mystery of the trinity. “For these simple christians,” he says, “the earth of the people of God brought forth hay, as for the heretics it brought forth thorns.” For the intelligent, no doubt, it yielded richer fruits.

From all these passages, and others quoted before, I cannot help inferring, that the doctrine of Christ being anything more

than a man, the whole doctrine of the eternal logos, who was in God, and who was God, was long considered as a more abstruse and refined principle, with which there was no occasion to trouble the common people; and that the doctrine of the simple humanity of Christ continued to be held by the common people till after the time of Athanasius, or after the council of Nice. And if this was the case then, we may safely conclude, that the unitarians were much more numerous in a more early period, as it is well known that they kept losing, and not gaining ground, for several centuries.
CHAPTER XIV.

An Argument for the Novelty of the Doctrine of the Trinity, from the Manner in which it was taught and received in early Times.

The subject of this chapter properly belongs to the Twelfth, as it relates to a circumstance from which it may be inferred, that the unitarian doctrine was held by the majority of christians in the early ages; but I reserve it for a distinct consideration in this place, because it requires a more particular discussion, and will receive much light from what was advanced both in the Twelfth and Thirteenth chapters.

One proof of the antiquity of a doctrine is its being found among the common people, in preference to the learned; the former being the least, and the latter the most apt to innovate; so that from the doctrine of the simple humanity of Christ being held by the common people in the time of Tertul-
Chap. XIV. originally Unitarians. 273

lian, Origen, and Athanasius, it may be concluded with certainty, that it was the doctrine which they had received from their ancestors, and that it originated with the apostles themselves.

There is also another mark by which we may distinguish what opinions are new, and what are old, whenever they are apprehended to be of much consequence; and that is by the manner in which they are advanced by the patrons of them, and that in which they are received by those who disapprove of them. The innovator will be timid and modest, and the asserter of an old opinion will be bold and confident. A new opinion will alarm and terrify; but an old one will be treated with respect. This maxim we see exemplified every day, and in no case more remarkably than with respect to these very doctrines of the pre-existence and divinity of Christ.

If we look back into the state of things in this country about a century, or half a century ago, we shall find the trinitarians shocked at the doctrine of the humanity of Christ, and endeavouring to bear it down with
with the greatest confidence and violence. On the other hand, all the defences of what is called the Socinian doctrine, were written with the greatest modesty, and with the air and manner of an apology. Let us now, by this maxim, judge how things stood with respect to this very doctrine in the time of Justin Martyr, Origen, and Tertullian.

As the doctrine of the humanity of Christ was then chiefly held by the common people, who were not writers, and as no work of any unitarian, written after the controversy was started, has been preserved to us, we labour under great disadvantages in this respect. But notwithstanding this, circumstances now may be collected from the writings of the trinitarians, to enable us to judge how both themselves, and the unitarians, thought and felt with respect to it; and circumstances furnished in this indirect manner by adversaries, are often the least suspicious intimations of the real state of things.

On this principle, it will, I think, sufficiently appear, that it was with great difficulty that the generality of christians were recon-
reconciled to the doctrine of the deity of Christ, and that of the trinity in any form. It is evident, that the lower class of christians was much staggered by it, and exceedingly offended when they did hear of it; which could never have been the case if it had then been supposed to have been the doctrine of the apostles, and to have been delivered by them as the most essential article of christian faith, in which light it is now represented. Such terms as scandali- zare, expavescecre, &c. used by Tertullian, Novatian, &c. and ταιρασσευαυ, &c. by Origen, can only apply to the case of some novel and alarming doctrine, something that men had not been accustomed to. We may, therefore, take it for granted, that it had not been much heard of among the common people at least; and if so, that it had never been taught by the apostles.

Admitting that the apostles had taught any doctrines of a peculiarly sublime nature (which the Fathers pretend to have been the case with respect to the pre-existence and divinity of Christ) yet, as all their teaching was in public, and there were no secrets
among them (Paul, for instance, having solemnly assured the elders at Ephesus, that he had not shunned to declare unto them the whole council of God) the common people must at least have heard of these sublime doctrines, and have been accustomed to the sound of the language in which they were expressed. And had they known that those doctrines had been taught by the apostles to any of their body, though not to themselves, they would have learned to respect what they did not understand, and was not meant for their use. They could never have been offended and staggered at things which they and their fathers before them had always been in the hearing of.

I shall not recite in this place all the passages which show how much the common people were offended at the doctrines of the pre-existence and divinity of Christ. Many of them have already passed before the eye of the reader, and many others will be produced in different connexions. It will be found, that even at and after the council of Nice, the unitarians continued to speak their sentiments with the greatest freedom, and
and always exclaimed against the prevailing doctrines, as no less new than absurd. Little were those writers who have inadvertently recorded these circumstances aware of the value of the information which they were hereby giving to posterity. Had Tertullian, Origen, and others, thought more highly than they did of the common people, we should probably never have known from them what their opinions and feelings were. But, happily for us, these writers thought meanly of the common people, and speaking of them with contempt, or pity, have, without design, given us very useful and valuable lights into this very important circumstance in the history of their times.

I shall now give an account of the manner which the doctrines of the pre-existence and divinity of Christ were first proposed by the most learned and distinguished persons of their age; and we shall find that it was with much diffidence, and the air of an apology, as if they were sensible that the doctrines were new, and might not easily recommend themselves. For this purpose I shall, in the first place, produce an extract from
Ihe Gentile Christians, Book III.

from the writings of Justin Martyr, who was probably the first who publicly maintained these doctrines.

He represents Trypho as saying, concerning the doctrine of the incarnation, "it is so extraordinary, that it can never "be proved. That this Christ was a God, "existing before the ages, and then born "a man, is not only extraordinary, but ri- "diculous. To this I answered, I know "that this doctrine appears strange, and "especially to those of your race," that is, to the Jews*. It is evident from this pas- "fage, that Justin thought that this doctrine would appear strange to others, besides the Jews; and as he proceeds, it will appear that he took care not to lay too much stress on this new doctrine, lest he should not be able to prove it satisfactorily.

"It will not follow that he is not the "Christ, though I should not be able to prove


"that
that he pre-existed, as God, the Son of him that made all things, and that he became a man by the virgin; it being proved that he is the Christ, the Son of God, whoever he was; though I should not prove that he pre-existed, but was a man of the same passions with ourselves, having flesh, and being subject to his Father's will. It will be right to say, that in this only I have been mistaken, and not that he is not the Christ, though he should appear to be a man born as other men are, and to be made Christ by election. For there are some of our race, who acknowledge him to be Christ, but hold that he was a man born like other men. With them I do not agree, nor should I do so, though ever so many, being of the same opinion, should urge it upon me; because we are commanded by Christ himself, not to obey the teachings of men, but what was taught by the holy prophets and himself." Trypho says, "They who say that he was a man, born like other men, and that he became Christ by election," i.e. the appointment
of God, "seem to hold a doctrine more credible than yours. For all of us ex-
pect that Christ will be a man, born like "other men, and that Elias will come to "anoint him. If, therefore, this person "be the Christ, he must by all means be "a man born like other men*.

This diffidence of Justin agrees remark-
ably well with the supposition, that the

* Oui appellez le ton bein ena xriun to 08n ean apodetpaa mno 
ouvebouv ki kai parasthehe, ouc to tpmhe ton oivon Theos on, kai genet-
ptiai avdrpwtoj dia tis aorheus. Allia ex xarlio apodetupmenev oj 
iros eston o xrius o ton The, ouc iros ectai, ean de mou apodetupn oj 
parasthehe ki geniunwv avdrpwtoj evnoucathv onou, sapmo evou, kai 
tnu to xalwv thew, upemenev, en toiv xelplaiwvai me mouc xegwv 
dicas, allia mou aprowvai oj iros eston o xrius, eau fanovia ws av-
wpwtoj ex xalwv geniunwv, kai eklvug xevomev ex tis xriun ena 
apodetupmwe. Kai xar esti tin, w filoi elugov, apoto to xalwv xegwv 
evoucathv avurwv xriun ena, avdrpwtoj de ex avdrpwv xevome-
wev aprowvai. Ois, ou xalwv, ean an plaicov taiai moi xalw-
vwv evoupiv, exepidi ouc avdrpwtoj didapwvai dpexelvouba eni xalw 
tis xriun xevecomev, allia teis dia tov xarwv xalwv avwpwtoj ena 
parasthehov, allia teis dia tov xalwv xalwv avwpwtoj xevome-
wev aprowvai. Kai o Troupov, emi mou donwv, evon, 
i xalwv avdrpwtoj xevomev ena elugov kai kai elugov xepiudhov, kai 
xriun xevomev, xalwv xalwv, xalwv xalwv, dia xalwv, dia xalwv 
uph. KAI xar plaicov mou to xriun avdrpwtoj ex avdrpwv xalwv 
exelwv, kai tov Elias xevomev mou elugov, ean de iros 
fanovia on o xrius, avdrpwtoj mou ex avdrpwv xevomev ena elugov 

unitarians
unitarians were originally no less than the whole body of Christians, and that the trinitarians were the innovators, appearing at first modest and candid, as was natural while they were a small minority, though they grew bold and imperious when they became the majority.

Independently of any nice construction of this passage, we may safely say, that if the doctrine of the simple humanity of Christ had not been at least a very general opinion in the time of Justin, he would never have spoken of it with so much tenderness and respect as he has done, considering how very different it was from his own opinion, his defence of which has sufficiently the appearance of an apology. He even intimates some degree of doubt with respect to his opinion, when he says that, if he should not be able to prove it, the fundamental doctrine of Christianity, viz. that of the messiahship of Jesus, would not be affected by it. Why should he provide this retreat, if he had not had some secret suspicion of the ground on which he stood. He calls the unitarians some, as if they
they were the minority; but the term is indefinite, and may apply to the majority; and from the complexion of the whole passage, I have no doubt but that Justin was aware that it was so, and that, with a view to this, he added, that he should not be influenced by that consideration.

That Justin's language is that of a man who knew that he was advancing a new opinion, is evident, as I said, from the general air and complexion of it; and the more we attend to it, the more sensible we shall be of the justness of this construction.

1. Let it be considered, that in this place, as well as in his writings in general, he labours the proof of the pre-existence of Christ, shewing that it is consonant to the principles of Platonism, and also deducible from the writings of Moses, and other parts of the Jewish scriptures, without referring to any other writer in support of what he advances.

2. He does not use a single acrimonious expression against those who differed from him with respect to it, which is just as any man would do who should write in defence
of a novel, or not very prevalent opinion, and one, of which himself was the principal abettor.

3. He talks of not being overborne by the authority of any number of men, even his fellow christians, but would adhere to the words of Christ, and the sense of scripture; which is a style almost peculiar to those whose opinions are either quite novel, or at least not very prevalent.

4. The phrase, "neither do I agree with " the majority of christians, who may have " objected to my opinion," which is nearly the most literal rendering of the passage (though I would not be understood to lay much stress on that circumstance) will naturally be construed to mean that the majority actually did make the objection, or that Justin suspected they might make it.

When I consider these circumstances, and also how apt all persons are to make their own party more numerous than it really is, I am inclined to think that even, if the passage might bear such a construction as that Justin meant to insinuate that the majority were with him, yet that it would not be
be the most natural construction, or a sufficient authority to conclude that such was the fact. I therefore think that, upon the whole, the passage has all the appearance of an apology for an opinion different from that which in his time was commonly received on the subject.

I am no doubt, influenced in my construction of this particular passage by the persuasion that I have, from other independent evidence, that the unitarians were in fact, the majority of christians in the time of Justin; that he therefore knew this to be the case, and could not mean to insinuate the contrary. Another person having a different persuasion concerning the state of opinions in that age, will naturally be inclined to put a different construction upon this passage. In this case I only wish that he would suspend his judgment till he has attended to my other arguments, and afterwards he may perhaps see this passage in the same light in which I do.

The word \textit{\textquotedblleft I think,\textquotedblright} I think, refers to natural descent; and I therefore conclude that Justin here meant not christians in general, but
but Gentile christians in particular; because, as he is opposing the opinion concerning Christ, which made him to be a man born of men, not to the doctrine of the miraculous conception, but only to his pre-existence (though I think it probable, that most, if not all, who believed in the simple humanity, were also in that age believers in the natural birth of Christ) the only idea that he had in his mind, and to which he attended, was that of his simple humanity, and we have positive evidence that this was the doctrine of all the Jewish christians, so that he could not speak of some of them holding it and others not. Whereas the Gentile christians were divided on that subject; and some of them, even later than this, viz. in the time of Origen, held that in the strictest sense of the expression, Jesus was a man born of man, being the son of Joseph as well as of Mary. I therefore think that Justin meant the Gentile christians, omitting the Jewish christians, whose sentiments he might suppose to have been well known to the learned Jew, with whom he was con-
It was as if he had said, Not only do those christians who are of your race, viz. Jews, believe Christ to be a mere man, born as other men are, but there are also some of our race, viz. Gentile christians, who hold the same opinion.

I shall conclude this article with observing, that, without attending to minute criticisms, it is quite sufficient for my purpose, that these ancient unitarian christians, whether they held the miraculous conception or not, whether they were Jews or Gentiles, or whether Justin meant to represent them as strictly speaking the majority of christians, or otherwise, were not treated by him as heretics. From this circumstance alone, it may be concluded, that they were very numerous, because, whenever unitarians have not been very numerous, and have not made a respectable figure among christians, they have always been considered with great abhorrence, and have been cut off from communion with those of the orthodox persuasion.

With
With what rancour does Eusebius treat this class of Christians, both in his History, and in his Treatise against Marcellus of Ancyra, when we know from Athanasius, and other authorities, that they were at that time very numerous (though among the lower classes of people) and probably in all parts of the Christian world.

When these things are duly considered, it can hardly be imagined but that, let this passage in Justin be construed in any manner that the words can possibly bear, it will be sufficiently to my purpose, and authorize all the use that I have ever made of it. But I can very well spare the passage altogether, thinking that I have evidence enough of my general position without it.

If we consider the time in which Justin wrote, viz. about A.D. 140, that is, about eighty years after the time of the apostles, and compare it with the account that Tertullian and others give of the state of opinions among the Jews and Gentiles in their time, we can hardly doubt (whether Justin confesses it or not) that the doctrine of the simple humanity of Christ must
must have been the prevailing one in his time. According to the ancient Fathers, the Jews, meaning the Jewish christians, were so fully persuaded concerning the simple humanity of their Messiah, that the apostles did not choose to inform them, except in an indirect manner, that Christ was any thing more than a man, and the Gentiles were drawn by the Jews into the same opinion; and though John was supposed to speak more plainly, we find no effect from it.

Since, therefore, it was only an indirect evidence of the divine or super-angelic nature of Christ, that the Jewish christians (by whom the gospel was communicated to the Gentiles) were ever favoured with; can it be thought probable, so highly averse as the account itself states the Jews to have been to the idea of any super-human nature in Christ, that they should, by their own reasoning alone on the subject, have generally abandoned their favourite doctrine in so short a time as four score years? Or, if from some most unaccountable cause, and without any person of great authority to lead them,
them to it (for no such authority can we trace) they should have abandoned their original and favourite doctrine, is it probable that they would have been so extremely active and successful in the propagation of their new opinion, and withal have found the Gentiles so very pliant as to have been able to induce the generality of them to make the same change, when at the same time they are known to have had but little connexion, and indeed but little respect for each other? Is a period of eighty years naturally sufficient for these two successive changes?

But if we take another well authenticated circumstance, we shall be obliged to reduce this short space (too short as it already is for the purpose) to one still shorter. Hegesippus, as explained by Valesius, in his notes on Eusebius's ecclesiastical history, says, that the church of Jerusalem continued a virgin, or free from heresy, till the death of Simeon, who succeeded James the Just, that is, till the time of Trajan, or about the year 100, or perhaps 110, for his reign began A. D. 98, and ended A. D.
117. Knowing, therefore, from other circumstances, what this purity of christian faith was, and what Hegesippus must have known it to be, we have only the space of forty, or perhaps, thirty years for so great a change. So rapid at that particular period must have been that movement, which we find by experience to be naturally one of the very slowest in the whole system of nature, viz. the revolution of opinions in great bodies of men. Can it then be thought probable that, considering the Jewish and Gentile christians as one body, the generality of them should have abandoned the doctrine of the simple humanity of Christ, in the time of Justin Martyr.

On the contrary, it is certainly not at all improbable, that the more learned and philosophical of the christians, beginning to be ashamed of a crucified man for their saviour, and firmly believing the doctrine of the pre-existence of all souls, and of their descent into human bodies, should have begun to fancy that Christ must have had some origin superior to that of other men, that this should first of all produce the
the opinions of the Gnostics, who thought that the Christ, who came down from heaven, was quite distinct from the man Jesus, and felt nothing of his pains or sorrows; or that these opinions being rejected through the authority of the apostles, the generality of Christian teachers or bishops (many of whom were educated in the Platonic school at Alexandria) should afterwards apply the Platonic doctrine of the logos to the same subject, and that by their influence, opinions leading to the deification of Christ should gradually gain ground among the common people. But this must have been a work of time, so that the majority of Christians could hardly have been infected with these principles so early as the time of Justin Martyr.

Irenæus, who wrote forty years after Justin, makes no mention of any Gentile Unitarians, in his works against heresy, but only of the Ebionites; and what he says of them is a very small proportion of the whole of his work. And almost all the orthodox Fathers, both before and after the council of
of Nice, make laboured apologies for their seeming to teach the doctrine of *more Gods than one*. This circumstance is a sufficient indication that the trinitarians were then the minority, as their violence and insolence afterwards shows, that if they were not the majority, at least they had the advantage of *power* in their favour.

As the advocates for the doctrines of the pre-existence and divinity of Christ, advanced it with caution and with apology, as being sensible that they were not likely to be well received; so, on the other hand, it appears that the unitarians did express the greatest *dread* of them, as the introduction of *polytheism*. Several instances of this have been produced already, and others will appear in different connexions, especially when I shall show the zeal with which the ancient unitarians defended their tenets. But I shall in this place introduce a few others.

Origen says, "Because it is probable that some will be *offended* with our saying, that the Father being called the only true God, there are other gods besides him partaking of..."
of his divinity*. Novatian speaks of the unitarians as scandalized at the doctrine of the divinity of Christ †. And the state of things was not different about the time of the council of Nice. Eusebius, in his controversy with Marcellus, says, "If they are afraid of making two Gods ‡."

Some for fear of introducing a second "God, make the Father and the Son the "same". Marcellus, for fear of saying "there are two Gods, denies the Son to be a "separate person §."

And again, "But you

* Αλλ' επει ειναι προκοφειν τινας τοις ειρημενοις, ενος μεν ελεημων θεον την αθικην απεγεγελλαμενα, απαρα δε τον ελεημον θεον θεων αλεημων τη μελαχη τηθα γυναμεναν. Comment. vol. 2. p. 47.

† Sed quia obliquantes adversus veritatem semper haeretici sinceræ traditionis, et catholicæ fidei controversiam solent trahere, scandalizati in christum quod etiam deus et per scripturas adseratur, et a nobis hoc esse credatur, merito a nobis, ut omnis a fide nostra auferri possit haeretica calumnia, de eo quod et deus fit Christus, sic eft disputandum, ut non impediat scriptura veritatem Cap. 30. p. 115.

‡ Et de φεσθεν αυτοις εμποτει, μη τινα αρα ουθ ορασασαει δοξιν. Ec. Theol. lib. 1. cap. 11. p. 69.

§ Ο τινι γαρ, δει τινι δυο θεον επεειν, την αρετην την υμη αριθμουδελον, την νυστασιν αθειον αυθιν. Ibid. cap. 10. p. 69.
"are dreadfully afraid left you should be obliged to acknowledge two hypostases of the Father and Son."

In short, it appears that the ancient unitarians entertained the same dread of the doctrine of the divinity of Christ, that the trinitarians of this day do of that of his simple humanity; a proof that each of them had been brought up in the persuasion of the opinions they held, being the doctrine of their ancestors, and of the apostles. In this the ancient unitarians could not be mistaken, but the trinitarians of the present age may very well be so. Whether, therefore, we consider the feelings of the unitarians, or those of the trinitarians of the early ages, we perceive evident traces of the former maintaining an old opinion, and the latter a new one.

CHAPTER XV.

Objections to the preceding State of Things considered.

That I may conceal nothing from my readers that can tend to throw any light on this subject, I shall fairly state every objection that I have yet met with, to any part of the evidence that I have produced.

SECTION I.

Of the Testimony of Eusebius to the Novelty of the Unitarian Doctrine.

