

A N  
A N S W E R  
T O T H E  
B R I E F R E M A R K S  
O F

*William Berriman, D.D.*

Rector of St. Andrew's Undershaft, and  
Fellow of Eton College :

O N

*Mr. CHANDLER's Introduction to the  
History of the Inquisition.*

In a LETTER to the said Doctor.

---

By *SAMUEL CHANDLER.*

---

Quid verum atque decens curo et rogo, et omnis in hoc sum ;  
Condo et compono, quacumque deponere possum.

*Horat. Epist. l. 1.*

Impiger, iracundus, inexorabilis, acer. *Hor. de Arte Poet.*

---

The SECOND EDITION.

---

L O N D O N :

Printed for JOHN GRAY, at the Cross-Keys in the  
Poultry, near Cheapside. 1735.

[Price Six-Pence.]



A N

# ANSWER, &c.

S I R,



H A T terrour seized me, when  
I first read the advertisement  
and title of your Pamphlet ! I  
had almost said,

*Steteruntque comae et vox faucibus haesit.*

The charge of *gross misrepresentations of fact*  
made me dread my fate, and fear least my  
passion for the civil and religious liberties of  
mankind had drawn me into some mistakes,  
contrary to the truth of history. But I soon

found that your title page was the worst I had to fear ; and notwithstanding the severe reproaches thrown on me my panick soon left me, and to my pleasure I saw I had to do with an impotent, though angry adversary.

You are I think exceeding unhappy in the beginning and end of your performance. You set out with a charge, which I am sure is not true, and conclude with something that looks exceedingly like a curse ; and out of the same christian disposition and sweetness of temper, you inform your reader that I have *partially represented history ; disguised and colour'd ancient authors ; picked out what I like though but ill supported ; dwell on every invidious circumstance, and drop or suppress what might set it in a proper light ; that my aim is to blacken and throw dirt, p. 2. that I am a crocodile, who first kill a man and then weep over him ; that I give scraps of quotations ; that venerable assemblies have not escaped the rancour of my pen, p. 3. that my comment is portentous, p. 15. that my reflections are invidious, p. 18. that I am destitute of ingenuity, p. 20. that my turns are illnatured, p. 21. that I am partial and sophistical, p. 22. that I am not ashamed with the virulency of my pen to put the noble confessors to fresh torture, p. 26. that I grossly abuse my readers, p. 28. that I mix fiction and partiality, p. 50. that neither truth nor honesty can be expected from me, p. 56. that I am arrived to such an height of malice and love of calumny that the most absurd and incredible charge shall stick, p. 59.*  
*that*

*that I have not a spark of ingenuity, or real sense of honour, p. 61. and finally in a prophetic manner, that the memory of the just [Laud] will be blessed, when the name of the wicked [Chandler] shall rot. I could not help putting together these Ecclesiastical flowers, which you have presented to the world, as a specimen of your good manners and charity; and though when I first heard of your intentions to animadvert upon my introduction, I expected a treatment worthy your character as a scholar and divine, yet as I have been disappointed in both these respects, you must pardon me if I treat you without ceremony, and pay the less complement to your profession and title. To begin then.*

*You tell your reader, that 'tis plainly p. 1. Mr. C's design, under the odious name of persecution, to decry and vilify all legal Establishments of Religion. But did Mr. C. ever tell you so? or were you ever in the inside of his heart? If not, you should not have begun with an assertion that Mr. C. knows, 'tis in his power to convince, I will not say you, but all the equitable part of mankind of the untruth of. I have indeed written against persecution. But doth this vilify all legal establishments? Are then all legal establishments inseparably attended with persecution? If not, my writing against the latter is no proof that my intention was to vilify the former. I have also very freely censured all ecclesiastical tyranny, and declared against setting up the priests as Lords of*



of the heritage, and making them kings in the room of the Son of God ; because whenever they have had their desired power, their language hath been, *Up Israel to the prey*; and their practice, to *execute punishment upon the people, to bind their Kings with chains, and their nobles with fetters of iron*. Against such tyrannical proceedings, against such imperious priests, I will ever protest, whilst I have a pen to write, and liberty to declare my sentiments. But what is there in all this to vilify all legal Establishments? Point out a single passage of my introduction from whence this can be justly inferred, as you would not be esteem'd a false accuser. If an Establishment was made upon my good Lord of *London's* foundation \*, upon such *a fixed certain uniform rule of faith and practice, as could be embraced by all denominations of Christians* ; I know not a single dissenter in *England* that would be against it ; and that such an establishment is practicable his Lordship hath abundantly demonstrated, and actually laid down the very rule itself, a rule which, he tells us, the several denominations of Christians do actually agree in. Now the nearer any establishment comes to this, it comes nearer to perfection, and was such a legal establishment to take place, no reasonable men would refuse to enter into it. So that your two observations in favour of Establishments shall remain in their full force, especially as I shall leave you in possession

\* *See our Political Letter*, p. 24, 25.

session of scarce any thing else, besides your reproaches, throughout your whole pamphlet.

After this you prepare your reader, by many invectives against me, to expect a full triumph over me, and tell him, you *doubt* p. 4. *not to convince every equitable reader, that whatever opinion we are to entertain of Mr. C's abilities, it must be with great abatement in point of candour and ingenuity.*

To the first instance I appeal, who hath most. I say Bishop *Alexander* was offended at the novelty of the expressions of *Arius*, and not able to bear such an opposition from one of his presbyters to his own principles. The first of these assertions you qualify, the latter you deny. As to the first, I did not say, it was *merely* the novelty of the phrase, as you put it, that gave offence, and so far your observation is impertinent; but only that the novelty did; which I need not prove, since you have not opposed it. As to the latter, you say, *it is an addition of mine own, without any grounds in the Histo-* P. 4, 5. *rians; and that they no where tell us that he was of an high spirit, and impatient of contradiction.* But whether this be an addition of mine or not, without any grounds, let the following passage decide: “ A certain  
“ presbyter who had ingratiated himself  
“ with *Constantia*, told her freely and com-  
“ plained that *Arius* was unjustly banished,  
“ and excommunicated through the hatred  
“ and private enmity of *Alexander*; for  
“ that he was moved with envy against him  
“ for

“ for his great reputation amongst the people \* ; ” an evident intimation of his high spirit and impatience of contradiction. I must however own to you that this presbyter is said to be a favourer of *Arius* ; but as the terms *Arian* and *Liar*, *Orthodoxy* and *Truth*, are not always equivalent, you must excuse me from believing, like yourself, always on one side ; and especially from rejecting the evidence of this presbyter, who appears to have been a man of reputation and virtue, by the honour he had of *Constantine*’s friendship and confidence. A farther proof of this prelate’s imperiousness and impatience of contradiction is this, that after he had heard the dispute between *Arius* and others, in the council he collected for this purpose, and agreed himself to the doctrine of the *Consubstantiality*, he commands *Arius* to be of the same mind †. This is imperiousness with a vengeance. But because *Arius* could not, the Bishop immediately excommunicates him. Would you have a fuller proof of his impatience of contradiction ?

I

\* Πρεσβύτερος τις — εταρρησιασάτο προς αὐτὴν καὶ καλέμεμφο, μὴ δίκαιως Ἀρειὸν τὴν πάριδαν εὐγεν — δια ὁδοῦ καὶ ἰδίας ἐχθρας ἐβλήδεντα παρὰ Ἀλεξάνδρου — εὐδοκίμουντα γὰρ, εἶπεν, παρὰ τῷ πλῆθει ὁρῶν αὐτὸν ἐξηλοῦσθαι. Sozom. p. 484. Edit. Mogunt.

† Τοῦ Ἀρειοῦ οὐσιῶς ὅμοιον ἐκέλευσε. Sozom. p. 427.

I should now have dismissed this article, but only that I am willing to set you right in a passage of *Sozomen*, which you have mistaken. You say the historians tell us, *that Arius had been excommunicated for siding* p. 4. *with the Melitian faction before Alexander came to the See.* But *Sozomen*, whom you cite for this, doth not say so. His account is this; that *Arius* had once sided with the *Melitian* party, but that he afterwards forsook it, and was ordained Deacon by *Peter* Bishop of *Alexandria*; and that he was excommunicated by *Peter*, not for siding with the *Melitians*, but for reproving *Peter* upon account of his excommunicating the *Melitians*, and rejecting their baptism. Now it is no consequence that because a person disapproves of methods of severity towards others, that therefore he sides with them. *Arius* could not then be one of them, because he had actually left them, and was a Deacon in the *Alexandrian* church, from which *Melitus* with his followers had divided.

