
A
VINDICATION
OF

MR. LOCKE'S Christian Principles,

FROM

the injurious Imputations

OF

Dr. HOLDSWORTH.

PART I.

Now first published.

its meaning to various understandings of which the
Sentences have determined nothing clearly, and
which is of so little importance to be determined,
that all that is of consequence to the great ends of
religion in the article of the resurrection, is suffi-
ciently secured without it. And I must own I do
not see what service it can be of to the Christian
religion, to supply a question of curiosity with the most
necessarily articles of our faith, or to assign an emi-
nent and worthy man, one who on all occasions
seems to have his heart filled with honest duty and piety,
this service for the help of humanity, as his private
and unimpaired, for the sake of his mind and under-
standing a question. I am every man shall be made
again at the last day in his own way, to be
punished or rewarded according to what he had done
in this life, and that those who have pleased God,
shall with him ever live, and not otherwise. In God are
trusts in which the Angels and you agree; and what
particulars or matters their bodies shall be made up of,
would not have been worth the least thought, if it had
no way been imposed as an article of faith.

I leave you now, Sir, to consider, whether you
have not good the charge of your mind, and
Mr. Locke of civility, false reasoning, and false
pretence of scripture; and if I have said any thing
which may help to convince you, that you have done
too hard upon him, and which may incline you to
make him some publick reputation, or at least to re-
peat between God and your own consciences of the
wrong you have done him, I shall not think my pains
ill bestowed; and the least inclination of any such
effect would engage me to be with the greatest
esteem and respect.

211

You will find Mr. Locke

A
VINDICATION
OF

Mr. Locke's Christian Principles.

REVEREND SIR,

THE hopes you express in your introduction, of having it in your power to treat me personally with decency and respect, made me *hope* too for a gentler treatment, than it seems you was able to go through with, in the heat of your zeal against an imagined heretic. However I willingly submit to some rough language, since I must own it a great condescension in you, to bestow so much learning and labour in any manner, upon my short and plain remarks; especially, when a great deal of it might have been spared, without losing any thing of the force of your arguments. I shall therefore give no answer to many personal flights, cavils, and reproaches, all along thrown at me; and shall even pass over a great deal of what may be called mere railing at Mr. *Locke*; since these things have nothing to do with the question in hand, and would be an unnecessary trespass upon the reader's patience. But there is one of your remarks, which, though it concerns me alone, I am tempted to take notice of, for the singular ingenuity of it.

I had

I had said, that the *intention* of my *Letter* was to do Mr. *Locke* justice; and that my *only motives* to it were a love of truth, and a concern for the interests of religion. To which you answer: "The defence of Mr. *Locke* may possibly be thought very consistent with truth and religion; but then it is certainly a motive distinct from them both; and if that were the third motive, it is plain the other two were not the only motives."

Such an extraordinary piece of logic from a learned member of a famous university, cannot but have its due weight with me; and therefore I shall from henceforth acknowledge, that my *third motive* for defending Mr. *Locke* was to defend Mr. *Locke*. But, notwithstanding this *third motive*, which you have ingeniously found out for me, you may, if you please, believe me, when I say, that if you had opposed and censured Mr. *Locke*, without any injury to truth, or the interests of religion, I should have been silent, and had no motive at all to write in his defence. To the charge of having been led into it by *prejudice, partiality, and a blind veneration for a celebrated name*; I shall only retort, that if my papers have given any ground to think, that I am *blind with prejudice* in favour of Mr. *Locke*, yours have made it pretty evident, that you are too much prejudiced against him, to see any thing, that concerns him, in a *true light*.

Of this we have an early instance in your second chapter, by the character you have there drawn of him, and his *manner* of writing; the finishing strokes of which, I shall here transcribe as a sample of that *false light*, in which you represent him throughout your book. "He always treated his adversaries with so much haughtiness and scorn, and insolence of language, that his management of the controversy became much more grievous and insupportable, than any clearness or strength
" of

" of his reason; and so they rather dropt the man than his argument."

I dare say, Sir, if you had not set a name to this picture, no body could have guessed for whom it was meant: it certainly resembles no one less than it does Mr. *Locke*. He was eminently a well-bred manly writer, and had a singular soft, and respectful way of insinuating those arguments, which most pressed his adversaries; which was always his way of management; unless he had to do with writers of Mr. *Edwards's* spirit, whose usage of him demanded another kind of treatment. In the controversy betwixt him, and the Bishop of *Worcester*, (which you think it not impossible might be managed in the way you have represented) he remarkably preserved all the respect, that was due to the Bishop's station and character; no insolence appeared, but that of daring to defend himself against a person of such eminence, and presuming to shew, where the weak side of his objections lay; so that there was no occasion given to drop the man, if his arguments could have been defeated. This, Sir, is a fact, which gained the general approbation at that time, and for which the controversies themselves may be now appealed to: and those, who consult them impartially, will, I doubt not, find so much prejudice in all your observations upon Mr. *Locke's manner*, as may warn them what to expect in your remarks on the matter of his writings, which we are now going to consider.

In chapter 1, you set down several *Socinian principles*, which you pretend Mr. *Locke* has maintained in his writings; and that therefore you might justly call him a *Socinian writer* in your sermon; which was the first imputation I had singled out to complain of. But as your proofs of his agreement with the *Socinians* in those points do not occur till

" Vide second and third Letters concerning Toleration. And his answer to the Occasional Paper,

long

long after, I shall consider them^b in their place, and doubt not to make it appear, that you had no sufficient grounds from them for such a charge.

In the mean time you enquire chap. ii. whether Mr. Locke was a Socinian in the doctrine of the Trinity. And give us your proofs, that he was, in sect. i. from the reasonableness of Christianity, and the two vindications of it: Which we must first examine.

I pass over your preliminaries, and groundless observation, to come to the great points maintained in those books, upon which your charge of Socinianism is founded: They are these.

“ That believing Jesus to be the Messiah was
“ all, that was required to make any man a Christian, who first acknowledged the one eternal God.

“ That the belief, that Jesus was the Son of God,
“ was nothing more than this. And

“ That whenever the expression of the Son of
“ God is used in all the Scripture, the signification
“ of it is only, that Jesus was the Messiah.”

The first of these propositions, you yourself, Sir, seem to own the truth of, when you say^c, “ Neither will I enter into the examination of that
“ question, viz. whether the belief, that Jesus is the
“ Messiah, be all, that is required to be believed
“ to make a man a Christian; for there is no doubt
“ but all men are made Christians, and must be
“ saved by faith in Christ.”

If there is no doubt of this, it must be, because it is a doctrine contained in the Scriptures. Why then is it brought as one of the articles to prove Mr. Locke a Socinian? Why may he not be allowed (without owing it to Socinus, or the richness of his own invention) to have found this truth in the Scriptures? And if Socinus happened to find it there too, must Mr. Locke be obliged either to give it up, or to bear the imputation of Socinianism, for

^b Chap. ii. § iii.

^c Page 18.

^d Page 20.

embracing a truth in common with that heretic? At this rate he might have been required to renounce his Bible, because Socinus believed it. But this article is for the present dropped.

“ What you insist upon against him under this
“ head, is, that the words the Son of God signify
“ and mean, not only the Messiah, but also the
“ divine nature of Jesus Christ; that it was the
“ opinion of the Jews, that their Messiah was not
“ only to be an extraordinary man, but a divine
“ person; and that this was proposed to the faith
“ of those, who were made Christians in the preach-
“ ings of Christ himself, and his Apostles: and
“ this you doubt not will clearly appear, if we
“ distinctly consider the use and import of this
“ phrase Son of God, in those passages of the Evan-
“ gelists, and Acts of the Apostles, where Mr.
“ Locke has traced it.”

You will not now, it seems, insist, “ that the
“ phrase Son of God must be always distinct from,
“ and imply something more than the Christ, be-
“ cause the one is often joined with the other ex-
“ pression in the same sentence.” Though you had once, as Mr. Edwards does, laid great stress upon that argument, which upon second thoughts you have given up.

“ But there are other undeniable proofs, you say,
“ That Christ, or Messiah, and the Son of God,
“ were very different appellations, and generally
“ implied different things, when predicated of
“ Jesus.”

You then^e proceed, to consider the places of Scripture, from whence you collect these undeniable proofs; and most of them are the very same, from which not only Mr. Locke, but a very eminent Pre-
late of our church, has drawn the contrary con-

clusion; of which I shall have occasion to take further notice hereafter. Mr. *Locke*, on his part, to prove, that *Son of God* and *Messiah*, are synonymous expressions, argues from several texts compared with one another. As, when our Saviour asks his Disciples, whom they thought him to be; *Peter's* answer is set down in these words, *Mark* viii. 29. *Thou art the Messiah*; in *Luke* ix. 20. *The Messiah of God*; and *Matth.* xvi. 16. *Thou art the Messiah, the Son of the living God*. Which expressions, says he, we may hence gather, amount to the same thing. In like manner he compares *John* i. 45. with verse 49. *Luke* xxii. 70. with the three preceding verses, *Acts* ix. 20. with verse 22. from which places, so compared, he concludes, that *Son of God*, and *Messiah*, signify the same thing.

This method of reasoning, from texts compared with one another, as it is the surest way to find out the true sense of Scripture, so it shews us the sincerity of what he professes in his vindications, that he "took not the sense of the texts in debate, " from the *Antitrinitarians* and *Racovians*, but from " the Scripture itself, giving light to its own meaning by one place compared with another."

You on the other hand argue, from the different conduct of our Saviour himself, and of others towards him, with regard to those two titles, that they must have been understood to imply different things. Which of these two contrary opinions are best supported, I am not obliged to consider by the design of this undertaking; which is not to defend Mr. *Locke's* interpretations of Scripture, but to shew, that he has not by them given any ground to justify your charge of *Socinianism*.

However, in regard to truth, and to the judgment of many orthodox divines, who have main-

tained with him, that *Son of God* and *Messiah* have always the same signification in Scripture, I shall make some observations on the chief arguments you have brought to prove, that they generally signify different things; which may help us to see, whether they are so clear, so undeniable, as you suppose them to be.

The sum of what you offer in proof of this, is, that our Saviour freely owned himself at all times to be the *Son of God*; but with great reserve, if ever, to the unbelieving *Jews*, that he was the *Messiah*. That he forbade his Disciples to make known, that he was the *Messiah*; but laid them under no such obligation, as to the title of the *Son of God*. That when the unclean spirits cried, saying, *Thou art the Son of God*, it would have been in vain to have charged them not to make him known, if *Son of God* and *Messiah* had been titles of the same import; for then confessing him to be the one, would have discovered him to be the other.

In answer to this, it may be remarked, that the account we have in the Gospels, of the malice and cunning of the *Jews*, in endeavouring to lay hold of our Saviour's words, that they might have wherewith to accuse him, gives great light into the reasons of this different conduct of his, without supposing any difference in the signification of those two appellations. It was, no doubt, known to the *Romans*, that the *Jews* expected a temporal king and deliverer, under the title of *Messiah*; and therefore our Lord did with great prudence, all along, avoid taking upon himself that title, (as he avoided being made a king) that his enemies might have no ground to accuse him as a mover of sedition. But *Son of God*, though equally understood, both by his Disciples, and by the unbe-

lieving *Jews*, to signify the same with *Messiah*; (for it is plainly upon a supposition of his being, or pretending to be, the *Messiah*, that the first confessed him to be, and the others enquired whether he was, the *Son of God*) yet this title being not so peculiarly appropriated to him, but that it had been applied to other eminent persons, and might denote the character of a great prophet, was less obnoxious to the *Roman* governor; and therefore freely owned by our Lord at all times, and in all places.

The same observation will take off the force of most of your other arguments. As to that, which you urge from our Saviour's charging the unclean spirits not to make him known, which you say would have been in vain, when they had already done it, by saying, *Thou art the Son of God*, if that title signifies the same with *Messiah*, I see no ground for supposing, that this charge relates to the very time and place, where they had already proclaimed who he was. It seems a command not to publish farther abroad, that he was the *Messiah*; probably, that it might not come to the knowledge of the supreme powers, who might have been alarmed with that title.

This reason of our Saviour's conduct will likewise account for that of the *Jews*, and their high-priests, whom you suppose^b to have "thought there was a wide difference between those two titles, because when *Jesus* appropriated that of *Son of God* to himself, they still charged him with blasphemy; whilst the worst construction they could put on his being called the *Christ*, or *Messiah*, was only sedition or treason. Which distinction, you conclude, they could not have been inclined to make, if they had apprehended, that *Messiah*, and *Son of God*, were names implying the same thing."

^b Page 28.

Sedition and treason were crimes against the authority of the *Romans*; and if the *Jews* and high-priests apprehended, that the title of *Messiah* was obnoxious to them, as that by which the great king, whom they expected to free them from the *Roman* yoke, was commonly known, it was natural for their malice to cry out sedition, upon his being called *Messiah*; a title, which the *Jews* would fain have drawn our Saviour to own, that they might make a handle of it, wherewith to accuse him before the *Roman* governors.

But as he carefully avoided this snare, yet he freely owned the title of *Son of God*, which could be no ground of accusation to the *Romans*; when they found they could not fasten the charge of treason against him, they accuse him of blasphemy, which was a crime against their own law, that they might get him condemned upon that. But this can be no argument, that they did not themselves apprehend *Messiah*, and *Son of God*, to be names implying the same thing, since it was only, as they denied him to be their *Messiah*, that they accused him of blasphemy, for calling himself the *Son of God*; a title, which they knew belonged to that office; and, on the other hand, it was upon that supposition only of his pretending to be the *Messiah*, that they inquire, *Art thou the Son of God?* And it is remarkable, that our Saviour in defending himself against the charge of blasphemy, maintains his claim to the title of *Son of God*, solely on account of his office as *Messiah*; though with his usual caution he does not name it, *Say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God*ⁱ; which passage alone might be sufficient to determine the sense of that phrase.

ⁱ John x. 36.

What has been said makes it needless to give a particular answer to your argument ^k from the distinction our Saviour himself made, when being asked by the chief-priests, *Art thou the Christ?* *Art thou the Son of God?* he declined saying, that he was the *Christ*, but owned himself the *Son of God*; upon which you conclude, "no question he did not distinguish without a difference." A difference there certainly was, in the consequence of owning one, rather than the other of those titles, as I have observed above; which sufficiently accounts for our Saviour's conduct, without supposing a real difference in their meaning: and I believe those, who would infer from this conduct, that those two titles must have *different significations*, will be at a loss to find any other reason for our Saviour's owning himself to be the *Son of God*; and declining to own, that he was the *Christ*, than that which I have mentioned. And if this was the true reason for his making such a distinction, it can never be proved from thence, that there was any other ground for it.

Nay, I am almost persuaded, notwithstanding the weight you seem to lay on this argument, you do not yourself imagine, that the Chief-priests in questioning our Saviour, had any other intention (though they varied the terms of their question) than to know, whether he would profess himself to be the *Messiah* or not. Their question, as we have it in one of the Evangelists, is plainly one, though both the terms are expressed, *I adjure thee by the living God, tell us if thou be the Christ the Son of God*. Nor do I believe you will deny, that when our Lord owned himself to be the *Son of God*, they as much understood him to mean, that he was the *Messiah*, as if he had directly affirmed it; or that he certainly knew they would so understand

^k Page 33.

him,

him, which they manifestly did. For when he was on the cross, they reproached him with having falsely pretended to be the *Messiah*, though he had never publicly taken upon him that character, otherwise than by owning himself to be the *Son of God*. And therefore our Saviour's answering the last, when he had declined to answer the first question, could not be on account of any real difference in the meaning of the expressions, or in the apprehension of the *Jews* concerning them; but only, as has been said, to avoid giving them any handle, whereby they might accuse him of sedition to the *Roman* government. So that from none of these places of Scripture is it so clearly proved, as you ^l pretend, that *Son of God* is distinguished from *Messiah*, when predicated of Jesus.

As for those passages, in which *Son of God* is distinguished from, by being directly predicated of, *Christ*, or *Messiah* ^m; you tell us, Mr. Locke pretends, that "there the word *Christ* is only a proper name." But that he should make this good (say you) in the places cited, is impossible. It might be expected you should have given us some reasons, why this is impossible; but perhaps, you did not find it so easy to refuse, as to rail at the assertion, by calling it *false and ridiculous, a mean and low evasion*. A censure, which if the assertion has any support from Scripture or history, must itself pass for nothing but a poor evasion. And that we may the better see, whether there is not some ground for the assertion in Scripture, give me leave to consider a little that one passage, which you have particularly set down here, where Mr. Locke pretends, that "the word *Christ* is only a proper name." It is *Acts* ix. 20. where it is said of St. Paul, *straightway he preached Christ in the*

^l Page 33. ^m Ibid.