It is alleged by Eusebius, the historian, or rather Caius (who is supposed to be the author that he quotes, and who, Photius says*, wrote The Little Labyrinth,

* Γαις τινος προστάτης ειν Ρωμη διάφευγον ου φασι συλλαβει ει του λαβυρινθου.—Τον λαβυρινθου τινες επηγαζαν Οριγενος, επει Γαις εις αυτομα. Bib. sect. 48. p. 35.

which
which is thought to be the work that Eusebius copied from) is so far from confirming this account of the great antiquity of the unitarians, that he expressly asserts that they were a modern sect. That this charge, with the evidence, may be fairly before the reader, I shall quote the passage in which it is contained at full length.

"Artemon made Christ a mere man. "They who hold this doctrine pretend that "it is very ancient; for they say that all "the primitive christians, and the apostles "themselves, received and taught it, and "that the truth was preserved till the time "of Victor, the thirteenth bishop of Rome "from Peter, but that it was corrupted in "the time of his successor Victorinus. "This might appear probable, if, in the "first place, the sacred scriptures were not "against it; and if there were not writings "of christians now extant, older than the "time of Victor, which they wrote against "the heathens and against heresies. I mean "those of Justin, Miltiades, Tatian, Clemens, "and many others, in all of which Christ is "spoken of as a God. Who is unacquainted "with
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"with the writings of Irenæus, Melito, and " others, speaking of Christ as God and " man? How many psalms and hymns also " are there, written by christians from the " beginning, in which Christ is celebrated " as a God—How were they not ashamed " to speak thus falsely of Victor, knowing " very well that Victor excommunicated " Theodotus, the leader and father of that " God-denying hereby, who first said, that " Christ was a mere man *."

* Τὴν γὰρ τοῦ δεδημωμένου αἱτεών άποκριτον γνωσθαι τον σώφρον φασκοσιαν καὶ πρὸ σωληνον νεωλισμεναν διευνοσι. Επειδὴ σεμινωσιν αὖν ως καὶ αρχαῖαν οἱ ταυτάς θέλον εισηγηθαί. Φασι γὰρ τῆς μὲν αρχαίας απαθίας καὶ αὖν τῆς αποστολῆς παρεισπνηκαί τε καὶ διεδεχόμεναι ταύτα, αὐτὴν οὖν λεγαί· καὶ τείρησθαι τον αληθείαν τινα ευρηματικόν μεχρί των Βιβλίων χρονών, ως τὸν τρισμεναίαν απὸ Πέρικρόν Ραμί τοις επισκόποις. απὸ δὲ τὰς διάδοχας αὐτὰς Ζεφύριον, σαφηνεχα- 
ραξία χριστίαν. η δὲν τοῖς παντίνοις τὸ λεγόμενον, εἰ μὴ πρώτων μὲν αδελφιτίων αὐτοῖς αὐτὶ γράφετε· καὶ αδελφῶν δὲ τιμῶν εἰς γραμ- 
μάδα προσέλθειν των Βιβλίων χρονών, αὐτὸν οὖν παρὰ τὰ έκείνα ὑπερ τῆς 
αληθείας, καὶ πρὸς τὰς τὸν αἰσθήματα εγκαταλέγειν. λεγὼ δὲ Ιστινιν καὶ Μικ- 
τιανοῦ τούς, Κλωνίδους καὶ Κλήμεντος καὶ έλεον των εἰκόνων εἰς αὐτοῖς διευκο- 
τάθαι ο θερις, τα γαρ Εὐρυκαίει τοὺς Μελανην καὶ τῶν λαγών τινώς αὐ- 
στοι βιβλία, θεοῦ καὶ αὐρωποῦ καταγειλόντα τον χριστόν, φανοῖ δὲ 
όσοι καὶ γράφουσι αὐτοῖς πρὸς τοὺς γράφοντας, τον λογον τοῦ θεοῦ 
τοῦ χριστοῦ γνωσθεί θεολογίας. Ποιὲς δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸς ταύτα Βιβλίων κα- 
ταλείπετος, ακριβῶς εὑρίσκει, διὰ Βιβλίων τὸν σεβαλέα θεολογῶν τον αρχηγὸν 
καὶ ταύτας ταύτας τῆς αρνηθέος αποστασίας, απειρωμένα τῶν κοινωνιῶν,
In these passages we have an account of the claims of the ancient unitarians to the high antiquity of their doctrine. And it has been seen that, by the general acknowledgment of the Fathers, and of Eusebius himself, among the rest, that the first doctrine that was taught by the apostles, was that of the simple humanity of Christ; and that his divinity was very little known till it was published by John, after the death of the other apostles. Eusebius, therefore, denying it in this case, is not at all to be regarded, since it is contrary to all other evidence, and also to the reason of the thing, as I have abundantly proved, unless he had brought some sufficient proof to counteract that evidence. What he has offered of this kind I shall distinctly consider, after I have produced a passage from Theodoret, in which he also mentions the claim of the unitarians to the antiquity of their doctrine.

"Artemon," he says, "taught that Christ was a mere man, born of a virgin, and ex-
"calling the prophets in virtue. This, he
"says, the apostles taught, perverting the
"sense of the sacred scriptures, but that
"those who came after them made a God of
"Christ, who was not God*." It appears
also from Eusebius's answer to Marcellus,
that he also charged his opponents with
holding a new doctrine, and scrupled not to
call that doctrine heresy †.

The first argument of Eusebius is, that
the sacred scriptures are against the unita-
rians. This, however, is a matter of opin-
ion, in which he might be, and I doubt not
was, mistaken. He then mentions the
writings of some persons who held the doc-
trines of the pre-existence and divinity of
Christ, viz. Justin, Miliades, Tatian, and

* Τὸν δὲ κυρίον Ἰσων χριστὸν αὐθροποιοῦσι ηπιτελοῦν, εὐ παρθενὶ γε-
νεμένον, τὸν δὲ παροικίων εὐρέθνυθαι. ταῦτα δὲ τῇ τῆς αποστολὴς
ἐλεγε κεκρυκέναι, παραπομποῦν τῶν θείων γραφῶν τὴν διάνοιαν, τὴν
dὲ μὲν εἰρενίς θεολογίαν τὸν χριστὸν, εὐ παρθενὶ θεοῦ. Haer. Fab. lib. 2.

† Ἡλιον γὰρ τῇ αὐθροπίῳ λογῳ ὁμοὐν, ὅτι δὲ ἦν ἄλλως
ζωὴς εὐφηγεία, τὸν χριστὸν εἰσαὶ ὁμολογεῖν εὐθείως τῇ ἐπείδη τοῖς
ἐνεποιεῖσθαι τῶν αἵρεσιν, &c. Contra Marcellum, lib. 1.
p. 19.

Clemens.
Clemens. But of these Justin was the oldest, and it is not denied that he did hold those doctrines, being probably the first who advanced them. Who the Clemens is that he mentions, he does not say; but had it been Clemens Romanus, it is probable that he would have placed him first, the rest being named in the order of time in which they flourished; and besides, there is nothing in the epistle of Clemens that is in the least favourable to those doctrines. Consequently, it must have been Clemens Alexandrinus that he intended, and therefore the highest antiquity of the doctrine of the divinity of Christ that Eusebius could prove, is that of Justin.

Pearson makes no difficulty of contradicting Eusebius in this case. His opponent, Mr. Daillé, having said, if that account be true, he replies, "He knew very well that, strictly speaking, it was not true; for he knew many others, long before Theodotus, and not a few even before Ignatius, who taught the same heresy, a catalogue of whom may be seen in"
in Epiphanius*," and whom he proceeds to mention.

Eusebius's reply to Marcellus’s charge of novelty is equally unsatisfactory, as he only, in a general way, refers to writings older than those of Origen, in all which he says he found the same faith †.

As to the hymns used by christians, and said by Eusebius to have been from the beginning, no inference can be safely drawn from them, because divinity may be ascribed to persons in very different senses, and some of them very innocent ones, especially in

* Theodotum novisse rursus perneco. Dallæus ipse dubitantem hæc proponit, si vera sunt, inquit, que Caius, füve alius apud Eusebium scriptor vetustissimus dicit, Theodotum scilicet primum afferuisse Christiumuisse nudum hominem; ipse enim optime novit hæc, si stricte fumantur, vera non esse: novit alios quamplurimos diu ante Theodotum, non paucos etiam ante Ignatium, cændem hæredin promulgasse, quorum catalogus apud Epiphanium legitur. Vindiciæ, lib. 2. cap. 2. p. 24.

† Ega de et ωριγενὸς περακιδέρων αὐτῶν, καθενος ὡς εἰς εἰκονισθηκεν τῷ ἔλεγχῳ, εἰς πάντων το και συνεδρίᾳ εἰς οὐκ ἐπικαλάρει γεφειακε, δι' αὐτὸς τὸ τῆς χαιρετισμος καρπό επιτελεῖται, ἐν όρθος αὐτὸ διάβηκαν εἰς τῶν επιτεχνικῶν των μνείας τῶν διεβαλλομένων. Contra Marcellum, lib. 1. p. 20.
the language of poetry; and as to the antiquity of these hymns, as the historian has not mentioned the age of them, it is very possible, for any thing that appears to the contrary, that they might have been those very hymns which were rejected by Paulus Samosatensis on account of their novelty.

It is likewise alleged, that Pliny says, that "the christians on a certain day, before " it was light, met to sing a hymn to Christ " as to God (or a God) *." But as to this writer, if he had been told that hymns were sung by christians in honour of Christ, being himself a heathen, he would naturally imagine that they were such hymns as had been composed in honour of the heathen gods, who had been men. He would be far from concluding from that circumstance, that Christ was considered by his followers either as the supreme God, or as a pre-existent spirit, the maker of the world under God.

* Affirmabant autem hanc fuifle summam vel culpæ sumæ, vel erroris, quod effent soliti statu die, ante lucem convenire; carmenque Christo, quasi deo, dicere. Epist. 97.
Of the Excommunication of Theodotus by Victor.

THE argument that is urged with the most plausibility against the antiquity of the unitarian doctrine, is that which is drawn from the excommunication of Theodotus, by Victor, bishop of Rome, about the year 200; as it may be said, that this bishop, violent as he was, would not have proceeded to the public excommunication of a man whose opinions were not generally obnoxious.

I wish that we had a few more particulars concerning this excommunication of Theodotus, as it is the first of the kind that is mentioned in history. It is to be observed, that it is not Caius, the writer quoted by Eusebius, who says that he was excommunicated on account of his being an unitarian, but Eusebius himself *; so that,


considering
considering the writer's prejudices, there may be some room to doubt, whether he was excommunicated on that account.

The unitarians, it has been seen, said that Victor favoured their doctrine, and this we find asserted in the Appendix to Tertullian's Treatise, *De Praescriptione*, which, whether written by Tertullian himself, or not, is probably as good an authority as that of Eusebius. He says that, after the two Theodotus's, "Praxeas introduced his heresy into Rome, which Victorinus endeavoured to strengthen. He said that Jesus Christ was God the Father omnipotent, that he was crucified, suffered, and died, &c. *" Victorinus, in this passage, Beaufobre says †, it is agreed, should be Victor, and it cannot be supposed, that he would have patronized in Praxeas the same doctrine for which he had before excommunicated Theodotus. The probabi-

---


† *Histoire de Manicheisme*, vol. I. p. 533.
lity, therefore, is, that Theodotus was excommunicated on some other account than that of his being an unitarian.

Theodotus having been excommunicated as an unitarian, is not consistent with that general prevalence of the unitarian doctrine in the time of Tertullian (which was also that of Victor) which we have seen that Tertullian expressly asserts. However, the account of Eusebius, though improbable, may be admitted without denying that of Tertullian, when the circumstances attending them are duly considered.

Tertullian lived in Africa, where there seems to have been a greater inclination for the unitarian doctrine than there was at Rome; as we may collect from the remarkable popularity of Sabellius in that country, and other circumstances. Athanasius also, who complains of many persons of low understanding favouring the same principle, was of the same country, residing chiefly in Egypt; though he had seen a great part of the Christian world, and was, no doubt, well acquainted with the state of it.
We should likewise consider the peculiarly violent character of Victor, who was capable of doing what few other persons would have attempted; being the same person who excommunicated all the eastern churches, because they did not observe Easter at the same time that the western churches did, for which he was much censured by many bishops, even in the west.

Such an excommunication as this of Theodotus was by no means the same thing with cutting a person off from communion with any particular church, with which he had been used to communicate. Theodotus was a stranger at Rome, and it is very possible that the body of the christian church in that city did not interest themselves in the affair; the bishop and his clergy only approving of it. For I readily grant that, though there were some learned unitarians in all the early ages of christianity, the majority of the clergy were not so.

Theodotus, besides being a stranger at Rome, was a man of science, and is said by the unitarians to have been well received by Victor at first; so that it is very possible
possiblē that the latter might have been instigated to what he did by some quarrel between them, of which we have no account.

Upon the whole, therefore, though Victor excommunicated this Theodotus, who was a stranger, and had, perhaps, made himself conspicuous, so as to have given some cause of umbrage or jealousy to him, it is very possible that a great proportion of the lower kind of people, who made no noise or disturbance, might continue in communion with that church, though they were known to be unitarians.

There is no instance, I believe, of any person having been excommunicated for being an unitarian before Theodotus.—Whereas, had the universal church been trinitarian from the beginning, would not the first unitarians, the first broachers of a doctrine so exceedingly offensive to them, as in all ages it has ever been, have experienced their utmost indignation, and have been expelled from all christian societies with horror.

X 2    SEC-
SECTION III.

Of the Part taken by the Laity in the Excommunication of the early Unitarians, and other Considerations relating to the Subject.

It is particularly remarkable, that we read of none of the laity having been excommunicated on account of their unitarian principles, which they were well known to hold. And whenever any of the bishops were deposed on this account, it is also remarkable, that the common people appear to have been their friends. None of the laity were excommunicated along with Noetus, about A. D. 220, with Sabellius, about A. D. 255. (See Lardner's Credibility, vol. 4. p. 593.) Paulus Samosatensis, A. D. 269, or Photinus, A. D. 344, &c. After the bishops had deposed Paulus Samosatensis, it is observable, that only sixteen signed the condemnation (Eusebii, Hist. lib. 7. cap. 30. p. 359) and he could not be expelled from the episcopal house till
till the aid of the emperor Aurelian was called in; and be may be supposed to have been offended at him for his having been in the interest of his rival Zenobia. This could not have been necessary, if the majority of his people had not been with him, and therefore, if his deposition had not, in fact, been unjust.

Besides, the prosecution of Paulus Samosatensis, as Dr. Lardner has observed, was vehemently urged by his presbyter Malchion, who had a quarrel with him. Having been disoblige[d], he could not be satisfied till he was deposed. Credibility, vol. 4. p. 624. "He wrote, says Jerom, the large epistle in the name of the council. Paul had many friends and admirers among the bishops and presbyters of the neighbouring churches and villages, and was much beloved and admired by others," Ibid. p. 640. He could not be expelled in the first council, in 264, when Firmilian of Cappadocia and Gregory of Neocæsarea were present; and Firmilian was dead at the time of the second council, in 269 or 270. Ibid. p. 534. Dr.
Dr. Lardner's account of Paulus Samosafensis, is as follows:

"As we have not now before us any of Paul's writings, and have his history from adversaries only, we cannot propose to judge distinctly of his talents, nor draw his character at length. However, from the several particulars before put down, and collected from divers authors, some things may be concluded. And I apprehend that, laying aside for the present the consideration of his heterodoxy, we shall not mistake much if we conceive of him after this manner. He had a great mind, with a mixture of haughtiness, and too much affection for human applause. He was generally well respected in his diocese, and by the neighbouring bishops, in esteem with the great, and beloved by the common people. He preached frequently, and was a good speaker. And from what is said by the Fathers of the council, of his rejecting, or laying aside, some hymns, as modern, and composed by moderns, it may be argued, that he was a critic, which is a valuable accomplishment."
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"ment at all times, especially when un-
"common." Ibid. p. 644.

He adds, in a note, "A learned writer
"among the moderns (viz. Garnier) whom
"I did not think of when I drew the above
"character, confirms almost every part of it.
"For he allows Paul to have possessed the
"third see in the church, and to have had
"the patronage of a great princefs, an ap-
"pearance of piety, reputation for learning,
"flowing eloquence, and the favour of the
"multitude."

As to Photinus, he was so popular in his
diocefe, that his solemn deposition by two
councils, could not remove him from his
see. "He defended himself," says Tele-
mont (Hist. of the Arians, vol. i. p. 116.)
"against the authority of the church, by
"the affection which his people had for
"him, even to the year 351, though his
"hersfy began to appear as early as 342, or
"343, according to Socrates; and the Eu-
"febians condemned it in one of their con-
"ffions of faith, in 345." At length the
Emperor Constantius, a zealous Arian,
thought it necessary to interfere, and to get

X 4

him
him banished, in a council held at Sirmium itself. Had the body of christians in those times been generally trinitarians, the common people would, no doubt, have been ready enough to take an active part against their heretical bishops.

As to Eusebius charging heretics with teaching *new doctrines*, he is remarkably inaccurate and inconsistent with himself in that respect, and so, indeed, are all the other ecclesiastical historians. No unitarian is mentioned, but he is said to have been the first to have taught the unitarian doctrine. This language is held even with respect to Photinus, the very last of the celebrated unitarians. But it is possible, as I have observed before, that by *novelty* these writers might sometimes mean nothing more than heresy.

The charge of teaching the unitarian doctrine as a novelty, is first advanced against Beryllus, bishop of Bostra in Arabia, who, perhaps, was the first who wrote in defence of the doctrine, that of the divinity of Christ beginning at that time to be prevalent. Eusebius says of him, that

he
"he introduced things new and strange to 
the catholic faith; having dared to assert, 
that our Lord and Saviour did not pre-
exist in his own distinct person before his 
incarnation, that he had no proper divi-
nity of his own, but that of the Father 
only abiding in him *.

Sozomen also says, that Marcellus intro-
duced a new doctrine, that " the Son of 
God had his beginning with his birth of 
Mary;" and yet, in the same section, he 
says of him, that he adopted the opinion of 
Paulus Samosatenis †.

The same writer calls Photinus the in-
troducer of a new herefy, when, in the same 
chapter, he says, that he held the same opi-

* Βερυκλος ὁ μικρὸς προσάδειν δεδωκομεν Βοσρων της Ἀρχαγας 
επισκοπης, τὸν ἐκκωλοσιακον παρατεταν κανονα, ἔχειν τινα της 
πιθεσις παρευσφερειν επιειραλο. τὸν σώθρα κη κυριον ημων λεγειν τελικω 
μα προθετανει καλι, ἵδιαν ετιας περιγραφης, προ της εις ανθρωπος 
επιθημας, μηδε μην θεοθη ειδιαν εχειν, αλλ' εμπολυνουμεν αυθα μονω 

† Εν δε τω τω του μαρκελου άγιους επισκοπου της Γαλατων 
εις κανων θεματων εινηρητης, κη του ημων τη ζεως λεγολα εκ Μαρια 
την αρχην ειναφεια—Εις την Παυλη τη Σαμοσατης εξεκυλωθη 
δοξην. Hist. lib. 2. cap. 33. p. 91, 92.
Photinus is also charged with being the author of his own opinion by Socrates †; and yet he had before mentioned him as a disciple of Marcellus ‡.

As to the general testimony of Eusebius, and other writers, who were themselves believers in the pre-existence and divinity of Christ, that the primitive church was orthodox in their sense of the word, it is not, as I said, to be regarded, unless they bring some sufficient proofs of their assertion. They were, no doubt, willing to have it thought so, and, without considering it very particularly, might presume that it was so. But the facts which they them-

* Ηδί προσεδον καὶ υπὸς αὐτοὺς εἰσιπημένς γενομένος.—Ως τα Σα- 
  
† Τὸ δὲ ἐν Ἡρωεινοῖς ὅ τις εἰκεν ἐκκλησίας προσεδον, τὸ παρεπ-
  
‡ Φωτεινὸς γιὰ τὸν εἰκεν ἐκκλησίας προσεδον, γενός τῆς μικρᾶς Γαλα-
  
§ εῖναι, τὸν καθήμενον μισθίας, αἰσθηθῶν τὸν διδασκάλιον, 
  
†† εἰς τὸν τινὶ ἐνσηματισε. Ἡσὶν. lib. 2. cap. 29. 
  
| p. 98. | selves |
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felves record, and the account which they give of the apostles in divulging the orthodox doctrine with so much caution, make it impossible to have been as, in general terms, they assert. I am even surprized that any person should lay the least stress on the mere assertion of a writer in this case, when it is so common for men to represent the opinions of those whose authority they know to be great, as being the same with their own. Every man should be heard with caution in such a case, and what he says on one occasion, should be compared with what he says on another, and especially with what he drops, as it were, accidently, and when he was off his guard.