Whether or no *Arius* was of a turbulent spirit, as you represent him, I leave others to judge. I think *Alexander* at least as criminal in this respect as he, especially as he excommunicated him, and all the clergy who were of his opinion; and wrote letters to the Bishops every where not to communicate with those who favoured him, though many of them were venerable for the apparent sanctity of their lives.\* Hence, says  
B
the

\* *Sozom.* p. 427.



the historian, *they grew more eager and warm on both sides, and the contention, as usual, became greater.* \* In the written confession which *Arius* afterwards delivered to *Constantine*, I am sure he speaks like a lover of peace ; for after giving an account of his faith he says : Therefore we beseech your Piety, that since we hold the faith of the Church and the Holy Scriptures, we may be again united to our Mother the Church ; *that controversies being taken away, and the unnecessary disputes which arise from them, we and the church may be at peace with each other.* As to his opposing the Bishop out of revenge for his disappointment, at not being promoted to the see of *Alexandria*, I see no authority for it but *Theodorit*, who appears to be an enemy to *Arius*, and therefore as incompetent a witness against *Arius*, as you think an *Arian* against one that is *Orthodox*. The account of *Socrates* is quite different, and much more probable ; who tells us †, that *Arius's* opposition to the Bishop was occasioned, by his apprehending that the Bishop taught the opinion of *Sabellius*. *Constantine* also in his letter to *Alexander* and *Arius* dates the rise of the controversy from *Alexander's* making inquiry into his presbyters sentiments in impertinent questions ; and to *Arius's* imprudently speaking of things he ought never to have thought of ‡. Now whether *Theodorit's* single

\* Sozom. p. 485.

† Socrat. p. 9.

‡ Euseb. Vit. Constant. l. 2. c. 69.

single testimony is to be preferred to the account given by *Socrates* and the Emperor, I submit to every impartial person to determine.

The next fault you find with me is, that <sup>p. 5.</sup> I have not translated right—the words *αἰ δὲ αἰ ὡς*. To which all I have to answer is, that the words will bear my translation as well as yours, and your translation and mine agree in sense; for if *God is always*, and *a Son always*, then it is true, *that God is ever God and ever a Son*; and I doubt not but you allow it to be sound divinity to say, *that God is ever a Father and ever a Son*. But I will not contend with you about this.

As to the explications you give about <sup>p. 7.</sup> *ἀναρχον γενεσιν* and *ἀγεννητογενής*, and such like hard words, I have little concern about them; and shall only say, that if you can give any real sense of *ἀγεννητογενής*, *unbegottenly begotten*, or *ungeneratedly generated*, i. e. *begotten and not begotten, generated and not generated*,

Eris mihi magnus Apollo.

If *Alexander* used these words to guard against mistakes, he took in my opinion a very wrong method. For how mistakes can be guarded against by nonsense and contradiction, is much above my poor comprehension.

But when you add *that whatever might be* <sup>p. 8.</sup> *Alexander's meaning in a particular expression*,

it was not for disapproving it that Arius was censured ; I must tell you that Arius expressly says the contrary in his letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia. These are his words, \* I must put you in mind that the Bishop greatly worries and persecutes us, and moves every weapon against us ; so that he hath persecuted us out of the city as Athcists, because we dont agree with him, when he says in publick amongst other things ἀγεννητους unbegottenly begotten. You Sir may refuse for all that I know this evidence, though I confess I am so unfortunate, as not to believe that every thing Arius says is false, and every thing Alexander affirms is true.

8. Your next remark is upon the sense of the words μεσίτευσα οὐσις, a middle nature, as I rendered them: You say the Bishop could only mean, a distinct Hypostasis or Person from the Father. But I think this could not possibly be his meaning. The whole passage runs thus : “ The unskilful say, that  
 “ one of these two things must be, either  
 “ that the Son is out of nothing, or else  
 “ that there are two unbegotten things or  
 “ principles ; being ignorant what a vast  
 “ difference there is between the unbegotten  
 “ Father, and the things created by him  
 “ out of nothing, both rational and irrational ;

\* ΟΤΙ ΜΕΓΑΛΑΣ ΤΗΑΣ ΕΚΠΟΡΕΙ ΚΑΙ ΕΚΔΙΩΚΕΙ ΚΑΙ  
 ΠΑΝΤΑ ΚΑΛΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΚΑΘ' ΗΜΩΝ Ο ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΩ, ΩΣ ΤΕ  
 ΚΑΙ ΕΚΔΙΩΞΑ ΤΗΑΣ ΕΝ ΤΗΣ ΠΟΛΕΩΣ ΩΣ ΑΙΔΡΩΤΗΣ Α-  
 ΔΕΣΣ, ΕΠΕΙΔΗ Ε ΣΥΜΦΕΡΕΜΕΝ ΑΥΤΩ ΔΗΜΟΣΙΑ ΛΕΓΟΝΤΙ  
 ——— ἀγεννηγένους εστι. Theod. E. H. c. 5. p. 22,  
 23.

“ tional ; between both which, *viz.* God  
 “ and his creatures, is the only begotten  
 “ nature.\* The argument is this, that it  
 doth not follow either that the Son is out  
 of nothing, or unbegotten, because the Son  
 is a middle nature between the unbegotten  
 Father and the things produced by him out  
 of nothing. This is something like sense,  
 whereas if we translate it in your way it  
 will appear otherwise, and run thus: The  
 only begotten person is a middle person  
 between the person of the unbegotten Fa-  
 ther, and the person of things created by  
 him out of nothing. It is not therefore so  
 very extraordinary that I should mention  
 this as an instance of the Bishop’s agreement  
 with *Arius* ; because if *Arius* said, what you  
 cannot disprove, that the Son was neither  
 a part of God, nor out of any other thing  
 that did exist, it must follow that *Arius*  
 thought what *Alexander* affirmed, that the  
 only begotten nature of the Son was a mid-  
 dle nature, between the unbegotten God,  
 and the things produced by him out of  
 nothing.

Thus we have dismissed the article rela-  
 ting to the Bishop. Now for his presbyter.  
 And as to him, with your usual impartiality, p 10.  
*Arius*

\* Δυσοιν δ' ατερον λεγοντες δειν ειναι οι απαιδευτοι,  
 η εξ εκ οντων αυτον ειναι φερονειν, η παντως αγεν-  
 νητα λεγειν δυο. αγνοουντες οι ανασκητοι, ως μα-  
 χραν αν ειη μελαξυ πατρος αγεννητε και των κτί-  
 σεντων υπ' αυτε εξ εκ οντων, λογικων τε και αλο-  
 γων. ων μεσιτευσα φυσις μονογενης. Theod. p.  
 17.



*Arius* must be wrong, and *Alexander* right : because, since the *Alexandrian* council condemned *Arius*, it must be concluded, that he had personally asserted those positions which are charged upon him; or at least we cannot suspect any partiality in the council of *Nice*. You are greatly mistaken in both in my opinion. I do not only suspect them but charge them, with notorious partiality. *Arius* was a better judge of his own opinions than either of them, and he expressly denies the most invidious charges they would fasten on him, both in his letter to *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia*, and in that confession of his faith which he presented to the Emperour, and actually swore to his belief of. The same *Eusebius* also, and *Theognis* in their penitential letter to the Emperor assure him, that they did not subscribe to the *Anathema* †, because they did not believe that the person accused was such a one as he was charged to be; and that they were fully persuaded he was not, from his own letters which he wrote to them, and from several discourses which they had with him in person. *Sozomen* doth indeed say that the council of *Nice* carefully examined into his assertions; but not one word that he publickly owned the tenets imputed to him by that council\*. This the presbyter before mentioned actually denied, assuring *Constantia* that the synod of *Nice* had injured him, and that he did not think as was reported of him. † And therefore till better proof, I am at liberty still

† Soc. p. 44. \* Ib. p. 485. † Soc. p. 60.

still to believe that they were the council's inferences, and not the assertions of *Arius*. Yea *Sozomen* seems to speak doubtfully of this matter himself; for after he had been reckoning up some of the most obnoxious opinions ascribed to him, he says, *Κτισμα και ποιημα και αλλα πολλα α λεγειν εικος*, || which it is probable he said.