L 4

lyna-

synagogues, that he is the Son of God. Now if *Christ* is here to be taken for the dignity or office of the *Messiah*, it must be supposed, that the *Jews*, to whom *St. Paul* preached, already knew, that *Jesus* was the *Messiah*, and only wanted to be informed, that this *Messiah* was the *Son of God*: for it is plain, that he instructs them in something, which they did not know, of one whom they did know, by the name or title of *Christ*, that *Christ* is the *Son of God*. Whereas, it clearly appears, by verse 22, that the persons, to whom he preached, were such, as denied him to be the *Messiah*; for it is there said, that he confounded the *Jews*, proving that this is very *Christ*. But if the word *Christ* in verse 20, is to be taken for a proper name, as *Mr. Locke* contends, then the sense will be the same as in verse 22, this person called *Christ* is truly the *Christ*, or the *Son of God*. And indeed these two verses compared together do very much illustrate one another, since they relate to us the same preaching, at the same time, and to the same persons; for it cannot be doubted, that the same doctrine is delivered ver. 20. in these words, *that he (Christ) is the Son of God*, and ver. 22, in these words, *that this is very Christ*, which both shews, that those expressions signify the same thing, and that *Christ* must be understood as a proper name in verse 20, unless we can imagine, that *St. Paul* there takes for granted, that those very persons owned *Jesus* to be the *Christ*, or *Messiah*, whom immediately after he mightily confounded by proving, that he was truly so, *that this is very Christ*. It may likewise be farther observed here, that the same word, as a proper name, seems to be the antecedent implied, which the relative *This*, in verse 22. necessarily requires; *Christ* (the person commonly so called) *this is very Christ*.

Mr. Locke maintains, that many other places of Scripture plainly require, that *Christ* should be taken

taken as a proper name, particularly *Acts* iii. 6. iv. 10, and all those places, where the words are, *In and by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth*; because, as he argues, if *Christ* in those places signified the personal dignity or office of the *Messiah*, the word *Nazareth* would bring an inconvenient relation upon it, as it stands in the text. These, Sir, are not bare assertions: reasons are brought from Scripture to shew, that *Christ* is sometimes used there as a proper name; and whether it is a sufficient answer barely to deny it, as you pretend, must be left to others to judge.

Mr. Locke had farther urged on this subject, that as it was usual for the disciples of eminent philosophers to be called by the name of their master, so the followers of *Christ* were called *Christians*, from their master's name: and this he confirms by observations from *Tacitus* and *Suetonius*, where our Saviour is called *Christ*, as a proper name. But these are contemptible arguments with you. "It may be presumed, you say", that the first *Christians* thought it a greater honour to be called by the kingly style of their Lord, and with that view gave themselves that name: and in what manner *Agrippa*, or the *Roman* historians, used or applied the words *Christ*, or *Christians*, it is not in the least to the purpose to enquire."

But may it not be presumed (at least as probably) that the name of *Christians* was first given to the followers of *Christ* by the unbelievers? Who might derive it, as was usual, from their master's name. We are not told, that the Disciples called themselves, but that they were called, *Christians*, first at *Antioch*. But whosoever gave them that name, it was certainly very much to the purpose of the question in hand, to enquire how the *Roman* historians

applied the words *Christ* or *Christians*. For when the sense of some passages of Scripture seems to require, that *Christ* should be taken as a proper name, it is sure a great confirmation of that sense, if we find the word so applied by the *Roman* historians; and makes it the more probable, that from the time of the Apostles down to them, *Christ* was sometimes used as a proper name.

Your next argument to prove, that *Son of God* does not signify the same with *Messiah*, is, that "our Saviour, in several places of the Evangelists, calls himself the *Son of Man*. And you believe it will not be questioned, but that this expression signifies the *Messiah*." Upon which you ask, "if there is no difference between the meaning of these two expressions, *Son of God*, and *Son of Man*, though both applied to the same person?" To this, I answer, that if both these appellations are given to our Saviour, on account of his Messiahship, as that of *Son of God* most unquestionably is; then they both mean the same thing, when so applied, how exalted a sense soever the one may otherwise have more than the other. That the title of *Son of Man* belongs to the *Messiah* will certainly not be questioned, since he often applied it to himself: yet that it signifies or imports the great office, to which he was appointed, as that of *Son of God* and *Messiah* do, may perhaps bear a question, as what cannot be so clearly proved, though you take it for granted. It must be confessed, that we are left very much in the dark, on what account it is, that our Saviour peculiarly styles himself the *Son of Man*, probably alluding to the vision in *Daniel*: and as no solid argument can be founded upon titles, that are not absolutely incommunicable, which neither of these are, I see not how any certain conclusion can be drawn from them.

However, from all these observations of yours laid together, you go on with ^a consequence upon consequence, till you have concluded Mr. Locke a *Socinian* convict. "If, say you, the words *Son of God* cannot signify the same with *Son of Man*, nor barely the same with *Messiah*, they signify "his divine nature; and if they signify his divine nature, then the divine nature of *Messiah* was also a part of that faith, which was necessary to make men *Christians*: and if so, then a man, who endeavours to persuade the world, that it is not necessary, may be supposed to deny it: and to deny the divine nature of *Jesus Christ* is *Socinianism* in the doctrine of the Trinity. And therefore Mr. Locke may be justly charged with "it in these his writings."

Not so fast, good Sir, though we have here the whole foundation of your charge against Mr. Locke, your conclusions may not so certainly follow from the premises, as you imagine. First, it is possible, that the words *Son of God* may in their most exalted sense signify the divine nature of our Saviour; and yet that sense of them not have been so plainly taught, as to be part of the faith, which was necessary to make men *Christians*; since that title was undeniably applied to our Saviour on many other accounts. Or, secondly, it is possible, at least, for a man to think, that that highest sense of those words was not commonly understood by all, who acknowledged *Jesus* to be the *Messiah* the *Son of God*; or even to think, that those words do not signify his divine nature, without denying his divine nature, if there are other proofs of it in Scripture. For by what rule, I pray, must a man be supposed to deny the truth of a doctrine, because he does not think it contained in some cer-

tain words, when there are several stronger proofs of it? Or, because he thinks the belief of it is not absolutely required to make a man a *Christian*? Do you, Sir, acknowledge no truths in the Scriptures, the explicate belief of which you do not think necessary to make a man a *Christian*? If so, you must have a larger catalogue of fundamentals than was ever yet heard of in the Christian church: Or else you must allow us to *suppose*, by your own rule of judging Mr. *Dicke*, that you *deny* many important truths contained in the *Holy Bible*.

But Mr. *Locke* has left no room to *suppose* this of him, for he has plainly declared, that "though it is certain, that what our Saviour and his Apostles admitted men into the Church for believing, is all, that is absolutely required to make a man a *Christian*; yet this is not in *defiance* of all the rest: this excludes not the belief of any of those many truths contained in the Scriptures, which it is the duty of every *Christian* to study, and thereby build himself up on our most holy faith." This Mr. *Locke* asserts more than once: and why may not that doctrine, which you will needs *suppose* him to deny, be one of those truths, which he affirms, "it is the duty of every *Christian* to study, and thereby build himself up on our most holy faith, though not absolutely necessary to make him a *Christian*?" Let us but *suppose* this, and your sole proof of Mr. *Locke's* being a *Socinian* from these his writings falls entirely to the ground.

Nor can his denying, that the words, *Son of God*, were understood by all, who used them, to signify the divine nature of the *Messiah*, be any bar to this supposition: for you must allow, Sir, that the proofs of our Saviour's divinity cannot be taken chiefly, much less solely, from his being styled in Scrip-

Scrip-

Scripture the *Son of God*; since it is undeniably plain, that *that* title is given him on several other accounts, (Bishop *Pearson* reckons four) and therefore it would be impossible to maintain his divine nature on that foundation alone, without the support of other places of Scripture, where the *attributes* and *works* of the supreme God are ascribed to him. So that those, who think the words *Son of God*, are every where in Scripture used to signify no more than the *Messiah*, may yet firmly believe the divine nature of that *Messiah*, from the authority of those more *undeniable proofs*.

This evidently appears to have been the case of many eminent divines of our Church, who were strenuous assertors of our Saviour's divinity, though they maintained the same sense of those words, in which Mr. *Locke* understood them. Some of these he has quoted in his vindication, *viz.* Archbishop *Tillotson*, Bishop *Taylor*, and Bishop *Patrick*. From the first he cites these words concerning *Nathanael*; "and being satisfied, that he (our Saviour) was the *Messiah*, he presently owned him for such, calling him the *Son of God*, and the *King of Israel*." From Bishop *Patrick's* witnesses to Christianity, p. 14. he gives us these words, "to be the *Son of God*, and to be *Christ*, being but different expressions of the same thing;" and p. 10. "It is the very same thing to believe, that *Jesus* is the *Son of God*, and to believe, that *Jesus* is the *Christ*, express it how you please. This alone is the faith, which regenerates a man."

Against the authority of those great men you object, that Bishop *Taylor* was known to have had many singular and false opinions; and that Archbishop *Tillotson* was not free from the charge of being a *Socinian*. As to the first, I shall only

say here, that whatever singular opinions he had, he was known to be no *Socinian*; which is all that is requisite to the point in question. And as to your exception against the Archbishop, it is of a piece with your censures of Mr. *Locke*, founded on suspicions, and uncertain conjectures. If the Archbishop has any where maintained *Socinian* heresies, it is too little to say, *he was not free from that charge*: if he has not, it is too much: such calumnies are not to be so lightly dealt about. But since you have thought fit to except against him on that account, give me leave to substitute another for his and Mr. *Locke's* support, against whom I believe you will find no exception, and that is Bishop *Pearson*, who has these express words, "to be the *Christ*, and to be the *Son of God*, were ever inseparable, and even by the *Jews* themselves accounted equivalent." And in proof, that the *Jews* did account those expressions equivalent, he produces those very texts, which you bring to shew, that they are not equivalent, of which I gave some hint before. "Thus, says he, *Nathanael* that true *Israelite* maketh his confession of the *Messias*; *Rabbi thou art the Son of God, &c.* Thus *Martha* makes expression of her faith, *I believe, that thou art the Christ the Son of God, which should come into the world.* Thus the High-Priest makes his inquisition, *I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ the Son of God.* This was the famous confession of *St. Peter*. And the Gospel of *St. John* was therefore written, that we might believe that *Jesus* is the *Christ the Son of God.*" All these passages, from which you conclude, that *Son of God* cannot signify the same with *Messiah* or the *Christ*, and upon which you lay the chief weight of your charge

* Art. II. *His only Son.*

† Page 162.

against

against Mr. *Locke*, for maintaining that they do mean the same thing; Bishop *Pearson* quotes, to shew, that those expressions are equivalent, and by the *Jews* so accounted; and the ground of this their faith, he tells us, was a constant interpretation of the second *Psalms*, as appropriated to him. Which *Psalms* you know is in the *New Testament* applied to our Saviour on account of his resurrection.

The single authority of this last named *Prelate* might have superseded all other arguments in defence of Mr. *Locke* upon this point, since it sufficiently justifies his interpretation of those texts: And as you could not but know, that the same sense of them was maintained by this unquestionably orthodox divine, as well by those others before cited, that alone ought to have prevented your vain labour to support the charge of *Socinianism* upon a foundation so evidently insufficient.

To this argument you object indeed, that "when a man is firmly engaged in the defence or advancement of heretical opinions, it is not popular names, and great authorities, not any of those Bishops cited by Mr. *Locke*, that can screen him from the ill reputation of them." But what is this to the purpose? It is not pretended, that Mr. *Locke* was engaged in defending or advancing heretical opinions, otherwise, than by interpreting certain texts of Scripture, as they are said to be understood by the *Socinians*. And if it be abundantly shewn, that *this* is the avowed sense of many great divines acknowledged to be no *Socinians*, their authority must undoubtedly screen him from being convicted of *Socinianism* on that account.

You had just before produced some words of Mr. *Locke's* on this subject, where you say, "He

* *Acts* xiii. 33. *Luke* xx. 36. *Rom.* i. 4.

w Page 35.

* Page 36.

" owns,

"owns, that he understands many places of Scripture as the *Socinians* do;" though he is so far from *owning* this, that he denies, that he knows any thing of it, but what his adversary had told him. For what reason you set down part of that passage, I know not, unless it be to introduce a *remark*, which perhaps you may think has some smartness in it. But you have given it us so imperfect; and so partially, that I must beg leave to transcribe the place more at large; because I think the part you have omitted, very much conduces to set it in a light, that can reflect no dishonour upon the author of it, nor answer any purpose of yours. The passage, as I find it in the *Vindication*, from which you quoted it, stands thus: "I know not but it may be true, that the *Antitrinitarians* and *Racovians* understand those places as I do: but it is *more than I know*, that they do so. I took not my sense of those texts from those writers, but from the Scripture itself, giving light to its own meaning, by one place compared with another. What *in this way* appears to me its true meaning, I shall not decline, because *I am told*, it is so understood by the *Racovians*, whom I never yet read. If the sense, wherein I understand those texts, be a mistake, I shall be beholden to you, if you will set me right: but they are not popular authorities, or frightful names, whereby I judge of truth or falsehood."

Upon this passage, as you had mangled it, you judiciously remark, "This seems to have been one of Mr. *Locke's* particularities: he would enjoy the opinion, but disown the bad company." Whether this be a *particularity* or not, I humbly conceive there is nothing wrong in it. He had certainly reason to *disown* the company, whose opinions he never consulted or knew, when he had so much better grounds for his, by comparing places

places of Scripture; and so much better *company*, as we have shewn, to countenance him in it.

You next observe, "that Mr. *Locke*, in the place above cited, thinks it hard upon him to be thought a *Socinian*, for following (so you express it) the *Socinian* opinion in one point; and therefore, says he, I must certainly be of their persuasion in every thing else." To which you answer, "No, this is not necessarily to be inferred; but so much is certain and necessary, that he, that joins with the *Socinians* in their great and distinguishing doctrines, may be justly called a *Socinian*, though he does not acknowledge all their errors; as a man would be a *Mahometan*, who believed in *Mahomet*, though he did not receive into his faith all the errors of the *Alcoran*."

This is just as much to the purpose, and of the same kind with the objection taken notice of above. How is it at all an answer to Mr. *Locke's* complaint? It was not for joining with the *Socinians* in their great and distinguishing doctrines, that Mr. *Edwards* had then, or that you have now, charged him with being a *Socinian*; but for agreeing with them in that one point of understanding this phrase, *the Son of God*, in those texts, where our Saviour is so called, to signify the same with *Messiah*. This has been shewn to be no such *distinguishing doctrine* of theirs, that if Mr. *Locke* had been disposed to take his sense of those texts from any other authority than that of the Scripture, he had any need of going to them for it, since we have so many orthodox divines, from whom he might have had the same doctrine: and as their concurrent opinion sufficiently shews, that it cannot be inferred from his *interpretation* of those texts, that he denies the

divine nature of *Jesus Christ*; he might well think it not only *hard*, but most unreasonable, and unjust, to conclude him a *Socinian* barely on that account.

In pages 37 and 38, you give us a notable declamation upon some scraps collected here and there, out of Mr. *Locke's* two *Vindications*, which I might well pass over, as there is no manner of argument or reasoning in it, nor one word to the purpose you was then upon, of proving him a *Socinian*. What indeed can be proved from disjointed sentences patched in that manner together? And what can be more unjust or groundless, than that which you there (after Mr. *Edwards's* example) retort on Mr. *Locke* as a *creed-maker*, *imposing his authority*, and *insolently dictating to others*? For no man can communicate his thoughts in a less imposing manner, than he has done in his *reasonableness of Christianity*. One need only read his preface to that book, to be convinced of this, of which I give you a part in the following words: "If by this my labour, thou receivest any light, join with me in thanks to the Father of lights. If upon a fair and unprejudiced examination, thou findest I have mistaken the sense and tenor of the Gospel, I beseech thee, as a true *Christian*, in the spirit of the Gospel, which is that of charity, and in the words of sobriety, set me right in the doctrine of salvation." Is this, Sir, the language of an *imposing creed-maker*? Or is it not a full refutation of all that fine piece of rhetoric, which you have brought in by head and shoulders, only to make a flourish? You then return to your task of proving Mr. *Locke* a *Socinian*.

This you say ^y will appear, if we consider his particular interpretation of some of the texts before-mentioned; to which you next proceed, and continue

^y Page 39.

through

through the nine following pages. Most of the texts you there instance in, are some of those, where *Son of God* is applied to our Saviour, and by Mr. *Locke* understood to mean no more than *Messiah*. But as part of them has been already considered, and enough said on that point to shew, that his interpretation of those texts, whether true or false, affords no foundation for your charge against him, it is needless to be more particular in considering them, though I may have occasion to take notice of some objections of yours against his reasonings on that subject. In the mean time, let us stop at page 42. where you mention Mr. *Locke's* sense of several other texts, on which your candour in judging of his intentions is not a little remarkable.

He had cited ^z three places, where in the original, there is only *I am*, which he says implies, *I am the Christ*, the sense necessarily requiring the word *Christ* to be supplied. But you tell us, "there is ^a one place, which he considered not, where the word *Christ* cannot be supplied. And that is, where our Lord tells the Jews, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, before Abraham was, I am.*" After which you give us this wonderfully just and charitable remark^b. "Mr. *Locke*, no doubt, saw these texts stand in his way against him, and implying the divinity of the *Messiah*; and therefore, though he was upon another pursuit in the places, where he speaks to them, he thought it worth his while, as it were *en passant*, to subdue them to himself." The last of these texts, which you have brought in here, where it had nothing to do, is the only one of them, that can imply the divinity of the *Messiah*; and this text you own, Mr. *Locke* did not consider, that is, he meddled not at all with it: how then can he be said to intend to subdue it to himself? He had indeed

^z John xiii. 19. Luke xxi. 8. Matth. xxiv. 5. ^a John viii. 58. ^b Page 43.

no occasion to consider it, for he was speaking only of texts, where the word *Christ* must be supplied, and he knew it could not be supplied in this: nor could he intend to *subdue* those other texts to himself, which he did consider, since he gives them no other sense than our translators understood them in, who have put in all of them *I am He*, or, *I am the Christ*, as the occasion of the words plainly demand in those places. What ground then could you possibly have for this remark from those texts? Or how indeed could any texts stand in his way, or be against him, by implying the divinity of the *Messiah*, unless he had attempted to oppose that doctrine? Whereas you know he never wrote one word against it. What then must we think of this treatment? Is it justice? is it charity? or what is it?