This may certainly be said in favour of the unitarians, that they did not contradict themselves on this subject, but uniformly maintained, that theirs was the ancient doctrine, transmitted to them from the apostles; whereas Eusebius manifestly contradicts himself. He certainly knew that Justin Martyr had not only mentioned unitarians, as existing in his time, but had also treated them with much respect; and to
to say nothing of his own testimony, to the apostle John having been the first who taught with clearness, and consequently with effect, the doctrine of the divinity of Christ; he himself speaks of the Ebionites as cotemporary with Cerinthus, who by his own account lived in the time of the apostle John*

That Eusebius should take so violent a part, as he always does, against the ancient unitarians, is not difficult to be accounted for. He was himself strongly suspected of Arianism, at a time in which the Athanasian doctrine was prevalent, and though a learned man, he was not of the firmest tone of mind. In these circumstances, he would naturally make the most of such pretensions to orthodoxy as he had, and would be inclined to shew his zeal by invectives against those who were more heretical than himself. This we see illustrated every day. This was the cause why many of the reformers from popery joined with the papists, in the persecution of those who were desirous of carrying the reformation farther than them-

* Hist. lib. 3. cap. 27, 28. p. 121, &c.
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selves. This might, in some measure, contribute to produce the zeal of the Calvinists against the Arminians, that of the Arminians against the Arians, that of the Arians against the Socinians, and that of Socinus himself against Francis David.

It may be said, that if the great majority of christians in early times were unitarians, why did they not excommunicate the innovating trinitarians. I answer, that the doctrine of the trinity, was not, in its origin, such as could give much alarm, as I have already explained; and it was not obtruded upon the common people as an article of faith necessary to their salvation, or indeed as a thing which they were at all concerned to know. And before it became very formidable, there was a great majority of the learned and philosophizing clergy on its side. However, that it did give very great alarm, as it began to unfold itself, I have produced the most undeniable evidence.
CHAPTE R XVI.

Of the State of the Unitarian Doctrine after the Council of Nice.

THAT the unitarians constituted the great body of christians till the time of Justin Martyr, and that they were the majority at least of the common people till about the time of the council of Nice, has, I presume, been proved to as much satisfaction as the circumstances of the case could be expected to admit. There is every reason to believe that it was so a priori, a great number of circumstances, applied by the clearest axioms of historical criticism, shew that it must have been so. And there is likewise the strongest positive testimony to the fact, from some of the most considerable christian writers. The unitarians were the major pars credentium, in
Chap. XVI. originally Unitarians.

the time of Tertullian, they were the το ἀνθρώπου, the multitude, and the τα ἄνθρωπα, the multitudes of Origen, and the αἱ πολλα, the many of Athanasius.

According to Eutychius, who is said to have compiled his annals from the archives of the church of Alexandria, there must have been more unitarian bishops than the Greek historians give us any account of. He says, that "there were two thousand and forty eight bishops assembled at the council of Nice, some of whom were Sabellians, who believed that Christ had no being before he was born of the virgin; others saying that God was one substance called by three names, but not believing in the word, or the Holy Spirit, which," he says, "was the opinion of Paulus Samosatenis; and that Constantine having heard their opinions, but approving of that of three hundred and eighteen, who held the same doctrine, he appointed them to meet in a large room, and gave them power to make decrees." The same account Selden, the publisher of Eutychius,
chius, found in an Arabian and christian writer, named Joseph, and also in a celebrated Mahometan historian, Ismael Ebn Ali.

This account, though seemingly very different from that of the other ecclesiastical historians, Beaufobre thinks may be reconciled with it, if it be supposed that the bishops of villages, presbyters, and those who were deemed heretical, were not allowed to have a seat with the rest*. Wormius, he observes, says that no sectary was allowed to give his opinion in that council †.

* Histoire de Manicheisme, vol. i. p. 531.
† Mittens ergo Constantinus rex in omnes passim regiones patriarchas et episcopos convocavit, adeo ut post annum et duos menses, Niceæ convenirent bis mille quadraginta octo episcopi, sententiis et religionibus inter se discrepantes.—Erant qui dicerent chrietum a patre esse, instar flamme ignis quæ ab igne flammante dependeret, nec prioris diminuere posterioris ab ipso derivationem. Erat que haec Sabellii et affectarum ipsius sententia.—Alii chrietum hominem suisse a divinitate creatum ejusdem cum nostrum aliquo substantiæ, filiique principium a Maria suisse, ipsumque elec tum qui substantiæ humanæ liberator esset, comitante ipsum gratia divina, et in ipso per
That the unitarians were exceedingly numerous in the time of Athanafius, or not long before it, especially in Africa, is evident from his complaints on the subject. He says that "in Pentapolis of Upper Lybia, per amorem et voluntatem habitante, ideoque appellatumuisse filium dei. Dicentes etiam deum sublantiam unam esse, et personam unam quae tribus nominibus appellatur, nec in verbum, nec in spiritum sanctum credentes: erat haec sententia Pauli Samofateni patriarchæ Antiochæni, ejusque sectatorum qui Pauliciani audient.—Alii (denique) accessoruerunt divinitatem Chrifi; quæ Pauli apostoli sententia est, nec non episcoporum trecentorum et octodecim, auditis ipsorum sententiis miratus est Confiuatus rex hanc discrepantiam, domoque ipsis deposita in qua loca ipsis paravit, disputationes ipsos habere jussit, ut perspecto apud quem vera esset fides, ipsum sequeatur. Illi ergo tercentum et octodecim in unam fiden, unamque sententiam confenserunt, cumque reliquis qui litem ipsorum moverunt disputantes, illis argumentis sui superiores evaferunt fidenque veram declararunt: reliqui autem episcopi sententiis et religionibus inter se diversi fuerunt. Rex ergo trecentis et octodecim episcopis satis loco quodam proprio et ampio parato, ipse in eorum medio confedit, acceptaque, annulum, gladium et sceptrum suum ipsis tradidit, dicens ipsis, vobis hodie in imperium meum potestatem concessi, ut in eo faciatis quicquid facere vobis expedit eorum quæ ad religionem rite stabilendam et fideliu commodum spectant. Seldens Eutychius, p. 439, 440, 443, 444.

Vol. III. X "some
"some of the bishops embraced the doc-
trine of Sabellius, and prevailed so much,
that the Son of God was hardly preached
in the churches."

SECTION I.

Of the State of the Unitarians from the Time of the Council of Nice, to the Sixth Century.

NOW proceed to mention the traces I have found of unitarians after the council of Nice. And notwithstanding their numbers certainly kept decreasing, owing to the prevalence of the trinitarian and Arian doctrines, each in their turns favoured by the civil powers (which it is remarkable, the unitarian doctrine never was in any age or country) it appears from circumstances, that the unitarians were in considerable numbers, some holding separate assemblies, but

many more concealed in the great body of christians, and joining their public worship.

It is highly probable that, even long after the doctrine of the divinity of Christ was established by councils, and the decrees of emperors, many of the common people were well known to believe nothing of the matter; and yet, if they made no disturbance, and did not think proper to separate themselves from the communion of the orthodox bishops, who were not authorized to propose any test to them, they were not excommunicated. In fact, they were considered by the more learned as simple ignorant people, who acquiesced in the doctrine of the humanity of Christ, because they were incapable of comprehending that of his divinity, and the sublime doctrine of three persons in one God. This circumstance, together with there being no distinguished writers among them, and also their being mixed and confounded with other sects, accounts for our hearing so little of them.

Many of the Montanists, besides Praxeas, against whom Tertullian wrote, were probably unitarians. Jerom represents the
Montanists in general, as "differing from " the orthodox in the rule of faith, and " agreeing with the Sabellians ."

Sandius says, that Noetus was said by some to have been the disciple of the Montanists †. According to Socrates, Eusebius said that they who disliked the term con-substantial at the council of Nice, charged their adversaries with favouring the sentiments of Sabellius and Montanus ‡ .

Nicephorus observes, that " Some Montanists were Sabellians." He also expressly says, that " they denied the personal existence of the Son, and that he was consubstantial with the Father || ."


† Hist. p. 97.

‡ Ο ι μεν γαρ τω ωμωσιν την λειν εκαλυψατε την Σαβελλιαν και Μοταναν δοξαν εινεγκασαν αυτη της αποστολικης ενομιζος. Και δια της επικρατηγος ευκαλυπτυ της ωμωσιν την υπαρξιν την ευχη της ζωης ναοις των εικων εισεγεται και καταληκτους εισαγεται της εικονος νομισματας, ως εικονισμον εισεγεται, εξηθεποιο. Hist. lib. 1. cap. 23. p. 57.

|| Οι μεν γαρ το ωμωσιν μη ειροομενοι, δοξαν ευχην τα Μοταναν και Σαβελλαν φεουν, της αυτω προσδιογεμενος αυτης εποιησε αυτοις.
Zonaras also says, that "Montanus, besides maintaining that himself was the paraclete, confounded the whole trinity, confounding it into one person." Lastly, Harmenopulus, in his account of sects, says expressly, that the disciples of Montanus reduced the holy trinity to one person.

Upon the whole, therefore, though Tertullian was a Montanist, and no unitarian, it may be concluded, that the prevailing sentiments of those who went by that name were unitarian. Sabellius himself is said by Nicephorus, to have learned his doctrine from some of the Montanists. According to the author of the Appendix to Tertullian's Treatise De Praescriptione, they were only those Montanists who followed...
loved Æschines, who were unitarians, while those who followed Proclus were not so.

The Donatists, also, who did not separate from the church on this subject, are yet said to have been afterwards heretical with respect to the trinity.

Jerom says, that Donatus himself wrote a book concerning the Holy Spirit agreeable to the Arian doctrine, which in this respect was the same as the unitarian. Austin also says, that he did not hold the catholic doctrine of the trinity, but that he was not generally followed by those who bore his name. Theodoret says, that the Donatists agree with the Arians.

* Sunt etiam qui Æschinem pronunciantur. Sunt qui secundum Æschinem pronunciantur—Privatam autem blasphemiam illi qui sunt Æschinem hanc habent, qua adjicient etiam hoc, ut dicant Christum ipsum esse filium et patrem. Sect. 52. p. 223.

† Cur autem solis Donatiftis, qui a schismate pro-

filuerunt in hæresim, ut possea etiam de baptismate et divina trinitate male sentirent. Facundus contra Moci-

anum, p. 199.

‡ Extant ejus multa ad suam hæresim pertinentia et de spiritu sancto liber, Ariano dogmati congruens. Cata-
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is, that both Montanus and Donatus, living at a time when the unitarian doctrine was generally received, held it themselves; though their followers, influenced by the same causes that affected other christians, gradually adopted the philosophical opinions.

That the Pelagians should be heretical, with respect to the doctrine of the trinity, will not be wondered at, (though Pelagius himself is said to have been orthodox in that respect) as the unitarians of all ages have adopted the sentiments of Pelagius with respect to human nature. Cassian, who met with them in Gaul, evidently considered them in this light. For he censures them as holding that "Christ was a mere man; and saying that men may live sinless lives, because Christ, who was a man, did so. They say, that Jesus became Christ after his baptism, and God after his resurrection; the one arising from his unction, the other from the merit of his passion."

* Addiderunt quoque dominum, salvatoremque nostrum post baptismum factum esse Christum, post resurrectionem deum: alterum assignantes unctionem mysterio, alterum
"Otherwise," he says, "we come to the Pelagian heresy, and say that God dwelt in Christ from a certain time, and came into him, when, by his life and conversation, he deserved that the power of the divinity should dwell in him."

Admitting this to be true to any considerable extent, it will not be doubted, but that the unitarians must have been very numerous, because the Pelagians were so. Perhaps the Pelagians, described by Cassian, might be inclined to the opinion of Nestorianus. But this, as I shall shew, did not differ from unitarianism with respect to the person of Christ.

* Terum merito passionis: unde advertit novus nunc jam, non novae hæreses auter, qui dominum salvatoremque nostrum solitarium hominem natum esse contendit, idem se omnino dicere quod Pelagianistæ ante dixerunt; et consequens errori suo esse, ut qui utique sine peccato solitarium hominem Jesum Christum vixisse afferit, omnes quoque per se homines sine peccato posse esse blasphemet. De Incarnatione, lib. 1. cap. 3. p. 966. See also p. 1017, 1018, 1066.

* Alioquin ad illam Pelagianæ hæreses impietatem devolvimur: ut dicamus ex certo tempore habitantem in Christo deum; tum in eum supervenisse, quando ille vita et conversatione id promeruerit, ut in se virtus divinitatis habitaret. Hær. lib. 5. cap. 4. p. 1022.
Marius Mercator says, that Julianus, a Pelagian, adopted the opinion of Theodorus, the master of Nestorius.

The simplicity of the unitarians is a circumstance by which they are generally noted; and by this they were likewise concealed, as giving no umbrage to any. But it does not follow, that because they were styled simple, they were persons of low understanding. Tertullian, who gave them that epithet, in answer to the Gnostics, who likewise applied it to the orthodox christians, says, "we are reckoned simple by them, but we are not therefore senseless." In a treatise ascribed to Athanasius, the more simple are represented as easily taken with the assertion, that God the


logos suffered in the flesh*. Basil represents "simplicity of faith as a bait with " which the ignorant are drawn to their de-
struction +." Writing on the subject of
the Holy Spirit, he begs that what he wrote " might be concealed from the vulgar, left " it should be throwing pearls before " swine ‡." Gregory Nazianzen also must have felt himself in the same situation, when he said, "Have we not suffered from the " mad populace §."

The doctrine of the trinity being consi-
dered as a sublime doctrine, the common people, who could not comprehend, or re-
lish it, but who at the same time made no disturbance in the church, would naturally

§ Οὐχ ἡμέρας μὴ δικαίωμα μικρομενον. Or. 32. p. 525.
be pitied and overlooked. Athanasius, considering the violence of his character, speaks of the unitarians with a good deal of tenderness, on account of the difficulty of understanding the doctrine of the trinity. I have quoted a passage from him, in which he represents them as (οι πολλοὶ) the many, and persons of a low understanding, but by no means as persons out of the church. Contrasting them with the Gnostics and the Arians, he says, "some persons considering "what is human in Christ, seeing him "thirsting, labouring, and suffering, and "degrading him to a mere man, sin indeed "greatly; but they may readily obtain for-" giveness if they repent, alledging the "weakness of the flesh; and they have the "apostle himself administering pardon to "them, and as it were holding out his hand "to them, while he says, Truly great is the "mystery of godliness, God was manifest in the "flesh."

* Οἶχεν τινες, εἰς τὰ αὐθαρσίας βλέποντες, ἵνας τον κυρίον διοικία, η ποιμνία, η σκυθία, ής μονον φυλαρχασσιν ὡς καὶ αὐθαρσίᾳ τη συλ- 

θε, αμαθαισσι μεν μεγαλως. δυναλαὶ δὲ ομος ταχειος μελαγιωσ-

κῶνες βαθμαὶς συγγραμμεν, εξορεὺς αποφασιν τιν τη σωματι- 

ιαν:
According to him many persons within the pale of the church, must either have been unitarians, or have believed the doctrine of the trinity without understanding it, which, in fact, is no belief at all. For, being consulted what was to be done with respect to the spread of the doctrine of Paulus Samosatensis, after acknowledging that persons of low understanding were chiefly infected with it, and quoting what Paul says of the great mystery of Godliness, God manifest in the flesh, he says, "those who understand the subject accurately are few, but all pious persons may hold the faith delivered to them." But what kind of holding must it be, when they had no perfect understanding of what they held.

Gregory Nazianzen also represents the common people as excusable for their errors,
and safe from not being disposed to scrutinize into things *

Unitarians, however, were far from being all of the common people, and unlearned. There were several considerable writers among them. "Beryllus of Bostra," Nicephorus says; "left elegant writings behind him †." Marcellus and Photinus distinguished themselves as writers, and Gregory Nazianzen says, that the heretics boasted of the number of their books ‡. Unhappily there are none of them now extant.

After the establishment of orthodoxy by Constantine, "all the sects," says Eusebius, "were forbidden to hold separate assemblies;" and among the rest the unitarians.

† Εἰς οἷς τε τὰς κατὰ Βασιλείαν αρχαῖαν πάντα ἤτοι Βερολίως, φιλοσοφεῖς τὸ διὰ συγγραμματεύματα καθαλευφασ.Hist. lib. 5. cap. 15. vol. 1. p. 363.
‡ Και τῷ πάλαις τῶν Βερολίων φιλοσοφικοῖς ἐπείδη δὲ τῷ πείρα τριᾶς φυσικῶν λόγων, καθαλευφασίας μεν οὖν, οὐ μὴν ὁμοίως ἑξετάσσομαι τοῖς ἀκόσμοις. Or. 50. p. 744.
Unitarians after Book III.

rians, called Paulians, are mentioned*. But this did not make them change their opinions. For he says that, after Constantine's edict against heresy, some, terrified with the emperor's threats, came into the church, dissembling on account of the times. "For, the law forbidding the "publication of their books, some who "were taken acting contrary to the law, "on that account, consulted their safety "by every dissimulation †."

This accounts for the great number of unitarians that Facundus mentions, as being in the church, in the time of Theodosius. Their opinions must have been well known, or he could not have been acquainted with

* Επιγγυείς των διὰ τῆς μονοθεσίας ταύτης ο Ναυαλάνιος, Ουκαλελαινοί, Μαρκιωνισαί, Παυλιανοί, οι καί τὰς θρύγγας επικεφαλίσμενοι, καὶ παρ' αυτοὺς τοῖς θεμιστίζεις διὰ τῶν οἰκείων παλαιστὶς συνηθιζόμενοι—επειδ' ἔστη ὁ οἰκουμήνη τῶν θεμιστίων ἐξαιτίας ἐπὶ ταῖς θυγείας τοῦ πασχάλου οἰκουμήνη ἐν εἰσὶν οἷον τε διὰ τὰ νομικά ταύτης ἐπικεφαλίσματα, μὴν μὴν συσταθείν τις ὅποις τοῦμα. De Vita Const. lib. 3. cap. 64. p. 621.

† Οἱ μὲν νομοθρηταῖς βασιλικὰς αποκάλυπτο ποιός, τὴν εὐκλείαν ὑπεδούλιον, τὸν νομόν καὶ ἑπίσκεψιν μεταβάται τῶν άνθρώπων ταῖς βίβλοις διαγιγνομένοι ο νομός η προσωπικοὶ τοῖς ἐπειρήμασις οἱ κακοδεχόμενοι μέλισσες, ὡς ἄρειν, παρ' ἐπισκόπου, εἰς τὴν Τιαν ορισθομενοί. Ibid. p. 622.
them; but they were not molested, while they did not molest others, and wished only to be quiet.

As the passage in his writings, from which I infer this, is a pretty remarkable one, I shall cite it at full length. Speaking of the condemnation of Theodorus (the master of Nestorius, whose system differed very little from that of unitarianism) in whose favour he is writing, he says, that "in condemning him, they condemned all those who thought as he did, even though they afterwards changed their opinion."

"—What will they do with Martha, and then with Mary, the sisters of Lazarus, who were particularly attached to our Lord, while he was upon earth. And yet both of them, first Martha, and then Mary, are said to have spoken to him thus, Lord, "if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died; who, though they thought that he was the Son of God, who was to come into the world, yet could they not have said, if thou hadst been here, if they had believed him to be God omnipresent."

"They therefore only thought as Theo-"
"dorus is said to have done, and were * excommunicated along with him. And * how many of this kind do we know, by * the writings of the apostles and evange- * lifts, there were at that time; and how * many even now are there still, in the * common herd of the faithful, who by * only partaking in the holy mysteries, * and by a simple observance of the com- * mands, we see pleasing God; when * even the apostles themselves, the first * teachers, only thought as those whom we * see to be included in this condemnation * of Theodorus *.

