

9.

*Prometheus Christianus:*  
O R, A  
**TREATISE**  
Shewing the FOLLY and VANITY of  
**ATHEISM,**  
A N D

Containing the Solution of the main Arguments of the *SOCINIANS*, the *ARRIANS*, the *DEISTS*, and other *Unitarians*, which have a direct and immediate Tendency to the Utter Ruin and Subversion of the very Foundation of Christianity.

Whereunto is annex'd,  
The Refutation of some *Dogmatical Points* of a *Modern Author* relating to the

**T R I N I T Y.**

---

By *JOHN SAUVAGE*, Gent.

*once Superior of a College of Benedictines.*

---

L O N D O N Printed, and are to be Sold by  
*Rich. Baldwin, near the Oxford-Arms in Warwick-Lane. 695.*

---

---

THE  
P R E F A C E.

**F**inding the Innumerable number of Heterodoxical and Prophanè Errors which in these dissolute Times make the Novelists to Swarm with the frequent new Accesses of their Profelytes, I deem'd it expedient to Propose the Grounds of their severall Errors, and so to Refute them, which here I undertake.

---

---

THE  
CONTENTS.

SECT. I.

**S** *Howing the Nullity and Vanity of the*  
Atheists, Page 1

SECT. II.

*The Main Objection of the Heterodox Unitarians is fully propos'd and solv'd by the Orthodox Trinitarians.* P. 5

SECT. III.

*A farther Attempt of the same Adversaries is propos'd and solv'd,* p. 11

SECT.

# The CONTENTS.

## S E C T. IV.

*The Objections against Circumcision solv'd,*  
P. 13

## S E C T. V.

*Wherein the rest of the Unitarian's Arguments  
are propos'd and solv'd,* p. 16.

## S E C T. VI.

*Certain Absolete Opinions of another Au-  
thor are propos'd and solv'd,* p. 19.

## S E C T. VII.

*Two other Opinions of the same Author are pro-  
pos'd and solv'd,* p. 23.

*Prome-*

[ 4 ]

---

---

*Prometheus Christianus :*

O R, A

# T R E A T I S E

Shewing the

## F O L L Y and V A N I T Y

O F

# A T H E I S M.

---

## S E C T. I.

*Shewing the Nullity and Vanity of the Atheists.*

**T**HIS Prophane and Pernicious Error hath drawn many a Soul to their utter Ruine and Perdition; for their Position is, That there is no Supreme Deity nor Godhead existent, to govern and regulate the Natural and Moral Transactions of this Universe.

The

The Grounds of their Doctrine are fetled upon their insatiable Avidity to satisfy the Suggestion of their Sensual Appetite, not invoking the least Dictamen of Reason to their support and conduct. Hence they let the Reins loose to all Lasciviousness, Delight, and Pleasure that Sense can dictate to them.

To convince these Miscreants of their dull and stupid Error, I must first desire them to take a survey of the admirable Products and stupendous Variety of this inferior Orb. Let them consider, that there can be no Effect without a Cause; and, where will they find a Cause that is impower'd to produce such Variety of Creatures as do embellish the Globe of the Earth with such due Subordination, Stability, and Natural Instinct, for the preservation and propagation of each Species in their kind? Let them consider, that there is no created Power that hath any Proportion to be the Cause of such admirable Effects; for it exceeds the Capacity of all Created Power, whether Human or Angelical, to produce one Blade of Grass, or one Leaf of a Tree, in perfection, much more to create such a copious number of Vegetables and Animals as furnish this World for the use of Man. All this argues the Certainty and Infallibility of the Existence of the Original Cause of such variety of Products, and convinceth, that it must be an Omnipotent, All-wise, Prudent and Provident Creator.