But lest all you have hitherto insisted on should not do your business, you challenge Mr. Locke's friends to *acquit him if they can from being Socinian* in another place, where, as you tell us, "*Son of God*" is a title at last grown so mean with him, "that he supposes *Adam* was called so, by as just a title as the only Begotten of the Father; and that only because they both received immortality from God the Father." Upon which you desire Mr. Locke's friends "to consider, with what consistency *Adam* can be equally a son with the only Begotten of the Father; or how equally possessed of immortality with him, who was in the beginning with God, and who made *Adam*, and all things that were made."

As a friend to truth, Sir, and in justice to Mr. Locke, I must take the liberty to assure you, that he does not, in the place you^d quote, nor in any other that I know of, say, that *Adam* was called *Son of God*,

^c Page 45. ^d Reasonab. Christ. p. 202.

by as just a title as the only begotten of the Father, or that they were equally his sons. Neither does he make our Saviour's having received immortality from God the foundation of his sonship, as you pretend, but one consequence of it. These assertions, therefore, being none of Mr. Locke's, but an injurious comment on his words, his friends are not accountable for the mistakes, or misrepresentations of others. He says in that place, that our Saviour was *properly the Son of God*, and that, as such, immortality was his *natural right*. But he has no where applied the title of *only begotten Son* to him on any account, that respects his human nature: this title must belong to that nature, which he had with the Father, before the world was. And as it is manifestly incommunicable, no person can be said to be *equally a son*, or by as just a title as the only begotten of the Father, or equally possessed of immortality with him, who was in the beginning with God. Nor has Mr. Locke ever said any such thing. I challenge all his enemies to produce, if they can, any such expressions of his. But the bare title of *Son of God* is distinguished in Scripture from that of *only begotten*, by being undeniably ascribed to our Lord on several grounds, which can only be applicable to his human nature, as his *mission*, his *conception*, his *resurrection*; and therefore if with these, Mr. Locke, when he is speaking of that image and likeness of God, which *Adam* received, and lost by his fall, and to which we are restored by *Jesus Christ*; if he reckons that likeness of immortality, which *Christ* also received of the Father, to be one of the reasons for his being styled, as *Adam* was, the *Son of God*, I see neither *extravagance*, as you term it, nor *Socinianism* in it; since it leaves him in the sole possession of that incommunicable, and greatly superiour stile the *only begotten of the Father, who was in the beginning with God*. Texts, which you cannot pretend Mr. Locke has either directly, or *en passant*, ever at-

tempted (in your candid expression) to *subdue to himself*.

The next thing we meet with, is your objections to Mr. *Locke's* reasonings, which I promised to take some notice of, tho' I had already sufficiently discussed the subject they are upon. He asks, "whether it can be imagined, that the unclean spirits, when they cried out, *Tbou art the Son of God*, had a mind to acknowledge and publish the deity of our Saviour. To which you answer, *No*. "Nor that *Jesus* was the *Messiah* neither. Their confession "no doubt was extorted from them, and they trembled at his power, while they obeyed it." Pray, Sir, consider, whether the history itself does not confute this answer: our Saviour, we are told, "strictly charged them, that they should not make him known, and would not suffer them to speak, because they knew him." Can it then reasonably be supposed, that he first compelled them to declare, who he was, and then would not suffer them to speak, because they did so? Or may it not be much more probably thought, that they, as well as the *Jews*, had some ends of their malice to serve, by designing to publish, that he was the *Messiah*; and that this was the reason, why they were so strictly charged not to do it.

Once more, Mr. *Locke* had urged, that *Son of God* could signify nothing else but the *Messiah*, because it was used by all sorts of persons, *Jews* and *Heathens*, believers and unbelievers. To which you answer, "That you have already made it appear, that both friends and enemies sufficiently understood the meaning of that phrase; and that all, who used it, apprehended, that the person, to whom it was applied, ought to be divine." A *divine* person is an appellation of latitude, which has been given to many, who had far less title to it, than the Saviour of the world; and whether all, who used the

phrase *Son of God*, might think the person, to whom it was applied, ought to be in some sense *divine*, I shall not dispute. But that they all apprehended he was to be the one *supreme* God himself, will I believe be very difficult to make appear. The *Jews* knew, that their promised *Messiah* was to be of the seed of *David*: and can it be imagined, that they were so well acquainted with the doctrine of the Trinity, and the incarnation, as readily to conceive, that this *Son of David*, was likewise to be the eternally begotten *Son of God*? The only argument, by which you have pretended to make this appear, is, that they accused him of blasphemy, when he called himself the *Son of God*, and said, that God was his Father; understanding him thereby, to ascribe divinity to himself, making himself equal with God. And from hence you infer, that we may see what opinion they had of the person of the *Messiah*; that he was to be in an equality with God. But with submission, Sir, that accusation of theirs will by no means imply this consequence; they supposed, that our Lord was an impostor; and therefore his saying, that he came from God, that he was the *Son of God*, and that his works were the works of his Father, must in their account be 'blaspheming the name of God, by falsely making use of that name; and in aggravation of his guilt, their malice might call this, making himself equal with God. Or suppose they really thought he pretended to be so, that can never be a proof, that it was their opinion, that the *Messiah* was to be in an equality with God. They rather might think, that he ascribed to himself, more than belonged to that character. And if this had not been the case, if they had believed (as you pretend) that the true *Messiah* was to be equal with God, our Saviour would probably have defended himself, against the charge of blasphemy, suitably to that notion: Say

ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, thou blasphemest, because I said I am the Son of God, when you yourselves know, that the person, whom that character denotes, is to be equal with God. Instead of any thing like this, he maintains his claim to that title only on his being the *Messiah*; and justifies his so doing from the guilt of blasphemy, not on account of his divine nature, but by the appellation given in Scripture to others deputed by God, *If they are called gods, to whom the word of God came say ye, &c.* This, Sir, I think takes off the whole weight of your proof, *that the Jews understood Son of God, to signify the divine nature of the Messiah.*

Much less can it be proved, that the *Heathens* understood it in that sense; nor have you attempted to make this appear. Indeed it is scarce imaginable, that the centurion, who was present at our Saviour's crucifixion, when he said, *Truly this man was the Son of God*, meant to affirm that the person, whom he had just seen expire on the cross, was the ever living God. In all probability he intended nothing more, than that he certainly was what he professed to be, a prophet sent from God, and no deceiver. This St. Luke's manner of expressing it confirms, *Certainly this was a righteous man*, for no doubt he gives us the sense of the centurion's words in the parallel places.

Neither do the Scriptures give us any ground to believe, that even our Lord's own Disciples, whilst they conversed so familiarly with him upon earth, when they confessed him to be *the Son of God*, meant to acknowledge his divine nature: for whatever intimations he had given them of his divinity, or how frequently soever his expressions might imply it, their understandings seem not to have been enlightened enough at that time to apprehend so sublime

^c Mark xv. 39.

^d Luke xxiii. 47.

a my-

a mystery. He had told them many things concerning himself, of a much lower nature, and more easy to be understood, which yet they did not at all conceive till after his resurrection, when he *opened their understandings*; and even then he tells them, that he had many things to say to them, but they could not bear them yet, till the Holy Spirit should come, *who would lead them into all truth.* And what truth can we suppose them less able to bear, or that more needed that divine instructor to enlighten them in, than this stupendous one, *that the word, who was God, was made flesh and dwelt among us?* And if the Disciples themselves, who had such opportunities of being informed, were so backward, as we find they were, in apprehending many doctrines relating to the *Messiah*; there is little reason to think, that they and all others, who used the phrase, *Son of God*, readily conceived it, without difficulty, and even without instruction, in that sublimest sense, in which you contend it was understood by friends and enemies. You say yourself, in the last text you consider in the book's we are upon, "ⁱ We may imagine, that it was difficult for *Philip*, and the rest of the Apostles " to conceive, how by seeing their master, they " could have been said, to have seen God the Father: " And to apprehend how he could be in the Father, " and the Father in him." But where would have been the difficulty of this, if they already apprehended the divine nature of their master, and his equality with God? for they must then have conceived, that he was *one God with the Father*; unless you would suppose them to believe there *were more Gods than one.* The difficulty they found in conceiving in what sense those words of their master could be true, plainly shews, that they had then no apprehension, of his being one of the persons of the indivisible godhead; and consequently that they did

ⁱ P. 48.

not

not understand the phrase *Son of God*, to signify his divine nature; so that your pretensions to make it appear, that it was understood in that sense, by all sorts of persons that used it, may, I presume, by this time appear to be very insufficient for that purpose. And likewise that Mr. *Locke's* interpretation of it, in all those Scriptures we have considered, is neither false nor Socinian. So that notwithstanding all the pains you have hitherto taken, the injury of calling him a Socinian writer, remains still to be accounted for.

When you have done with his interpretations of Scripture, in his book called *The reasonableness of Christianity*, and the two vindications of it; you go on to the end of this section, with some general remarks on these books, not less groundless and unjust than the particulars we have before met with; the most considerable of which I shall take notice of as briefly as I can.

The first is, that "it would be very difficult for any man, who is not under very partial engagements to the memory of Mr. *Locke*, to read over those books of his, and not to see, that it is entirely his design in all of them, to destroy all proof of the divine nature of our Saviour, in the four Evangelists, and in the Acts of the Apostles."

Enough has been already said, to let any indifferent reader see the partiality of this censure. How could Mr. *Locke* design to destroy all proof of the divine nature of our Saviour, by interpreting one particular phrase, in the sense it is understood by the most eminent acknowledgers of that divine nature, as has been fully shewn? Those judicious Prelates did not, it seems, ground their faith on a bare title, as you do; but on more unquestionable proofs; which proofs you cannot pretend that Mr. *Locke* has, in any of those books, attempted to destroy: so that without any partial engagements to his memory, he must be acquitted of that design.

^k P. 49.

The

The next thing to be noticed, are your groundless animadversions on Mr. *Locke's* asserting, *That believing Jesus to be the Messiah was all that was required to make a man a Christian*; for that is what you must mean, where you say, *sure no age of Christianity ever owned such a faith sufficient to make a man a Christian*, tho' you do not there set down his words, as what perhaps would too plainly shew the injustice of your remark. For sure, Sir, there was never any age of Christianity, that denied faith in *Jesus Christ* sufficient to make a man a Christian, tho' he should be ignorant of some truths concerning him. But whatever any age of Christianity has done, Dr. *Holdsworth* must allow such a faith sufficient to make a man a Christian; since he has told us, ¹ that "One, who joins with the Socinians in their great and distinguishing doctrines, may be justly called a Socinian, tho' he does not acknowledge all their errors; as a man would be a Mahometan, who believed in Mahomet, tho' he did not receive into his faith all the errors of the Alcoran." Certainly then he cannot deny, that a man is a Christian, who believes in *Jesus Christ*, (that distinguishing doctrine of theirs) tho' he should not receive into his faith all the truths of the Bible. And to do him justice, he has once in direct words owned this: "For there is no doubt (he says) but that all men are made Christians; and must be saved by faith in Christ." Tho' now this very doctrine is declaimed against, as "debasings, diminishing, and departing from the faith of Christians." "Our Lord himself (you say) hath fixed for ever the term, upon which we are to be made Christians, in that commission, which he left, to baptize all nations in the faith or belief of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." And whatever Christians depart from this faith," &c. Pray, Sir, when did Mr. *Locke* allow Christians

¹ P. 49. ^m P. 36. p. 20.

to

to depart from this faith? Or, what is there more in it than he requires to make them *Christians*? You know that he supposes those, who are made *Christians* by believing in Christ, to have *first acknowledged the one eternal God*; for you have yourself ^a set down this as one of the great points he maintains: Indeed believing in the *Son of God* manifestly implies believing in God the Father, whose Son he is acknowledged to be; and it must no less imply believing in the Holy Ghost; because there could be no ground for believing *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*, without believing, that the miracles, which brought them to that faith, were performed, as they were professed to be, by the power of the Holy Ghost. So that what you call *Mr. Locke's Summary or Creed* does really and necessarily include believing in the three persons, in whose name our Lord commissioned his Apostles to baptize all nations; and therefore he cannot be said to *widen the pale of Christian communion farther than he has authority to do*. Besides, baptizing and being baptized are rather consequences of our being Christians, than the *terms*, upon which we are to be made such: they are acts of obedience, by which we evidence ourselves, and are acknowledged by the church to be *Christians*. And if believing in the *Messiah* did not include faith in the Father and in the Holy Ghost, as it manifestly does; yet this plain command of being baptized in their name could not fail of being obeyed by all, who were *Christians*, as far as *Mr. Locke himself was, and desired others should be*. For he has fully and frequently told us, that those, who are made Christians by believing in the *Messiah*, are bound to believe and do, all that they find their Lord and master has taught and commanded.

If you had not read these books of his, with great prejudice, or very partial views, you must have been

^a P. 19.

convinced,

convinced, by many passages in them, that tho' he *waved all doubtful disputations*, for the sake of those Deists or unbelievers, for whom he owns indeed his book was chiefly intended, (and I hope no good *Christian* will blame that design) yet he was far from allowing the conclusion you think clear from his doctrine, that if a man is made a *Christian* by only believing, that *Jesus* is the *Messiah*, ^p Then the most thorough *Christian* may be such by believing this, which you call his *Summary or Creed* only. How groundlessly you have declaimed on this subject, must be evident to every impartial reader, who considers these words of his.

“^q And tho' by his Apostles, our Saviour taught “ a great many other truths, for the explaining this “ fundamental article of the law of faith, that *Jesus* “ is the *Messiah*, some whereof have a nearer, and “ some a more remote connexion with it, and so “ cannot be denied by any *Christian*, who sees that “ connection, or knows they are so taught; yet an “ *explicite* belief of any one of them is not necessary required to make a man a *Christian*.” A little lower he says, “ All these truths taught us from “ God are of great use to enlighten our minds, “ confirm our faith, stir up our affections, &c. and “ the more we see of them, the more we shall see, “ admire, and magnify, the wisdom, goodness, “ mercy, and love of God, in the work of our redemption: This will oblige us to search and study “ the Scripture, wherein it is contained and laid open “ to us.” Again, “^r All that we find in the revelation of the New Testament, being the declared “ will and mind of our Lord and master the *Messiah*, “ whom we have taken to be our King, we are “ bound to receive as right and truth; or else we “ are not his subjects, we do not believe him to be the “ *Messiah* our King, but cast him off, and with the

P. 50.

^q 2d Vind. p. 74.

^r P. 76.

“ Jews

"Jews say, we will not have this man to reign over us."

Do these assertions, Sir, appear calculated to diminish, and debase the faith of Christians? Or must not that appear to be a very unjust reproach? Mr. Locke, you see, requires all that would be thorough Christians, to search the Scriptures and to believe, and do, all that they find revealed, and commanded, in the New Testament. The whole truths contained in the Bible are no doubt the objects of our faith; yet you cannot deny, that a Christian may happen to be ignorant of, or misapprehend some of them, without ceasing to be a Christian; and perhaps there is no man, who explicitly believes them all. But whosoever is ignorant of, or denies, that Jesus is the Messiah, sent to reveal the Will of God, tho' we could suppose him to believe all the rest of the Bible, would notwithstanding be no Christian. This, therefore, Mr. Locke calls the fundamental article of the law of faith, being that, without an explicit belief of which a man cannot possibly be a Christian; and upon the profession of which alone the first converts were admitted into the Christian church, both by our Saviour and his Apostles; as he has abundantly shewn in tracing their preachings through all the Gospels and Acts, where it is plain nothing more is taught, or required, in order to their admission. Your assertion, therefore, "That Mr. Locke has taken away some of the known fundamentals of faith, and requires less to be believed than was required by our Saviour and his Apostles, to make a man a Christian," is manifestly false. It is evident, that they received men as disciples, or Christians, immediately upon their professing their faith in Jesus the Messiah. Whatever other truths may be contained in that fundamental article, or whatever else was necessary for them to be instructed in, after they had acknowledged the

Messiah for their Lord and master, they were no doubt taught by degrees as they could bear, or as occasion offered; which is apparent by many passages in the Epistles. And all the same truths conveyed down to us by the Scriptures, Mr. Locke no less requires his Christians, by diligently studying them, to inform themselves in, and to receive for right and truth all that they find contained in them; otherwise he declares them to have renounced their allegiance, in effect to reject the Messiah from being their master and king, and so, instead of being thorough Christians, they are in his account no Christians at all; as you have seen in what has been quoted from him. Many more passages there are in these books of his to the same purpose, which might have satisfied you, that his real intention was, first to convince Deists, that Jesus Christ was a teacher sent from God, and then to engage them to search in the Scriptures for what truths he had taught. So that he could not design to take away any of the known fundamentals, if those fundamentals are to be found in the Scriptures by a sincere enquirer.