* Condemnaverunt omnes ab ipso in quem illum in- 
cidisse putant errore convertios.—Ubi quid agent de Mar- 
tha et Maria, fororibus Lazari, quae familiari devotione ipsi 
domino dum hic in carne degerit adhaesperunt. Et tamen 
utraque, id est, prius Martha, ac deinde Maria, legitur illi 
dixisse, domine si fuisses hic frater meus non fuisset mor- 
tuus. Quæ licet crederent quod ipse esset filius dei qui in 
mundum venisset, tamen non dicerent si fuisses hic, si eum 
cognoscerent ficit deum, ubique esse preeentem. Eadem 
ergo sapuerunt quæ dicitur sapuiffe Theodorus, et eum 
Theodoro simul anathematificæ sunt. Et quantosvel eo 
tempore in evangeliis et apostolicis scriptis tales fuisse cog- 
novimus? Quantoseq etiam nunc tales in grege fidelium, 
sola sanctorum mysteriorum participatione, et simplici 
preceptorum
If this was the case in the time of Theodosius, there can be no doubt of its having been so in the time of Constantine, and that it continued to be so long afterwards. The candour of Facundus towards these simple unitarians is remarkable, and is well illustrated by his account of the state of the Christian faith in the time of the apostles. Speaking of those who believed Christ to be a mere man, he says, "The apostles "themselves were once imperfect in the "faith, but never heretics. For while "they believed too little concerning Christ, "they received power to cast out unclean "spirits, and to cure diseases, when our "Lord sent them, and gave them a com- "mission. If, therefore, the apostles, in "the very time of their ignorance, were "not heretics, how can any one call these "so who died such," &c. *? He says,  

praecceptorum obedientia, placentes deo vidimus; cum et ipsi primi pastores ejus apostoli sic aliquando sapuerunt, quos omnes cum Theodoro vidimus in hoc anathemate condemnatos. Pro Defensione trium Capitolorum, lib. io. cap. 7. p. 162.

* Cum ipsi apostoli aliquando fuerint in fide imper- feâti, nunquam tamen hæretici. Cumque adhuc parum de Christo
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the woman who touched Christ's garment did not take him to be God *.

This testimony of Facundus may teach us, that we are not to take it for granted, that the unitarians were extinct at any particular time, merely because they are by some writers said to be so. Epiphanius says, that "the heresy of Artemon was extinct, when it was revived by Paulus "Samosatenis †." But it could only be that there were few, or none, who went publicly by that name. The many of Athanasius were, no doubt, unitarians, though they might not be call-


† Αρδείς δὲ τη διανοια, ἐξετασε της αληθειας, και ανεπανοια την εκεσια τη Αργειατη, τη αποδεικνυσι την αντικην την αληθειαν και επεκαυσον. Ηθερ. 65. Opera, vol. 1. p. 608.

ed
ed *Artemonites*. On the other hand, we are not to give to particular persons who distinguished themselves in the defence of the unitarian doctrine, all the *converts* they are said to have made. They, no doubt, *found* them unitarians, though they might be more encouraged by those leaders to declare themselves more openly. But we shall find, that when all their great leaders were gone, they did not want boldness in asserting their principles, which is a proof that they did not want numbers.

The number of followers that historians give to Marcellus of Ancyra, the capital of Galatia, and also to his disciple Photinus, bishop of Sirmium, in Pannonia, is prodigious; and the effects of their labours are said to have remained a long time. The former, though living in troublesome times, and probably being induced to make some improper compliances, is, notwithstanding, noted for the courage with which he, for some time at least, maintained his opinions. That he was not easily overborne by authority, Eusebius, his antagonist, testifies, when he says, that "he made no ac-

"count
"count of the Fathers of the church*."
Alluding to the preaching and writings of
of Marcellus, Hilary says, "Galatia has
"brought up many to the profession of
"one God; and," alluding to Photinus,
"Pannonia wickedly maintains that Jesus
"Christ was born of Mary," i. e. that he
did not exist before his birth†. This
writer complains heavily of the distressed
situation of the truth among so many here-
flies, and more than intimates, that the
followers of Photinus, though often con-
demned, were not sufficiently separated from
the church. The mischief, he says, was
* within ‡.

* Oµξ τη χαθας της Ἐκκλησιαστικής παλέρας αθέου. Contra
Marcellum, lib. i. p. 19.
† Impie multos ad unius dei professionem Galatia nu-
trivit—Peftifere natum Jesum Chriftum ex Maria Panno-
nia defendit. Lib. 7. p. 131.
‡ Nihil solicitudini meæ, nihil confcientiae vacat. Sub
specula enim omnium hæreticorum ad occasiones singu-
lorum verborum in os meum pendentium loquor, et omnis,
sermo mei iter aut anguſtiis præruptum, aut foveis in-
cifum, aut laqueis prætenfum eft. Jam quod arduum aut
diffícile sit minus conqueror; non meis enim, fed aposto-
lisicis fcanndo gradibus. Mihi vero aut in anguſtiis decidere,
aut in defoſſa incidere, aut plagis illaqueari, femper in pe-
riculo,
Photinus, though violently opposed by the Arian emperor Constantius (Hilarius Contra Constantium, p. 332) was remarkably popular in his see, and elsewhere; for an account of which see Sozomen, lib. 4. cap. 6. p. 135; and "though excommuni-cated and condemned, he could not be re- moved," says Hilary, "on account of the affection that the people had for him," as his language ought to be interpreted. And it is particularly remarkable, that though Photinus was so obnoxious to the riculo, semper in metu est. Prædicaturo enim, secundum legem, et prophetas, et apostolos, unum deum, adee mihi Sabellius, totum me sub verbi hujus professione, tanquam desideratum cibum, morfu sævissimo transforans. Negantem me rursum, contra Sabellium, unum deum, et consicientem verum deum dei filium, exspectat nova hær-esis, et a me duos deos arguet praedicari. Natum quoque dei filium ex Maria, dic turio, Hebion, qui et Photinus assisset; audioritatem mendacii sui, ex professione veritatis, sumpturus. De cæteris tacco, qui ab omnibus extra ecclesiæm esse non ignorantur. Hoc vero damnatum, et abjectum licet frequentur, sed internum hodie adhuc malum est. Lib. 7. p. 131.

* Photinus hæreticus comprehensus, olim reus pronunciatus, et a communique jampridem unitatis aëeissus, nec tum quidem per factionem populi potuit ad moveri. Fragmenta, p. 444.
orthodox, on account of his principles, his moral character was never impeached. A high encomium on him may be seen in Philaster *.

And when he was expelled from his see by the arm of power, he enjoyed an honourable retirement, and employed himself in writing books, in which, besides promoting the cause of Christianity in general, he boldly maintained his peculiar opinions. "Photinus," says Jerom, "endeavoured to revive the heresy of the "Ebionites, and wrote many volumes, the "chief of which are against the heathens, "and the books to Valentinian†." Socrates says, that "he wrote against all here-


† Photinus de Gallograecia, Marcelli discipulus, Sirmii episcopus ordinatus, Hebionis heresim instaurare conatus est: postea, a Valentiniano principe pulsus ecclesia, plura scriptit volumina, in quibus vel præcipui sunt, contra gen- tes, et ad Valentinianum libris. Catalogus, Opera, vol. i. p. 316.
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"ties, proposing only his own opinion.""
"Though banished," says Sozomen, "he " continued to defend his opinion, and "wrote books in the Greek and Latin "tongues, in which he endeavoured to "shew that all opinions were false except "his own†." That he continued strenuously to maintain his opinions, notwithstanding his persecution and banishment, is evident from all the accounts we have had of him. Nicephorus says, that "what "Photinus laboured in all his writings "was, that all opinions besides his own "were nothing‡."

Of all the theological works of the ancients, I own that I regret most of all the loss of those of Photinus, and especially his treatise against heresies. An impartial ac-

---

* Epigraph de μαλα πατην αποσεως, το οικειον μονον δομης παρα-

† Φολεινος δε φευ-γειν καλειναιαθεις, οιδε οις επαυσαιδο υπο οικειον 

‡ Ο οί επενεκασιο πας γραφας τω, ωλην της οικειας, τας των 

P. 755.

Z 4. count
account of his conference with Basil of Ancyra, would be exceedingly valuable. A few things that are quoted from him I shall produce in my account of the arguments used by the ancient unitarians in defence of their principles. That his writings were not thought meanly of by his adversaries, appears by their frequent notice of them, and the answers that were written to them long after his death. Among others, Vigilius Martyr, about the year 500, wrote against Photinus, as well as Sabellius and Arius.

Both Photinus and Marcellus were obnoxious to the Arians, but Marcellus more particularly, perhaps, for not having approved of the conduct of the Arians with respect to Athanasius, who always shewed a kindness for him.

There are several traces of there being great numbers of unitarians in the time of Austin.

* Bib. Pat. vol. 5. p. 546.
There appears to have been Photinians who even held open assemblies at Sirmium, contrary to a law of the emperor Gratian, A.D. 381; when the bishops of the council of Aquileia petitioned the emperors to take farther measures with respect to them*. The words *invisible* and *impassible*, Ruffinus says, were added to the creed in the church of Aquileia, on account of the Sabellian, or patripassian heresy, though they were not in the creed at Rome†. Jerom speaks of Ancyra, the capital of Galatia, as sorely over-run with various heresies in his time‡; and yet,


† His additur invisibilem et impassibilem. Sciendo quod duo isti sermones in ecclesiæ Romanæ symbolo non habentur, constat autem apud nos additos, haereseos causa Sabelli illius profecto, quæ nostris patripassiana appellatur. In Symbol, p. 173.

‡ Scit mecum qui vidit Ancyram metropolim Galatæ, civitatem, quod nunc ulque sciσmatibus dilacerata sit.

quod
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Ambrose, his cotemporary, speaks of the heresies of Photinus, Arius, and Sabellius, as being extinct, but says that, that of the Manicheans prevailed*. But as it is well known that the heresy of Arius was far from being extinct at that time, so it is no less evident that that of Photinus had many adherents.

Sabellianism was one of the five heresies, as he calls them, against which Austin thought it more particularly necessary to write. The other four were those of the Pagans, the Jews, the Manicheans, and the Arians†. It is also to the unitarians that he refers in the following passage, "Let us not," says he, "hear those who say there is only the Father, and that he has no Son, nor that there is a Holy Spirit, but that the Father himself is sometimes called the Son, and sometimes the Holy Spirit."
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"Spirit*," Lardner says, that the frequent notice which Austin takes of the Sabellians, in his tracts and sermons to the people, is an argument that in his time there was some considerable number of persons who maintained his opinion†. Paulinus of the same age, speaks of heretics in his time, who said, that "Christ was "God by adoption," from which he infers, that "they must think him to be a "mere man ‡."

If we look towards the east, where Basil and the two Gregories were then flourishing, we shall find still louder complaints of the prevalence of heresy, and especially that of the unitarians. For it is to be observed that, as it was some time before the

† Credibility, vol. 4. p. 606.
‡ Aut certe purum eum hominem sine deo natum (quod cogitare impium est) necesse est fateantur, ac per hoc quasi eguerit adoptione a patre in filium sit adoptatus. Adv. Felicem, Bib. Pat. vol. 5. p. 435.
gospel was propagated with success in the western parts of the Roman empire, not till the doctrine of the divinity of Christ had made considerable progress, the christianity of those parts was always what was called more orthodox than that of the east, where the gospel was first preached, and consequently, where the prejudices of christians in favour of the old unitarian doctrine were stronger than in other places.

Cyril of Jerusalem complains of heretics, both Arians and unitarians, as in the bosom of the church. "Now," says he, "there is an apostacy; for men have departed from the right faith, some confounding the Son with the Father," meaning the unitarians, "others daring to say that Christ was created out of nothing," meaning the Arians. "Formerly heretics were open, but now the church is full of concealed heretics." *

* Νον δὲ εἰσιν αποστασία: απεισάνυ τινας οι ανθρωποι της ορθως εἰς ἑαυτους καὶ οἱ μὲν ἐν πάσηλος καὶ εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν εἰς μὴν ὁμοίους εἰς τὸ εἶναι παρενεχθεῖα λέγειν τοῦτον καὶ ἀπείρον μὲν τινας κατεργάσαντας, νῦν δὲ πεπληρώθη ἡ κακαλωσία νεκρωμένων αὐτῶν. Cyril., Catech. 15. p. 209. See also p. 5.

Complaints
Complaints of the spread of herey, both that of the unitarians, and that of the Arians, by Basil himself, and his cotemporaries, are particularly loud and incessant. The opinions he most complains of were such as were held by the common people, though many of the clergy were also infected; and what is remarkable, the malecontents complained loudly of Basil's innovations, both with respect to doctrines, and practices. For some time Basil, though surnamed the Great, was obliged to give way to the storm, and to retire from his diocese; and yet, this it seems was a dangerous step. For according to him, the most unremitted assiduity was necessary to guard their flocks from seduction. "If "any person," says he, "leave his diocese "for the shortest time, he leaves the com-"mon people exposed *."

To give my readers a clear idea of Basil's situation, I shall select from his writings a few passages, which will give us a suffi-

cient insight into it; and the case appears to have been the same through the whole of Asia Minor, but more especially in Galatia, which had been the diocese of Marcellus. "Groan with us," says Basil, "the only begotten is blasphemed, and there is no one to contradict it." Gregory Nazianzen represents him as absolutely banished for holding opinions different from those of his people.

The difficulties of Basil were occasioned both by the Arians, and the unitarians, but chiefly the latter; though they both agreed in decrying the novel doctrine of the divinity of the Holy Spirit, which was the great topic of controversy, as has been already seen, at that particular time. All the following passages shew that his strongest apprehensions were from the unitarians, the disciples of Sabellius, Marcellus, and Paulus Samosatenensis. "We are torn in pieces," he says, "on one side by the

---

* Στενάζολε ἐφ ἡμιν δι’ ὁ μονογενῆς βλασφημεῖσι, καὶ ὁ συλλεγόν

† Ὡς γε καὶ ἐξοριὰν ὑπὲρ τῆς αὐθεντικῆς καταγνώσεως. Or. 20. p. 364.

"Anomeans,
"Anomeans, and on the other by Sabel-lius*. "'Is not the mystery of godli-
ness every where laughed at; the bishops
continuing without people, and without
clergy, having nothing but an empty
name, able to do nothing for the ad-
vancement of the gospel of peace and
salvation. Are there not discord[s con-
cerning God, and blasphemy, from the
old impiety of vain Sabellius †." "You
know, says he, "my dear brethren, that
the doctrine of Marcellus, overturns all
our hopes, not acknowledging the Son
in his proper personality ‡."

Basil’s enemies alleged the authority of
his predecessor, the famous Gregory Thau-
maturgus, as he is now generally called, as if

* Epist. 74. ibid. p. 126.
† Ovid. Fasti, iv 841: "igitur nec tu, quae deae
nascuntur, et promittunt tu in lumina, et
non sine -arche."
‡ "The same, indeed, say the Anomœans; who
were of opinion that the Council at
Nice was a mere show in the presence of
Epist. 64. Opera, vol. 3. p. 100.
he had held that "the Father and Son were "two in conception, but one in hypostasis." This he does not absolutely deny, but says, "that it was advanced by him not seriously, "but only in disputation *." W

Writing to the clergy of the church of Neocaesarea, he says, that Sabellius the Lybian, and Marcellus of Galatia, were the real authors of the doctrines taught by his opposers. He complains heavily of the violence with which they opposed him, and that they had the assurance to call his doctrines mischievous ones †.

* Ως αρα Γρηγορίου ειπονος εν εκδησει τιτειως, παθερα και μην επωσια μεν ειναι δυο, υποστασει δε εν του ταλ οι, οι η δουμαλους ειρηθαι, αλλ' αγωνισμος εν τη φρος Αιωνω διαλεξει. Επι. 64. Opera, vol. 3. p. 101.

† Σαβελλιος α Διευς, και Μαρκελλος ο Γαλατης μονος εν παιδιον ειση

μεναν, και διδασκα ταιλα και ζησαν, απερ απεν θαρ ημων, ας ειπεν

ων ευρημα διηξενοι περισσεριν οι καθηγοριοι της και, δοκουνοις

τη γνωσιν, και κατ εις παιδιν καθαιρεν εις ημεριαν τα σοφειματα

τανα, και της παραλογισμος εξομωιος. Ψει εκ ημων και αρετη και

ημων διηγορεουσι, και παιδα τροπον τας συνωνης ημων εκπλευσιν,

τιους ενεκεν; εικε τοις επι τοις παιδιοις ειπον διδαγμασιν ελεγχουν

υφομενους: οι γε επι τοις ημων καθηγορων ευθυς, οι και ουρας

τως εφ ημαις 'υψηλασαι, διαλωτεις ημων τας διδασκαλιας, ας
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It is acknowledged that, in general, the unitarians were of the lower sort of people; yet, in Basil’s diocese many of them were those of better condition. He complains of the leading men in his own church being addicted to the opinions of Sabellius and Marcellus, and of their being dissatisfied with his psalms, his new mode of singing, and his institution of monks*. He particularly mentions an excellent person, of the name of Terentius, as having joined the Paulians, in a passage in which he makes great complaint of the progress of that sect, of their boldness, the publication of their confessions of faith, and threatening to join his church†. This would not have been thought of, if their number had not been very considerable. Basil himself was charged with having been a favourer of the unitarian doctrine, and even with having writ-

* Epift. 63. Ibid. p. 95.
† Καὶ μεγαφρονεν της τασιας τας μερις εκειν, κη ἐπαγαλλεσθαι, τοις γραμμασιν, εἰς κη πυρω προλεγεσθαι, κη ετι ταυτη ἑδιμας εχειν συναπλεσθαι τα καπ ηνας εκκλησιας, σφος δε τειοις μακενοι ημιν απηγγελθ, δι υπηγαγονον σφον την υπερ αυτων σταθαι, τον παλαι αριστον ανδρα Τερεθον. Epift. 272. Ibid. p. 263.
ten in defence of it; but this he absolutely denies, appealing to God for the truth of his declaration.

In this age it was the custom to apply to the church of Rome, in any difficulties from the distant churches of the empire; a circumstance which greatly contributed to advance the power and insolence of that church. And it was chiefly by means of the overbearing influence of this church, that those doctrines, which are generally termed orthodox, got established. Basil requested that persons might be sent from Rome to condemn the heresy of Marcellus, saying, that "to this day, in all the letters "they send, the heresy of Arius is anathematized, where no fault was found with " Marcellus, who brought in a contrary heresy, affecting the very being of the deity "of the only begotten Son, and giving a "wrong sense to the word logos.""

* Οὐδὲ εὐγαμάκειν ἐκεῖνα, ἀλλὰ συνὶδεμεδα αὐτῶς, ἀλλὰ, ἐκ ἀκαδημαίην ἔχομεν τὰς ἐκρυίας ἐκεῖνο το πονερὸν φρονήμα, το τῆς συνέχειας τῶν ἰστοπαιν, ἐν ὁ ἁρετικὴ αἰρέτις τῷ Σαβελλίῳ ανενεκδην. τόδε μὲν ἐν γνωρίμῳ τῷ θεῷ, τῷ τὰς καρδίας γινωσκοῖν, Ἐπιστ. 345. Ibid. P. 339.

† Ἐπει μεχρὶ τὴν εἰς εἰς εὐγαμακειν γραμματισ, τοις μὲν δυσωνομοι Ἀρέηον αὐτα ᾧ καθὰ ακαδημαίην ἐξέχρισον εἰς.
Gregory Nazianzen, who was cotemporary with Basil, complains of the small number of the orthodox, saying, "they "were the smallest of the tribes of Israel*." And yet Optatus, who was cotemporary with him in Africa, speaks of all heretics as extinct, and the Sabellians among the rest, their very names being unknown in Africa †. But if this had been the case, we should never have heard of the complaints*

* Kai ἐκ παρθένων ταῖς αριθμοῖς τῶν σωληνῶν, ὡς τῶν νομιμῶν τοῖς ἑλεύθεροις ἐχειν τὰ σωληνημένα, τῶν ἀληθινῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας φύλις εἰς ὑπερτομήν, τῶν ἀληθινῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐφαρμόσων τίς ἑλσίς τῶν νομιμῶν τῶν ἀληθινῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας φύλις. Ἰνν. 52. Ibid. p. 80.

of Austin, who resided in Africa at the same time.

We have likewise boasts of the extinction of heresy in Chrysostom. But, by his own evidence, they may be proved to be premature. He speaks of all heretics by name as extinct; and among the rest the Arians are mentioned, which is known to have been by no means the case *. It may even, with some probability, be inferred from this writer himself, that notwithstanding the prohibitions of government, the unitarians of that age had the zeal and courage to hold public assemblies. For, speaking of the unitarians, he says, "Let us " avoid their assemblies, and learning the " eternal exisistence of the Son, his power as " the maker of the world, &c. let us hold " the truth†," &c.

It appears from the writings of Chrysostom, that, in his time, many persons were much attached to the religion and customs of the Jews; and it is very probable, that

* De Pseudoprophetis, Opera, vol. 6. p. 479.
the doctrine of the unity of God, of which the Jews were strenuous assertors, might be a principal inducement to it, especially as some who were fond of the Jews are represented as continuing in the church. "Let the Jews," says he, "learn this, and those who rank with us, and yet think as they do*."