Then let the dull and stupid Atheist cast his Eyes up to Heaven, and contemplate the Variety of the superiour Orbs of the Sun and Moon, with the rest of the Planets and their Attendants, with the fix'd Stars that are immovably seated in the Firmament, which are more in number than the Sands of the Sea. Let the Atheist consider how all these, by their rapt motion,

on, are daily carried in their Sphere round this inferior World once every day, without leaving their stations where they were first fixed: let him consider moreover the regular and constant motion of the wand'ring Planets and their Concomitants, how they are all rapt by the First Mover round this World once every day, while at the same time, by their natural motion, they are in progress of effecting their natural course, which the Moon accomplisheth in Eight and twenty Days, the Sun in one Year, the rest of the Planets in a longer time; and thus by their various Aspects and benign Influences communicate to us all the Blessings of a munificent and benign Creator, as Corn, Wine, Oyl, and all the Fruits of the Earth, which are abundantly sufficient not only for Man's necessary support and maintenance, but also for his pleasure and delight: Which made St. Chrysostom say, *In paginis Cælorum legitur divinitas; In the Book of the Heavens is read the Divinity.* And St. Augustine crys out, *O altitudo sapientia & scientia Dei! O the altitude of the Wisdom and Science of God!*

Add to this the general and universal Consent and Agreement of all Nations contain'd in the whole extent of this Universe, whereof there is not one Nation that denies the Existence of a Deity. Now, if this general Perswasion should prove false or deceitful, to whom could this Error and Deceit be imputed, but to Him that imprinted this general Belief and Perswasion into the Minds of all Nations, it being wholly impossible that the Great Omnipotent Creator of the Universe, whose Providence is infinite, and who is Veracity and Truth itself, should de-

ceive any one, and, by reason of his Omniscience, should be deceived himself, who penetrates the most abdit and most secret Recesses of the superiour and inferiour World by his Omniscience? Yea, it is the Opinion of most learned Divines, that it is impossible that any one Person, having attain'd to the perfect use of Reason, should be ignorant of the Being of a GOD.

Now, if all this will not convince the *Atheist* of his black Error, I will give him a Metaphysical Demonstration *à priori* for the Being of a GOD.

And first, I will settle the true Notion of a Deity or Godhead; secondly, I shall prove the Possibility of the Object of this Notion; and thirdly, I shall demonstrate the real Existence of it.

As to the first; a True GOD is that, and only that, which hath all Perfections possible, and no Defect; and whatsoever hath all this, is compleatly God; and whatsoever faileth of any part of this, is not, nor cannot be GOD. This being presuppos'd, as the Ground and Subject of my Demonstration, I thus proceed to prove the possibility of it, which was the second thing propos'd:

All that which is not a Chymical Fiction is possible.

This Object is no Chymical Fiction.  
Therefore this Object is possible.

Nothing can be here deny'd but the *minor* or second Proposition, which I thus prove:

A Chy-

A Chymical Fiction hath a great Defect, to wit, its impossibility to exist.

This Object hath no Defect.

Therefore this Object is possible.

Now for the third thing propos'd, which was, to demonstrate the Real Existence of it:

All that which is possible, and hath no Defect, is existent.

This Object is possible and hath no Defect.

Therefore this Object is existent.

The *major* or first Proposition of this last Syllogism cannot be deny'd; the rest is clear and evident; and therefore I here leave the inconsiderate *Atheist* to ponder the Force and Energy of this Demonstration, and so I proceed to the *Socinians*.

## S E C T. II.

*The Main Objection of the Heterodox Unitarians is fully propos'd and solv'd by the Orthodox Trinitarians.*

HERE our *Adversaries* do agree with Us, in the acknowledgment of *One Only Omnipotent and Infinite Wise GOD*; but they deny the *Divinity* of the *Three Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*, acknowledging

knowledging but one *Hypostasis* or *Suppositum* in the Deity. To prove which, they propose this following Argument,

*The Divine Nature is the Father.  
The Son is the Divine Nature.  
Therefore the Son is the Father.*