We are now come to a new, and very unexpected accusation. After being taxed with taking away, Mr. Locke is next charged with imposing fundamentals. "Let him declaim (say you) as much as he pleases against the orthodoxies, fundamentals, and systems of the several sects of Christians; it is plain he is very far from striking out of the same old road himself; and that he in his turn is as ready with his set of fundamentals, his Summary or System; and as willing to impose them upon others, as he complains others have done before him." I wish, Sir, you had been so kind as to have given us a particular of Mr. Locke's set of fundamentals; for as ready as you tell us he is with it, I have really never been able to find it out; unless you

mean "All that we find in the revelation of the New Testament, being the declared will and mind of our Lord and master;" for it must be owned he obliges every *Christian* to believe this, which may make indeed a large catalogue of fundamentals. In earnest, Sir, is there no difference betwixt declaring *that* one grand article to be a fundamental, without the belief of which no man can be a *Christian*, and which by consequence all *Christians* must agree in; and for the rest requiring only a sincere disposition to receive as right and truth, whatever they find contained in the New Testament; is there, I ask, no difference in this, from culling out of the Scriptures, or deducing from them, a select number of propositions, and declaring it necessary to salvation to believe every one of them in such a particular sense? which is the *old road* Mr. Locke complains of, and from which I am persuaded you rather think he does but too far *strike out*; tho' at present, to furnish matter for a rhetorical declamation, he is to be guilty of *imposing*, as well as taking away *fundamentals*. Upon which subject you thus go on.

"And so it will always be, while *Christians* assume to themselves a power of declaring fundamentals, without attending enough to the perpetual reception and interpretation of the catholic church, and what doctrines were always admitted as fundamentals in it." I dare say, Sir, you will not deny, that all the fundamentals, Mr. Locke has taken upon him to declare, have been *always admitted as such in the catholic church*; and therefore you might have given him your licence to *impose* them. But how many more doctrines may have been always so received, perhaps neither you, nor any one else can declare. It is certainly a much surer way in every enquiry about fundamentals, carefully to examine in the Scriptures, what is there plainly revealed, and declared to be necessary to salvation; rather

rather than as you * direct us, to enquire *what doctrines were always received as fundamental, by all the successions of Christians, from the beginning of Christianity in the catholic church*. This is a task, which by far the greater number of *Christians* are entirely unqualified for; and I beseech you, Sir, upon whom must an unlearned man depend in this enquiry? The church of *England*, the *Papists*, the *Arians*, &c. will each of them give him a different set of fundamentals, and all of them pretend an equal claim to the faith of *primitive Christianity*. How then can his faith be guided, as you would have it, *first by the Scriptures, and then by their faith also*? It is plain he must rather have his last resort to the Scriptures, to find there what primitive faith ought to have been, and which of these has the best pretensions to truth, and to antiquity.

And why might not Mr. Locke be allowed to take the same method? He never pretended to make new discoveries in the *Christian religion*; but among the many new inventions, which are mingled with it, to find out in the Scriptures themselves, what was that ancient faith, which was once delivered to the saints. He knew without your instructions, that *those things, which were matters of faith once, will be always such; and those things which were never matters of faith, will be never such*. It was his full conviction of this truth, that made him resolve to consult the Sacred Writ alone, where he was very sure those things were fully contained, and plainly delivered, which were matters of faith from the beginning; and he might think it not quite so sure, to find them unmingled any where else. As excellently as his head was formed for abstracted thinking, he never employed it that way in matters of faith. Those discoveries of the imperfections of the human mind, which you condescend to own his genius fitted him for, were no vain

speculations in him: he was too sensible of the limited nature of human reason, ever to carry it beyond its bounds in matters of revelation; and therefore all your elegant harangue about *new discoveries, exercise of wit, vain philosophy in matters of faith*, and so forth, is quite spoiled, by being (much more than Mr. Locke's enterprising genius, as you call it) entirely wrong applied. He was so far from *setting out with the vanity of a philosopher to interpret Scripture, and settle articles of faith*, as you alledge*, that he no sooner begins to search the Scriptures, than he lays the philosopher aside, as every unprejudiced reader may observe in the book we are now upon; where with the greatest simplicity possible he follows our Saviour and his Apostles step by step; and uses no other helps to find out their meaning, but what the Scripture itself affords, by comparing one place with another; well knowing that philosophy, and abstracted thinking, had nothing to do there.

And what was the result of this diligent search? *He informs the Christian world, (as you tell us) that they are more Christians, than they need to be.* The place, or the words, in which he gives us this extraordinary information, you have not been pleased to favour us with: But I have shewn you where he expressly informs *Christians*, that they are *much less Christians* than they ought to be, or rather no *Christians* at all, if they do not receive as right and truth all that they find the *Messiah*, whom the acknowledge to be their Lord and master, has revealed in Scriptures. And if the Christian world receives any thing more than this, I am afraid, Sir, it will scarce be an addition to their *Christianity*.

But you go on: *And insults the ministers of the Christian religion, that he may give the more scope and freedom to his own inventions and interpretations*

* P. 53.

Here,

Here, Sir, you have been again defective in not acquainting us with words or place; and as I can find nothing like *insulting the ministers of the Christian religion*, in all his works, you must allow me to doubt of the truth of this accusation, since you would not, or could not, be more particular.

And now upon the evidence you pretend to have brought from these books, that Mr. Locke was a *Socinian* in the doctrine of the Trinity, you tell me that "therefore I may declaim as long as I please, that in *Christian* prudence and charity, such a man as Mr. Locke ought not to be given up for an heretic or *Socinian*; for if he chose with all his acuteness and learning about him, to countenance and defend such opinions, who can help it?" I presume, Sir, it by this time appears, that the opinions Mr. Locke chose to defend, those two grand points we have been so long upon, give no sufficient ground for your severe charge; since I have clearly shewn, that they are not peculiar to the *Socinians*; and on several accounts, that his maintaining them is no proof, that he denied the divinity of our Saviour: and therefore for all that you have hitherto urged, there may still be great want of *prudence and charity* in giving him up for a *Socinian*.

Let it be as *ridiculous* as you please to think, that an acute philosopher must of course be a true believer, and an exact interpreter of Scripture, for I know of no body, that either thinks or says so: But this I must affirm, that when a man of eminent abilities, and character in the learned world, desires to be thought a true believer, defends himself against all accusations to the contrary, and has never deduced from his interpretations of Scripture, any doctrine in opposition to the established articles of faith; if it is not ridiculous to say of such a man, that he was never given up, but went himself, to the adversaries of the *Christian faith*, you will find it difficult with all your rhetoric,

rhetoric, to clear it, and the methods of introduction to it, from being much *worse*. To collect all that a man has said in different places, and with quite different views; to draw consequences from them, which he disowns, or are foreign to the purpose he was upon; to pretend from thence to spy out secret designs; and to conclude him a heretic in his heart, tho' he will not confess it; which is your method throughout your book; what is all this but to set up a kind of *inquisition*? Want of *prudence* and *charity* are indeed terms too soft for such a conduct.

Answer to the proofs in Sect. II. from his Notes and Paraphrase on the Epistles of St. Paul.

YOU are willing, Sir, it seems to do a work of supererogation, for tho' you think Mr. *Locke* sufficiently convicted of Socinian principles in the doctrine of the Trinity, from the fore said books; yet you will examine two or three passages of his other writings, in which you say he appears to be tinctured with the same heresy. Your proof of this consists in remarks upon his notes and paraphrase on two texts in St. Paul's Epistles. The first is, 1 Cor. viii. 6. "But to us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him." The other is, Rom. ix. 5. "Whose are the Fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh, Christ came who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen." It is not my purpose, nor does my undertaking oblige me, to defend Mr. *Locke's* explication of these texts, but only to consider, whether your proofs from thence, that he was a Socinian, are conclusive or not.

It is manifest you say, that his bold explication in the first of these texts of Κύριος, "by one Lord agent, signifies, that our blessed Saviour was Lord only by

"by reason of his agency; which being only finite and deputed, that is, limited to the kingdom and authority of the *Messiah*, must exclude and deny his eternal and divine nature, which is the same Socinian principle observed in Mr. *Locke* above already." To this I answer, that when a title is given to any person on several accounts, the ascribing it to him on one of those accounts, cannot justly be construed to signify, that it belongs to him in that respect only, excluding all others, unless it be so express. And since it is undeniably certain, that our Saviour is in Scripture styled *Lord*, on account of that authority and dominion, which was given him by the Father, in virtue of his being the *Messiah*; as is fully asserted by Bishop *Pearson*, as well as the higher sense of that title, for which you refer to him in your margin: Mr. *Locke* might therefore understand, that title to signify our Saviour's power and dominion as he was the *Messiah*, in this passage, and the other you mention, where he refers to it, without intending in the least to signify, that he was Lord only by reason of his agency, or deputed authority. And much less does that application of the word exclude or deny his eternal and divine nature. For the proofs of our Saviour's divine nature cannot depend upon the sense of those titles, which are often given to persons far inferior to him; and which are plainly ascribed to him in such respects, as can belong only to his human nature; as was observed above on the title of *Son of God*. When St. *Peter* tells the *Israelites*, that God had made that same Jesus, whom they had crucified, both Lord and Christ; by which he could intend no other than his deputed dominion; can it be said, that he excluded or denied the eternal and divine nature of Christ? If not, neither can Mr. *Locke's* ascribing that title to him on the

same account, be justly censured as a denial of his divinity; or be at all a proof, that he was a *Socinian* in the doctrine of the Trinity. And as to his paraphrase on the latter part of the verse, viz. "By whom are all things, that come from the Father to us, and through whom alone we find access to him," they are the very same words, with which the learned Mr. Mede paraphrases a parallel place, *Dissert. on Pet. ii. 1.* And his authority is unexceptionable enough, to defend Mr. Locke from any sinister intention in that interpretation, as false and partial as you pretend it to be.

But upon *Rom. ix. 5.* you tell us, *his paraphrase upon the sacred text is more evidently and remarkably Socinian and unjust.* Whether it is just or unjust, is not my present business to consider; I am not concerned to justify his interpretations of Scripture, and therefore shall not examine the force of your arguments against the sense, in which Mr. Locke understands that text; and which, no doubt, you know many learned men have understood it in before him. But this I must observe, that his having no note upon it shews, that ~~who~~ he freely set down what he took to be the true reading, he had no intention to oppose the doctrine deduced from the other reading: and I do not see how any thing can prove a man a heretic, but his professedly opposing some article of faith. Let his paraphrase be supposed as *unjust* as you please, how do you prove it to be *evidently and remarkably Socinian*? Why for this very notable reason, because he turns and construes those words, *who is over all God blessed for ever, as our modern Arians do.* I did not know before, that interpreting a text of Scripture, as the *Arians* do, made it *evidently Socinian.* Some of those, that are called the *modern Arians*, and who agree with Mr. Locke in his sense of this text, acknowledge the eternal and divine nature of our Saviour; and so might Mr. Locke do, for any thing that

that he has said on this text. Indeed, Sir, you had better have reserved it, till you had some occasion to make him an *Arian*, for it can by no means serve for your present purpose to prove him a *Socinian.*

Answer to the proofs in Sect. III. That he maintained several other Socinian Doctrines.

YOU begin this Section with informing us, that the passages just before considered, "in his *Paraphrase and Notes*, are sufficient, when added to what has been already observed, to convince any unbiassed man, that Mr. Locke agrees with the *Socinians*, in his thoughts of the Holy Trinity." But I must beg leave, Sir, farther to observe, that since you have not been able to shew, that he has any where ever offered either to assert, or to oppose, any doctrine concerning the Holy Trinity; none but a man extremely *biassed* could be convinced of an agreement with the *Socinians* in this point, which must, it seems, be all latent in his secret thoughts.

"But it is not in this doctrine only, you tell us, that Mr. Locke was *Socinian.* Most of his other principles in religion, in these tracts, appear to be of the same make with theirs. To be particular, with the *Socinians*, he denies original sin in these words: "It is strange, that the New Testament should not any where take notice of the corruption of human nature, in the posterity of Adam," and tell us, that *that* corruption seized on all because of Adam's transgression, as well as it tells us so of death: But as I remember every one's sin is charged upon himself only."

It does not promise very fairly, when in quoting a particular passage from an author, upon which an accusation is founded, care is not taken to set down words precisely as they are; for a very small alteration

teration will sometimes make a very great one in the sense, as it has done in the words, which you have given us for Mr. *Locke's*, but which in his book stand thus: ^b “*If by death threatened to Adam*” were meant the corruption of human nature in “his posterity, it is strange, that the New Testament should not any where take notice of it, and tell us, that corruption seized on all, *because of Adam's transgression, &c.*” These words have manifestly another sense, than the turn you have given them will admit. Mr. *Locke* does not say, that the New Testament takes no notice of the corruption of human nature, in the posterity of Adam, as you have exprest it; but that it takes no notice *that by death threatened to Adam was meant that corruption; or that corruption seized on all, because of Adam's transgression.* This is what he affirms ^c, that the New Testament takes no notice of; which is very consistent with acknowledging the corruption of human nature, as he actually does, tho' not in the way of punishment. And as he had just been speaking of some, who by death (which the Gospel teacheth us, came on all men by *Adam's sin*) understand a state of guilt, wherein every one descended from him were so involved, that they deserved endless torment in hell-fire; and likewise a state of necessary sinning, and provoking God in every action they do; he plainly intends, in the passage you have unfairly quoted, only to oppose that notion, of the universal corruption of mankind being part of the punishment threatened to *Adam's sin*; not of it's being in some measure, and in some respects, a consequence of it. For in that discourse he affirms ^d, that what *Adam* fell from, was a state of perfect obedience, and represents his posterity as coming into the world, under much greater disadvantages, than he was at first placed in it; so that no one could by reason of the

defect of their obedience have obtained eternal life, had it not been for the redemption by *Jesus Christ*. To which in another place ^e he adds the necessity of assistance by his Holy Spirit. Mr. *Locke* could not, therefore, in that place, design to deny either the corruption of human nature, or that the New Testament takes notice of it.

After the words, to which you have given this turn, you add, “But this is evidently false; it is directly contrary to what St. *Paul* assures us, *Rom. v. 12, 19. That by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and that by one man's disobedience many were made sinners.*” Mr. *Locke's* words in that passage, as I have restored them, is not at all contrary to what St. *Paul* here says, even in the sense, in which you would have him understood; as any one may see, who compares them. But it seems somewhat assuming, Sir, to pronounce so peremptorily concerning this matter, and so absolutely to determine the sense of those texts, upon which you cannot but know, there have been great diversity of opinions in the Christian church, and even among the divines of the church of *England* itself. St. *Austin's* rigid doctrine, viz. That all *Adam's* posterity were born in a state of damnation, by reason of his sin, all mankind being accounted to have sinned in him, by reason of a covenant made with them in him, has indeed had many followers ever since that time; tho' some have all along opposed it, as contrary to our ideas of God, and our clearest notions of justice and goodness. And as it appeared late in the Western church, where great divisions have been about it, in the Greek church it never was received at all.

Others have maintained, that such a corruption is spread by means of *Adam's sin*, over the whole race of mankind, as puts them under a necessity of

^b Reas. of Chris. p. 6. ^c P. 4, 5. ^d P. 3, 7. defect

sinning, and provoking God in every action they do; and some have taught, that this was part of that punishment, which was threatened to *Adam's* sin. The harshness, not to say the absurdity, of these opinions, which give great advantage to the enemies of the *Christian* religion, being liable to objections not easily answered, is all, that Mr. *Locke* opposed in the doctrine of original sin; as is plain from his representation of those notions, in the places I have cited, and that passage, which you have brought against him, taken as it stands in his book.

Many again have believed, that an exclusion from *Paradise*, which was a state of bliss, and from immortality, with all the frailties and miseries consequent to a mortal state, was the punishment of *Adam's* transgression, and transmitted to all his posterity by means of that transgression. And this they think comes up to the full sense of all the texts of Scripture concerned in this point; particularly those you have quoted as contrary to Mr. *Locke*: "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and by one man's disobedience many were made sinners," that is, (as they understood it) *were treated as sinners*, by being subjected to death, and to all the miseries of a mortal state, in consequence of *Adam's* sin. And a deliverance from this state by being restored to immortal life at the resurrection, they believe to be that universal redemption, that all mankind shall have in *Christ Jesus*. This they apprehend to be conceivable, and no more: therefore they understand by original sin this only; for which they pretend they have all the fathers with them before St. *Austin*, particularly St. *Cyril*, and *Theodore*. This, they do also pretend, comes up to the words of the article; for as this general adjudging of all men to die may be called, according to the style of

of the Scriptures *God's* wrath and damnation; so the fear of death, which arises out of it, corrupts mens natures, and inclines them to evil. Bishop *Burnet's* *Expos.* Art. ix.

This opinion Mr. *Locke*, it seems, thought most agreeable to the tenor of the Scriptures. And this sense of those texts is much the same with that, which he gives them in his *Paraphrase and Notes*. Not, as you injuriously affirm, because *he very well understood the evidence of these passages to be against him*. A censure you may be allowed to make, when you have produced your charter for looking into men's hearts; but rather (as any candid adversary would suppose) because he sincerely thought *that* to be the true sense of them; taking them, as he says, to be parallel with 1 *Cor.* xv. 22. *As in Adam all die*; for (whether this be *begging the question or not*) there is no manner of ground to doubt, that this was his true judgment, that he really understood those passages of Scripture to carry the doctrine of original sin no farther, than they have been thought to do, by many great divines, and by most of the fathers before St. *Austin*.