You farther tell me, that you cannot p. 12. understand by what rules of grammar *Mr. C.* translates *αγεννητος γαρ εκ υν*, there never was a time when he was unbegotten. *Mr. C.* is not answerable for your want of understanding. Perhaps he never intended a literal translation, but to express what he apprehended to be his sense. And I imagine he hath expressed it right. For the words seem to be made use of in opposition to the hard word *Αγεννητογενης*, and to denote that as he was before all ages perfect and unchangeable God, so he was always begotten. For thus he says, before he was begotten, or made, or appointed, or founded, he was not; immediately subjoyning *αγεννητος γαρ εκ υν*, for he was not unbegotten, i. e. before he was begotten or made, &c. i. e. there never was a time when he was unbegotten; and I think nothing can be plainer to a man that hath any understanding than this, that if Christ was not before he was begotten, there never was a time when he was unbegotten.

As to your suspicions that *Arius* used the expressions *προς χρονον, αναλλαιωτος, &c.* in P. 13. an

an evasive manner, I shall say nothing to them. Suspicions are endless and deserve no reply. I shall only add, that *Arius* appears to be uniform and consistent in his doctrine, and that there doth not seem any thing like reserve or evasion in his confessions. But I will not be answerable for all his followers.

p. 15. But what shall we do with the *portentous comment*? Would any one, say you, suppose it possible for the wit of man, to make these two propositions: The Son was not before he was begotten, *i. e.* he was from before all ages the begotten Son of God, *exegetical of one another*. Yes. The wit of half a man can do it, that looks upon the connection of the words in *Arius's* letter. His first words are, *ὁ υἱὸς ἄρτι γεγεννημένος*, *The Son is not unbegotten*. And the last are just the same. If then he *was not unbegotten*, he was I humbly conceive *the begotten Son of God*. So far there is no portentosity in my comment. But how shall I come off about the words *before all ages*? Why *Arius* will help me here too. For in the middle of his confession he says it expressly, that he was *πρὸ χρόνων καὶ αἰώνων*, *before all times and ages*. So that the portentosity is not in my comment. A comment upon any proposition may be just and regular, if the comment contain the true sense of the proposition though there should be some addition to explain it, especially if the addition be taken from the Author commented on. When you add, that I could *not decently own the*  
*true*

true meaning, and therefore invented another, I shall only tell you, that I think I had no end to answer by concealing the true sense, and that if I know myself I dare own the truth wherever I find it, though a child or an enemy should tell it me; and even retract an error when convinced of it.

And accordingly I allow you, that the p. 16. words of *Eusebius* you refer to in the next remark, do not literally signify the *rise and progress of the affair* as I rendered them; but only that he had diligently examined, or as you will have it considered the rise of it. *Διαλογίζομαι* signifies seriously and carefully to reason or think of, *i. e.* to examine a matter; and *αρχήν* signifies the rise or beginning of any thing. So that my translation so far is true, that *Constantine* had diligently examined the rise of the affair. And that he had as diligently examined the Progress of it is as true, though the particular passage referred to doth not mention it. And this any one may see who will read over the whole letter, as recorded by the historian \*. In the mean time I pity the man that is so bare of subject matter of remark, as to take notice of such trifles.

It is of somewhat more importance what p. 16. you add, that *Eusebius* and *Constantia*, who were friends of *Arius*, influenced *Constantine* to write in that strain of neutrality, as you call it, in his letter to *Alexander*. I know, Sir, that there is no sin greater in the opinion

C

on

\* Euseb. Vita Const. l. 2. p. 64, &c.



on of some men than this same neutrality ; but as to others who place religion in practice, and not in mere orthodoxy as to disputable opinions, and with whom moderation and forbearance are christian virtues, you must give them leave to think, that whoever were the advisers of that excellent letter, they were wise and prudent persons, and that the advice itself was, as *Eusebius* calls it, *α. συγκατάτατον*, most necessary and reasonable \* ; and that if *Hosius* and others inspired the Emperor with other sentiments, and persuaded him to attempt the cure of heresy by persecution instead of argument, they so far abused their interest in him, and were enemies to the church of God. But how will you prove that *Constantia* was so early the friend of *Arius*, as to have a hand in writing this letter to *Alexandria* ? This letter was previous to the council of *Nice*, whereas *Constantia* doth not appear to have had any favourable opinion of *Arius* till considerably after, by means of one of her domestick chaplains. And even he did not openly profess his sentiments, nor pretend to persuade her to embrace any of the peculiar opinions of *Arius*, † but only that he was unjustly used by the council, and did not entertain the opinions commonly ascribed to him. And in this she believed what her chaplain assured her of. And that this was all she endeavoured to persuade her brother

\* De Vita Const. l. 2. c. 63. † Η δὲ Κωνσταντία οὐδεμίαν αὐτῶν τῶν τῆς συνόδου καὶ οὐδεμίαν ἐν ᾧ περὶ αὐτοῦ λόγος κατεχε. Soc. p. 60. Theod. p. 70.

brother *Constantine* † is evident from her dying words to him, in which she discovers her apprehensions of his being exposed to some judgment, because he had been persuaded by certain persons unjustly to punish with perpetual banishment men that were righteous and good, viz men who were falsely accused by the council of opinions they did not hold. So that as it doth not appear that *Constantia* was in *Arius's* sentiments, it is absurd to imagine she persuaded the Emperor to write in a neutral strain; especially as 'tis not probable that she had any favourable opinion of him till a considerable time after the letter was written. Nor doth it appear to have been written merely by the influence of *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia*; nor, whilst the Emperor was at *Nicomedia*, as you affirm, but as he was going from that city towards the East. For *Constantine* himself says, towards the close of his letter, “ Having been lately at the city of “ *Nicomedia*, I immediately determined to “ go into the East. And as I was now hastening to you, and had travelled the greater “ part of the journey to you, the news of “ this affair was brought to me, and made “ me alter my mind.” A plain intimation that he was not at *Nicomedia* when he wrote it. And that he wrote it not by the influence

C 2

of

† Soz. p. 484.

\* Πρωην επισας τη Νικομηδεων πολει — σπευδον̄τι δε μοι προς υμας ηδ̄, και τω πλειονι μερει συν υμιν οντι, η τωδε τε περ̄χμᾱθη̄ αγγελια. προς το εμπάλιν τον λογισμον αρεχαιτισεν — ανοιξατε δη μοι λοιπον — της εωας την οδον. Soz. p. 18.

of *Eusebius*, but that of *Hosius* himself, seems probable to me ; because it is certain *Hosius* whom the Emperor greatly loved and honoured, was present with him, and the person employed by him to carry it to *Alexander* and *Arius*.

p. 17.

I agree with you that the Emperor did not afterwards look upon the controversy as a matter of small importance. But what was it that made him alter his opinion ? It was the Bishops, Sir. The persecuting tyrannical Bishops at *Nice*. They anathematized and damned their adversaries, and excited the poor Emperor to banish and destroy them. They gave him an example by banishing *Arius* from *Alexandria*. It is methinks pity his Majesty had not also approved of another project almost resolved on by this venerable assembly, opposed by but one person as *Sozomen* \* informs us ; viz. That the Bishops and Presbyters, the Deacons and Subdeacons should not lie with their wives, which they had married before their consecration. What did the Holy Ghost depart in this point from the Holy Synod, and rest only on *Paphnutius* ?

p. 18.

As to the reflection which I made, that the orthodox first brought in the punishment of heresy with death, you say it is both *invidious and very extraordinary*. But it is not invidious because it is true ; and though you nibble at my authority you cannot dispute it. It is an infamy that nothing can wash them clean from ; and supposing it was only made

\* Soz. p. 437. Socrat. p. 39.

made *in terrorem*, yet it was an execrable and tyrannical law ; and as the orthodox burnt the writings of the *Arians*, it is impossible for you to prove, that the Emperour, and they by whose persuasions he made it, never put it in execution. They did proceed to burning of books, and to damnation and banishments of mens persons. And what could hinder such men, when they had the power, from proceeding even to death ? God Almighty of his infinite mercy grant that the clergy may never have the same power intrusted with them, in these free and happy kingdoms. The use they have made of it will never be forgotten.

You say, that *it is not the matter of your present inquiry, how far the establishment of religion by penal laws and sanctions, is to be justified, and when it deserves to be branded with the odious name of persecution.* But as I had charged the orthodox with first bringing in the punishment of heresy with death, surely it could not have been improper to have passed some censure on so cursed and diabolical a practice, had you been against it. No. You intirely drop it, and seem rather to vindicate the thing itself, by calling my reflection invidious and extraordinary ; because, as you say, *it amounts to this, that the first christian emperor being on the orthodox side, his laws, and the penalties enforcing them, were on the same side also.* As though those laws and penalties were just ; or ever the better for being on the side of Orthodoxy. But I wonder a man of  
your



your sagacity should not have perceived that I had a quite different intention in that observation; viz. to shew that the orthodox first set up the trade of ecclesiastical butchery, and let loose that outrageous devil of persecution even to death, which afterwards spread such desolations in the church of God, which one cannot read without trembling, nor relate without horror.