No person speaks with more triumph of the extinction of heresy, especially that of the unitarians, than Theodoret; and yet his account is flatly contradicted by Facundus, in the passage above quoted from him. And as Facundus wrote after Theodoret, it may be taken for granted, that the unitarians were more numerous in the time of Theodoret than they were in his.

Theodoret represents the cities in his neighbourhood as full of heretics when he came into the diocese; mentioning the Arians, Eunomians, Manichæans, Marcionites, Valentinians, and Montanists, and even heathens and Jews; when himself, who

Unitarians after Book III, maintained the evangelical truth was excluded from all cities *. Though he does not mention unitarians, it will appear probable, from what has been seen above, that they were intended by the term Montanists. He boasts, however, of his having purged his diocese of all those heresies, especially that of the Marcionites †. In another place, he particularly speaks of the unitarians as extinct, and as an event produced by that power which rebuked the deep, Is. iv. 27. and “dried it up, who says “ to the deep, Thou shalt be desolate, and “ I will dry up the rivers ‡.” He likewise speaks of the doctrine of the trinity as held not only by the teachers in the church, but also by the lowest artificers, several of whom he

* Μακιλλον δε τοις μεν αλλοις απασα πασας πολις ανενεκε, ε μονον τοις τις Αγιους και Βαπτισμιον φρονεσαν, αλλα και Μανχαιοις, και Μαριωνισας, και τοις τα Βαλεινοις, και Μολιαν νοσεσαν, και μεσοι και Ελλοι και Ιουδαιοι· ενοι δε των ενογελογοιν υπαργυρωμενων δομημαν πας ειρηγεμαι πολεος. Epist. 81. Opera, vol. 3. p. 953.
† Ibid. p. 954.
enumerate, by women, even of the lowest ranks, and by the inhabitants of villages, as well as those of cities *.

How far this is to be considered as a faithful state of facts, or the flourish of an orator, I leave the reader to determine, by comparing it with the accounts of Facundus and others. Cyril of Alexandria, who was cotemporary with Theodoret, holds a different language. "Some," says he, "are so far seduced, that they cannot bear any longer to confess that Christ is God; but that he is rather the organ and instrument of the deity, and inspired by "God†." In this it is possible, that he alluded to the Sabellian, or Patripassian doctrine, which I shall shew was the language

* Καὶ εἰς ἐκείνους εὐθὺς τὰ δογματικά, οὐ μόνος γε τῆς εὐκηκτίας τῆς θρησκείας, ἀλλὰ καὶ σκυθρομάς, καὶ χαλκόπυρς, καὶ ταλασσωργας καὶ τῶν ἀλλῶν ἀποχαιρετισθεν. καὶ γυναικων ὁπίως, οὐ μόνον τὰς λογίας μερισχομένας, ἀλλὰ καὶ χερσόπως, καὶ αἰσινήδες, καὶ μεθυ καὶ θεραπαυματικας, καὶ οὐ μόνον αὐτοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ χαρίλικοι τὴν δὲ τὴν γυνικείαν σωφρόσυνην: Serm. 5. Opera, vol. 4. p. 556.

of the philosophical unitarians. But it may be inferred, from several passages in the writings of Cyril, that there were unitarians in his time. I shall give one of them in the notes *

Cyril even speaks of writers in defence of the unitarian doctrine in his time, and such as he thought it worth his while to animadvert upon. "But because a heretic," he says, "famous for his skill in the Jewish "scriptures, in his exposition of this passage" (the Father is greater than I) "has "written intolerable blasphemies against "the only begotten, I thought it my duty "to shew the falsehood of his discourse †."


† Verum, quoniam quidam haereticorum etiam apud Judæos fæcarum peritia literarum illuſtris hunc locum exponens intolerabiles in unigenitum scripsit blasphemies, mei
"He has the arrogance," he says, "to assert, that the Father is in no sense greater than the deity of the Son, but only supposes that the nature of the Father exceeds his humanity." In this manner he must have meant to describe the Sabellians.

From these circumstances, let the reader judge, whether the unitarian heresy was extinct in the time of Theodoret, whatever it might be in his neighbourhood. His great zeal, and his power in his diocese, would probably prevent the unitarians from declaring themselves, and their acquiescence might be called their conversion.

The Pelagians, as I have shewn, very generally adopted the unitarian doctrine. But, besides these, Cassian speaks of other unitarians in Gaul, whom he does not class with Pelagians. "There have lately risen," he says, "I mean in our days, a


* Ad hoc arrogantiae quidam processerunt, inquit, ut nullo modo audire patientur patrem, filii deitate majorem esse, sed sola humanitate naturam patris excedere arbitrentur. Cyril. Alex. vol. 1. p. 939.

poisonous
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"poisonous heresy, chiefly in the city of Beligæ, of a certain name, but an un-
certain author, which, with a fresh head, rises from the old error of the Ebionites.
It is doubtful whether it can be called old, or new. It is new in the asserterors,
but old in the error, viz. that our Lord Jesus Christ is a mere man."

According to Maxentius, who flourished in the year 520, the unitarians were by no means extinct in his neighbourhood. Speaking of the church as rejecting the doctrine of those who say that "Christ is God by favour, and not by nature," he says, "against this all heretics, as well those who are manifestly cut off and divided, as those who are within the church, and spiritually divided from it, whom the


"holy
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"holy charity of the church bravely tole-
"rate, always take up arms, and cease not
"to urge it with false charges, and en-
"deavour to excite all they can influence
"against it. As yet," he adds, "we are
"in the threshing floor, corn mixed with
"chaff, good men grieve at the society of
"the wicked." This passage is very simi-
lar to that of Facundus, and makes it ex-
tremely probable, that, in all christian coun-
tries, there were great numbers of unita-
rians, sufficiently known to be so, in com-
munion with the catholic church, without
being molested.

* Vera dei ecclesia, cui non sunt haereticorum ignorant, non est illa quae christianum gratia non natura deum confitetur.—Adversus illam omnes haeretici, tam qui ab ea manifeste abscondi atque divisi sunt, quam qui intra eam positi, spiritualiter ab ea dissentiunt (quos fortiter fancia fidelium tolerat charitas) semper arma corripiunt, eamque fallis criminationibus infestari non desinunt, atque eos quos suis potuerunt erroribus in ejus nituntur invidiarm concitare.

SECTION II.

Of the State of the Unitarians after the sixth Century.

We must not expect to find any distinct account of the unitarians, or the condition they were in, in what are called the dark ages. There can be no doubt, however, but that they continued to be in the same state in which they had been in the preceding period, i.e. not very conspicuous, or forming many separate societies, at least, such as the historians of the time had any knowledge of; but mixed with other christians, though without making any secret of their opinions. Of this, though there are no distinct accounts, there are sufficient traces. I have noted only a few, as they happened to fall under my observation, when I was reading for other purposes.

Pope Gregory the Great, who flourished about the close of the sixth century, speaks of heretics who said "they did not envy" Christ
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"Christ being God, because they could "be so if they would, considering Christ as "a mere man, and made a God by fa- "vour*." These must have been unita- rians, for it is a language that was never held by Arians.

In Bulgaria Sandius says, that the Pho- tinians remained till the time of Pope Nicholas, about the year 860. Hist. p. 117. Agobard speaks of Avitus having written against them, but at what time does not appear†.

For some time the unitarians were called Bonoians, from Bonosus, bishop of Ser- dica, in the latter end of the fourth, and the beginning of the fifth century. Men- tion is made of him as an unitarian, along

* Non invideo Christo deo facto, quoniam si volo, et ipse possidum fieri. Qui Jesum Christum dominum nostrum, non per mysterium conceptionis, sed per profectum gratiae deum putavit, perversa allegatione afferuens eum purum hominum natum: sed ut deus effet, per meritum profecisse, atque ab hoc æsimans et se quoslibet alios posse ei coequari, qui filii dei per gratiam sunt. In Job. cap. 35. p. 110. C


with
with Photinus, by Marius Mercator*, and also by Justinian, who ranks him with Paulus Samosatenensis, Photius (probably Photinus) and Nestorius †. Mention is also made of the Bonosians in a council held at Orleans, A. D. 540 ‡.

Sandius says, that the Bonosians were the same with the Felicians, so called from Felix, of Urgella in Spain, who, in conjunction with Elipandus, of Toledo, taught heretical doctrines with respect to the trinity, A. D. 780 (Hist. p. 360) and that this Elipandus held the same opinions with Sabellius, he says, appears from a copy of his confession to Beatus and Heterius. He adds, that the four preceding bishops of Toledo, who compiled the Toledan Gothic

* Hunc igitur Hebionum philosophum secutus Marcellus Galata est, Photinus quoque, et ultimis temporibus Serdicensis Bonosus, qui a Damaso urbis Romae episcopo prædamnatus est. Opera, p. 165.
liturgy, were of the same opinion with him. Ibid. p. 120.

Elipandus, however, may have been a Neotorian, by his ascertaining that Jesus Christ was the adopted Son of God, as we learn from the transactions of the council of Frankfort in 794.

The Goths and Vandals, and all the other northern nations, which invaded the Roman empire, are generally said to have been Arians. But it is very possible that this may have been said without making proper distinctions, and that many of them were unitarians. Chilperic, king of the Franks, was probably one, at least so was Leovigild of Spain, who sent ambassadors to Chilperic in 585, as may be inferred

* Adserunt igitur, sed falsis adseritionibus irretiti, dominum nostrum Jefum Chrif tum, adoptivum dei filium de virgine natum; quod divinis nequeunt adprobare documentis. Hæc igitur dicentes, aut in utero virginis cum suspicantur adoptatum: quod dici nefas est, quia de beata virgine inerrabiliiter fumpfit, non adoptavit, carnem; aut certe purum eum hominem sine deo natum, quod cogitare impium est, necesse est fateantur. Binni Concilia, vol. 3 pt. 2. p. 140.
from what Sandius says of him, and his ambassadors *

Some Sabellians, as well as Arians, were condemned at a council held at Toledo, A. D. 400 †. Also unitarians, or Nestorianists, seem to be alluded to in a council held in the same city, A. D. 684 ‡.

The Albigenenses, at least many of them, appear pretty clearly not to have been orthodox with respect to the trinity; but whether they were more generally Arians, or unitarians, I have not been able to determine.

† Si quis dixerit atque crediderit, deum patrem eundem esse filium vel paracletum, anathema fit. Si quis dixerit vel crediderit filium eundum esse patrem vel paracletum, anathema fit. Si quis dixerit vel crediderit paracletum esse vel patrem vel filium, anathema fit. Si quis crediderit vel dixerit, carnem tantum sine anima a filio dei susceptam anathema fit. Binnii Concilia, vol. 1. p. 60.
‡ Si quis igitur Jesu Christo dei filio, ex utero Mariæ virginis nato, aliquid aut divinitatis imminuit, aut de suscepta humanitate subdicit, excepta sola lege peccati; et non eum verum deum, hominemque perfectum in una persona substitutem inceperissime credit, anathema fit. Binnii Cor. illia, vol. 3. p. 297.
Of these Albigenes, Liofius and Herebert are particularly mentioned, as men of excellent moral characters, who were accused of Manicheism. However, when they were interrogated at Orleans, in 1017, it appeared that they did not hold the doctrine of the trinity.

In the same uncertainty are the opinions of Peter Abelard, and those of his disciple, as he is called, Arnold of Brescia. But it is no uncommon thing for the same person

to be called an Arian by one writer, and an unitarian by another. Thus Lewis Hetzer is called an Arian by Sandius, who was himself an Arian (Hist. p. 424) whereas Mosheim (Hist. vol. 4. p. 183) represents him as having been of the same opinion with Socinus.

Abelard, however, was most probably a Sabellian, as may be inferred from his comparison of the unity of the three persons in the trinity to the unity of the proposition, assumption, and conclusion, of an oration. At least it was so understood at a council held in 1136*. What is said of him on the occasion of another council, in 1140, may perhaps shew that, with respect to the trinity,

he was an Arian, with respect to the doctrine of grace a Pelagian, and with respect to the person of Christ, a Nestorian. It appears then, that, in all the periods of antiquity, there were considerable numbers of unitarians, either avowed or concealed; and especially among the Albigenese, who bore so noble a testimony against the errors of the church of Rome. Unitarians also appeared in great numbers about the time of the reformation by Luther. But he and Calvin, not going so far, but retaining more fundamental corruptions of christianity than any that they abolished, employed all their influence to bear down those who did not exactly agree with them, and stop where they did.

The truth has never, however, been without its witnesses, perhaps, even in no age or country; and providence seems now to be opening a way for the much wider spread, and the firmer establishment of the truth, especially in this country.

That it is not improbable, but that, even in times of pretty great rigour, quiet people, who wrote nothing, and collected no disciples, would be permitted to continue in communion with the catholic church, notwithstanding their opinions were suspected, or known, to be heretical, may appear from the state of things at home, in the last, and the present age.

Is it not well known that there are both Arians and Socinians members of the church of England, and even among the clergy themselves, and yet, if they can reconcile it to their own minds to keep in communion with a trinitarian church, there are no attempts made to molest them. Zealous as the heads of the church may be for the purity of its tenets, they think proper to connive at these things, and so they did in an age more zealous than this. The excellent Mr. Firmin was not only an avowed Socinian, and in communion with the church of England, but in habits of intimacy with Tillotson, and some of the most distinguished churchmen of his time.
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At present there are Arian and Socinian writers within the pale of the church, and yet they are not excommunicated. Such a thing as this might not have passed so easily in the time of Theodosius. But even then I make no doubt, but that persons who could content themselves without disturbing others, would not have been molested.

Persons who do not bona fide hold the acknowledged tenets of any church (I mean such great and distinguished ones as those relating to the object of worship) ought to withdraw themselves from it, and not, by continuing in communion with it, to countenance its errors. But how many are there who do not see the thing in this light, or whose habits and prejudices are such, that they cannot bring themselves to act as I think every principle of honour, as well as of religion, dictates; and yet I cannot call all such persons hypocrites, doing what they themselves know and feel to be wrong. They have excuses, which I doubt not, satisfy their own minds, though they do not satisfy me. Great allowance is also to be made for the force of habit,
and even for a natural timidity. There are many Erasmus's for one Luther, many Dr. Clarke's for one Whiston, a name, which notwithstanding the weakness of his judgment in some things, ought never to be mentioned without respect, on account of his almost singular and unparalleled uprightness.

As to the common people, the idiotæ of Tertullian, we generally see that, as they are not innovators in doctrine, they go to public worship where they have been used to do, without any nice discrimination of what is transacted there; and the observation will generally apply to the bulk of the inferior clergy. When Henry VIII. reformed the church of England, how many joined him in it, who would never have declared themselves dissenters from the established church?

These considerations, which are founded on such a knowledge of human nature as we may learn from all history, and our own daily observation, may render it credible, that the majority of the common people, might be unitarians, and yet continue in communion.
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union with the church, after its forms became trinitarian, especially as they would not become so all at once. In the most ancient liturgies, there were no prayers addressed to Christ; and as the members of christian societies were not required to subscribe to any thing, there was nothing that they were expected to bear a part in, concerning which they might not be able to satisfy themselves.

The case is the same, in a greater or less degree, at all times, and in all churches. Quiet people will generally be indulged in their own way of thinking, and they are only those who disturb others that are themselves disturbed.
CHAPTER XVII.

Of Philosophical Unitarianism.

Besides the simple unitarianism above described, or the doctrine of Christ being a mere man, inspired by God, which was the belief of the generality of Christians of lower rank, there was likewise, in early times, what may be called a philosophical unitarianism, or an explanation of the doctrine concerning Christ on the principles of the philosophy of those times. And this deserves the more notice, as it probably gave occasion to what is commonly called the patripassian doctrine, if such a doctrine was ever really maintained.

As the sun was supposed to emit rays, and draw them into himself again, so the Divine Being, of whom they imagined the sun to be an image, they likewise supposed, emitted
emitted a kind of efflux, or divine ray, to which they sometimes gave the name of logos, which might be attached to any particular substance, or person, and then be drawn into the Divine Being again. Such a divine efflux was imagined to have been the cause of the appearances of God in the Old Testament, and likewise to have been imparted to Jesus Christ; who, nevertheless, was a mere man. For before his baptism they supposed that he had not this divine ray, and that it would leave him when it had enabled him to act the part assigned to him.

This doctrine preceded that of the permanent personification of the logos. It is particularly described by Justin Martyr, and it is remarkable, that, though he does not adopt it, he passes no censure upon it, which is a proof that, in his opinion, it was not heretical.

"There are," he says, "some I know, "who say that the divine power which "appeared to Moses, and Abraham, and "Jacob, was called an angel, from his de-
"livering the will of God to men, and a
"glory, when he appeared in an ineffable
"manner, and a man, when, at the will of
"the Father, he appeared in that form;
"and logos, when he brought the will of
"God to man; but that this power is in-
"separable from the Father, as a beam of
"light is from the sun, since, when he
"sets, he takes his beams with him. Thus
"they say the Father, when he pleases,
"makes this power to go out of him, and,
"when he pleases, takes it into him again.
"In the same manner, they say, angels
"exist. But that angels are permanent be-
"nings, and do not return into that from
"which they had their origin, I have
"shewn. And that this power, which the
"prophets call God, and angel, is not like
"a beam of the sun, but numerically dif-
"ferent from it, I have briefly shewn
"above; when I proved that this power
"is produced by the Father's power, and
"at his will, but yet not a thing cut
"off from him, so as to diminish his
"essence, but like the lighting of one
"fire
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"fire from another, which is not thereby lessened."

Whitby says that Clemens Alexandrinus speaks of this doctrine with approbation.

* Allea esti γινωσκω εν τινας προδευτα ταιδα βελωμεναι, και χατ-κευ των δυναμιν την σαρα ται σαφες των ελαια φανευαν τω Μουσει ι
tω Λεμνα, ι τω Λαμενο, αγυλον και εποδηθαι εν τη φρονι ανθρωποις
αφοδω, επειδη ει αυτης τα σαρα ται σαφες ταις ανθρωποις ακυτλευαι,
δεδαν ει επειδη ει φαραγινα φανεραι, ανδρα δε αει και ανθρωποι και εποδηθαι,
επειδη ει μορφαις τους αυτους ακυτλευαι, και εποδηθαι ει
και ταις ανθρωποις ακυτλευαι. Αλμοδε δε και αχω-
ρισιν ται σαφες ταινιν την δυναμιν υπαρχειν, αντερπτον το τα
και ους ει εισαι αλμοδε και αχωριστον ουθε τα πλευν εν τω
αραιω, και δεικν ευθι, συναπορεθαι το θεο, εις τοι αραθρ δια
λεγεις, δυναμιν αυτω σπρονηλαι τωις, και δεικν ευθια
πουλαι απασσειας εις εαυτοι. Καλα τεκου τον τροπον και της
αγχαλες σειν εισων αισθανεσιν. Αλλ' ει μεν ει εισων αγυλοις εις
μεν ευθιας και αυτωις, και
ουλομενει εις ενευρ εις ατερ γεγονοσιν, αποδεδοθαι. Και ει
δυναμιν ασθη της και δεικν ευθια τα χρονιας λογος, δια αει
αεινεις αποδεδοθαις, και αγυλοις, ης, ως τα τα πλευν ως
ουμενοι αμωις αριθμεις, αλα και αριθμα εις ης της, και ει
τοις απειρομενους δια τραχειων του λογον ευθαια, εισων την
δυναμιν ταινιν γεγονοσιν απο ταις ανθρωποις δυναμει και
βελον αυτη, αλλ' ει καλα αποινων, ως απο-
μερισμενοις της ται σαφες ειςας, γιατης εις
tαι αισθημα και τευμαται εις
αις εις την και πριν τυμβηναι. Και παρε-
θεμετοθε- χαιρεν παρεκληθαν τα ως
ατο τωρον ανασηκομενα σωμα
εις ομοιο ομοιοις, ειν εινεμεν εινεμεν, εις και απαθηηαν σωμα δυναται,
He also says, "it is particularly remark-
able, that Justin Martyr, though he did
not approve of this doctrine, passes it
without any censure, or mark of herefy.*"

They who adopted this notion would na-
turally say, that the divinity of Christ was
only that of the Father residing in him;
and it is not impossible but that, as they are
charged by their adversaries, they might, on
this principle, say, that Christ was God;
and the divinity being the same in both,
that he was the very same with the Father.
The Holy Spirit being another divine efflux,
they might also say, that all the three per-
sons were one. Farther, though the thing
is hardly probable, especially as it is, in a
manner, given up by some of their antagо-
nists, they might say, that since Christ suf-

* Ubi præcipue notandum est, Justinum quidem sen-
tentiam hance improbare, eam vero sine cenfura aut hære-
seos nota dimittere. Sententiam hancce, quam post Noetum
et Praxeam, Sabellius propugnavit, Clementi Alexandrino
ex Pædagogia sua placuifle non sine ratione existimo; camque postea renovabat, et pro ea acriter contendebat,
Marcellus Ancyrae episcopus. Disquisitiones Modeftæ, P. 173.
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suffered while this divine ray, or logos, was in him, it also suffered along with him. For, according to the philosophy of those times, though the supreme being himself was incapable either of evil or of passion, yet other beings, derived even from his substance, were capable of those affections. They might therefore imagine, that the logos, while out of the deity, might suffer together with the person to whom it was attached; and hence they might get the name of patri-passians. This, however, would never apply to any but philosophers. The common people are described as simple unitarians, without having any such whimsical hypothesis as this.