The *Pelagians* and *Socinians*, in opposition to all these opinions affirm, that *Adam's* sin, with all the effects of it was entirely personal: that by it sin is said to have *entered into the world*, *Rom.* v. 12. only as it was the first sin: that *Adam* was made mortal, and had died, whether he had sinned or not: and that every man is punished for his own sins, and not at all for the sin of another.

But in nothing of this did Mr. *Locke* agree with them: he is far from denying with them, that *Adam's* sin did in any wise at all affect his posterity: on the contrary, he maintains^f, that death came upon all men by reason of *Adam's* sin; that

^f Reasonab. of *Christ.* p. 1, 2.

the doctrine of redemption, and consequently of the Gospel, is founded upon this supposition, *that Jesus Christ came to restore us to what we lost by Adam*; and that those, who deny this, thereby do violence to the whole tenor of the *New Testament*. He did not indeed come into the notions of hereditary guilt, incurring God's wrath, and eternal damnation for the sin of another, necessity of sinning and provoking him in all we do, doctrines, which perhaps men would not have so readily received, or been so tenacious of, if it were not to excuse or extenuate their own guilt, by laying the blame on their forefather, or even on their Maker himself.

However, Mr. *Locke* acknowledges such an universal degeneracy or corruption[†], "that all *Adam's* issue to St. *Paul's* time had actually sinned, so that there was a necessity of a Redeemer to restore them to that immortality, which otherwise could not be obtained but by perfect un-sinning obedience." He likewise asserts, the frailty and weakness of our nature to be such, as renders us incapable of performing even that imperfect obedience, which is now required of us, without the divine grace and assistance; a doctrine, which was always founded upon a supposition of our being in a worse state since the fall of *Adam*, than he was created in: and *that* so inseparably, that none, who have denied this effect of original sin, ever acknowledged, that mankind stood in any need of a divine assistance for the performance of their duty. The *Socinians* deny the last, in consequence of their denying the former; so that it is manifest, Mr. *Locke* can, in no respect be said to agree with them in denying original sin.

You object against Mr. *Locke's* rendering the words, *were made sinners*, Rom. v. 19. by the words

[†] Page 14.

became

became mortal; that by sinners in this place must be meant something different from mortal, and by righteous something more than immortal; because in the 21st verse of this chapter, sin is mentioned as the meritorious cause of death, and righteousness as the instrumental cause of everlasting life; whereas, according to Mr. *Locke's* interpretation (you say) of sin and sinners, St. *Paul* must have been absurd enough to suppose, that the same things might, in the same sense, be both causes and effects. I beg leave to tell you, Sir, that this is an absurdity formed only in your imagination, upon a mistake. Mr. *Locke* has no where interpreted sin and righteousness to signify in Scripture death and life: nor is that sense of those words a consequence from his having rendered the words, *were made sinners*, and *were made righteous*, by *became mortal and immortal*, i. e. liable to death, the punishment of sin, and entitled to immortality, the reward of righteousness, which is his plain meaning here. On the contrary, the 21st verse of this chapter, *that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign unto eternal life*, in your own sense of it, is a confirmation of that sense, in which Mr. *Locke* understands the former verses, and as it were an explication of them; the same discourse being continued, and the same thing asserted in different forms of expression, viz. that as mankind was subjected unto death, made, or treated as sinners, in consequence of *Adam's* transgression; so they should be restored to life, be made, or treated as righteous persons, by the righteousness of *Jesus Christ*.

You conclude this subject by saying[‡], "Mr. *Locke* indeed here refers us to Dr. *Whitby's* *Comments* on these places; and he might as well have referred us to *Socinus* himself, or any of

[‡] Page 64.

" his

"his fraternity." I must first observe, Sir, that this is most unfairly urged; for whatever mistakes Dr. *Whitby* might fall into at the decline of his age, when perhaps his judgment was decayed with it; he was so far from favouring the *Socinians*, when he wrote his *Comment*, that throughout that whole work, he, on all proper occasions, zealously and solidly opposes their errors; so that his interpretation in those *Comments* might be referred to very unexceptionably. But it is next to be observed, that the sense, in which Mr. *Locke* understands the texts, we have been speaking of, and for which he refers to Dr. *Whitby*, is directly contrary to the doctrine of the *Socinians*; so that you happen to be quite out in this unlucky remark. You are so used, it seems, to join *Socinus* in your thoughts with Mr. *Locke*, that you could not help tacking them together, where they are most opposite. How *Socinus* interpreted those texts, I pretend not to say; but if he was consistent with himself, he could not possibly allow the sense Mr. *Locke* gives them; since he and his followers absolutely deny, that *Adam's* posterity became mortal, in consequence of his disobedience. And I might rather have offered Mr. *Locke's* interpretation of those texts, as one proof, that he did not agree with the *Socinians*, and that he is unjustly charged with denying original sin; though he did not carry it to all the extremes, in which it was once received in this church, and on which the *Calvinist* doctrines are founded, of *reprobation* and *unconditionate decrees*.

The next thing you charge Mr. *Locke* with, isⁱ, "That with the *Socinians* also, he denies, that the punishment of wicked men in a future state shall be eternal." Which you ground upon his as-

ⁱ Page 64.

firming,

firming, "that the death, which was threatened to *Adam*, and which was every where the wages of sin, as well after as before the resurrection, does not mean *eternal life in misery*, but a *ceasing to be*, the having no more life and sense than dust has." For this you quote several places in his *Reasonableness of Christianity*; and it is undeniable, that he does maintain this.

But it is as undeniable, Sir, that both in that book, and in several places of his other writings, he plainly asserts, that the wicked shall suffer great and terrible, and everlasting punishments in a future state; even so plainly, that you yourself are forced to^k confess it. Neither has he any where denied, that the punishment of wicked men in a future state shall be eternal; though he denies, that by *that death*, which was threatened to *Adam*, and came upon all men by his transgression, was meant *eternal life in misery*: for in his *Reasonableness of Christianity*^l, he particularly distinguishes between death the punishment of *Adam's* sin, and that punishment, which every one shall suffer for his own actual transgressions; where, after he has been shewing how it is consistent with the justice and goodness of God, that the posterity of *Adam* should suffer the punishment of death for his sin, he has these words, "and therefore *though all die in Adam*, yet none are *truly punished* but for their own deeds, *Rom. xi. 6. God will render to every one*; how? *according to his deeds*. To those, that obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that *doth evil*." And a little lower, going on to prove, that the wicked in a future state shall suffer only for their own sins, having cited the two places, where our Saviour describes his own proceeding at

^k Page 69.^l Page 9.

the great judgment, he says, "here is no condemnation of any one for what his forefather had done; which it is not likely should have been omitted, if that should have been a cause, why any one was adjudged to *the devil and his angels*." These two passages are sufficient to shew, that by asserting that death, or a *ceasing to be*, was the punishment threatened to Adam's sin, he did not intend to deny, that the wicked shall be punished in a future state for *their own sins*. But there are several other places in the same book, where he clearly expresses his belief of the torments and miseries of another life. P. 196 he says, "In the parable of the rich man in hell, delivered by our Saviour, repentance alone is the means proposed of avoiding that place of *torment*;" and p. 231, "our Saviour requires obedience to his commands, with the enforcement of unspeakable rewards and punishments in another world." A little after, he quotes this sentence, "depart from me ye cursed into *everlasting fire*." These shall go into *everlasting punishment*." These passages, with many others, are such express acknowledgments, that the wicked are to suffer extreme and endless misery in a future state, that you might with much more colour have charged him with *maintaining contradictions*, than with denying, *that the punishment of wicked men in a future state shall be eternal*; for he does not less clearly and frequently maintain this doctrine, than he does that other, which you think inconsistent with it. And of this you are so sensible yourself, that you set down some of his expressions to that purpose; upon which you add^m, "But whether he had any secret to reconcile those expressions with his own idea of death, the ceasing to be, or annihilation, I will not determine."

If you could not find out this secret, you needed not however have bestowed four pages upon proving, what you cannot but confess Mr. Locke owns as well as you: Much less ought you so positively to have charged him with denying, what he so fully asserts, by whatever *secret* he might reconcile those seeming contradictions.

Had this *secret* been in favour of any Socinian doctrine, I am persuaded, Sir, you would have spied it out with half the light, which he has given you to discover it by. But this happens to be in opposition to them, and in that case, where Mr. Locke is concerned, you are not, it seems, very quick-sighted. You must give me leave therefore to acquaint you, since you seem not to have observed it, that throughout this book, he frequently speaks of *Jesus Christ's coming to restore all mankind to that immortality, which they lost by Adam's transgression*; and this, I presume, may serve as a key to let you into the secret. According to his notion all men would have remained under the sentence of *death* for ever, if *Jesus Christ* had not delivered them from it: but being by him recovered to a state of immortality, they must all appear at his tribunal, where they shall be adjudged to everlasting happiness or misery, according as they have obeyed or disobeyed his laws. And upon this ground, Mr. Locke has so fully and so frequently maintained the certainty of *eternal punishments in a future state*, that no man could take it into his head to charge him with *denying it*, but one, who was resolved at any rate, even at the expence of truth, to make out his pretended agreement with the Socinians.

"Once more you say, with Socinus also himself, Mr. Locke denies, that there is any notion or opinion of a Deity naturally implanted in the

"mind of man: and the principal reason he gives for it is this, that besides Atheists, whole nations have been discovered, among whom no notion of God was to be found. And the very same reason is given by Socinus himself. So that he seems to have been originally inclined to favour the opinions of that sect, and even his seeming singularities are derived from them."

This is a very extraordinary article to be made any part in a charge of Socinianism; by which, I think, has been always understood an agreement with Socinus in matters of faith and revelation. Mr. Locke does without question deny, that there is any innate idea of God stamped upon the mind of man; not only in that place of his *Essay*, which you quote, but more at large in the first book, where he is proving, that we have no innate ideas at all. It is likewise true, that one of the reasons he gives for it, is that, which you mention; and very probably Socinus might give the same; it being too obvious for any one to miss, who is enquiring, whether there be any innate idea of God stamped on the mind of man. But that reason is so far from being, as you alledge, Mr. Locke's principal argument against it, that he expressly says, "If all mankind had every where a notion of God, it would not follow from thence, that the idea of him was innate." And his chief arguments are taken from those, who have the notion of God. As "how late is it before any such notion is discoverable in children? Can it be thought, that the ideas men have of God, are engraven on their minds by his own finger, when we see men have far different, nay often contrary and inconsistent ideas of him?" What true or tolerable notion of a Deity could they have, who acknow-

• *Essay*, B. i. ch. iv. sect. ix. P Sect. xv.

"ledged

"ledged and worshipped hundreds?" Then speaking of the true conceptions, which wise men of all nations came to have of the unity and infinity of the Deity, "this (says he) seems to me plainly to prove, that the truest and best notions men had of God, were not imprinted, but acquired by thought and meditation, and a right use of their faculties." These passages, with many more in the *Essay* to the same purpose, might have shewn you, Sir, without my help, that the reason Socinus has given, is not the principal reason Mr. Locke gives, to prove, that we have no innate idea of God.

But if it had been so, how weakly would this have supported your inference? There is neither a seeming singularity in this opinion, nor is it peculiar to that sect, from whom you conclude he derived it. It is no new notion, nor confined to any set of people. I am persuaded there are many learned men in both our Universities of the same mind, that we have no innate idea of God, or of anything else; who yet would think themselves very ill used to be ranked among the Socinians. I leave you to enquire in your own, whether this is not so; but I will name two of Cambridge, who have publicly professed that opinion, Mr. Edmund Law, who has obliged his country with a translation of Archbishop King's *Origin of evil*; and long before him the learned Dr. Bentley, in one of his excellent sermons preached at Mr. Boyle's Lecture, whose words are as follow: "As to that natural and indelible figure of God, which human souls, in their first origin, are supposed to be stamped with, I shall shew at a fitter opportunity, that it is a mistake, and that we have no need of it in our disputes against Atheism."

However, if no body but Socinus and Mr. Locke had ever denied, that the idea of God is stamped

¶ *Folly of Atheism*, Serm. i. p. 5.

upon the minds of men, an opinion of such a nature will not help to justify the imputation of *Socinianism*. You might as reasonably charge the celebrated Mr. Norris with being a Papist, because he agreed with Father Marlebranche, in his notion of having our idea of God, and of all other things, by seeing them in him. The manner, by which the idea of God is conveyed to our understandings, is no more an article of faith, than the manner of our receiving any other ideas. In these philosophical or metaphysical speculations, learned men, of whatever persuasion in religion, have always imagined themselves at perfect liberty. If some think we have our idea of God by seeing it in him; others, that he has originally imprinted an idea of himself upon their minds; and others again, "that our idea of him is acquired, by making a right use of the faculties he has given us, by which we cannot miss of discovering him with an evidence equal to the certainty of mathematical demonstration," as Mr. Locke maintains; neither of these opinions interfere with any article of our faith, nor has revelation interposed to decide, which is the true: though it may be observed, that the inspired writers, by referring those, who were ignorant of God, to the proper use of their faculties, by which they might discover him in the works of creation, and providence, seem rather to favour the last. Yet it is certain, that they have left every one at liberty to judge in matters of this nature, as their own reason, experience, and observation direct. The proofs of a Deity, and the cause of religion, will suffer nothing, which ever opinion is received. Mr. Locke's notion upon this point will not serve in the least towards justifying your charge of *Socinianism*. This article therefore of the indictment must be allowed to pass for just nothing.

We are now come to the last, and most considerable of those *Socinian* doctrines, which this section

tion is to prove Mr. Locke maintained. How defective your proofs of the former are, has been shewn; and I doubt not they will appear as insufficient on this article, which we are going to examine.

Lastly, you say, "with the *Socinians* Mr. Locke denies the sacrifice and merits of *Christ's* death, and the satisfaction paid by it to divine justice. For in his book of the *Reasonableness of Christianity*, treating on purpose and at large of the advantages we have by *Christ*, he entirely omits this inconceivable advantage." The same reason for this charge was urged before by Mr. Edwards; and it was answered both by Mr. Bold, and by Mr. Locke himself in his Vindications; and that so sufficiently, that a man of candour should be ashamed to repeat the argument. Part of Mr. Locke's answer is in these words, "The reason of my omitting it in that place was, because my book was chiefly designed for *Deists*; and I think it no blameable prudence, that I mentioned only those advantages, that all *Christians* are agreed in, and that I observed that command of the Apostle, *Rom. xiv. 1. Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations*; without being a *Socinian*. Would any one think, he in earnest went about to persuade men to be *Christians*, who should use that as an argument to recommend the Gospel, which he has observed them to lay hold on as an objection against it?" A little after he says, that the word *satisfaction* not being used in the Scripture, he could not put it into his *Christianity as delivered in the Scripture*: but that as satisfaction may be plainly collected out of the Epistles, though not named, so it may out of several places of his book. Upon which he quotes the places, where he had said, that the de-

sign of our Saviour's coming was to be *offered up*, and where he speaks of the work of our *redemption*. And in his first Vindication he mentions other places, where he had said, that *Christ laid down his life for both Jews and Gentiles*, and that he freely gave himself to death for us.

To all this you object, "that he speaks of these things in so loose and general a manner, so entirely en passant, and without any view to the doctrine of the satisfaction, that he dares not say, that he himself takes those passages to imply satisfaction, but only that they are taken to imply it, and that satisfaction may be collected from them."

Had he spoke of those things, which are taken to imply satisfaction, in ever so loose and general a manner at first; yet when he repeats those passages as proofs, that *Christ's* satisfaction may be plainly collected out of his book, that sufficiently implies, that he himself understood them in that sense; and the repetition in both his Vindications certainly cannot be said to be done *en passant*, or without any view to the doctrine of the satisfaction; since it is on purpose to prove, that though the word *satisfaction* is not in his book, yet it is implied there. Nor indeed can I well imagine (whatever you mean by a loose and general manner) how he can be supposed in any manner to have said, that the design of *Christ's* coming was to be *offered up*, and that he freely gave himself to death for us; or to have spoke of the great work of our *redemption*, without any view to the doctrine of the satisfaction: for those expressions either signify the same thing, or are particular descriptions of the manner, by which that satisfaction was made. And though you allege, that he dares not say, that he himself takes those passages to imply satisfaction, you could not but know, that he has said what is full as strong to the same purpose. One, who has so carefully ransacked

facked his works to find matter against him, could scarce unwarily overlook the following remarkable words, concerning the satisfaction of *Christ*. "*Mr. Bold* says right, that this is a doctrine, that is of mighty importance for a *Christian* to be well acquainted with; and I will add to it, that it is very hard for a *Christian*, who reads the Scripture with attention, and an unprejudiced mind, to deny the satisfaction of *Christ*." Now I appeal to yourself, Sir, whether this is not as full an assertion of the doctrine of satisfaction, as if he had said, that he himself took those passages of Scripture to imply satisfaction. For if he did not take that doctrine to be implied in the Scripture, how could he think it of mighty importance, or of any importance at all, for a *Christian* to be well acquainted with it? Or with what consistency could he think it very hard for a *Christian*, who reads the Scripture with attention, and an unprejudiced mind, to deny the satisfaction of *Christ*, if he himself did not take it to be implied in Scripture? His omitting therefore to mention the satisfaction among the advantages we received by our Saviour, could not be, as you pretend, because with the Socinians he did not admit that doctrine to be true; for what he affirms could hardly be denied by an unprejudiced mind, he certainly admitted to be true.