18.

I have only one thing more to observe on this article; which is that it is surprising to me, that any man who hath read the ecclesiastical historians with any the least care, should affirm as you do, *that the sanguinary law against those who should conceal any of Arius's books is mentioned only by Sozomen*; when it is not only related by *Socrates*, but the very imperial edict itself given us at large by him, of which this is the conclusion. “ This therefore I in-  
“ join, that if any one should be found to  
“ conceal any writing of *Arius*, and shall  
“ not immediately bring it, and burn it in  
“ the fire, his punishment shall be death.  
“ For as soon as ever he shall be found in  
“ this fault he shall undergo a capital pu-  
“ nishment.” \* You give me large occasions of triumph, but I will spare you; only putting you in mind, that you are the most unfit person in the world to charge others with *gross misrepresentations* of fact.

From

\* Ελενο μέντοι προαγορεύω — τὴν δὲ θανάτου  
εἶναι τὴν ζημίαν. Παράχρημα γὰρ ἄλλος ἐπὶ τῇ  
κεφαλῇ οὐκ ἐπέσειται τιμωρίας. Soc. E. H. p. 32.

From the Emperor we pass to the famous Council of *Nice*; and your first remark is, that *I throw dirt on the most venerable assembly of men that ever met since the days of the apostles*; which remark I do not think to be a very cleanly one. I have already proved them to be an assembly of persecutors, and well wishers, most of them, to that infamous superstition of priestly celibacy; which hath, I am apprehensive, been the occasion of more adulteries, rapes, prostitutions and leudnesses of all kinds, than have ever been practiced in the publick stews. I have also proved from several authors, even those who speak the most favourably of them, such as *Eusebius*, *Theodorit*, *Socrates* and *Sozomen*, that some were drawn to this council through the hopes τῶν ἀγαθῶν of worldly profit, which I insist on to be the true sense of τὰ ἀγαθὰ; though I will allow you to translate it *good days* if you please, if you will do me the like favour, by allowing what I have a thousand instances to prove, that the clergy generally count those the best days in which they obtain the greatest power and riches; that others of them came to see such a miracle of an Emperor, others of them to negotiate their own private affairs, to redress their grievances, to prosecute their enemies, and to be revenged of them. I have also proved from the same authors, that some of them were of a quarrelling malicious temper, and acted with a spirit of rancour and bitterness; and that as soon as they met together

together they began with mutual reproache, and accusations, and endeavoured to inflame the Emperor against each other, and wers hardly brought to the work of creed-making by the influence of his authoritye I have also represented that their enemies charge them with being generally a set of very ignorant men, and destitute of knowledge and learning. As the very friends of this council allow of most of these charges, I thought myself obliged impartially to represent them; and if we had the representation of those who were enemies to it, and injured by it, I doubt not but they would appear in a much worse light than they do at present. The mention of these things you call *throwing dirt*, and *with the virulency of my pen putting those noble confessors to fresh torture*. But I have tortured none that were true confessors, nor suppressed the testimony of the historians in their favour. I allowed you that they tell us, some were remarkable for their gravity, patience under sufferings, modesty, integrity, eloquence and other virtues. What would you have more? I suppose you would have had me *ingenuously suppressed* the evidence that there were others of a very different character, and been of the same mind with *Constantine\**, who charitably declared, that if he saw a Bishop committing adultery, he would cover the foul action with his purple, that it might give no offence

. 26.

\* Theod. p. 36.

fence to the beholders. But I am not yet convinced it is my duty to conceal the crimes of the clergy, when I am writing their history, and cannot allow that orthodoxy any more than heresy should be a cover for roguery and wickedness; and therefore as you own all my authorities to be good, I shall only make two or three remarks upon your observations on the council of *Nice*.

When I charge some of this council with coming to negotiate their own private affairs, and to redress their grievances, and be revenged of their enemies, you cry out, *Partial* p. 23. *and sophistical again!* and sophistically endeavour to soften this conduct, by translating the words of *Sozomen*, Many of the priests came *as it were* to contend, &c. But all this daubing wont stick. *Sozomen* honestly puts them upon the foot of other assemblies; and says that this was like others. *Οἱ αὖτε φιλεῖ γινεσθαι*, i. e. according to common custom, or as it generally happens, so here *many of the priests came together earnestly to contend*,\* or as though they had nothing else to do but earnestly to contend about their own affairs; and the reason he gives for it is, because *they imagined they had now a fit opportunity to redress their grievances*, viz. because they had such a miracle of an Emperor, who had been so condescending and kind to them. So far you cite the historian yourself. But why did you suppress what followed? I will supply your defects.

¶

The

\* *Αγωνισαθαι συνελευσιν*. Soz. p. 430.



The historian immediately subjoins: “What-  
 “ ever matters any one had to accuse the  
 “ others of, he delivered in his libel to the  
 “ Emperor, in which he gave an account  
 “ of all the injuries that were done him.  
 “ And this was their custom almost every  
 “ day.\* ” So that here was no *as it were*,  
 but real spleen and enmity and the spirit of  
 revenge. It was the first work they went on,  
 and what they brought on the carpet every  
 day, and what therefore *many of the priests*  
 must have had most at heart, and came prin-  
 cipally for. As to *Eusebius*, from whom  
 you say in the page, I did not relate the  
 account, and in the margin that I did, he is  
 not one jot more favourable to them, nor is  
 it invidiously related. His words are, “Then  
 “ they began to accuse those who sat near  
 “ them; they made their defences and re-  
 “ criminated, and that many things being  
 “ urged on one side and the other, many  
 “ altercations happened in the beginning;  
 “ and that it was not till after a great deal  
 “ of pains and patience that at last the  
 “ Emperor reconciled them.” † So  
 that accusations, apologies, recriminations,  
 defences, &c. was the first work entred  
 upon by this holy synod, and argued many  
 of them to be men of passionate, quarrel-  
 some and revengeful spirits; which though  
 you pass by under the charge of *common*  
*frailty*, the Scripture calls by a harder  
 name, and declares to be *the wisdom that*  
 is

P. 24.

\* Scz. p. 430.

† De Vita Constantini, l. 3. c. 15.

that is from beneath, which is earthly, sensual, devilish.

In the same page you are exceeding angry p. 24. with me for my quotation from *Theodorit*. But without reason. I grant you that he doth speak in favour of this council; nor did I ever deny it. But yet he says some of them were subtle and crafty, and of a quarrellsome malicious temper. This he asserts of those *Arians* who were of the council, *Lib. 1. c. 7.* and intimates the same thing of some of the Orthodox, *Lib. 1. c. 11.* His words are these: “ I do not think it just  
“ to pass it over in silence that there were  
“ men \* who were full, or lovers of en-  
“ mity, who accused some of the Bishops,  
“ and delivered in their libels of accusation  
“ to the Emperor.” The thing was too notorious to be quite omitted, though prudence directed him to conceal the numbers, and speak as softly as he could of their quarrels, and mutual hatreds. And I put these two chapters together in the quotation, that my reader might see I was impartial. And after a review of this whole matter, I see as many proofs at least of subtleness and craftiness, of malice and revenge in the orthodox party, as in the *Arian*, of which their frequent alterations of the Creed, and their treatment of their adversaries are an abundant demonstration.

You farther add, under this article, that p. 26.  
Mr. Chandler is wrong in representing them to  
C 2 have

\* Φιλαρχήσιμος ἀνδρες ἐγγράφαις τῶν ἐπισκοπῶν τινος. Theod. p. 36.

*have begun to accuse each other, after the Emperor had exhorted them to peace.* It is hard that Mr. C. must never be right ; but it is some satisfaction to him, that *Eusebius*, who lived some years before him, gives just the same account as he doth. Pray good Dr. let us consult him. *Eusebius* then tells us, that after *Constantine* entered into the place where the council met, he made an oration to them, in which he tells them, that he had heard of their differences, was however glad to see them together, and should obtain his wishes, *could he see them united together in their minds, and one common agreement among them all.* This, says he, you who are consecrated to God ought to be the ministers of to others. After this he passionately beleeches them *to remove all causes of their mutual differences, all intricate matters of contention by the laws of peace.\** Is not this an exhortation to peace? Well, what was the immediate consequence? I am ashamed to tell, but you force me, Sir. Why as soon as ever he had done, and gave them the liberty of speech, they began to accuse one another, and broke out into many contentions†. Surely you will allow me for once to be in the right.