This opinion of the logos being something like a divine ray, emitted from the Father, and properly belonging to him, though for a time attached to the person of Christ, may be traced in Origen and others; and it is ascribed to almost all the eminent men among the unitarians, as late as Marcellus. For it does not appear that his disciple Photinus was ever charged with it.

Origen,
Origen, after saying that Christ is the God of the dead as well as of the living, says, that "perhaps God the logos is God to those who place everything in him, thinking him to be the same with the Father." Celsus objecting to christians that, "while they exclaimed against polytheism, think they do not offend by worshiping his servant." Origen replies, "that he would not have made this objection, if he had understood what our Saviour says, that he and his Father were "one," which union he explains by the union of christians, who had one heart and one mind. "This," he says, "is a sufficient argument, without having recourse to the sentiments of those who maintain, that the Father and the Son are not two hypostases;" by which he must have

* O de Θεος λογος ταχα των εν αυθι εναλλον το παπαν. οι των σωθεσαι αυθον νομιζοσιν εις Θεος. Comment. vol. 2. p. 48.

† Όι ευπεριπομενοι ο Κελς το, εγοι εξει παπαν εν εσμεν και εις ευκαι εερικαινου υπο τος ανα τη θεον εν των. Ρες εγοι και οι εν εσμεν, εις αιν αει δημοκρατον παπαν των επι παπαν Θεον. Ο γαρ παπαν, οινοι, εν ει αν ανα τη παπαν ει δε, την εν ταυτον πεπεσαυλιαν, μη τινων αυτομολογοιν αυτο των αναιρετικα δυο ειναι υποτατον παπανα.
meant the Sabellians, whose doctrine, as far as it may be said to have differed from that of the simple unitarians, was the philosophical unitarianism described above. "The Sabellians," says, Novatian, "while they say that Christ is a mere man, yet, in a manner, make him to be not the Son, but the "Father, and the Father omnipotent *."

Origen well describes the different classes of unitarians of his time in the following passage: "Hence may be solved the doubts which disturb many, who alledge a principle of piety, and a fear of making two Gods, and by this means fall into false and impious opinions; either denying that the identity of the Son differs from that of the Father; saying, that the Son is God only in name, or denying the divinity of the Son, while they allow his identity,

* Siquidem Christus non filius, sed pater creditur, et novo more dum ab illis desisti de his duodev homin nudus adseritur, per eos, rursum Christus pater deus omnipotens comprobatur. Cap. 12. p. 40.
“and that he is a different person from the “Father, &c *.” The first that he describes were the philosophical unitarians, who allowed the divinity of the Son, but said it was the same with that of the Father; whereas the latter (probably the common people) denied the divinity of the Son altogether. It is evident from this passage, that the unitarians, in the time of Origen, were numerous; for he calls them many, which he would not have done unnecessarily. The argument by which he solves their doubts has been mentioned before, viz. that the Father is God, with the article prefixed, and the Son without it.

* Καὶ τὸ πολλὸς φιλοσόφος εὑρεὶ εὐχερέμενος ταρασσόμενος, εὑραβεμένος δύο αναγρευσαὶ θεος, καὶ παρὰ τὸ ἀπεραντήσας ψευδεῖ καὶ ασεβεῖς δογματισμο, οὗο αρνημένος ὑπολήφα γίνεται ἡθαὺς τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς ομολογεῖσαι θεον εὑρεῖ τὸν μετὰ ὀνομαθεοτὸ παρὰ αὐτὸς ἦνων αὐτοις ἦνων προσαγορευμένοι. Ἡ αρνημένος τὴν θεότητα τοῦ θεοῦ, τιθέμενα δέ αὐτὸ τὴν ἑπιστήμην καὶ τὴν κατὰ καλά περιγράφων τηγχασεσι πάντα τοῦ πατρὸς, εὑρεθείς λαεσθαι δύναται. λείπους γαρ αὐτὸς ὅτι τὸν μὲν αὐτοθεοτὸ θεος εὗρεν διὸ περὶ καὶ τὸ συνηποτι οὐ παραείρειν εἰς τὸν πάντα ἐνγιγνῶσκοι σε τον μονού αληθινον θεον; των δὲ το τοιαετο αὐτοθεοτο μετοχὴ τῆς εὐρεὶς θεοδηθεοτοποιηθήν, οὐ ο θεος, αλλὰ θεος εἰρημένος αὐτὸ το θεότησιν πατρὸς ἡμῶν, ἐντομὸς τῷ πάντα τοῦ θεοῦ εὑρεῖ. In Johann. Comment. vol. 2. p. 46.
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It does not appear that the persons to whom Origen refers were charged with saying that the Father suffered; but this is expressly alleged against Noetus, who, as Epiphanius says, "scrupled not to say as "much." Being interrogated concerning his doctrine, he said, "What evil have I done? "I honour one God. I know but one, and "no other, besides him who was born, "suffered and died*.

This writer acquits the Sabellians of this charge. For he says that "the Sabellians "agree in every thing with the Noetians, "except that they deny that the Father "suffered †." But Austin blames him for making that difference ‡. And Epiphanius


† Σαβελλιανοι, οι τα ομαι Νομικων δοξατοις, παρε τοιο μισν λεγει γαρ μη στοθεικα τον σοιερα.  Anastaspholos, Opera, vol. 2. p. 146.

‡ Unde vero sit factum, et Noetianos ut Sabellianos non unius hæresis duo nomina, sed tanquam duas hæreses supradictus episcopus poneret, liquido invenire non potui; quia si quid inter se differunt, tam obscure dixit, studio
ascribes to them the proper principle of philosophical unitarianism in the following passage. "The Sabellians say that the "Son was sent from the Father, as a beam "of light from the sun, to administer "every thing relating to the gospel dispens-
"ation, and the salvation of men; and was "then drawn up into heaven, like a beam "of light, which returns to the sun *."
In another description of their principles,
he is, perhaps, not quite so accurate. "Sabellius said, there was but one hypof-
tasis, and the Father, Son, and Spirit, "three names of it; or, as in man, there "are the body, soul, and spirit; the body

"for sitan brevitatis, ut non intelligam. Loco quippe isto, quo et non tam longe a Noetianis, Sabellianos commemo-
rans, Sabelliani inquit similia Noeto dogmatizantes, præter hoc, quod dicunt patrem non esse paßum, quomodo de Sabellianis intelligi potest, cum sic innotuerint dicere pa-

trem paßum, ut Patripaffiani quam Sabelliani crebris nun-

* Περὶ θείας ἐστὶ τὸν οὐν καὶ οὐκ ὁδικόν, ὡσπερ ἁλίνα, καὶ ἐργαζό-


μένον τὰ ποιήμα τὰ τὸν κόσμον τὰ τῆς οἰκονομίας τῆς εὐαγγελίας, καὶ σωληνὰ τῶν αἱτίων, ἀναληφθῆ ἐστὶ οὐκ ὡς ὁποῖο ἢ ἀναφέρεται αὐτίνα, καὶ ποιὰ εἰς τὸν πλαν. Ἀρ. 62. 


" being
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"being the Father, the soul the Son, and "the spirit the Holy Spirit *.""

This philosophical unitarianism is the doctrine ascribed by Tertullian to Praxeas, though he speaks of the common people as simple unitarians. "He says, that the Fa ther, Son, and Holy Spirit are the same." He likewise calls him a Patripassian, and says, that "he first carried the Patripassian "doctrine into Rome †." They are Patripassians also whom Cyprian enumerates among heretics. Epist. Opera, p. 200.

Beaufobre thinks that the charge of Patripassianism was entirely founded on a mistake, and as Lardner observes, Austin only inferred that the Sabellians held that doc-


‡ Ibid. sect. 1. p. 500.

C c 2  trine
trine (Credibility, vol. 4. p. 450). Beau-
fobre accounts for the misrepresentation of
the ancients, by supposing that they con-
founded the terms word of God and Son of
God, because in the theology of the church
they were the same, though in the mind of
a Sabellian they were very different. Hist-
toire de Manicheisme, vol. 1. p. 539.

It is very possible that Tertullian and
others might give the epithet of heretical
to the unitarian doctrine in this obnoxious
form only. For it is evident that he did
not consider the simple unitarians as here-
tics, for he says they were the major pars
credentium, the majority of the believers.

Marcellus is generally described as being
what I call a philosophical unitarian, but
he is not said to have been a Patripaffian.
According to Theodoret, he held that
"Christ came as an extension of the Fa-
ther's divinity. This he called God the
"logos; but after all the economy" (that
is, when the gospel dispensation shall be
accomplished) "it will be again drawn into
"him, and centered in God, from whom
"it had been extended. He called the Holy
"Spirit
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“Spirit an extension of an extension, and said that this was given to the apostles.”

Beryllus, one of the first who is noticed as an unitarian, though celebrated for the elegance of his writings, is not said to have been a Patripassian. He only held that “Christ had no proper subsistence till he came into this world, and had no divinity of his own, but only that of the Father residing in him.”

It is allowed by Tertullian, that the Patripassians, as well as the orthodox, said that the Father himself was impassible. That was an universal maxim concerning the divine nature; but they said that the Father had compassion for the Son. Whether this compassion was ascribed by them

* Ἐκλάσαν δὲ τινὰ τῆς τῶν πατέρων Θεότητος εἰρήνην εἰς τὸν χριστὸν ενιαυθενίαν, καὶ τοῦτον Θεόν λέγον εκάστοτε. μεία δὲ τὴν συμπαθίαν υπονομοιόταταν πάλιν αναστασθήσασιν, καὶ συναρτίαν ἀφρὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, εἰ ἐπερ αὐξεθήν. τὸ δὲ παναικίον αυτεύμενον παρεδώκαν τὴν ειλασθεὸς λεγεὶ, καὶ ταῦτα τοὺς αποστόλους μαρασχέσθησαι. Ὁρ. Ἐπ. Λ. Τ. Κ. 1. Υπ. 10, Opera, vol. 4. p. 224.

† Εἰρενέε καὶ γὰρ τὸν κυρίον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν, μὴνα υποστασιν κωνας ἴδιας κινήσεως, ἀπὸ τοῦτον καὶ ημᾶς εὐθυμεῖν· αλλά ἦδε Θεότητα ἴδιαν εἴρεν, μονὸν δὲ παράρρητον υποστασιν καὶ Θεότητα εν τῶν εἰσφυμενοῖς καθαρσιν θυσίαις. Ησίλ. Λ. Κ. 1. Υπ. 22. vol. 1. p. 371.
to the Father himself, or only to the di-
vine ray, or logos, that was in Christ, does
not appear. Perhaps it was the latter. On
this subject Tertullian replies to them as
follows. " Wherefore neither had the Fa-
ther compassion for the Son. For so,
thinking to avoid a direct blasphemy,
they think it will be lessened in this man-
ner; granting that the Father and Son
are two persons, the Son suffering, and the
Father sympathizing with him. But in
this they are foolish; for what is sympa-
"hizing, but suffering with another *."
Notwithstanding this mode in which the
unitarian doctrine was held by some philo-
sophizing persons, it appears that they were
considered as being mere unitarians, as much
as the common people, to whom this mode

* Ergo nec compassius est pater filio; sic enim direc-
tam blasphemiam in patrem veriti, diminui eam hoc modo
 sperant, concedentes jam patrem et filium duos esse; si
filius quidem patitur, pater vero compatitur. Stulti in
hoc. Quid est enim compati, quam cum alio pati? Porro,
si impassibilis pater, utique et incompassibilis. Aut si com-
passibilis utique passibilis. Nihil ei vel hoc timore tuo
praestas. Times dicere passibilem, quem dicis compassi-
bilem, Ad Praxeam, fect. 29. p. 518.
of explaining the doctrine must have been unintelligible; and all the more distinguished unitarians of that age, whether they be said to explain their sentiments in this manner, or not, are represented as holding the same opinion, and the very same that was maintained by the Jews. Thus Sabellius, Marcellus, and Photinus, are all classed together by Chrysostom*; and instances frequently occur, in which all these are said to hold the same doctrine with Artemon, Theodotus, and Paulus Samosatensis.

That Sabellius in particular, though he is generally represented as a Patr Lapassian, was nevertheless a proper unitarian, who believed Christ to have no proper divinity of his own, is evident from the arguments with which his antagonists press him.—Thus Epiphanius, in answer to the Sabellians, says that "Jesus came the Son of God " to the river Jordan †."

* Alli' ide παλιν επιφυδα Σαβελλιος και Μαρκελλος και Φω-

† Αρκαισιν αυτων Σαβελλιανοις μεν μελα των αλλων μακυριων 

η μακυρια τω Ιορδαν, ας νην ειπτου, ιντος υαρ εν Ιορδαν αληθος χα-

Whatever Sabellianism was, whether the more simple, or the more philosophical kind of unitarianism, it appears to have been very popular in Africa, and to have had many adherents among the bishops of that country. Athanasius makes heavy complaints on this subject, saying, as was quoted before, that Sabellianism prevailed so much there, that the Son of God was hardly preached in the churches.

The controversy with the philosophical unitarians took a turn considerably different from that with the simple unitarians, and unfortunately led the orthodox into an embarrassment and inconsistency, which became very apparent when the Arian controversy arose. And, indeed, the language that had been adopted as proper for the controversy with the philosophical unitarians, appears to have contributed very much to the rise of Arianism. For as these learned unitarians asserted that the Father, Son, and Spirit (meaning the divinity belonging to them) were the same, their adversaries had incautiously advanced, that they were essentially different, and that the Father and Son had
had even different natures. And so far were the orthodox, in this state of things, from asserting, as they did at the council of Nice, that the Son was consubstantial with the Father, that they were the first to assert the direct contrary, as they did in the condemnation of Paulus Samosatensis. Thus Basil says, “that they who condemned him rejected the word consubstantial*.”

But this language was retracted when Arius was to be condemned. So different a thing was the orthodoxy of the different periods. Optatus, and others, acknowledge that the famous term consubstantial, was first introduced in the Sabellian controversy, when it seems to have been used by the Sabellians, and disclaimed by the orthodox, whose object was to distinguish the members of the trinity, which the Sabellians were charged with confounding (Lib. i. p. 8.) Origen, in answer to the Sabel-

lians, shows, that in several places the Father and Christ are spoken of as different persons, especially when the Father is said to raise Christ from the dead*. I have observed that Origen expressly maintained that the Son had an essence different from that of the Father; and he makes it an objection to the unitarians, that they made the essence of both to be the same. "Because," says he, "Christ is called the true light, and in the epistle of John God is called light, some think that the essence of the Son does not differ from that of the Father†." On this account, among others, the orthodoxy of Origen was called in question by some after the Arian controversy; whereas it is very evident that

* Μέλαις δὲ τούλι η φίλου εἰς τον ομοδοξημα μικής δύνασθαι τοις εἰς μη τι βλέπειν τον πατέρα τοις γε φεγγάνθηναν τι το μικής τοις τίλαις ὁμοιοίς εἰς τον νεφρόν, ὅπερ το σώμα τῆς ημεροθήκης, τα τιλαράτως τιλιν νεφρόν χαριζομένη, εἰς τον νεφρόν, πρώτων, εἰς νεφρόν. Comment. vol. 2. p. 187.

† Ετέκε δὲ φῶς αὐτάρκησις ἔπαιζε καὶ μενο ποιμής, εἰς τὴν καθευδίαν τῆς αὐτῆς Ιουάννης εἰσοδήμος λέγεται τῷ θεῷ εἰσα αὕτω, ὁ μεν τῶν μελετῶν καὶ εἴδεν καθαρισμαζότως εἰς τῆς μικῆς τοῦ πατέρα. Ibid. p. 70.
both his opinions, and his language, were the very same that were held by all the orthodox of his own age; and Athanasius and others made allowance for this, and apologized for him, as they also did for Dionysius of Alexandria, who is often called the Father of Arianism.

Though the orthodox found it convenient to change the use of this word *consubstantial* when the circumstances of things were changed, the unitarians did not; and therefore Marcellus and Eustathius of Antioch, his disciple, declared loudly for it, at the council of Nice, as Beaufobre observes*.

There is another circumstance relating to this controversy that deserves to be particularly noticed; as it also shews what different ideas, and what different language, men will adopt in different situations. As the philosophical unitarians held that the Father, Son, and Spirit (meaning the divinity belonging to them) were the same, and alleged in


proof
proof of this our Saviour saying *I and my Father are one*; the orthodox, in answer to them, said that the *one* was in the neuter gender, and therefore, that the unity between them was not an unity of *essence*, but only of *harmony*, and *affection*. Novatian says, that "because Christ says *they were one*, in the neuter gender, let the heretics understand that it signifies the concord of *society*, not unity of *person*." This is the very explanation of this text, that the unitarians after the council of Nice always gave, when the orthodox availed themselves of it, as a proof that the Father and the Son were one in *essence*, or were *consubstantial* to each other. Then nothing could be said too high of the divinity of the Son. But Novatian, who lived before the Arian controversy, says, "Most of the heretics, moved with the greatness and

* Qui potuisset dicere, ego pater, si patrem esse meminisset. Et quia dixit unum, intelligat hæretici quia non dixit unus. Unum enim neutraliter positum societatis concordiam, non unitatem personae, sonat. Cap. 27, p. 99.

"truth
"truth of Christ's divinity, extend his "honours beyond bounds, daring to call "him not God the Son, but God the "Father himself*." Thus the great ob- ject of the orthodox in the second century, was to make a God of Christ, but a far inferi or God, and also a God of, or out of God the Father, left he should be thought to be another God, and independent of the Fa ther. On the other hand, the great object of the orthodoxy of a later period, was to exalt the Son to a perfect equality with the Father, so as to allow the Father no ad vantage but what was nominal, or respected mere order. Hence the difference of the language, and in the arguments of the two different periods. While the unitarians always considered the Father as the only true God, and Christ a mere man, the serv vant of God. And if the more philoso-

* Ut plerique hæreticorum, divinitatis ipsius magnitu- dine et veritate commoti, ultra modum extendentes ho- nores ejus, aüi sint non filium, sed ipsum deum patrem promere vel putare. Cap. 23. p. 87.
phical among them ascribed any divinity to him, it was only the divinity of the Father, residing in him, and acting by him, and that only for a time; it being withdrawn from him again, when the purpose of its emission had been answered.

CHAP.
CHAPTER XVIII.

Of the Principles and Arguments of the ancient Unitarians.

I SHALL now proceed to give a distinct view of the principles of the ancient unitarians, and of the arguments by which they defended them; and I beg that my readers would compare them with the arguments of the trinitarians, of which an account has been given already.

SECTION I.

Their Zeal for the Divine Unity, and their Sense of the Word Logos.

ALL the denominations of unitarians, comprizing both the vulgar and the philosophical part of them, considered themselves as advocates for the unity of God, which they thought was infringed by their opponents.
opponents. Of this we have sufficient evidence in every period of their history; and thus much is acknowledged by all their adversaries. Whatever their mistakes were, it was owned that they were led into them by their dread of violating the first, and the greatest of all the principles of religion, viz. that of the proper unity of the divine nature. Sufficient evidence of this hath been given already; but to this view of their arguments, I shall prefix a few other passages of the Fathers, which likewise clearly prove it.

Origen evidently considered the unitarians as persons who really dreaded lest, by admitting Christ to be God, they should infringe upon the honour that was due to the Father only. "By these means," he says, "may be explained that which greatly disturbs many persons, who plead a principle of piety, and who fear to make "two Gods*." He afterwards recurs to the same subject, and introduces it as an

objection of persons with whom he would not trifle, and whom he was far from charging with hypocrisy. "But since," says he, "it is probable that many may be " offended, because we say that one is the " true God, namely, the Father, and be- " sides this true God, there are many who " are made gods by participation; fearing " that the glory of him, who exceeds all " creatures, should be brought down to " that of others, who obtained the appella- " tion of Gods, &c.*" Origen, therefore, must have thought respectfully of those early unitarians, and have considered them as objecting to the doctrine of the divinity of Christ from the very best principles.