And as he best knew his own motives, it is most equitable to believe, that the reasons he gives for that omission, were the real reasons of it; which he farther expresses, after the words last quoted from him, in this manner: "But it (*viz.* the satisfaction of *Christ*) "being a term not used by the Holy Ghost in the Scripture, and very variously explained by those that do use it, and very much stumbled at by those I was there speaking to, who were such, as I there say, who will not take a blessing, unless they be instructed, what need

“ they had of it, and why it was bestowed upon them; I left it with the other disputed doctrines of *Christianity* to be looked into (to see what it was *Christ* had taught concerning it) by those, who were *Christians*, and believed *Jesus* to be the Saviour promised and sent from God.” This defence, one would think, might have prevented any farther insisting upon his omitting to mention this, among the advantages we have by *Christ*.

But you say, that “ in his *Notes and Paraphrase* upon *St. Paul*, where he comments upon many passages generally taken to imply the satisfaction, he gives them a sense and turn contrary and opposite to that doctrine; which makes it very clear, that his omitting to mention it in that place was not only out of caution and prudence, as he pretends, but because, with the *Socinians*, he did not admit that doctrine to be true.” The whole of this charge, Sir, I take the liberty to deny: and whether I have just reason so to do, will appear by considering the several instances, in which you pretend he gives that contrary sense and turn.

The first passage you instance in, is his note on the word *Redemption*, *Rom. iii. 24.* where he has these words. “ Redemption by *Jesus Christ* does not import, there was any compensation made to God, by paying what was equal value in consideration, whereof they were delivered. For that is inconsistent with what *St. Paul* expressly says here, *viz.* That sinners are justified by God *gratis*, or of his free bounty.” Upon which you add, *this assertion is manifestly against the satisfaction.* And in another place, where you resume the same subject, his note on that word is all of it direct opposition, and flat contradiction to the doctrine of our Saviour’s satisfaction for sin.” But this is a mistake,

‘ P, 110,

Sir:

Sir: what he there says of *redemption*, might very consistently be said of *satisfaction* by *Jesus Christ*; they are indeed terms of much the same signification. Your argument against this note of Mr. *Locke*’s is founded on a supposition, that there can be no satisfaction made, without paying what was equal value. But certainly, Sir, you cannot be ignorant, that many, who own the doctrine of satisfaction, do not understand it to import, that a compensation was made to God, by paying what was equal value. How indeed can man dare to determine, that no other kind of satisfaction could be appointed or accepted by God, for the sins of men, unless the Holy Ghost had so declared? But this he has not thought fit to do. And as Mr. *Locke* has shewn, that redemption in *Scripture language* does not signify precisely *paying an equivalent* (which would make our pardon due by a claim of right) neither in *common language* does making satisfaction generally signify the precise *payment of an equivalent*; but whatever is required, or accepted by the party offended, as the condition of forgiving the offender, is called demanding or making satisfaction; and therefore as denying, that an equivalent was paid, is not denying, that a satisfaction was made, the assertion in that note is no manner of *opposition*, or *contradiction to the doctrine of our Saviour’s satisfaction for sin.*

Redemption and satisfaction are general terms, which can only be explained by describing the action done, whereby the redemption was accomplished, or the satisfaction made. And when Mr. *Locke* asserts (as you confess he does in many places) “ That our Saviour by his death, atoned for our sins, that the price, with which he bought us, was his precious blood, that he hath given himself for us, an offering and an acceptable sacrifice to God, &c.” he expresses the doctrine of *satisfaction* more particularly, than if he had used the word itself. And therefore you

you are quite out, when you say, that "after his" note upon the words *Redemption, &c.* it must be "next to impossible to conceive, how he could give" those general words of Scripture, *attoned, given for us, offering sacrifice*, any sense, which could "be applied in favour of the doctrine of the satisfaction." For those, which you call *general words*, with others of the same import (except the word *attoned*) are really *particular* explications of the general doctrine of the satisfaction, or redemption by *Jesus Christ*; these two terms standing alone without the explanations, importing only that *Jesus Christ* did by some means or other reconcile God to man. Whereas the expressions Mr. Locke has used are particular descriptions of the means, or of the nature of that satisfaction, on account of which (tho' not in the way of an equivalent) God was pleased to exempt man from the punishment due to his sins.

You object indeed, that "he only repeats the" words of the Apostle, to explain them; and that "it is always his method, when he has no mind to" explain himself, upon any doctrine of *Christian* faith, to leave it as he found it, in the general "words of Scripture." I cannot guess, Sir, upon what grounds (unless the carelessness of most readers) you expect to be believed in this charge; since in the very place, where you make the objection, you have yourself confuted it, by setting down no less than three several passages from Mr. Locke, which are all explications of his, in words *different* from those of the Apostle, viz. "The precious blood of Christ, acceptable sacrifice, our Saviour by his death attoned for our sins." (which by the way is the same, as if he had said, *made satisfaction* for our sins.) In the other places you mention, where he retains the Apostle's words, it is manifestly, because they are so plain, that no explications could make them more so. Not

(as

(as you injuriously alledge) "That he might have it" in his own power, at any time to give them what "turn or explication he pleased; the truth of which," you say, you have in your papers several times "made appear." But I defy you to produce one single instance, that you have given of this, throughout your book. It was at *no time* Mr. Locke's *method* to give particular explications of Scripture, either where the words are too clear to need, or too obscure to admit of it; but where he thinks the Scripture has given any light, by comparing one place with another, to explain a mistaken or obscure passage, he makes no scruple to speak his thoughts, tho' they do not exactly fall in with the commonly received notions: And that he has done so, was your first complaint on the very point we are now upon, in his note on the word *Redemption*. For on this doctrine of *Christian faith*, Mr. Locke is it seems so unfortunate, as to fall under your displeasure, both for *leaving it*, and for *not leaving it*, in the general words of Scripture.

But upon the whole I will venture to say, and I presume have made it appear, that whether he *paraphrases*, or *explains*, or *retains* the very words of Scripture, he every way fully and strongly asserts the satisfaction made by *Jesus Christ* for the sins of men, tho' he does not think that necessarily imports, a compensation made to God, by paying what was equal value.

The next passage you instance in, is verse 25 of the same chapter, where he observes, that the word translated *propitiation*, signifies *propitiatory* or *mercy-seat*. Upon which, with great candour, you make the following comment. "He was aware, that *propitiation* here might signify an attonement made "by sacrifice, which signification would the lead

! P. 74.

reader

"reader to suppose a satisfaction paid, and therefore he took care to provide it with another meaning." But if that word really has another meaning, which the learned Mr. *Mede* does as well as Mr. *Locke* observe, and you do not deny; there was no ground to provide him with another reason for making that observation.

However, whether his sense of that word be right or wrong, it is unlucky, that the only reason you thought fit to help him to for giving it that sense, should happen to be confuted by the very note itself. For he there speaks of the *atonement* under the law, made by blood sprinkled on the propitiatory, or mercy-seat, and of our Saviour, as the *antitype*, the real propitiatory or mercy-seat in his own blood, referring to *Heb. ix. 25, 26.* where the sacrifice of himself is opposed to the blood of others. He could not therefore chuse the word *propitiatory*, to avoid one, that might signify an *atonement* made by sacrifice, as you suggest; since in the same note he expressly mentions the *sacrifice*, which *Christ* made of himself, as offered in the place of those, by which the *atonement* under the law was made. So that the reader could scarce avoid supposing a *satisfaction paid*, tho' he might at the same time suppose, that our Saviour was figured, not only by the *legal sacrifices*, but likewise by the *mercy-seat*, which was sprinkled by the blood of the sacrifice, and which was the *place of God's presence*; and that in all these respects, our Saviour, who was the *antitype*, might, as Mr. *Locke* there says, be properly called the *propitiatory*; for certainly nothing of all this is in any respect contrary to the doctrine of the satisfaction.

One passage more, you tell us, you cannot but mention, for the singular delicacy and novelty in the interpretation. And if that had been all you had mentioned it for, I should have left it with you, to have made as much *nonsense* of it as you pleased.

But

But you have cited it as an instance of his giving passages of Scripture generally taken to imply the satisfaction, a sense and turn, contrary to that doctrine; which obliges me to take notice of it. Give me leave, Sir, first to observe, that you have been no less unlucky in your choice of this passage than the former, since both his paraphrase and note on the place are directly contrary to what you would infer from them; as will appear. It is upon *Rom. viii. 3.* "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak thro' the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh."

You are much displeased with Mr. *Locke*, for observing upon this text, that *condemned sin in the flesh* does not mean, that *Christ* was condemned for sin, or in the place of sin; but that sin itself was condemned, or put to death in his flesh, *i. e.* was suffered to have no life nor being in it, referring to *Heb. iv. 15.* *He was in all points tempted as we are, yet without sin.* All these harsh and hard interpretations, you say, appeared plain and easy to Mr. *Locke*, while they delivered him from the doctrine of the satisfaction of *Christ*." But, as it happens, his interpretation of this passage, as well as of those we have before considered, does nothing towards delivering him from the doctrine of the satisfaction; for that doctrine is as fully asserted in his *Paraphrase and Notes* on the place, as it is in the sense you have given us of it. All the difference is, that he takes it to be contained in one part of the verse, and you in another.

Besides *Christ's* being made an offering for sin, Mr. *Locke* understands this passage likewise to assert, that he was himself without sin, that sin was suffered to have no being in his flesh. And you say too, that

* P. 78.

the

the passage plainly signifies, that Christ was sent into the world, like all other men, excepting only his innocence. But according to your way of understanding the words *condemned sin*, to be part of those, which express Christ's being made a sacrifice for sin, you leave no words in the text, to give the least hint of his innocence; and I fear you must be beholden to the *absurd pains*, which you say, Mr. Locke has taken to do violence to that passage, to make out your own sense of it; for the text plainly says, that God sent his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, but not a word of his innocence, if that be not signified, as Mr. Locke understands it to be, by the words *condemned sin in the flesh*.

However, supposing him to be mistaken in the sense of those words, that he had no design by this interpretation to be delivered from the doctrine of the satisfaction, is manifest from his *Paraphrase and Notes on the place*; where he is so far from taking away any proof of that doctrine, that he supplies what was wanting in our translation more fully to express it; reading in his *Paraphrase* thus: "God sending his Son in flesh, that in all things, except sin, was like unto our frail sinful flesh, and sending him also to be an offering for sin, he put to death or suppressed sin in the flesh." And in his note he tell us, that the word, which in the text is translated for sin, signifies an offering for sin, as the margin of our Bibles takes notice; then referring to 2 Cor. v. 21. Heb. x. 5, 10. "So that, says he, the plain sense is, God sent his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and sent him an offering for sin."

Now I beseech you, Sir, of what importance is it to the doctrine of the satisfaction, whether the words for sin, or condemned sin, be understood to signify, that Christ was made an offering for sin? Or how could Mr. Locke be delivered from that doctrine, by denying that sense in one part of the verse, when he asserts it in the other? And with what candour

candour or justice could you infer from his interpretation of this text, that he had any design to lay aside the doctrine of the satisfaction? Since it is as plainly asserted by his explication, as if he had, with you, understood it to be contained in the words *condemned sin in the flesh*. For which ever way those words are taken, the satisfaction made by Christ is still fully declared in the text, and maintained in Mr. Locke's paraphrase and note upon it, as has been shewn, and you could not but know. So that upon the whole it appears, that in all the passages you have brought to prove, it was his design entirely to lay aside the doctrine of the satisfaction, he has in those very places plainly asserted that doctrine; and consequently, that your accusation in this, as on the other points of his pretended agreement with the Socinians, is entirely false, and without any foundation.

Answer to the proofs in Sect. IV. That he was a man of unwarrantable latitude in his principles of religion.

AFTER taking all this pains to prove, that Mr. Locke was thoroughly engaged in the Socinian opinions, you have at last found out, that he allowed himself a latitude of thinking even beyond the bounds of Christianity itself. Your whole design here is to have it thought, that he esteems all religions alike, gives no preference to Christianity, nor makes any distinction between the worshipers of the true God, and those who worship false gods, or Mahomet, or the Devil; an indictment I could not have expected, even from Dr. Holdsworth himself. The contrary is so notorious thro' all Mr. Locke's works, that those, who are acquainted with them, who know what he has wrote for the service of Christianity; and that awful sense of the Deity, the worship and obedience due

due to him, which he on all occasions expresses; will scarce think this article worth the notice of an answer. But the present controversy may fall into the hands of some, who are strangers to his writings, and for their sakes I shall consider it as briefly as possible.

The whole of your evidence upon this extraordinary indictment is taken from *his laws of Carolina*, which were constitutions for the promoting of trade in a part of the world, where persons of all religions would probably be concerned, and where the natives were not *Christians*. And all that can be justly inferred from them is, that in such a situation, Mr. *Locke* did not think it proper, that any outward distinctions should be made on account of opinions, that were not in themselves prejudicial to society. Tho' it seems indeed to be his judgment likewise in all other cases, that avoiding such distinctions was most for the *real advancement of true religion*; that the less bias was put upon men's minds, either by civil advantages or disadvantages, the more likely they would be to discern truth, and to embrace it for its own sake; as may be gathered from several passages in his *Letters concerning Toleration*. So that it might be not only for securing the trade and peace of those plantations, that he was for allowing equal privileges to persons of all religions there, but as the likeliest means to spread and promote *Christianity*. Nay he gives that reason for it in the very *Constitution*, quoted by you for his making no distinction between the religion of *Jesus Christ*, and that of the worshippers of the Devil. With how good grounds, let the words of the Constitution shew.

* “ But since the natives of that place, who will be concerned in our plantation, are utterly strangers to *Christianity*, whose idolatry, ignorance, or mistake gives us no right to expel, or use them

* Constitution xcvi.

“ ill,

“ ill; and those, who remove from other parts to plant there, will unavoidably be of different opinions concerning matters of religion; that civil peace may be maintained amidst the diversity of opinions; and also that *Jews*, heathens, and other dissenters from the purity of *Christian religion*, may not be scared and kept at a distance from it, but by having an opportunity of acquainting themselves with the truth and reasonableness of its doctrines, and the peaceableness and inoffensiveness of its professors, may by good usage and persuasion, and all those convincing methods of gentleness and meekness, suitable to the rules and design of the Gospel, be won over to embrace and unfeignedly the truth. Therefore any seven, or more, persons agreeing in any religion, shall constitute a church, or profession, to which they shall give some name to distinguish it from others.”

It is upon this Constitution, that all the following exclamations are made. “ By Mr. *Locke's* most *Christian* Constitutions, religion is only considered as an instrument of trade: all religions are put up on the same foot with *Christianity*; and the sacred name of church is wisely prostituted to be common to the most impious and idolatrous superstition in the world. But this is Mr. *Locke's* model of a religious comprehension, and a glorious one indeed it is, since the Devil himself is not excluded out of it.”

If you had remarked just the contrary, that Mr. *Locke* had only considered trade as an instrument of religion, to acquaint infidels and other dissenters from the purity of *Christian religion*, with the truth and reasonableness of its doctrines; and that he had set them on the same foot with *Christians* in civil matter, that by such good usage they might be won over to embrace, and unfeignedly receive, the true religion; as the

Constitution particularly expresses, I doubt not every one would have owned it a much more just and judicious comment.

I beseech you, Sir, where did you find Mr *Locke's* model of a religious comprehension, from which the Devil himself is not excluded? Or where does he speak of any terms of communion capable of comprehending all those, whom you are so angry with him for calling churches? It is impossible for me to imagine upon what grounds your pathetic expostulations are raised. You mention three terms of communion laid down by Mr. *Locke*, the most general he could think of, viz. 1. That there is a God. 2. That God is to be worshipped. 3. That it is lawful, and the duty of every man, when required by his governors, to swear by him.

These were terms, that every member of civil society were required to agree in; which you either mistake or misrepresent, as terms of a religious comprehension or communion.

However, after a terrible alarm about fellowship with the Devil, comprehending the worship of him, or of false deities, with that of the true God; and of a government, which calls itself Christian, daring to form such a comprehension; you are so kind in the very next paragraph, that you will not suppose, that heathens, or even Jews and Mahometans, were designed to be comprehended in these terms. (We are then, it seems, in no danger of including the Devil in them.) You will only suppose, that those wide terms of communion were intended, to comprehend all the different opinions, or sects of men called Christians, tho' they had no agreement in the belief of Christ, or the fundamentals of Christianity, such as Deists, Quakers, and Socinians.

* It seems he meant by churches, nothing more than religious professions; for he uses them as equivalent appellations.