P. 27.

As to *Sabinus's* charge I allowed you he was an heretick. This with you may be a reason for never believing him, but with no others but those of your own complexion ;

\* De Vita Constantini, l. 3. c. 12.

† Id. Ibid. c. 13.

tion ; and though *Eusebius* was a learned man, yet it doth not therefore follow, that none of the rest were ignorant and unlearned ; and as *Sabinus* appeals to *Eusebius* for the truth of this that many of them were so, are you sure that the same orthodox, who burnt the writings of the *Arians*, have suppressed no part of the character given by *Eusebius* of the persons who composed this council ? Or do you believe in your conscience, that out of so great a number as met together at *Nice*, there were no *Yea and Nay men*, who followed the majority and voted as they were bid ? I shall only add, that when *Socrates* argues *ex hypothesi*, that if they were a set of ignorant illiterate men, yet they were enlightened by the Holy Ghost, and so could not err from the truth, it is a kind of an allowance that they were not some of them overburthened with learning and knowledge. For what need of inspiration if they had knowledge enough without it ? If they were inspired, it must be because they did not understand those things which they received the knowledge of by divine illumination. Of consequence the allowing them to be inspired is a confession of their ignorance ; and my representing it in this light is no misrepresenting of my historian, nor abuse of my readers.

There are many pages which follow which do not in the least affect the truth of my history, and in which therefore I have no concern ; and therefore I shall only make one short observation upon them, *viz.* that if the  
council



council had intended the peace of the church, they ought to have made the creed as wide and extensive as they could, and not to have inserted the most exceptionable phrases they could invent, as they actually did, and which with all your winding and twisting you have not disproved.

I now proceed to *Page 40*. In which you give us an instance of your skill in criticks, and another of your knowledge in history. I had asserted that the creed was altered and amended. You learnedly answer, *there was no alteration made in the doctrine of the creed, but only some explications added*. As though the addition of several explications was no alteration of the creed. Again, I had affirmed, that five Bishops were displeased with the word *Consubstantial*, and made many objections against it. You reply, that *of the five Bishops our author mentions there were only three at most that refused to sign the Consubstantiality, and that the other two, Eusebius of Nicomedia, and Theognis of Nice did actually subscribe it, and only rejected the Anathema's subjoined*. This author well perceives the contempt with which you treat him, but he gives you now to understand, that he cannot imagine who set you upon burning your fingers by dabbling in ecclesiastical history; and he affirms that there were five Bishops, viz. *Eusebius of Nicomedia, Theognis of Nice, Maris of Chalcedon, Theonas of Marmarica, and Secundus of Ptolemais*, who would not subscribe the word *Consubstantial*, and that amongst these  
five

five two of them, viz. *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia*, and *Theognis* of *Nice* were actually banished for it. Let *Socrates* determine between your knowledge and veracity as an historian and mine. His words are: “ Five  
 “ only would not receive the creed, finding  
 “ fault with the word *consubstantial*, (viz.  
 “ the five just mentioned) for they said the  
 “ word *consubstantial* must mean, that which  
 “ is from another, either by division, or  
 “ fluxion, or projection. By projection, as  
 “ a twig from its roots; or by fluxion, as  
 “ children from the father; or by divisi-  
 “ on; as two or three gold vessels from the  
 “ same mass. But the Son is like nothing  
 “ of these things; and therefore they said  
 “ that they would not give their assent to  
 “ this faith,” and therefore scoffing greatly  
 “ at the word *consubstantial*, they would not  
 “ subscribe to the deposition of *Arius*——  
 “ And therefore by a mandate of the Em-  
 “ peror, *Eusebius* and *Theognis* were ba-  
 “ nished. Upon this *Eusebius* and *Theognis*  
 “ a little while after their banishment, de-  
 “ livered an instrument of their repentance,  
 “ signifying their agreement with the faith  
 “ of the consubstantiality. ” \* Here, Sir,  
 is full evidence of my assertion, and if this  
 was a proper place I could easily reconcile  
 this account with the seemingly different one  
 given by *Sozomen*. You may see by this  
 how little positiveness becomes any writer,  
 especially in an affair in which he allows there  
 is

\* Soc. p. 23.

is some perplexity. It is true, they say in their penitential letter to the Emperor, that they *agreed and subscribed to the faith, but not to the Anathema*, \* not, as you affirm, that they actually had subscribed, or pleaded their subscription to the Consubstantiality ; for that they did refuse to subscribe it at first and were banished for it, the evidence of *Socrates* is plain and full.

p. 41.

The next thing you complain of, is, that *there is a sort of Men with whom ill-natured suspicions will pass for clear demonstration*, because I say that *Constantine* saw into their tempers, &c. Had what I said been founded on mere suspicion, you might have justly said it was ill-natured. But sure all equal and impartial judges will allow, that as *Constantine* had been himself witness to their quarrels, and mutual accusations, and revengeful spirit, his advice to them at parting was founded not on suspicion only, but plain demonstration. *But what could our author mean by that sneering expression of his filling their pockets?* Why he meant by it, what he thought you would not have been angry with, *That he filled their pockets*, that he τοῖς προσηκασὶ δωροῖς ἐτίμησεν, † honoured them with proper gifts, or as *Eusebius* says, μεγαλοψυχῶς ἕκαστον—τιμῶν ξενίοις, ‡ he magnificently honoured every one with presents. And as I found fault neither with the feast or the presents, why should you, or where is the sneer of mentioning it? Had they feasted

\* Soc. p. 43, 44. † Soz. p. 438.

‡ Euseb. Vit. Constant. l. 3. c. 16.

feasted oftner, and met together for no other account but feasting, I think they would have done much less mischief, than they did by hatching creeds, and coyning hard words, which they themselves never knew how to explain, and which others could not understand. So that I hope you will not think me so heterodox for the future, as to imagine that I am an enemy to the feastings of the clergy.

Upon the whole I shall conclude this head with Mr. *Limborch's* account of this famous synod. “ Such was the fierce and  
 “ restless spirit of the Bishops met toge-  
 “ ther at *Nice*, so many and bitter their  
 “ contentions, that forgetting the princi-  
 “ pal cause of their meeting together, they  
 “ meanly presented accusations against each  
 “ other to the Emperor. — Who can be-  
 “ lieve that an assembly of men, inflamed  
 “ with passion and mutual hatred, and  
 “ breathing nothing but revenge, would  
 “ rest contented with procuring only the  
 “ condemnation of their hated enemies,  
 “ and not use their utmost endeavours to  
 “ excite the Emperor to banish those  
 “ whom they had condemned? ” Strange  
 character of the most venerable assembly  
 of men, that ever met since the days of  
 the Apostles, as you call them! What is  
 this Mr. *Limborch's* way of throwing dirt  
 too? Are not his characters of men to be  
 trusted no more than mine? I am in pain  
 E for

\* *History of the Inquisition*, Vol. I. p. 12.



for his character of the blessed Martyr *Laud.*

p. 43.

Your next article is *Eusebius*, under which you say, *it is due to him in common justice, that his reasonings should be fully stated*; adding, *he doth not mean, that all use of unscriptural words would occasion differences, but only those in particular used by Arius.* Supposing this to be true, where is the pertinence of this remark, or how doth it affect my argument? I expressly say, that the anathema forbids only the unscriptural words of *Arius*; and my argument is, that if the introducing the unscriptural words of *Arius* had occasioned differences and disturbances, and therefore ought to be rejected; in like manner the unscriptural words of the orthodox ought for the same reason to have been rejected, because they were the occasions of as many differences and disturbances. And do you weaken the force of this arguing if you can. I must therefore still insist that the behaviour of *Eusebius* was inconsistent, in rejecting the unscriptural words of one party, and adopting the unscriptural words of the other; especially as he knew the word *consubstantial* was an exceeding difficult one, and as to the meaning of which the very Bishops could not agree, even after they had agreed to insert it into their creed. \*

Next to *Eusebius* comes your hero *A'banasius*, whom you seem to think as unworthily

\* See Soc. E. H. p. 58.