Novatian says, that " when they," the unitarians, " observe, that it is written there " is but one God, they think that they " can no otherwise maintain the truth of " this, than by asserting, either that Christ is a

"mere man, or that he is God the Fa-
ther †. Eusebius says, that "Marcellus
wrote his book in order to assert the
unity of God ‡." He also says, that
Marcellus gloried in acknowledging but
one God ‡. Athanasius says, that "the
followers of Marcellus and Photinus de-
nied the pre-existence of Christ, and his
divinity, and his everlasting kingdom,
along with the Jews, on pretence of esta-
blishing a monarchy §." "They so cor-
rupt the sacred faith of the gospel," says
Hilary, "that from a profession of re-
verence towards God, they denied the
nativity of his only begotten Son, saying,

* Quia cum animadverterent scriptum esse quod unus
fit deus, non aliter putaverant istam tenere se posse fenten-
tiam; nisi aut hominem tantum Christum, aut certe deum
† Τέθο φησι οτι των εκείνων, δια το ενα γνοριζον Θεον. Ec. Theol.
lib. i. pref. p. 57.
‡ Αλλα και οσμονελαι αυχον ενα Θεον ειδευα. Ibid. cap. 17.
p. 80.
§ Οι απο Μαρκελλου κι Φαειν των Αναγογωλοιων, οι την προφαθ-
ναιν υπαρξου τη χριστο. και την σεβασμον αυτω βασιλειαν
ομισως Θεους αδελφους, ετο προφατε τι συνιοσαθαι δουνεν τη μονο-

"that
Chap. XVIII. of ancient Unitarians. 403

"that there is a protension, rather than "a descent into man *." In this he alludes to the principles of the philosophical unitarians. Gregory Nazianzen, addressing the unitarians, calls them, by way of ridicule, φιλαγγεία, φιλανάρχει, as pretending to a great zeal for the honour of the Father, as the unbegotten, and without origin †; and in another place he complains, that "the greatest obstacle to the "reception of the truth, was the piety "of his hearers ‡." He says they had zeal, but not according to knowledge, and therefore would be punished with few stripes §.

* Quidam ita evangelicae fidei corrumpunt sacramentum, ut sub unius del pia tantum professione nativitatem unigeniti dei abnegent: ut protension fit poius in hominem quam descensio. Lib. I. p. io.

† Ἡ προτεστομαί οἱ οὐκ θυμούσθησαν τούτοις ἐνώπιον τινος βασιλέως. Τούτων ἐν καθαρίᾳ καὶ εὐλαβείᾳ. Or. p 209.

‡ Οὐκ ἐπὶ καὶ ὁ τῶν αὐλο τῶν διδασκαλίων νηπίων ἔστησεν, ἃ τῶν αὑτῶν εὐλαβείας, ταύτης ἐν καθαρίᾳ. Or. I. p. 17.

§ Καὶ τίνος ἐν λόγῳ, τῶν μετριώτερον καὶ ὑπατίκοις τοῖς παθόμενοι, ἐκ τῆς ἐλπίδος δεινοφανώς, ἀλλὰ τῷ γεί ἐν εὐλαβείᾳ ταῦτα παθησάσθω, καὶ ἐκ τῆς καταφάνους, ἅλλ᾽ ἐκ καὶ ἐπιγραφῆς. τοιαύτα εὐδόκει τῶν ἡμῶν εὐλαβεῖς. Or. p. 17.
There is something particularly striking in the account that Epiphanius gives of the manner in which Sabellians would accost men of plain understanding on the subject of the unity of God, and the usual effect of such zeal and good sense. "Well, my friends," say they, "have we one God, or three Gods? and when a pious person, and one who is not sufficiently upon his guard, hears this, he is immediately alarmed, and assents to his error, so as to deny the Son, and the Holy Spirit."

Cyril of Alexandria says, that "they who acknowledged only one God, and who denied that he had generated a Son out of himself, pretended that it was from a principle of piety." Beaufobre there-

---


† Eἰσαῖας τί φαίνειν αὐ, οἱ τῶν περὶ πάνω αὐτούς εἰσαγαγοῦν λόγοι, χνοποιάθομεν μὲν τῆς εὐσεβείαν, διὰ γε τὰ συνομολογοῦν ὡς εις Θεος.
therefore had reason to acknowledge that Sabellianism was innocent in its origin, and arose from the fear of making more gods than one *.

That the cause of the unitarians was considered as the same with that of the Jews, the great advocates of the divine unity appears from Chrysostom, who, speaking of the divinity of Christ, as proved from the Old Testament, says, that "if " any Jew, under the form of a christian, " lift up his head (I mean Paulus Samosata- " tensis) the same arguments may be used " against him;" and afterwards, " what " was said against the Jews, may be said to " those who have the same origin †." M. Caleca also makes Sabellianism to be the same thing with Judaism ‡.

My readers will probably wish to know in what sense the ancient unitarians understood the term logos, of which so many different opinions have been entertained by christians; and on this head it is in my power to give them the most complete satisfaction. The logos has been so long considered by the generality of christians as synonymous to Christ, that they think any other interpretation to be harsh and unnatural. Socinus himself, and many who are now called Socinians, considered it as meaning the gospel, or the word of God, in its most literal sense. But all the ancient unitarians, without exception, considered it as signifying that word of God by which the world was made, viz. the power of God, his essential operative attribute; and it will appear, that they were exceedingly surprised at hearing of any other interpretation of it. Now, considering that the common people, as well as the learned, among the unitarians, had this idea of it, it cannot but be concluded to have been the proper original sense of the term, because it was so understood by those very persons for whose
use the gospel of John was written. This is an article of so much consequence, that I shall produce a considerable number of authorities for it; disposing of them pretty nearly according to the age of the writers from whom they are collected.

Hippolytus, writing against Noetus, says, "I shall be told, you tell me some thing strange, when you call the logos "the Son ". In the larger exposition of faith ascribed to Gregory Thaumaturgus, it is said, "Some make the wisdom of "God to resemble the wisdom of man, "because he is wise, and his word to be "like that word which is uttered, or con-
ceived, in the mind, without any hypo-
"stasis ." "Some disciples of Paulus

* ἀλλ' εἶπέν μοι τις, ξένον μοι φορεῖς λόγον λέγον μου. Opera, p. 16.

† Non minus alieni sunt, qui trinitatem non secundum veritatem ex tribus personis confitentur, sed in unitate tripli-
catam secundum compositionem impie fingunt, et sapienti-
tiam in deo exislimant esse sicut in homine sapientiam hu-
manam, qua sapiens est : et verbum simile esse interpretan-
tur verbo quod ore profertur, vel mente concipitur, nulla
hypothesis. Opera, p. 16.
"Samosatensis," says Athanasius, "distinguish the logos from the Son, saying, "that the Son is Christ, but the logos is "another thing." "Paulus Samosatensis," says Epiphanius, held that the logos "of God, and his spirit, was always in "God, as the logos of man is in man; and "that the Son had no personal subsistence, "which was also the doctrine of Sabellius, "Novatus, Noetus, and others." Hilary also says that "the word of God, ac- "cording to the heretics, was the power "of God." That this was the doctrine of Marcellus and Photinus, we have the clearest evidence,

* Τινες των απο της Σαμοσατης, διαφημες τον λογον απο την ους, φασιναι τον μεν ουν ειναι τον κριτον, τον δε λογον αλλον ειναι. Con- tra Arianos, Or. 5. Opera, vol. 1. p. 543.

† Εν ου κει αει αυτα του αυτου λογου, και το απειμα αυτη, αὑστερ εν ενθρωπω καρδια ο ιδιος ρους και μη ειναι δε του ουν τε του ουν ενυποστηθη άλλα εν αυτω των. αὑστερ αμελει και ο Σαβελλους και ο Νωνθους και ο Νοτους και αλλοι. Haer. 65. Opera, vol. 1. p. 608.

‡ Per quod etiam illud vitii adjungitur, ut deus verbum tanquam pars aliqua virtutum dei, quodam se tractu continuationis extendens hominem illum, qui a Maria esset habitaverit, et virtutibus divinis operationis infruxerit; animae tamen suae motu naturalis viventem. Lib. Jo. p. 258.
especially from Eusebius, who wrote against the former of them. "Marcellus," he says, "believed Christ to be the word of "God, but a mere word, like that of man, "and not a living and substantial son." Again, he says, "Marcellus affirms, that "the logos is not used by way of figure, "though those who teach the contrary "should burst with their lies, but simply "and truly logos." or reason†. "Mar- "cellus held that the logos was always "united to, and connected with the Fa- "ther‡." He held that the "logos was in "God, as his reason; that it was for a time "out of God, and returned into him at the "day of judgment, and was then united to "him as it had been before.§." Chrysostom

* Ψίλων γαρ και το ανδροπείν λογον ειμιν, καθι δε μην αληθεις.
   Ζωια και υφεσια, τον χριστον ειναι ομολογειν εδειλει. Contra Marcellum, lib. i. p. 19.

† Ου καλαχρυσηςσο λογος ανισοκαιοις καιν διαφαγαιειν οι επερι ται δακαλαιες θεωμενοι, αλλα χρυσες το και αληθεος υπαρξων λογος.
   Ibid. lib. 2. p. 40.

‡ Τελον αληθον λογον εχειν εν εαυτω ενιμενοι και συνιμενοι αληθω

§ Τοσοοιο Μαρκελλος σερι τι λογον ειιτον, τι εν τω θεω, καθ' ουν
   θυταλα λαγων ειτον, δην δυσχορια απεκτησας, τοιοντας ειδος
   τω
also says, that "Marcellus, Photinus, and "Sophronius, say that the logos is an "energy, and that this energy inhabits "him who was the son of David, but is "not a subsisting person*." Theophilałat 
repeats this in almost the same words, say- 
ing, "Marcellus of Galatia, Photinus, and "Sophronius, said that the logos was the "energy of God, and not a personal sub- "sistence, and that it inhabited a descen- "dant of David †." Epiphanius says, that "Photinus asserted that the logos of God "was from the beginning, but that it was "not the Son of God ‡.

I shall add a few other testimonies from later writers. Cyril of Alexandria, writing
against Theodorus, who is said to have been the proper father of Nestorianism (which differed very little from the unitarian doctrine) evidently supposes that this was the received doctrine of the unitarians, when he says, "It is false to say that the word "of God has no substance. It is the "eructation of a foolish heart; For he "himself said to Moses, I am that I am, "and therefore they who think so we deem "most stupid." Again, replying to those who said that the logos is *verbum institutum*, or the proper internal reason of the Father, "Why did not our Saviour say, I and the "word of my Father are one, and he that "sees me, sees the word of the Father." He adds, that "the logos, in the introduc-"tion to the gospel of John has the article "prefixed to it, which shews that it did

* Minime enim mentietur falsissimum esse sermonem, quod verbum quod ex deo apparet, dicatur non habuisse substantiam: est enim flultissimi cordis eructatio. Nam ipse dicebat Mosi ego sum qui sum: quomodo autem unquam hoc quod vere est, in substantia per se non servari intelligitur? et propterca eos qui sic sentiunt, merito ru-"diffimos esse definimus. Opera, vol. 2. p. 687. " not
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not mean reason in general, but a particu-
lar specific logos*.

I do not think it at all necessary to reply to the reasoning of Cyril in this place, I only quote him in order to ascertain what it was that the unitarians, his adversaries, thought on the subject.

The emperor Julian gives his testimony to the unitarians having supposed that by logos was intended the power of God, "Some of the impious," meaning the christians, he says, "say that Jesus Christ is one person, " and he that is called the logos by John " another †." He likewise says that " John does not mention the name of Jesus, or

* Præterea si unigenitus dei filius idcirco verbum est et vocatur, quoniam (ut ipsi dicunt) insitum patris verbum fuscipiens, ad illud formatur: cur non dixit ad discipulos, ego et verbum patris unum sumus: et, qui me videt, is etiam verbum patris videt?—Ideo videmus filium hominis, articulo ad utrumque nomen praeposito, salvatore nostro proferri, quando se folum ab infinita hominum multitudine velit significare. In John, cap. 4. Opera, vol. 1. p. 610.

of Christ, when he calls him God and "logos "."

This use of the term logos or word, is common in the Old Testament, as when the Psalmist says, *By the word of the Lord were the heavens made*, &c. and Macarius, having no view to this controversy, says, "The word of God is God, and the "word of the world is the world," and then speaks of the difference between the word of God and the word of the world, and between the children of God, and the children of the world.

In this sense, according to Eusebius, the Jews always understood the term logos. "If "any one," says he, "suppose that the "Son is a mere word—that it is quiescent "in the Father, when he is quiescent, but "was active when he made the world, re-

---


† Ο τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγος, θεός εστί. καὶ ο λόγος τοῦ κόσμου λόγος εστί. τοῖς διὰ διάφορα καὶ μετοίκις τυφλασθη τοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ τοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ τοῖς κόσμων τοῖς ἐκατον γὰρ γεννήματα τοῖς ἰδιοῖς εὐκομε νοιν. Opera, p. 223.

"ssembling
"fembling the logos of man, which is "quiescent when we are silent, but active "when we speak; it is evident that he "interprets as the Jews do, and according "to human reason, and that he denies the "true Son of God *." He then adds what was quoted in this volume, p. 13. concerning the Jews acknowledging that God has a logos, but no Son.

* Ο δὲ ψευδον λογον ειναι τοι υπον απολαμβανουν, και μονον λογον ειναι μακενρησμονον, κα τοιο λογον ως ηδν ειδον τη ο λογο δ ευτον μεν ει τω πνευματου τω σωματι, ενεργου τε εν τω ημενερω την ιδιον δημιουργεν ενεργου μεν πνευματου εν εισης εις ημενερω, εν σιωπων μεν πνευματου εν εις ημενερω, εν δε φθεγγομενοι ενεργου, δηλου αι εις 1 αιδιους τιν η καιν θεοτων συνεκρουν φυσιματι, τοι δε αειδως υπον ται θεον αρνεμα. Contra Marcellum, lib. i. p. 4.
HAVING stated what the principles of the ancient unitarians were, I shall in the next place, give a view of the arguments by which they defended them; and as some of these were drawn from the principles of reason, and others from the scriptures, I shall mention the former in the first place. But in this I need not insist upon their capital argument, viz. that the doctrine of the divinity of Christ and of the trinity, is an infringement of the great doctrine of natural and revealed religion, the unity of God. This has appeared sufficiently already. Also many of their other arguments have been mentioned in the replies of their trinitarian adversaries. I shall, therefore, only recite such others as have happened to occur separately.
That the ancient unitarians were much addicted to reasoning, and that they often disputed with great acuteness and subtility, so as to puzzle their opponents, may be inferred from what is said of them by Eusebius, viz. that "they neglected the " scriptures, and reasoned in syllogisms *." No doubt they did reason, and probably in the syllogistic form, as was the custom with logicians, and I doubt not very closely and justly; but it will be seen that they were far from neglecting the scriptures.

According to the most ancient doctrine of the generation of the Son, there was a time when the Father was simply one, and had not generated this Son. Upon this idea, Marcellus said that, "if it be a perfection in the Father to have a Son, he was imperfect while he was without " one †."


† Ει γαρ αει τελειος ο θεος, και απαρειν αυτω δυναμις τη σθεαρα αυτω ειναι, και καρον αυτω ειναι σαφερα τη τουθευ ειναι, αναβαλλεις, και ειναι το καλα σπροικει, και ας ενω ειπειν, εξ ει δυναται τοις εικανον ειναι. Contra Marcellum, lib. 1. p. 22.
To the doctrine of divine generation in general, the objection was, that the divine essence must then be corporeal. "Marcellus said, that, if the Son be a *probole*," or production, "from the Father, and he be "his offspring, like the offspring of other "living creatures, both the being pro- "ducing, and the being produced, must be "corporeal *."

That the Son, who was generated from the Father, was allowed by those who first advanced that doctrine to be inferior to the Father, the most abundant proof has been given. Afterwards all this was retracted. But the unitarians retorted it upon them. "The enemies of truth," says Chrysostom, "urge that, if the Son be equal to the "Father, why did not the Father become "incarnate? As it was the Son who took "the form of a servant, is it not plain that "he is inferior. But if on this account "he took human nature, the Spirit, who,

† Ει γαρ προβόλη εστιν ο ους τα θανάτα, και γένει μεν ας αυτός οποῖα τα τω ζων γεννηματα, αναγινώσκει εν τον προβολώτα κρίνον, Contra Marcellum, lib. i. p. 22.
they say (though we do not acknowledge this) is inferior to the Son, should have been incarnate*.

The trinitarians, giving a reason for the mystery of the incarnation, held that the divinity gave a value to the sufferings of the human nature to which it was united. But the unitarians urged the absurdity of this; saying, according to Theodoret, “If a man only suffered, it was a man that saved us+.” This is an argument to which the orthodox have always made very lame replies. They have never chose to say that the deity of Christ suffered, or that it partook of the sufferings of the human nature. Consequently, if it was only man that suffered, the satisfaction made by that suffering could only be finite; and in fact,

* Καὶ γὰρ καὶ τίλο περιφερεσθαι οἱ τῆς αληθείας εχθροὶ, λέγοιτε; διὲ εἰ οὗτος ἦν τὸ γεγεννημένῳ, τίνος ενεκεν ο θάνατος οὐκ ανελαβε ταφικά, ἀλλὰ οὗτος υπέδω τὴν τῇ δόξῃ μορφήν; αὐτὸ ἦν ευδυνάω, δι’ εἰπεῖν καλεδεστέρος ἦν; καὶ μὲν εἰ διὰ τίλο τὴν ημελέραν ὑπεδώ φωτίν, τὸ πένεμα, ο φατιν αὐτοῖ τὰ οὐκ ελαθὼν εἶναι (καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ εἰσίν εἰπομεν) εκεῖνο σαφεισθαι εἴδει. Ser. 51. Opera, vol. 5. p. 697.

could extend no farther than the sufferings of any other man.

Novatian says, in proof of the divinity of Christ, "if he be only a man, why is he every where invoked, since it is the nature not of man, but of God, to be present in every place?" But whatever might be the case in the time of Novatian (when what he says could not be true of any besides the trinitarians) this certainly was not the practice even with them in the time of Origen, who flourished not more than twenty years before him. This has been shewn already, and therefore this universal practice might have been urged, and probably was urged, by the ancient unitarians, as an argument in their favour. According to Origen, the custom of christians was to pray to God through Christ. And

* Si homo tantummodo Christus; quomodo abess ubique invocatus, cum hæc hominis natura non sit, sed dei, ut adesse omni loco possit? Cap. 14. p. 45.

† Θεοκατουμεν εν τον παλαια της αληθειας, η του υπο την αληθειαν, ουλα δε τη νυκταιει απαγμαλα, εν δε τη ομοια, κα τη συμφωνα, κα τη ταυτητη τη βολημος. Ad Celsum, lib. 8. p. 386.
Christ was supposed to join in their prayers. "We are not to pray," says he, "without "our high-priest*." In like manner, other saints were supposed, in the time of Origen, to bear their part in the prayers of the churches to which they had belonged, long before it was thought right to pray to them, and this was the natural progress of things with respect to Christ.

It has been seen how strenuously the ancient unitarians insisted upon the antiquity of their doctrine, and how far all the learned trinitarians conceded to them, by admitting that, in the time of the apostles, the doctrine of the divinity of Christ was not taught openly; because the world was not then ready to receive it. It has also been seen that Basil was charged with introducing novelty into his diocese, especially in his form of doxology to the Holy Spirit; from which it is evident, that the unitarians of that age and country considered his doctrine as having had some other origin than either the scriptures, or chrif-

* Ἀλλὰ μὴ χωρίς τὴν ἀρχειευμ. De Oratione, p. 49.
tian antiquity; and one of them certainly thought very justly of it, when he said to Basil, "I know nothing of your foreign "philosophy." In that country, the authority of Gregory Thaumaturgus was very great, and it was appealed to both by Basil and his adversaries, who were perhaps better judges than himself, of what had been the custom before he came into the diocese. In a letter to his clergy, he says, "do not "despise the hypostases, do not deny the "name of Christ, or pervert the sayings of "Gregory †."

Gregory Nyssen says, that he and his friends were charged with innovation when they taught the doctrine of three hypostases, of one goodness, one power, and one divinity ‡."
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The apostles creed has been shewn to afford a strong argument for the antiquity and purity of the ancient unitarian doctrine. This argument was urged by Photinus, who, according to Ruffinus, pleaded that "the apostles creed, literally understood, was in his favour." Marcellus, in his epistle, quotes the whole of the apostles creed, and affents to it.