But

But even this is more than I must allow you, or than you have ground to suppose: there is not the least appearance of any religious comprehension at all intended in the Constitutions. It is entirely a dream of your own, and, if you please, when you are sure your understanding is awake, and your honest passions for a while suspended, only to read from *Const.* xcv. to cx, I am confident you will plainly see, that those wide terms of communion were terms of civil communion only, such as were thought so necessary to the well-being of the society; that no man or assembly of men should enjoy any of the privileges of it, that did not agree in them: But that it was never supposed, that all, who agreed in those terms, should be comprehended in one communion. On the contrary you will see, that several of the Constitutions manifestly suppose many distinct communions, being laws to regulate their conduct towards one another, for the preservation of peace among them. — And as no person was to have any protection from the law, &c. who was not a member of some church or profession, in which his name was to be recorded, one of the Constitutions expressly prohibits being entered in any more, than one religious record at once; so far were they from intending a religious comprehension, which might include Heathens, Mahometans, or even all the different sects of men called Christians. This laudable scheme, therefore, so much for the honour and interest of the Christian religion, formed, as you say, by men full of the vain philosophy, and villainous craft of this world, who have nothing so much at heart as secular wealth and trade; you may, if you please, take the glory of to yourself, since it is formed only by your own imagination. Mr. *Locke* has not any share in it. He had too great a regard for religion, the Christian religion, to let wealth or trade in competition with it, or to give the least ground for such unchristian reproaches.

You go on in this spirit, and tell us, "The members of the church of *England* are not to take it amiss, that Mr. *Locke* disowned one article drawn in is favour, since he could not afford one express law in favour of *Christianity* itself." A candid judge might have found laws in favour, not only of *Christianity*, but of the church of *England* too, in all those articles, where justice, charity, and a peaceable behaviour, are strictly required towards all persons of what profession soever, for these reasons^b, "That their conversion to the truth might not be hindered; that dissenters from the purity of *Christian* religion might be won over unfeignedly to receive the truth; and that no scandal may be brought on the true religion which we profess;" that is, on the church of *England*; for that was the religion, which most of the proprietors of *Carolina* did, as well as Mr. *Locke*, profess. And these laws for regulating the behaviour of its professors, he thought, more tended to promote the real interests of that church, than any secular advantages; which it seems he had not so much at heart.

That Mr. *Locke* did sincerely prefer the church of *England*, to all other divisions of *Christians* whatsoever, is evident not only from his constant publick profession of it, but from the private opening of his thoughts, in familiar letters to his friends, than which there is not a more certain way of discovering the real sentiments of a man's heart. One instance of this may suffice here, out of many, that might be produced. In a letter to a relation of his, a member of the church of *England*, who had asked him, what was the best method for a young gentleman to study religion? to whom he had answered, "That the only way to attain a certain knowledge of the *Christian* religion, in its full extent and purity, is

^b Vid. *Const.* xxxvii, cvi. ^c Letter to Mr. *Richard King*, in the collection published by P. D. *Mainz*.

"the study of the Holy Scripture:" upon a second enquiry he again answers, that if he asks, which is the best way to get the knowledge of the doctrines of any particular church, &c. that will not be hard to tell him: "But in this way of studying (says he) you pitch upon one as the right, before you know it to be so; whereas that choice should be the result of your study of the *Christian* religion in the sacred Scriptures. And the method I have proposed, would, I presume, bring you the surest way to that church, which I imagine you already think most conformable to the word of God." The gentleman was, as I said, of the church of *England*. And what can be a greater evidence of Mr. *Locke's* esteem of that church, than this declaration to a friend, that the surest way to bring a man to it is the study of the holy Scripture?

But what need we concern ourselves about Mr. *Locke's* favouring, or not favouring, the church of *England*, when you are just going to make him of no church at all? The last paragraph of this extraordinary section, that it may even outdo the rest, has found out something, that looks as if he were sometimes sensible of his own inclination to be an infidel, when he provides an apiate for unbelievers in these words, in his *Reas. of Christianity*: "It is remarkable, that in all the places, where our Saviour describes his way of proceeding in the last judgment, the sentence follows doing, or not doing, without any mention of believing, or not believing. Not that any, to whom the Gospel hath been preached, shall be saved without believing; but that the rest, who want the allowance of being justified by faith, must answer for all their actions, and being found transgressors shall be condemned." What can be said now to this plain evidence of Mr. *Locke's* inclination to be an infidel? I am really almost struck dumb by it, and can scarce give any other answer, than to stare and stand amazed, that any man of

sense or probity, can suffer his *prejudice*, so far to run away with one or both of them, as to be capable of so grossly mistaking, or misrepresenting a passage, which has nothing less in view, than that *miserable consolation of unbelief*, which you impute to it.

The argument he is upon in that place, from whence you have compounded your wonderful *opiate*, is to prove, that a *good life* is an indispensable condition of the covenant of grace; and the words you have cited, are to confute those, who^d (as he says) doubt, or scruple to call *that* a condition of the new covenant, as well as faith. But how could you possibly think, he intended this for a *consolation of unbelief*? When in the very same place he tells us, "That all being sinners and transgressors of the law, and so unjust, are *all* liable to condemnation unless they believe." These words, Sir, are as plainly there as the others, and if you had thought fit to quote them, would have quite spoiled your *opiate*. This necessity of faith for avoiding condemnation Mr. *Locke* constantly maintains; tho', to shew the necessity of a good life also, he takes notice, that our Saviour's sentence at the last day will be pronounced according to mens actions, without any mention of their believing, or not. But what kind of *opiate for unbelievers* this can be, when it is at the same time declared, that no man can attain salvation, or escape condemnation, that does not believe; or what need there was of quoting Scripture to prove this, which you knew Mr. *Locke* had asserted in that very place, is not easy to apprehend.

Answer to the proofs in Sect. V. That he denied the doctrine of the Trinity, in his dispute with the Bishop of Worcester.

IT looks somewhat absurd to go about to prove a man a *Socinian*, after having attempted to throw

^d *Reas. of Christianity*, p. 233.

him

him *beyond the bounds of Christianity itself*: but that was a little too gross; we must, it seems, return to the old charge of *Socinianism*.

This section begins with an appeal to me, whether you had not sufficient grounds to accuse Mr. *Locke* of loose and *Socinian principles*. But, by this time, I suppose, you may be willing to remove your appeal, if you are not yourself convinced, how greatly you have wronged him, in all your accusations. And I am much mistaken, if his dispute with the Bishop of *Worcester* will afford you any more *sufficient grounds*, than all the former have appeared to be.

You grant what I had urged in Mr. *Locke's* behalf, that he took pains, to clear his *Essay* from the charge of being inconsistent with, or dangerous to, any article of the *Christian* faith. You likewise grant, that he often complains to the Bishop, of joining him with the *Unitarians*; as if he had been one of those, who oppose the doctrine of the Trinity: and you believe he was desirous, that the world should think his *Essay* did not favour *Socinian* principles. But you insist, that "This does not prove he did not believe them. It is one thing (you say) not to have wrote in a certain particular book against the Trinity; and another thing, to believe it. It is one thing, to be unwilling to be thought a *Socinian*; and another thing, to disown their principles." In reply to which, I insist, that the concern Mr. *Locke* shewed, that the world should not think any of his writings favoured *Socinian* principles (for it was not his *Essay* alone, which he vindicated from that charge) and the pains he took to clear them from it; if it is not a proof, that he *believed* the Trinity, or *disowned* *Socinian* principles, it is at least a proof, that he was very sure he had never *published* any thing in favour of their principles, or that tended to destroy the arguments for the Trinity; and this cuts you off from all possibility

sibility of proving, that he *denied* the Trinity, or that he *owned* any *Socinian* doctrines; for what he *privately* believed about those matters, which he did not publish, you cannot possibly determine, nor have any right to enquire. But to pretend; that Mr. *Locke* has, in many places of his works, *maintained Socinian* doctrines, and advanced things contrary to the Trinity; and yet, that he was very desirous, that the world should think he had done nothing of all this, is surely a contradiction: for, how could he expect to persuade the world, that he did not write what (according to you) his works were full of? or, to what purpose did he publish opinions, which, you own, he had no mind the world should know? What consistency is there in this?

I had farther asked, what imaginable reason you could assign for Mr. *Locke's* great concern to vindicate his writings on the article of the Trinity, if he did not believe it; or from favouring *Socinian* principles, if he did believe them; since he lived in an age, when all kind of free-thinking was openly professed, without any manner of discouragements, so that he could have no fears or views of interest, to make him conceal his opinions, or be so earnest to justify himself. To which you answer, "You run yourself perpetually into the same mistakes: he never justified himself in the opinion of any impartial man, to be a friend to the doctrine of the holy Trinity. It is true, indeed, he could be under no fears, — and it is true, also, that the security of the times gave him encouragement to vent his pernicious opinions, and to set himself at the head of the free-thinking tribe." It is certainly no *mistake*, Sir, that Mr. *Locke* did take a great deal of pains to justify himself from having writ any thing contrary to the

doctrine of the Trinity; for you have yourself granted, that *he is full and large upon this subject*. What success his endeavours met with in any man's opinion, is nothing to the purpose here. All you was desired to account for, is, what could induce him to *endeavour* to justify himself; not how effectually he did it. But, it seems, this question somewhat *puzzled* you, since instead of accounting for that fact, which is undeniable, you give a reason for his doing what I maintain he never did; nor has all your labour made it appear, that he *ever vented any pernicious opinions*.

However, you had told me just before, "that I mistake much, if I think I puzzle you, when I ask you the reason of Mr. *Locke's* conduct; for you have given a very inconsistent account of it." This, I suppose, is in p. 89. for you have said nothing, that looks *that way*, but what I find there in these words: "He was a man of eclat and vanity; he affected to lead and dictate; and was willing to have his penetration and judgment admired, and submitted to. And, therefore, of all things, he endeavoured to avoid an imputation, which would fix a character of infamy upon himself and his writings, and forbid him, at once, all the hopes and glory of gaining applause and disciples." Applause and disciples! To what, I pray, Sir? To opinions, which he disowned; nay, *of all things, avoided the imputation of*? This is a new way to lead and dictate. I confess, you have puzzled me, to make this account consistent with itself, or with what I just now cited from you, *viz. He could be under no fears, and that gave him encouragement to vent his pernicious opinions*. And yet here, it seems, he was in great fear of infamy, and that made him *disown those pernicious opinions*. He affected to lead and dictate, and set himself at the head

of the free-thinking tribe: and, therefore, he, of all things avoided the imputation of free-thinking. In short, he concealed, or disowned, his opinions, to secure the glory of gaining disciples to them. If this is your consistent account of Mr. Locke's conduct, it may satisfy those, who have the useful faculty of reconciling manifest contradictions; but those, who have not their heads turned for such purposes, may rather be inclined to think with me, that the concern he shewed, to clear his books from Socinian principles, and from having any thing in them dangerous to the article of the Trinity, as it is a full evidence, that he was conscious he had not vented any such pernicious opinions; so it ought, not only in charity, but in justice, to determine our judgment in favour of his principles; since no other motive of his conduct can, with any consistency, be supposed, but, either as I have before urged, that he sincerely believed those points, upon which he vindicated his writings; or, that, in modesty and humility, he would not, by declaring his opinions, disturb the peace of the church.

To this you answer, "The very supposition of modesty, and humility, and regard to the peace of the church, in such a man as he was, looks like a jest, and a banter upon him. Let any man read his books, and he will soon see how little a share he had in the virtues of modesty and humility. All the language of them is quite of another spirit." This character, Sir, I am persuaded, will pass upon none, but those, who have never read his books; and, though it is a reproach you frequently throw upon him, I may say, there is none of all your unjust invectives more groundless. I have given some answer to it, at the beginning of these papers; but must, on this occasion, add, that no man, who was so capable of observing

the mistakes and received errors in any subject he treated of, ever did it with less haughtiness or arrogance than he; or shewed more desire to be convinced by reason, if he was under any mistakes himself; as appears by his preface to *The Reasonableness of Christianity*, his Answer to the author of the Occasional Paper, and many of his private letters to his friends: nay, if we were to judge of him only by his vindication against the *Unmasker*, provoked as he was by ill usage, he would not appear with that haughty air, you pretend he assumes. I have consulted the passages in it, which you refer to; and find them quite of another stamp. In one of them, he thus expresses himself: "I did not think myself so considerable, that the world need be troubled about me, whether I were a follower of Socinus, Arminius, or Calvin, etc. nor is it material to any one, what my opinions are, any farther than they carry their own evidence with them." This is not the haughty style of one, who would lead and dictate; much less shall we find him of that character, in any other of the books^a you name; and to determine the truth of this, I may, with great assurance, appeal to all his works. But, particularly, in his controversy with the Bishop of Worcester, it is impossible for any man to speak with greater modesty of himself, or to treat another with more submission and respect, than he does the Bishop: which, as it was more than usual in controversy, the Bishop was so sensible of, that he returned him thanks for it, in one of his letters.

There was, indeed, in Mr. Locke's writings something so eminently opposite to that haughty air, which you impute to him, that such a reproach could never have entered your thoughts, but to evade an argument, which you could not answer. He, on many occasions, expresses an earnest desire

of being set right in his mistakes, and a readiness to recant them publicly; and speaks with such an unaffected modesty of himself, especially in his familiar letters, as is not common in a man of so great talents. Instances of this are too many to be transcribed; but I will set down one evidence of the truth of it, which is the effect it had on Mr. *Molyneux*, who by this behaviour was entirely engaged to his friendship, as he professes in one of his letters. "You so favourably entertain all men's objections, you are so desirous to hear the sense of others, you are so tender in differing from any man, that you have captivated me beyond resistance." In short, *modesty* is so far from being foreign to Mr. *Locke's* character, that it was almost as conspicuous, and as much admired in him, as his penetration and judgment. So that there is no danger it should look like a *banter* upon him, if we impute it to modesty, and a commendable prudence, that he forbore to publish opinions (if he had any such, which is more than we know) that would have disturbed the peace of the church.

Here you will again cry out, "as for his regard for the peace of the church, it is impossible that should ever have entered into his thoughts. He does not appear to have had any determinate notion of the *Christian* church; he speaks of *Christians*, only as of certain sects of men, joined to one another, and their leaders by different systems of principles. As in his laws of *Carolina*, every persuasion is a church; and with such a notion of the church, it is impossible that peace should be consistent. A church made up of sects is essentially a *chaos*."

It is very certain, Sir, that there are few words, which are more generally used in a loose indeter-

minate sense, or in more different significations, than the word *church*. It is, likewise, certain, that by far the greater number of people have not any determinate notion of the *Christian* church; and, among those, that have, there are several very different notions of it. But, I hope, it does not follow, that none of these can have any regard to the peace of the church. You have not been pleased to acquaint us, what your notion of the church is; only we may gather, that it excludes all sects, that have different systems of principles; which, I fear, will prove as limited a notion, as that of the *Romanists*, who confine the catholic church within the bounds of their own. Most of the divines of the church of *England* allow them to be a part, though an unfound part, of the church; and Bishop *Smalridge* declares himself unwilling absolutely to exclude all, who have not *episcopal* ordination, from being members of the *Christian* church, out of a tender regard to the reformed churches abroad. And if these are allowed to be parts of it, we can scarce avoid admitting into our notion of the *Christian* church certain sects of men, joined to one another, not by, as you express it, but notwithstanding different systems of principles; always supposing, that they agree in fundamentals.

However, it does not appear that this was Mr. *Locke's* notion of the *Christian* church. In his *Laws of Carolina*, where he has given you so much offence, by calling every persuasion a church, he never speaks of them as making one church; nor seems any more to have that meaning, than I suppose you would have in saying, the church of *Rome*, the church of *Scotland*, the church of *Geneva*, the *Lutheran* church, etc. But, supposing Mr. *Locke* to have no determinate, or to have a wrong notion of the *Christian* church (the case, I doubt not, of many peaceable *Christians*) how will it follow from thence, that it is impossible the peace of

of it should ever have entered into his thoughts? In his laws of *Carolina*, the peace of the several churches seems to have entered very much into his thoughts; and if he had a notion, that the *Christian* church was *made up of sects* (which you have no ground from those laws to assert) might he not forbear to oppose a doctrine, which was received by the greatest part of it, either in regard to the peace of the church in general, or of that particular branch of it, of which he lived and died a member?

You ask^k, “How is it possible, that he should have any regard, to the peace of the church of *England*, when he notoriously opposes the doctrines, and speaks of the orthodoxy, and the clergy of it, in terms of the greatest scorn and contempt?” But this, Sir, I absolutely deny; and as to the first part of the charge, I presume it is by this time sufficiently evident, that you have produced no proof of it; for by no rule in logic, will *giving grounds of suspicion, or occasions to doubt, that a man is no friend to certain doctrines*, be the same with *notoriously opposing them*; and that is the most your proofs pretend to, though even that they fall short of. Neither have you proved the other part of your charge: for it is impossible to prove any thing by such disjointed words, as you have raked together, without giving us the occasion, or connexion of them: And it is certain on the contrary, that in several of his writings he speaks with the highest esteem and veneration of some eminent prelates, and others of the clergy; and by many expressions in different parts of his works, it appears, that the church of *England* was in his judgment the *most pure*, and most conformable in her doctrines to the sacred Scriptures, some of which I have had occasion to produce; so that,

^k Page 97.

though

though he might not think her infallible, and might speak of *fashionable orthodoxy, prevailing orthodoxy*, with respect to the contrary opinions in disputable points, which it is undeniable have at different times prevailed among us; yet he might have so great a regard for her peace, as not to oppose any doctrine she had constantly received as an article of faith. But whatever were his reasons, it is matter of fact he never did.

I had now got almost to the end of this section, when I began to recollect, that the title of it is, *Proofs that he denied the Trinity in his dispute with the Bishop of Worcester*, which the work I have found to do made me quite forget; for of seventeen pages, that it contains, fifteen of them are nothing but mere railing and invectives: a great deal of it favours too much of passion and pique for me to encounter. But in pursuit of what seemed most material to answer, I have passed over the two pages, wherein are contained all, that has any pretence to argument on the subject of the title, which we will now go back to consider.