thily accused as our blessed Saviour himself and to have always worn a spotless robe of innocence. I had said, that he was accused to the Emperor by many Bishops and Clergymen, who declared themselves orthodox, of being the Author of all the seditions in the Church. You reply, *Yes, his accusers* p. 44. *were such as declared themselves orthodox; and all that you have to object against them is that they were schismaticks, and bitter enemies to Athanasius.* What then? Can a schismatick never be orthodox in the faith, or speak truth? And was not *Athanasius* as bitter an enemy to the *Melitians* and *Arians*, as they were to him? If then the charges of either ought to be credited, why not of the *Melitians*? And *Athanasius* will stand condemned of this first charge if you have no better arguments to clear him, than that his accusers were schismaticks, and such as you and he counted his enemies. But how doth *Athanasius* clear himself of the crimes of seditions, murders, and sacrilege? Why thus, say you: *He insisted that the Melitians* p. 45. *were irregularly ordained, and heterodox in the faith, and highly injurious to those who thought rightly of the nature of God.* Ridiculous. As though to recriminate was to justify one's self; or calling a man an heretic would render him incapable of becoming an evidence against an incendiary or murderer. The accusation against *Athanasius* was for sedition, murder and sacrilege, Sir, and an accusation brought by many *Bishops and Clergymen*; and you have but

very poorly helped him out of the scrape, by telling your reader, that he clearly defended himself against two other accusations, which I did not so much as mention. Nay it appears that the Emperor himself found the evidence against him strong, in that he was at a Loss what Decision to make ; and commanded *Athanasius* to prevent any future occasions of such disturbances, by receiving all to communion under pain of banishment. But you are offended in that I charged him with ALL the seditions, &c. and you will have it only with some. But had you read the whole passage in the historian, perhaps you might have been of my mind. They accuse him, says he, to *Constantine*, as the cause of the seditions and disturbances in the church, and as driving away those who were willing to enter into it, *whereas all would agree if this one thing was granted.* \* Now he who prevents all from agreeing, by absolutely denying the one thing that would unite them, may justly be said to occasion all those seditions and disturbances, which are the consequence of such a denial.

p. 46. The next charge, viz. that *Athanasius* spirited up a woman to charge *Eusebius* with getting her with child, you say is an instance of most amazing impudence in the historian, and partiality in the relater. Not so fast good Doctor. How is it you prove the historian's

\* Περὶ τῆς ἐκείνου, καὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ συγγραφῆς.  
Soz. p. 473.

historian's amazing impudence? Why first, *he was a bigot to Arianism, and therefore ever ready to support it by lies and fiction.* See p. 46, 47, condly, he is given up on all hands as an <sup>48.</sup> *inaccurate and partial writer.* Thirdly, *his story is the reverse of Ruffinus's, and wholly unattested by all other evidence.* But I answer, if *Philostorgius* was a bigot to Arianism, *Athanasius* and his friends were bigots to orthodoxy, and therefore so far as bigotry is concerned deserve no more credit than *Philostorgius*. And as to his lies and fictions, I would advise you to be silent upon that head, because some of the holy orthodox fathers were themselves a little criminal this way. As to his being inaccurate and partial, perhaps he might have appeared otherwise had we been favoured with his ecclesiastical history at length; and as for the extracts we have of him from *Photius*, every one who considers the virulence with which his abridger every where treats him, will I imagine be apt to think, that that abridgment is not always accurate and impartial. And lastly, though the relation from *Philostorgius* be unattested by all other evidence, this is no sure proof that it had no ground at all. For it is not to be supposed that the orthodox would tell the story to the disadvantage of *Athanasius*; and as to the *Arians*, the orthodox have taken care to suppress all evidence from that side, by destroying those writings which contained it.



p. 48.

As to *Atbanasius's* ordination to the bishoprick of *Alexandria*, which I said was censured as clandestine and illegal, you merrily reply, *His Ordination censured? But by whom? By Mr. Chandler perhaps and such as he. He was accused if you will, and if he could have been convicted, no doubt he had been censured.* I supposed they who accused him censured him, which was all that I meant. But if you do not like the word *censured*, take that of *accused*. Now by whom was he accused? Why, some charged him with one crime, some with another; but all of them in common charged him with coming to his bishoprick by the perjury of his ordainers, and that he was so far from satisfying them upon this head, when they desired it of him, that he used violence towards them, and threw them into jail. And whether the evidence produced for these and other crimes was so strong, or from whatever other cause it proceeded, yet ἀπεροσδοκῆσαι καὶ τῶν νομιζομένων φίλων ἀνευονίῃ κατηγοροῖ \*, some of those who were esteemed his friends became unexpectedly his accusers. Of these accusers several were Bishops; and as to the truth of the accusation, the *Arians* seem generally to have believed it †; who asserted, that *Atbanasius* was clandestinely ordained by seven Bishops, contrary to the opinion of all the rest, in direct violation of their oath; and that for this reason many of the *Egyptian*

\* Soz. p. 480.

† Ibid. p. 466.

*gyptian* laity and clergy would not communicate with him. If these accusations had not been against an orthodox saint, and made by men suspected of heresy or schism, they would be allowed by all impartial men to carry some weight, and to justify my assertion that his ordination to the bishoprick of *Alexandria* was censured as illegal. And though *Gregory Nazianzen*, who was an *Athanasian* persecutor, and the *Alexandrian* synod, which was of *Athanasius's* party, maintain the contrary ; yet as here is opposite evidence, the impartial reader must judge for himself in a matter of this uncertainty ; always remembering that this matter might have been set in a clearer light, had we had any of the writings of the *Arians* to have consulted on this occasion.

But farther when I said, some of the p. 50. crimes objected to him, he cleared himself from, and as to others he desired more time for his vindication, you cry out: *What mixture of partiality and fiction is here !* But, Sir, here is no mixture of fiction and partiality. Some of the crimes I allowed he cleared himself of. Do you charge me with partiality on this account ? I suppose not, but for saying that as to others he desired more time for his vindication. As to this you are at a loss to find any thing like it in the historians. But I cannot help your negligence or ignorance. I will find it for you, and quote chapter and verse for your conviction. It is in *Sozomen*, p. 480. *Athanasius*

*nasius* being commanded to make his defence came oftentimes to the place of trial. Some of the accusations he cleared himself from : τῶν δὲ, πρὸς ἐπίστασιν ὑπερθεσιν ἠτήσεν ; as to others he demanded more time, a farther delay, in order to consider them. Is this fiction ?

P. 52, &c.

As to the three next articles you say nothing to the purpose, by producing *Athanasius* and *Theodorit*, against the plain assertions of the council ; and I am not afraid to trust it with every impartial man to determine who are most worthy of credit ; especially when he hath considered the following paragraph.

I took on me to assert, that when *Eusebius* and others laid the whole matter before *Constantine*, he altered his sentiments with respect to the transactions of the council of *Tyre*, confirmed the deposition of *Athanasius*, and banished him into *France*. Upon this passage, you thus remark. *But did Eusebius then and others lay the whole matter before the Emperor ; and by that means get the sentence of the council confirmed ? What truth or honesty can we expect from the man that shall affirm it ?* To this cruel question I shall make no other answer, but that your truth and honesty or mine are at stake. I appeal to my author. It is *Sozomen*, p. 488. His words are these: *Those who were of Eusebius's party went to the Emperor, and asserted that the synod of Tyre had done justly in their sentence against Athanasius ; and produced Theognius, Maris, Theodorus, Valens*

lens and Ursatius as witnesses that Athanasius had broken the sacred cup; and reproaching him, as the orthodox historian calls it, with many other things, they prevailed by their accusations. Upon which the Emperor, whether he believed the truth of these things, or at least thought that the bishops would agree if Athanasius was banished, commanded him to depart unto Treves in France. I imagine both these reasons prevailed on the Emperor to take this step; but that the former did, viz. his believing the accusations against *Athanasius* to be true, is as evident as history can make it. For the same author tells us, p. 491, 492. That the people of *Alexandria* crying out and praying for the return of *Athanasius*, *Antony the Great* wrote oftentimes in his favour; urging that he (the Emperor) ought not to believe the *Melitians*, but to look on their accusations as mere calumnies. But the Emperor was not thus to be persuaded, but wrote to the *Alexandrians*, and charged them with madness and sedition, commanding the clergy and nuns to be quiet; \* affirming that he could not alter his opinion, nor recall *Athanasius*, being condemned by an ecclesiastical judgment, as an exciter of sedition. He also wrote to monk *Antony*, telling him, it was impossible he should disregard the sentence of the

F council.