The orthodox used to alledge the received mode of baptism as a proof of the divinity of Christ; but we learn from Basil, that the unitarians replied, that "baptizing in the name of the Spirit was no proof of his godhead, because mention is made of baptizing unto Moses."  

* Fotinum vero haereticum scio eatenus scripsisse, non rationem dictorum audientibus explanaret, sed ut simplicitur fideliterque dicta, ad argumentum sui dogmatis traharet. In Symbol. pref. p. 169.

† Epiphanius, Opera, vol. 1. p. 836.

SECTION III.

Arguments of the ancient Unitarians from the Scriptures.

The great strong hold of the unitarians was the scriptures, and the plain literal sense of them. "They bawl out", says Basil, "with their proofs from scripture, "and make no account of the unwritten "traditions of the Fathers". And Photinus, in his dispute with Basil, said that "he could prove his doctrine by a hundred "passages of scripture". The orthodox in general, complained of the advantage which the unitarians had in appealing to the literal sense of the scripture. "If," says Gregory Nyssen, "a man rests in the


† Καὶ μὲν καυχὴσεις ὅτι τὸ ὑποδείγμα εκδου μακραίας θε- 

gεν ο ἐνναδας επιγείωδος. Epiphanius, Hill. 70. vol. 1. p. 829.

E e 4 "bare
bare letter, so far he judaizes in opinion, and has not learned that a christian is not the disciple of the letter, but of the Spirit, for the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life*.

It is to be observed, that by judaizing, was meant adopting the doctrine of the simple humanity of Christ. For the ancient unitarians were commonly compared by the orthodox to Jews, and the Arians to Gentiles, as worshippers of two gods; the Arian logos not being of the same substance with the Father; and therefore a maker of the world, or a God, quite distinct from him.

Gregory Nazianzen also represents the heretics as drawing many to them by their interpretation of the scriptures †.


† Τας δε παρα των θειων γραφων, εντασις τε κε ανθεσεις αις οι τω γραμματος εγερουν, κε τεν νεω των γεγραμμενων μηποδις της πολυς σφεσιςυλικαι, κε των οδον της ακεδειας ταφασση. Or. 36. Opera, p. 577.
With respect to the Old Testament, it was the general complaint of the orthodox that the unitarians interpreted it as the Jews did, and proved the doctrine of the unity of God from it. I therefore do not need to mention many of their arguments. Justin Martyr pretended to prove from the appearance to Moses in the bush, that it was not Jehovah himself who spake to him, but Christ. But Marcellus argues from the same thing, in favour of his doctrine, probably considering the God that spake from the bush as the Supreme Being, who was self-existent, and had no rival; for Eusebius says, that "Marcellus argued from "I am that I am"."

Of the unitarians alledging, Deut. vi. 6. "Hear O Israel the Lord thy God is one Lord, and also, Isa. xli. 4. I am the first and I am the last, and besides me there is no other (a text almost as celebrated as that of Moses) I could produce numberless instances, and they are both generally alledged at the same time. Marcellus, after quoting the latter,


says,
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fays, "There is therefore no younger God, " nor any other besides the God who is the " last, able to co-operate with God.*"

It has been seen, that the trinitarians en-
deavoured to prove the divinity of Christ from the Old Testament. On the other hand, the unitarians were not wanting, on their part, to prove his simple humanity from it.

Theodotus urged, Deut. xviii. 13. A prophet shall the Lord thy God raise up unto thee, of thy brethren like unto me †. And certainly, if he was to be like Moses, he could not be God.

The unitarians argued from Pf. cx. (Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Mel-

* Εγώ γαρ εσμεν, φιλε, Θεος σαμωλος, έγώ μελα ταφια, έγώ πλην ειμι Θεος περφος εκ ευν. έι την γενεαρει της της ευν. ιε αλλος της μελα ταφια Θεος αυ, Θεος συνεργειν δυνατος ευ. Eusebius Contra Marcellum, lib. 2. p. 41.
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Chizedek) that Christ was inferior to Melchizedek *

Theodotus argued from If. liii. in which the Messiah is foretold as to be a man of jor-rows, &c. †.

It is remarkable that the wisdom, of which Solomon gives a figurative description in the book of Proverbs, had been so long interpreted to mean Christ, that even Marcellus allowed it, and made use of it to prove, that Christ was a creature, as the Arians did, and thought that it referred to his human nature only ‡. A much better, and a more natural, interpretation is, that it has no reference to Christ at all.

* Kai ows enai tadoi n monon duxoam tina, alla Χει μειξολεον του κριτη φασκαι, χρισον δε περιει απολος εκληρωδη εις καθαρωθειν την εκεινη ταξιδου, διδεν εκ φθινο τη ειρημεναι, μεν εις τερες εις του αυνα καθα την ταξιν Μελχισεδεκ. ows enai, φθινο αιδον ειπ υπονερε συ την Μελχισεδεκ. Epiphani. Haer. 55. p. 468.

† Ειδα ο αιδος παλαι πνει Θεοδοτος, δι τη Εσαιας περι αυλ εφη, δι ανθρωπος εστιν, εις ειπαιν, ανθρωπος ειδος φερειν μαλακοι, ειδομεν αιδον εν ωδηγη, και εν νακωσι και πυμασθε, και εικ ελημασθε.

‡ Το τουν κεφαλαιον την της παιφομαι, ει την αρχην της Θα-

Dr.
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Dr. Lardner discovers traces of Nazaræan, or Sabellian interpretations of scripture in Eusebius, which he accounts for by supposing, that they were borrowed from some other writer, and inserted into his own work, which, he says, was a frequent method with christian commentators. He gives the following instances:

"All the Father's grace was poured out upon the beloved, for it was the Father that spake in him." Again, upon Ps. lxxii. "This righteousness of the Father is given to the king's son, of the seed of David, according to the flesh, in whom, as in a temple, dwelled the word, and wisdom, dom, and righteousness of God."

Once more, referring to Isaiah lxi. 1. and Luke iv. 18. "Shewing," says he, "that his was not a bodily anointing, like that of others, but that he was anointed with the spirit of the Father's deity, and therefore called Christ."
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Well might Gregory Nyssen, and others, complain of the advantage which the unitarians derived from the literal interpretation of the New Testament, which it is hardly possible to open without finding a decisive argument against the trinitarian system. I shall give some examples of the arguments which the ancient unitarians drew from it.

In proof of the proper unity of God, Marcellus argued from Mark xii. 28. *There is one God, and there is no other but he.*

The inferiority of the Son to the Father, the unitarians proved, from a variety of circumstances, one of which was, Christ being called a servant; and they chose to adhere to that language in speaking of Christ, that they might honour the Father. "On what..."
account,” says Chrysofom, “do you call Christ a servant? That we may honour the Father. But the Son says, that all men may honour the Son, even as they honour the Father.”

The unitarians urged, that, as a servant, Christ was sent by the Father, being subject to his orders. This, they also said, was a proof that Christ was not omnipresent. It may be curious to see what Chrysofom said in answer to this argument. “To be sent of God,” says he, “does not imply removal from place to place, but the manifestation of the economy. Concerning John the Baptist, who was of the earth, and who appeared upon the earth, the gospel says, There was a man sent from God.”

* Τινος δὲ ενεκεν αὐνον υπεργον φαίε* ἵνα τιμησομεν τον πάλεα. 

† Οὐ τὸ απεσαλαντα παρα τον θεο, ἐν την απο τοπον εἰς τοπος μετατασιν σημανει αλλα την οικονομια την φανερωσιν. Περι Ιωαννη του βαπτιστου λεγει το ευαγγελιον τε απο της ους, και απο της φανερωσιν. Εγενετο ανθρωπος αποσαλμενος παρα θεο, Ser. 5. Opera, vol. 6. p. 59.

When
When the unitarians were urged with the Father and the Son being said to be one, they said that they were one by consent and harmony, and proved it from Christ's saying, that his disciples might be one with them, as they two were one.

The reward that was given to Christ, on account of his services and sufferings, was alledged by the ancient unitarians as a proof of his having been employed by God as his servant, and that he had no dignity before. "The heretics," says Chrysofom, "urge that Christ was advanced on account of his sufferings. But he replies, that mention is made by John of his dignity before his suffering." The unitarians likewise

* Quando igitur ad evertendam naturalem trinitatis identitatem, hunc locum in medium haereticus affert, quemadmodum dicens, nos non identitate absoluta corporum, nec animarum alterius in alteram confusione unum sumus; sed affectu charitatis, animarumque ad servanda mandata dei confensu; sic et unum filius cum patre et.

Cyril Alex. in Joan. lib. 11. p. 987.

† Διο και ο Θεὸς αὐτον ὑπερψώσε· διὰ τὸ παθῶς, ως μισθὸν τι παθοῦς δεδωκας αὐτῷ τὴν υφώσιν. Πάλαις λεγεις, αφεῖλικι και εἰδικεν αὐτῳ ὑπερ ως του ὑομᾶ. Ἡμεν ἐν τῳ ενομαθ, ἡμεν ετε τὸν νον χαμιν, επτρεπων, και ἐπηγενων, καὶ καλαχθουν. Ὠρας φησι, μέλα τον γαύρων υφώδη, Ὠρας φησι, μέλα το παθῶς μισθον εδει τὴν υφώσιν.
u urged the Father raising the Son from the dead *.

The gospels were thought to furnish the strongest arguments for the simple humanity of Christ; and this was urged with the more force, as it was acknowledged by the orthodox, that the three first gospels did not teach his divinity. But the ancient unitarians brought as many arguments from the gospel of John, as from any of the others.

We learn from Epiphanius, that Theodotus urged, Luke i. 35. The Spirit of the Lord shall come upon thee; arguing that he did not enter into her, as the orthodox supposed †; and, John viii. 40. Ye seek to kill me, a man who told you the truth ‡. Austin says, that the Sabellians


‡ Καὶ οι ἀπ' αὐς οὐσαθῆς θεόλιαι, ψυχον αὐτῶν φασινεῖς εὖν τὸν χριστόν, καὶ εἰ σπερματι αὐτὸς γενουμαι, εἰ μὴν αὐτῷ απολογιαν σοφίαν χριστίαν εὑρεί, εἰς σαμων οἴομεν ‡,
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urged, John vii. 6. My doctrine is not mine *. Basil's enemies quoted against him John vi. 57. I live by the Father †.

It is remarkable enough, that both Chrysostom and Theophylact blame Paulus Samofatensis for making a pause before the words, Marvel not at this, John v. 27. as if they would connect them with the account of God's giving all judgment to the Son ‡. For all

alpha prophaseni tis eisiv xapekuptos tauta eaiw epitupewn span-

yagen. Di phainon, o kurios efni. wun de xipieie me apoudiasin audroton, os

tin apoudiasin нихri npeisina. ofas phainon, oti audroton estin. Haer.


* Utique si tua doctrina non est tua, O domine, cujus est

nisi alius sit cujus sit? Quod dixisti, Sabelliani non intelli-
gunt: non enim trinitatem viderunt, sed fui cordis er-

orem fecuti sunt. Nos cultores trinitatis et unitatis patris

et filii et spiritus sancti, et unius dei, intelligimus de do-

trina Christi, quomodo non est ejus. In John, Tr. 29.
cap. 7. Opera, vol. 9 p. 246.

† Ta de rhimaia tis seias graffis, aper xamhassies ois apdiymes-

novi kai diastrophes proz tis eisias xuneithai eis kathairestin tis dox-

thi monkeyhes thn prosoferant, wos ektastomen, kai a to douas thn

anaptysothes uia. kai xrafon thn prohedoteth tou, eifw 3w dia tou

stolera. twi par efu ev twn xalw twn eis xranon xepatomenuw twn

p. 166.

‡ Xepi de giaxon evi Paulos o Samostheus xalw aoudotov dog-

makhon twn kurewn wos anegnswse twi to xovon, kai efxisain edouen

Vol. III. f f aow
our printed bibles are now divided, as Paulus Samosatensis and his followers had pointed the passage; and the punctuation received by Chrysostom and Theophylact is followed by no person.

Epiphanius says that Theodotus argued from Acts ii. 22. where Peter calls Christ a man approved of God*. And indeed it was acknowledged by the orthodox, that, in all the period to which the history of Luke extends, the apostles did not openly preach such offensive doctrines as those of the pre-existence and divinity of Christ.

The unitarians found a variety of solid arguments in the apostolical epistles. There is hardly any text of which the trinitarians avail themselves more than Phil. ii. 6. *Who being in the form of God, thought it no robbery to be equal to God.* But even this text the ancient unitarians thought favourable to themselves. Epiphanius says, the here-

* Αλλα, φασιν, ειπον οι αποστολαι, ανδρα αποδειγματι εις μιας σημειος η' τερατι η' ειπον δεον αποδειγματι μαζ. Ηαε. 54. Opera, vol. 1. p. 467.
tics avail themselves of this text, "as if it "meant that Christ would not by robbery "make himself equal to God*." i.e. it would have been robbery if he had done so. Chrysoptom also says, that the Arians prove that Christ is not God from this text, say- ing, that Christ being in the form of God, did not seize upon an equality with God; εκ ἑπατος †?

Lardner observes that Origen understood this text as expressive of the humanity of Christ ‡, and that it seems to have been so understood in an epistle from the churches of Vienna and Lyons, they supposing the apostle to have meant that to be equal, or like to God, Christ did not think a thing to be caught at §.

Theophylact, commenting on Eph. iv. 6. One God, and Father of all, who is above all,

* Οὐ γὰρ εἰπεν, εἰκ νῦν ἐκεῖνος γενεσθαι ὦ θεός θεός αὐτῷ ἀρπαγμὸς. αὐχ ἔχαρπαγμον ἐκταλε εἰκαὶ ὦ θεός τῷ θεῷ εἰκάσει, δι' ἐκ τῷ Ἀν- coratus, fect. 45. Opera, vol. 2. p. 50.
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and through all, and in you all, observes that the heretics thought that the preposition ἐκ (through) was peculiar to the Son, and ἐν (in) to the Spirit; both implying inferiority; whereas he says they are now both applied to the Father.*

In Coll. i. 15. Christ is called the first born of every creature. On this Marcellus said, "How could he who existed always be the first-born of any thing; but the "first new man, in whom God would that "all things should be collected; the holy "scriptures calling him the first-born of "the creation †." Cyril of Alexandria, also says, "They continually urge the more "simple with the word first-born ‡."


† Ποι γὰρ δυνάμειν, τὸν αὐτόν, συρωβολοῦν εὐθεῖα τινος, ἀλλὰ τὸν πρώτον καὶ τὸν αὐτοῦ τοῦτον, εἰς τὸν νεωτέρων ανακεφαλαίωσαν έκεῖνον καὶ τὴν πρώτην ἑνώπιόν τινος. Ὑπερεύθεν ὑποτέθηκα. Eufeb. contra Marcellum, lib. 2. p. 44.

But the two decisive texts in proof of the unity of God, and the proper humanity of Christ, in this epistle, are the following: Eph. iv. 5. One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all; which was urged, as Eusebius informs us, by Marcellus*; and 1 Tim. ii. 5. There is one God, and one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus; which was pleaded by the same †. This was also alleged by Photinus‡.


† Hoc si timemus, deleamus in apostolo quod dicitum est: mediator dei et hominum homo Christus Jesus, quia ad authoritatem hæresis fure Photinus hoc uititur: et non legatur a nobis, quia ab illo male intelligatur. Hil. Ad Arianos, Opera, p. 392.
If my readers only compare these unitarian interpretations of scripture with those made by the trinitarians, in a former part of the work, he must be sensible, without any assistance from me, how infinitely more natural these are than those. The wonder is, that any other sense should ever have been put upon them. The history, however, that I have given of the rise of the doctrine of the trinity, solves this difficulty, and shows the necessity the trinitarians were under of wrestling the scriptures so miserably as they did.

CHAPTER XIX.

Of the Practice of the Unitarians with respect to Baptism.

The form of baptism, supposed to be prescribed in the gospel of Matthew, viz. in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and the trine immersion, which was used along with it, contributed very much to establish the doctrine of the trinity. It was natural enough, therefore, for the unitarians to oppose this superstition by discontinuing the practice; though it is probable that the custom itself was an innovation. That it was not in use from the beginning, is pretty evident from there being no trace of it in the New Testament, though we are not able to say at what time it began. However, that many persons did not baptize in this manner, before, as well as after, the council of Nice, is evident from the decrees of that council, and other proceedings
ceedings of a similar nature; and this was the foundation of the different treatment of those who were called heretics, when they returned into the bosom of the church. For if they had been baptized in the usual form, their baptism was deemed to be valid, how heretical soever the church had been in which they had received it; but if they had not been baptized in that particular form, it was decreed that they should be re-baptized.

In what manner the unitarians, who disapproved of the common form, did baptize their catechumens, does not clearly appear. But it should seem that some of them baptized in the name of Christ only, and others into the death of Christ, which they probably adopted from that expression of the apostle Paul. It appears from Basil, that "some held that it was sufficient to "baptize in the name of Christ." And the canons which are ascribed to the apostles ordered that "if any bishop did "not use trine immersion, but baptized

* Προς τοις λεγομεν εξερχεσαι μονα το εις τον κυριον βαπτισμα.

"only
"only into the death of Christ, he should " be deposed*."

The Eunomians, Theodoret says, baptized in this form, and also did not immerse the whole body, but only applied the water to certain parts of it †.

According to Athanasius, all the unitarians did not object to the common form of baptism; for, he says, both the Manicheans and Paulus Samosatenis baptized in the common form ‡. But they must in general have disliked that form; because it was decreed at the council of Nice, that the Paulians, returning to the church, should be rebaptized §. Austin also says, that "the

† Μη χρησιμολογην της καθαρισεως του βαπτισθησεις, μη δε ποιησαι της τριαδος επιθεσιν. αλλα απεραξ βαπτισθης εις τον δαυδον τη χηρα. η βαπτισθησεις δε μεχρι τον τετελει των υδων την δεσμην, τος δε ουδεν μονος την σωματος ας ειναις σπρωφειν το υδορ επαγωγεως.
§ Περι των Παυλιανων ελαι σπρωφοροι τη καθαρισια υπο εκθεσια απασβαπτισθαι αλλας εξαπαιτοθε. Canon 19. Zonaras, p. 64.
"Paulians were ordered to be rebaptized by the council of Nice; from which," he says, "it is evident, that they did not observe the rule of baptism, which many heretics, though they left the catholic church, did *." Pope Innocent also would not receive the Paulianists without baptizing, "because they did not baptize in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, as the Novatians did †."
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At a council held at Carthage, in 419, the Paulianists were ordered to be rebaptized*. And at the council of Constantinople, the Montanists, Eunomians, and Sabellians, were all ordered, after much preparation, in which exorcism was not omitted, to be rebaptized when they returned to the catholic church†. This seems to show, that the unitarians in general, and also the most zealous Arians, refused to make use of the common form of baptism; and it is probable that they continued to do so till a very late period, if, indeed, they ever dropped it at all. For Damascenus, who wrote in the eighth cen-

† Ευνομιας μετοι της εις μιαν καλαδουμ βαπτιζομενες, και Μοντανιας της ενωθα δεημενες Φρυγας, και Σαβελλιανας της μοντανιαν διδασκοντας, και ήβεια τινα χαρια του κυριου, και τας αλλας αυτας αμφοτερας (ετειθε πολλοι ειςν ενωται, μαλισα δι' αυτο της Σαβελλιας ερχεμενων) ακοιας της αυτων δεημενων παρουσιασθαι, την ορθοδοξιαν ας Ελληνος δεχομενα, και την σωθην υπεραν πολλαν αυτας χρησιμον, την δι' δευτεραν καιχεμενες, ειλα την τριτη εξορι- ζεμεν αυτας μεσα της σωθης τρις εις τον προσωπον και εις την ολη, και έλαυν καιχεμεναν αυτας, και πολλαιν χρονιους εις την εκκλησιαν, και ακροασθαι των γηρα και τω απας βαπτιζομεν... Canon 7. Zonaras, p. 77.
tury, says, that "they who had not been "baptized into the holy trinity, ought to "be re-baptized." It is to be hoped, that the unitarians of the present age will imitate their predecessors, by baptizing, as the apostles did, in the name of Christ only, without the invocation of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, or expressing what they apprehend to be the real meaning of that phraseology.

* At qui in sanctam trinitatem mlnime baptizati sunt, hi denuo baptizentur necesse est. Orthod. Fid. lib. 3. cap. 10. p. 446.