In the controversy between the Bishop and Mr. Locke, you say^l, “when he was told, that the way to clear himself, from being suspected not to be a friend to the doctrine of the Trinity, was to declare, that he owned that doctrine, as it has been received in the *Christian* church:” he answers,

First, “That he need not clear himself, from what was never laid to his charge.” And Secondly, “That how the doctrine of the Trinity has been *always* received in the *Christian* church, he confessed himself ignorant.”

To his first answer, you reply, that “though the Bishop did not charge him directly as opposing the doctrine of the Trinity; yet he knew,

^l Page 90.

“ that

“ that his adversary to his *Reasonableness of Christianity* did warmly charge him, as not favouring it. And yet he never thought fit to clear himself from that imputation.”

To his second answer, you reply, “ that it was not required of him to declare, that he owned the doctrine of the Trinity, as it has been always received in the *Christian church*, for he added the word *always*; and if he had only declared, that he owned it, as it has been received in the church of *England*, you doubt not it would have been thought sufficient. And that therefore, as both these answers are false and evasive, so it appears from them, that he was no friend to the doctrine of the Trinity.”

To all this I answer, first, that the Bishop was so far from *directly* charging him with opposing the doctrine of the Trinity, that he *directly* acquitted him of having any such intention, in several places of both his answers. So that to have cleared himself, from what the Bishop so often assured him he did not design to charge him with, was, at least, very needless: and for Mr. Locke to have cleared himself to the Bishop of *Worcester*, from what had been by *another person* imputed to the then unknown author of the *Reasonableness of Christianity*, must have been thought very impertinent.

Secondly I answer, that Mr. Locke did think fit to clear his *writings*, from all that was imputed to them; which was the most effectual, and indeed, the only way to clear himself. For suppose he had, in answer to the Bishop, said as you would have had him, My Lord; *I own the doctrine of the Trinity, as it has been received in the Christian church*; and therefore, your Lordship had no reason to bring me, or my book, into a dispute about that doctrine: the Bishop might have reasonably replied, that is nothing to the purpose: I have not charged you with denying the Trinity; but the question

question is, whether some things in your *Essay*, your way of certainty by ideas, your notions of identity, or your definitions, are not inconsistent with, or of dangerous consequence to, that article of the *Christian faith*? This certainly was all that Mr. Locke could be concerned to clear in his dispute with the Bishop, which he did with great strength of reason, and so effectually cleared himself.

But if he had thought fit to declare (where there was no occasion for it) that he owned the doctrine of the Trinity, as it has been received in the church of England; would that have been by you judged sufficient, to obviate the arguments you have drawn from his writings, to prove, that he denied that doctrine? I doubt not, you would have been ready with the same answer to his publick declaration, which you have given to my piece of *secret history*; that whether true or false, you ^m will let it pass for nothing. “ How little is to be gained (say you) by such a general acknowledgment? Do we not know, that there are persons now living, eminent in their stations, and for their learning, who profess to believe, and subscribe to the faith of the holy Trinity; and yet at the same time disown the divine nature of *Jesus Christ, &c.*” This is all the credit his private declaration could gain with you; and there is no reason to think a publick one would have fared better.

It was therefore no evasion in Mr. Locke to decline giving such an answer, as the state of the controversy did by no means require, and which would have been neither *pertinent* nor *satisfactory* to his adversaries. Nor can the reasons he gives for it be taxed with *falsity*; for the first, it is matter of fact, that he had not been charged with disbelieving the Trinity: and as to the second, how a doctrine so much disputed, and so differently explained, had

been received in the church (without adding the word *always*, which makes a clearer, though no real difference in the meaning) of this Mr. *Locke*, who professed to take his faith from the Scriptures, and was much more conversant with them, than with any other writings of the church, might with great sincerity confess himself ignorant.

But supposing these answers to be *false* or *evasive*, does it follow from thence, *that he denied the doctrine of the Trinity*? This is what you here undertake to prove; but an evasion, or avoiding to declare one's opinion about a doctrine, can never amount to a proof of *denying it*. And for all the boast of your title, the most you pretend to on this head is, *that he gave the world occasion to doubt, that he was no friend to the doctrine of the Trinity*; and even this does not appear from any thing you have produced. His answers were such, as the state of the controversy required; for supposing him ever so great a friend to the doctrine of the Trinity, a declaration of it on that occasion would, as I have shewn, been nothing to the purpose, nor in any respect reasonable.

You instance another place in his *third letter*, in which, you say, *he also gave the world occasion to doubt, that he was no friend to this doctrine*; because in speaking of these propositions, *there are three persons in one nature, and there are two natures in one person*; he says, "I do not here question the truth of these propositions, or deny, that they may be drawn from the Scripture: but I deny, that these very propositions are in express words in my Bible; for that is the only thing I deny here." To this you object, that if Mr. *Locke* had said *absolutely*, I do not question the truth of these propositions, nor deny, &c. without twice adding the word *here*, *he might possibly have given some satisfaction, that he did believe the doctrine of the Trinity*. You have taken care, Sir, to express yourself

yourself pretty cautiously: but I dare venture to affirm, that the most *absolute* words he could have used, (to whomsoever they might *possibly have given some*) would not have given you any satisfaction at all; you would notwithstanding have found out some *mental reservation* for him. Pardon me for being so positive; you have given me just grounds for it in the second part of your *Defence*, which I shall have occasion to observe in its place.

Nor need I say any thing farther here to this passage: the most you charge it with is an evasion, or that he did not think fit plainly to declare his opinion of some propositions concerning the Trinity; and I have not undertaken to prove, that he did. But not declaring his opinion concerning the Trinity will by no rule of logic conclude, that he *denied it*, which is what you should have proved. Mr. *Locke* might have many reasons for not declaring himself, if he was at all dissatisfied with the terms, in which that doctrine has been explained, and is now generally received, (as scruples of that kind have been entertained by some, who yet were steadfast in the faith.) That was one sufficient reason for not speaking in the most absolute manner, tho' he believed the Trinity, as he understood it to be delivered in the Scriptures: and if this was his case, I must again observe, his not attempting to *oppose* the received terms was such an instance of *temper and modesty* in so eminent a man, as rather deserves esteem and acknowledgments, than resentment and revilings.

Upon the whole then, since Mr. *Locke* never declared himself on the *Socinian* side, but, on the contrary, disowned them, and constantly vindicated himself from having writ any thing, that could favour their notions; they can have no *right in him, whatever* you pretend, nor have you any right to

give him up to them, as you take upon you to do. And I am much mistaken, if it will not be a far greater satisfaction to them, to see the members of the church of England, foolishly endeavouring to prove, that he was on the Socinian side, than it can be to see them contending, that he was against them. What satisfaction you can suppose that should give them, is not easy to imagine. But as he lived and died in the communion of the church of England, I had urged, that it is highly imprudent, as well as unjust, to labour to persuade the world, that in his private judgment he did not favour her doctrines; and this I still insist upon, though you exceedingly despise the prudent part: "No man (you say) of sense and probity will be less capable of being convinced of error, because Mr. Locke erred with him; or will alter his own opinion in compliance to the superiority of his penetration: And what fools or knaves may do, is not worth enquiry."

But may it not be worth enquiry, whether men of sense and probity are not sometimes liable to have their judgments influenced, imperceptibly to themselves, by the opinions of those, whom they esteem? That prejudice of education, which fixes far the greater part of mankind to whatever religion they happen to have been brought up in, seems to be owing in a great measure to their veneration for their teachers; and it would be hard to pronounce, that all are knaves, or fools, who live under such a bias. Some are too busy, some too lazy, or careless, and many think they have not learning enough, to examine the grounds of their religion; and so must take it upon trust. But even those, who endeavour to think for themselves, are not always secure from such an influence. If they happen to be conversant with some eminent author,

who, besides an uncommon penetration, seems to have a love of truth, and to lay aside all other regards in the search of it, how insensibly do the sentiments of such a one insinuate into their minds, whilst they imagine they follow no judgment but their own? And to have had some consideration for a weakness, to which men are on so many accounts liable, without being either fools or knaves, might not have been unworthy the severest honesty and wisdom.

But if there was no danger at all of influencing others, by persuading them, that Mr. Locke was a Socinian, I have in every view considered the part you and I have acted, (as you desire) and cannot for my life imagine, what service you can possibly be supposed to do the church. What can the church be the better, for your detecting his private prejudices against her doctrines, if he had any? Or what disservice can I possibly have done her, by maintaining against you, that we ought not to impute errors to him, which he never owned? What could the church have been the worse, if no body but Dr. Holdsworth had ever found them out? I have only pleaded, Sir, for a piece of common equity. As for receiving a notorious heretic, or mortal enemy to the faith and peace of Christians, into communion, as you extravagantly talk, I have no concern in it; nor have these expressions any support but passion.

They are, indeed, much of a piece with the virulent language of those other adversaries of Mr. Locke, whom you mention, for having been beforehand with you in their accusations of him. And as their scurrilous performances, full of prejudices and mistakes, were condemned by all the impartial world; I no more think it material, that they left the same imputation upon him, that you have done, than you esteem it material, whether the Bishop of Worcester gave him the like usage to what you have done,

done, or no. However, it is surely somewhat material, that the Bishop frequently *acquitted* him of having any intention to *oppose* the doctrine of the Trinity, which you so positively charge him with; though without any manner of ground for it, as we have seen. And if you had followed the example of those worthy and eminently learned men, *Bishop Stillingfleet* and *the Rev. Dr. Lupton*, another of his adversaries, who, in a sermon upon the same subject with yours, forbears all invidious names, and argues with the decency of a fair disputant; it had certainly been more for your honour, than to have ranked yourself with *Mr. Edwards* and *Mr. Leigh*, as you have done in this controversy, in the warmth of your zeal against heresy, and the strength of your prejudice against *Mr. Locke*.

We are now come to the close of this first part, where you sum up the particulars, upon which your charge of *Socinianism* is founded: but as I have fully vindicated *Mr. Locke* on each point, it is needless to go with you over them again here. I shall only in my turn draw up a short summary of what has been produced in his defence.

If it appears, that *Mr. Locke* did not at all agree with the *Socinians*, in "denying original sin, the satisfaction of *Christ*, and the eternity of the punishments of the wicked:" If, on the contrary, he maintained, that *Jesus Christ* came to redeem mankind, by the sacrifice he made of himself, and to restore them to life eternal, which they had forfeited by *Adam's* transgression; which is both an acknowledgment of original sin, and of the satisfaction of *Christ*: And if he fully asserted eternal punishments in a future state, as has been shewn: If he never *opposed* the doctrine of the Trinity: If he never endeavoured to take off the force of those texts, which are the most incontestable proofs of our Saviour's Divinity, particularly the begin-

ning of *St. John's Gospel*: And if those other texts, which he is accused of misinterpreting, are understood in the same sense, that he gives them, by those, who are allowed to be most orthodox.

If he never deduced any doctrine contrary to those articles of faith, from any of his interpretations, which is not so much as pretended.

In short, if all you have produced, instead of proofs, are nothing but suspicions, uncertain consequences, mistakes, or misrepresentations; as I have sufficiently made appear; then it is certain you have not made good the character you gave of *Mr. Locke* in your Sermon; and the world must judge, whether your defence of it, or mine of him, most deserves to be thought *weak, absurd, and partial*.

¶ You desire me to consider, *what discretion or piety there is in extravagantly preferring the sentiments and reputation of such a man, to those of the catholic church?* My discretion or piety, Sir, are not answerable for your *extravagant representations*. You know; my whole endeavour has been to shew, that he has published nothing contrary to the sentiments of the catholic church; nor have you been able to prove, that he ever did: And as I am well assured, that many persons both of piety and learning highly esteem his *Comments on St. Paul's Epistles*, and think his other writings greatly tend to promote true religion; I am not afraid of the contempt of good and thinking Christians (to which, you say, I expose myself) by endeavouring to rescue the character of so valuable a man, from the injurious prejudices you would raise against it; an author, not eminent for *logical triflings* (an expression, by which you do as much wrong to your own judgment, as to his character) but for such useful observations, as greatly tend to the service of truth,

the detection of error, and the advancement of real knowledge.

But with all his great abilities, if this celebrated man had, as you¹ alledge, appeared to be a *professed and obstinate heretic, and one of the worst and most infamous kind, a Socinian*, I should certainly have dropt my defence of his orthodoxy. If you could have made good this charge, Sir, you might have saved us both a great deal of trouble. It was but to have pointed out the place, and the words, in which he *obstinately professed himself a heretic, or a Socinian*; and I assure you I should not have attempted to prove, that he was *not*; nor need you, I think, have been at all this pains to prove, that he *was* what he *professed* himself to be. In the eagerness of your zeal, you have at last overshot the mark.

P. S. I have already replied to what was most material in your answer to some additions of my letter, in the proper place for it. But there are some passages, which deserve a little notice, that did not fall in my way there. I had mentioned a note of Mr. *Locke's* on *Gal. v. 18.* as an acknowledgment of our Saviour's Divinity, since he there plainly asserts the spirit of God, and the spirit of *Christ*, to be *the same*. To this² you object, "First, that Mr. *Locke* does in the same note say, that spirit signifies the Gospel; and so, say you, spirit of *Christ* may imply no more than the Gospel of *Christ*; and receiving his spirit no more than receiving his Gospel." But though Mr. *Locke* does in that note observe, that the *Law* and the *Gospel* are by St. *Paul* opposed under the titles of *Flesh* and *Spirit*, yet it is impossible, that in the words I quoted, he should by the spirit of *Christ* mean his Gospel; because that would make a very

¹ Page 103. ² Page 106.

absurd

absurd sense, quite inconsistent with the argument he is upon.

This I suppose you was sensible of, and therefore, secondly, you will "let it be said, if I please, that by spirit of *Christ* in this place is meant a divine power and assistance given to *Christians* by *Jesus Christ*." But you ask, "will it follow from that one passage of Mr. *Locke's*, that he acknowledged *Christ* to be God, because he is allowed to say, that the divine power is communicated to *Christians* by him?" It may not follow indeed, Sir, from his being allowed to say what you think fit to say for him. Mr. *Locke* does not say, that *the divine power is communicated to Christians by Christ*; but expressly, that it is *the spirit of Christ*, which assists them against the flesh, which spirit he immediately after calls *the spirit of God*: and that I still insist upon to be an acknowledgment of our Saviour's divinity; for I see not how the spirit of *Christ* can be the spirit of God, if *Christ* be not God.

Mr. *Locke*, in this note, refers to his *Paraphrase* on *Rom. viii. 9—11.* the words of which you set down, and then ask, "Where is the least appearance of the acknowledgment of the divinity of *Jesus Christ* in these words?" And who had said, that there is? But as it happens, though the words taken by themselves are not an acknowledgment of his divinity, yet compared with this note, and its reference to them, they are. The words of the *Paraphrase* are these, "and so having received the Gospel, you have therewith received *the spirit of God*?" To which words Mr. *Locke* refers, upon saying in his note on *Gal. v. 18.* that those, who receive *Christ* by faith, with him receive *his spirit*; which is a plain acknowledgment, that the spirit of *Christ* and the spirit of God are the same; so that these words are a farther confirmation of what I had before inferred from that passage alone.

You

You say indeed, that "it no where appears, that Mr. *Locke* means any thing else by spirit of God; than only a divine power or energy." But the falshood of this might be made appear almost *every where*, so frequently he speaks of the Holy Ghost, or spirit of God, in a personal manner.

But "upon the whole", you say, how ridiculous "is it to endeavour to squeeze an acknowledgment of the divinity of *Jesus-Christ*, by consequence and implication only, from the words of a man, who no where in any of his writings, in any direct words, makes any such acknowledgment, but every where most studiously avoids it." To which give me leave to answer:

That how little weight soever there may be in arguments from *consequence and implication only*; Dr. *Holdsworth* cannot disallow them in proof, that Mr. *Locke* owned the divinity of our Saviour; since he gives no other proofs, that he *denied* it, but by *consequence and implication only*. And I may fairly retort upon him, how ridiculous is it to endeavour to *squeeze a denial* of our Saviour's divinity, by consequence and implication only, from the words of a man, who, no where in any of his writings, makes any such *denial* in any direct words, but every where most studiously avoids it. This is certainly as strong on Mr. *Locke's* side, as it is against him; though I have no need of it; for the passage before us is more than a proof by consequence and implication: it is an express asserting, that the spirit of *Christ* is the spirit of God, *i. e. that Christ is God*.

As for what you add, that "he bends his whole force to make the acknowledgment (of our Saviour's divinity) not only unnecessary, but also false; as you have shewed already:" I take the liberty to say, that you have not shewed it at all:

you have not brought, nor can you bring, any one instance of his attempting to prove that doctrine to be *false*. And as for making the acknowledgment of it *unnecessary*, neither have you any proof of that, but by consequence and implication only; and that too upon very fallacious grounds, as I have largely insisted on elsewhere.

Thus, Sir, I presume, I have made it sufficiently appear, that all your proofs fall very short of what you undertook to shew: They are far from making it evident, that Mr. *Locke* *denied* the doctrine of the Trinity, or that he agreed with the Socinians in any other of their *most important and distinguishing doctrines*. We now go on to that of *the resurrection of the same body*, the principal subject of your Sermon.

The end of the First Part.