\* Καὶ μὴ μετὰ τὴν γνώμην ἰσχυρίζεσθαι  
μὴ δὲ μετακαλεῖσθαι τὸν Ἀθανάσιον, ὡς σασιώδη.  
καὶ ἐκκλησιαστικῇ κατὰ δέδικτα μὲν ἔχουσιν. Εὐζ.  
1. 2. 5. 3.



council. For, says he, *though a few might pass judgment through hatred or affection, yet it was not probable that such a large number of famous and good bishops should be of such a sentiment or disposition; for that Athanasius was an injurious and insolent man, and the cause of discord and sedition.* This is evidence as full as can be desired, that the Emperor had a fuller and truer account of the transactions of the council of Tyre than *Athanasius* had given him. And what is very remarkable is, that *Athanasius* appears to have been at *Constantinople* at this very time, and to have had the liberty of making his complaints before his enemies, which he had desired, and which the Emperor himself allowed as reasonable, in his letter to the council. And yet the saint could not make his innocency appear, even when he had no reason to complain of the partiality of his judges, nor of any iniquitous measures to oppress and condemn him. For notwithstanding he had endeavoured to prejudice the Emperor against what they had done, yet those prejudices immediately wore off when a more impartial report was made to him; he confirmed their transactions, commended them as a set of wise and good Bishops,

\* Αντωριω δε ανεδηλωσε, μη οιος τε ειναι, της ευνοδου υπεριδειν την ψηφον. ει γαρ και ολιγοι, οησι, προς απεχθειαν η χαιεν εδικασαν, ε δηπε πειδατορ τοσαυτην πληθυν ελλογιμων και αγαθων επισκοπων της ομοιας γινεσθαι γνωμης. τον γαρ Αθανασιον υβρισην τε ειναι και υπερηφανον και διχονοιας και σασιως αιτιον. Soz. ibid.

Bishops, and censured the saint as a seditious insolent and injurious person, and on these accounts sent him into the banishment he deserved. I do not however deny, what *Socrates* says, that his being farther accused with threatening to sequester the imperial revenues, might add to the Emperor's resentment, and confirm him in his opinion of his insolence and impudence. Upon the whole I would advise you to meddle no more with ecclesiastical history, or if you do, *Take care and remember SOZOMEN.* What you add, that the *Alexandrian* council and the *Younger Constantine* excuse this sentence of the Emperor as intended for his better security, carries in it not the least air of probability, after so express a declaration from himself that he banished him for his insolence and sedition. p. 44.

And from hence it appears that the charge of *Athanasius's* threatening to stop the corn that was yearly sent to *Constantinople* from *Alexandria*, is neither absurd or incredible. You indeed with your usual spleen cry out, *To such an height of malice,* p. 59. *to such a love of calumny is this author now arrived, that any charge shall stick that is levelled against Athanasius be it ever so absurd or incredible.* If you were not above advice, Sir, I would intreat you to look at home, and see whether these are not the very dispositions that too much influence your own heart. However, this charge against *Athanasius* hath but too good a foundation. It was an accusation of Bishops. You say

F 2

magisterially

magisterially, *most probably they were of the Melitian faction.* But you have said nothing to prove it ; and therefore they might be of the orthodox faction. *They were such as Socrates intimates were worthy of credit,* which you do not really deny ; only you add, that the historian says immediately, that *by this means the Emperor was circumvented or carried away ; and that this proves Socrates believed nothing of the truth of it.* I know not what *Socrates* thought himself ; but there is no intimation, that he thought the Emperor *was circumvented or carried away,* as you and the latin translation render it. His words are : *τατω γαθ συναρταγεις ο βασιλευς και εις θυμος αρχθεις,* the Emperor was hereby hurried away, and excited to anger ; to denote the greatness of his displeasure, and not his being deceived by fraud ; and therefore *the credit he ascribes to the accusers was,* not as you affirm, *what their office and station might give them with unthinking people,* but what their office and veracity actually gave them with the Emperor himself. Upon the whole, as this story suits well with the turbulent seditious temper of *Atbanasius,* and as the historian says nothing to discredit it, but intimates that those who charged him with it were worthy of credit, and as the Emperor himself knew him to be an insolent ungovernable man, and actually banished him for this amongst other crimes, and could never be persuaded to recall him ; this charge against him will stick,  
till

till you can find some more powerful means to take it off.

As to the selling of the corn that was given for the support of the poor of the church of *Alexandria*, and putting the money in his own pocket, which *Athanasius* was accused of ; You reply, *Yes ; he was accus-* p. 60.  
*ed: And what then? So was our blessed Saviour accused of blasphemy and treason. Would you intimate hereby, that he was as innocent of the crimes charged on him as Christ was? You will find it a difficult matter to prove it. I allow you that some Egyptian bishops did affirm in their letter to pope Julius, that the things charged on Athanasius were false. But should you not have told your reader, that the same historian relates in the same place, that the council of Antioch, which consisted at least of ninety Bishops, sent also letters of a quite contrary strain to the same pope? And though Athanasius says that the poor made no complaint of such embezzlement, but received the same benevolence as usual, you must excuse me from believing Athanasius in his own cause, especially as the Emperor believed the fact, and threatened Athanasius with death for it. It is true Constantius did at the instances of his brother Constans recall him from banishment ; you add, though as* p. 61.  
*it seems unwillingly ; and that had I any spark of ingenuity or real sense of honour, I should have represented the one part as well as the other. What should I have represented?*



seated? What that *Constantius* recalled him? I will then to retrieve my honour relate the manner of it impartially. You yourself allow, that he did it, *as it seems, unwillingly*. As it seems! As though there was any room to question it. The truth is, that *Constans* threatened his brother with war if he would not recall *Atbanasius* and *Paulus*. Upon this *Constantine* summoned a great number of the *Eastern* bishops, acquainted them with the choice his brother had given him, and asked their advice how he should act. Their answer was, that *it was better to restore the churches to Athanasius's party, than occasion a civil war*\*. And upon this necessity *Constantius* consented. So that the recalling of *Atbanasius* was a mere act of force upon the Emperor, and extorted from him, not by any conviction of the saint's innocence, but by the menaces of his brother, and the apprehensions of a civil war, which there is too much reason to think *Atbanasius* excited *Constans* to, in order to recover his bishopricrick. When you add, that *he was acquitted by the Western Bishops, who could judge with much less partiality and prejudice*; I confess I cannot be of your mind. Why with less partiality? What because they were orthodox? Or because they were better informed? By whom? Why by *Atbanasius* and his party; who with you are in all cases authentick evidences,

\* See p. 106, 107.

evidences; whatever proofs can be produced to the contrary. The *western* bishops were all under the influence of the popes of *Rome*; and one of the reasons why *Julius*, who was then pope, condemned the council of *Antioch* which had deprived *Athanasius*, was this, that they had not called him to the council\*. An admirable proof of his impartiality and freedom from prejudice, and of theirs who acted under his influence!

As to *Athanasius's Alexandrian synod*, I intended no more than that the consubstantiality of the Spirit with the Father and Son was here first synodically asserted, and stamped as the orthodox doctrine. And as you allow this I have no farther concern with your remarks. p. 62.

As to the council of *Constantinople*, which is your next general head, your first remark is upon the slip you imagine I have made in chronology; and from hence, you shrewdly observe, *one would suspect that Mr. Chandler hath not been much conversant in these matters, but hath now only looked on this part of history, on purpose to rake together dirt and scandal.* A very candid suspicion truly, and worthy the worthy Rector of *St. Andrew's Undershaft*. You know however every man must have a beginning, and if I am such a novice in ecclesiastical history, methinks you should have treated me with p. 64.

a

\* Soz. p. 510.

a little more good nature and mercy ; though young and unexperienced as I am, I am apt to think I have cut out work enough for the Doctor. As to the date of the council, you should know, that learned men differ about it, and that I have the liberty to follow my own judgment in this affair. And as to the council itself I have done them but justice, when I call them the creatures of *Theodosius*, and say they were convened to do as he bid them, *i. e.* to confirm the *Nicene* faith. And so say *Socrates* and *Sozomen*.\* He called together a synod of bishops who were of his own opinion, *βεβαιωτὴς τῆ ἐνστά των ἐν νικαία δοξαριων*, for the sake of confirming the decrees of the council of *Nice*. So that you have more than my naked assertion that they were an assembly of men that were at the Emperor's disposal, and ready to do what he bid them. Thus far I stand pretty clear: But alas for me ! I have unluckily suggested a fact in confutation of myself. In one place I say the council was all of the Emperor's own party, and in another that there were thirty six of the *Macedonian* party. Unlucky assertion indeed ! However it appears by the history that the Emperor first intended to call only a set of bishops of his own stamp ; for the confirmation of the *Nicene* creed was evidently the main job to be done. Accordingly  
about

\* Soc. p. 264. Soz. p. 711.

about one hundred and fifty of this complexion met together. To these were added thirty-six of the *Macedonian* party, a number trifling in comparison with the other, and which would justify the expression that the council was all of his own party; especially as they soon broke up from the council, and so left them literally all creatures of his majesty, and entirely of his own party. And being thus left alone, they confirmed the *Nicene* faith, ordained *Nectarius* Bishop of *Constantinople*, and decreed these excellent things : \* *viz.* that all heresies should be condemned, and that the bishop of *Constantinople* should take place next after the bishop of *Rome*. So that this council were ALL of the Emperor's party, notwithstanding my unlucky hint about the *Macedonians*. There is nothing worth my taking notice of in your two next remarks.

I now proceed to your last article, *the* p. 70. *great and good, the blessed Martyr Archbishop Laud*. But in what cause was he a martyr? For the purity of religion, the unblameableness of his life, or the liberties of his country? No: If he was a martyr, it was for superstition in worship, power and riches in the priests, and arbitrary government in the prince. On these accounts the high church clergy adore his memory, and offer incense to him as a saint. But do you really think there is

G one

\* Soz. p. 714.



one Man in *Great Britain*, besides the priests of his own complection, that think him either a martyr or a saint? A saint! and yet a rigid, bitter persecutor, and who drove his royal master into such extremes, as involved the nation in a civil war, and brought the unhappy king himself at last to the block. A saint! that crops off mens ears, and slits their noses, and mangles their bodies with stripes; and in his private retirement reflects on it with pleasure, and records it in his diary. It puts me in mind, that there are *some persons worse than crocodiles, who can kill men, without shedding a tear at their destruction.\**

The charges I brought against him, are I confess great and many. But then they are supported by evidence as clear and strong as can be desired. As to his being popishly inclined, you say it is *senseless*; but yet you cannot deny what I asserted, that he was so much a friend to the popish faction, that whilst he persecuted the protestants, who could not run all his lengths in doctrine and ceremonies, he greatly favoured the *Roman* catholics: And though I am intirely against persecuting them upon a religious account, yet how unbecoming the character of a protestant bishop is it, to oppress, imprison, and harrafs protestants for trifles, and at the same time to protect and countenance papists, those sworn enemies to the protestant

p. 72.

\* Berriman's *Remarks*, p. 3.

stant religion and liberties. That your blessed martyr did this is allowed by his friends and enemies. *L'Estrange*, whom undoubtedly you will not charge with partiality against him, says of him: *The Archbishop of Canterbury stands aspersed in common fame as a great friend at least and patron of the Romish Catholicks, if he were not of the same belief. To which I answer by concession: True it is he had too much and long favoured the Romish faction — though not the Romish faith. He tampered indeed to introduce some ceremonies bordering upon superstition, disused by us, and abused by them. From whence the Romanists collected such a good disposition in him to their tenets, as they began not only to hope, but in good earnest to cry him up for their proselyte\**. You see, Sir, he went such lengths as made the papists imagine him their own; and though his conference with *Fisher* the Jesuit afterwards proved he differed from them in some doctrinals, yet as he avowed and practised the most infamous and cursed part of popery; I mean, Sir, persecution for conscience sake, he was a papist in the worst sense of that word.

Besides, as piety and the care of religion is a necessary ingredient in my judgment to the character of a martyr; I am at a loss how to reconcile part of the Archbishop's conduct with my notion of religion

\* Rushworth, Vol. III. p. 1326.

gion and piety. The forementioned historian tell us†, that the Lord Chief Justice *Richardson* prohibited Revels, Church ales, and Clerk ales upon the *Lord's Day*. But *Laud* forced him to revoke that order; and tho' the justices of the peace drew up a petition to the King, shewing the great inconveniences which would befall the country, if they were permitted; yet before the petition could be delivered, *Laud* published by the King's order the declaration concerning recreations on the *Lord's Day*; which as *Rushworth* observes, *proved a snare to many ministers, very conformable to the church of England, because they refused to read the same publickly in the Church as was required. For upon this many were suspended, and others silenced from preaching.* Was this the custom of the primitive martyrs? Must men be forced to a prophanation of the sabbath? Must the ministers of the gospel be obliged to close the service of God, even in the house of worship, with an exhortation to Revels and Church Ales? Or must they be persecuted by suspensions and silencings for their refusal? Is this your martyr and your saint? Rather than be numbered with such saints and martyrs, *Sit anima mea cum Philosophis.*

As to the case of Dr. *Leighton*, it appears a faithful narrative and representation. The very diary of *Laud* himself confirms the

\* *Rushworth*, Vol. I. p. 196.

the most cruel part of his usage, and therefore leaves no room to doubt of the truth of the other. In it there is this passage, which a man of common humanity could not have wrote without a bleeding heart. *Friday, Nov. 16. He (Leighton) was severely whipt, and being set in the pillory he had one of his ears cut of, one side of his nose slit, and branded on one cheek with a red hot iron. And on that day sevenight HIS SORES UPON HIS BACK, EAR, NOSE, AND FACE BEING NOT CURED, he was whipped again at the pillory in Cheapside, and there had the remainder of his sentence executed upon him, by cutting off the other ear, slitting the other side of his nose, and branding the other cheek.* Did your Martyr record this to eternise his relentless cruelty? You, with a spirit like his, tell your reader, *that Laud*<sup>P. 72.</sup> *was not more rigorous, than Leighton's crimes deserved.* Would you give the world to understand by this, what they must expect when such priests as you sit again in high places of power, and that your hands and heart are already prepared for mutilations and blood? I am far from vindicating *Leighton's* conduct, if the things you mention out of his book are true; though the oppressions and violences, which had been practised by many of the bishops, were such as might have made even a wise man mad, and by all equitable persons will be allowed as some excuse for the very severest expressions

\* Rushworth, Vol. I. p. 57, 58.



expressions of *Leighton* against them. However, this I will affirm, that a christian bishop should have had no hand in such a bloody sentence, and that *Laud* would have acted a much more merciful part if he had ordered him to be immediately hanged. The Parliament \* had a quite different sense of *Leighton's* sufferings, and voted that the fine of 10000 pounds, and the sentence of corporal punishment, and the execution thereof, and the imprisonment thereupon were illegal ; and that the archbishop of *Canterbury*, then bishop of *London*, ought to give satisfaction to *Leighton* for his damages sustained by his fifteen weeks imprisonment in *Newgate* upon the said bishop's warrant.

As to Mr. *Limborch's* testimony, I can assure you I am no more a general believer in him, than in your martyr *Laud*. Great allowances must be made for him as a foreigner, and therefore not well acquainted with the affairs of the *English* history. He had also probably an affection for *Laud*, because of his embracing the *Arminian* principles, and appearing against the doctrinal part of popery. However, had his commendations of *Laud* been much more profuse, they would have signified nothing against the truth of history. As you represent the matter it amounts to no more, than that *Limborch* thought he was no papist, and commended the letters he wrote to  
*Vossius.*

\* Rushworth, Vol. IV. p. 229. ad An. 1641.

. *Vossius*. And therefore I have not dealt unworthily by my own author, by painting that imperious prelate in his proper colours; nor indeed can I see any Reason, that because I translated Mr. *Limborch's History of the Inquisition*, therefore I should agree with him in all his characters of men; and especially of those, whose true character I have a much better opportunity of knowing than *Limborch* had. p. 74.

As to your prophetick curse, that my name shall rot amongst the wicked, I shall only say, that *as the bird by wandring, and the swallow by flying, so the curse causeless shall not come*; and that I am of *Plutarch's* mind, who said, *I had rather men should say of me, that there neither is, nor ever was such an one as Plutarch; than that they should say, Plutarch was an unsteady, changeable, easily provokable, and revengeful man.* May I perish for ever from the memory of men, rather than be remembered as a tyrannical, haughty, persecuting, relentless, bigotted priest; and if posterity should ever speak of me, may it be as a lover of religion, a friend to the rights of conscience, and an advocate for the civil and religious liberties of my country. This character I will endeavour to merit; and it is the only immortality amongst men that I desire.

Thus, Sir, have I considered your remarks, and I hope cleared myself from the charge of gross misrepresentations of fact. I have only to add, that as you threaten  
me

me with due chastisement from other hands, I shall be very glad if any learned and candid divine of the church of *England* will set me right in any matters wherein I have been mistaken, and that I will ingenuously own any errors when they can be proved upon me. But if any person with your spirit, and in your stile, shall appear farther against me, he must excuse me if I think him beneath my notice, and pass him by with that intire silence and contempt he will deserve.

*I am, S I R,*

*Your's, &c.*

S. C.