So likewise, to prove the *Holy Spirit* to be but one and the same Person with the *Son*, as they suppose, they have prov'd the *Father* and the *Son* to be but *One Person*: and thus they reduce the *Trinity* of the *Persons* to only one *Hypostasis* or *Personality*. To effect this, they frame this Syllogism,

*The Divine Nature is the Son.  
The Holy Spirit is the Divine Nature.  
Therefore the Holy Spirit is the Son.*

By these two Syllogisms they intend to reduce the *Paternity* of the *Father*, the *Filiation* of the *Son*, and the *Passive Spiration* of the *Holy Spirit*, to be but one *Hypostasis* or *Personality*, grounding themselves upon that Orthodox Principle of ours, That there is a real Identity between the *Deity* and each of the *Three Persons*, without which Identity they could not be Divine.

For Answer to this *Achilles* or efficacious Argument, (as the *Socinians* do suppose) I reply by denying the Consequence of both Syllogisms; for neither of them concludes, for want of the distribution of the *medium* or middle Term, which is the *Divine Nature*.

To

To this the *Socinians* answer, That the two fore-mention'd Syllogisms are both expository, and therefore do conclude with greater Perspicuity and Certainty than either of the Moods contained under the three Figures which *Aristotle* hath settled for the Rules of Disputation; which likewise is the Opinion of all Philosophers and Logicians since *Aristotle's* Time: The reason is, because an expository Syllogism hath all its three Terms singular, and neither of them capable of Multiplication; so that the distribution of the *medium* is needless: as in this Syllogism,

*This Angel is sent from God.  
Gabriel is this Angel.  
Therefore Gabriel is sent from God.*

In this Syllogism grant the Premises, and deny the Consequence if you can: And a Thousand more such Examples might be produc'd, wherein the distribution of the *medium* is superfluous.

To this I answer, by granting the Force of an expository Syllogism, but denying that either of the two first Syllogisms is expository; for, though the *medium* in them both, which is the *Divine Nature*, appears singular, yet it is capable of Multiplication, by reason that it contains not only all the Infinite Perfections and Attributes of the *Deity*, which are all singular, and constitute but one singular Divine Substance, yet the *Deity* contains in it also the Notional Predicates and Relative Perfections of *Three Persons* which are really distinct from each other: And therefore, if the *medium* be not distributed, the

the Syllogism is not in form, and concludes nothing.

Here the *Socinian*, out of a civil compliance, rather than lose his fast hold, will accommodate himself to the *Genius* of his Adversary, by distributing his *Medium*, which he thus effects:

*All that is contain'd in the Deity is the Father.*

*The Son is contain'd in the Deity.*  
*Therefore the Son is the Father.*

This Syllogism is in form, and concludes rightly; neither can you deny the *major*; for you acknowledge, that the *Deity* is one singular, indivisible and individual Substance: you grant also a real Identity between the *Father* and the *Substance* of the *Deity*; therefore by a rigid necessity you must grant a real Identity between the *Father* and the whole Real Substance of the *Deity*; for, it contains no Parts nor Particles really distinct from each other.

I answer by distinguishing the *major*, All the absolute Perfections contain'd in the *Deity* are the *Father*; I grant it. All the notional Predicates and relative Perfections contain'd in the *Deity* are the *Father*; I deny it: for the Filiation of the *Son*, and the *passive Spiritation* of the *Holy Spirit*, are contain'd in the *Deity*, and yet are really distinct from the *Father*.

To

To this the *Socinian* replies, That according to this distinction we must admit two Parts really distinct from each other, whereof the one is Identified with the *Father*, the other not: where, of force, we must swallow a plain Contradiction, or admit two *Parts* in the *Deity* really distinct from each other, and both completely endow'd with the *Deity*; which is to admit two Gods, and so to de-throne and ungod the Omnipotent, who is the great Creator, Framer, and Preserver of the whole Universe.

To answer this Objection, I do declare, That it is very remote from our Thoughts to admit in the Divinity more than one *Real* and *Divine Substance*; so that your Allegation of our granting *Two Gods* is frivolous and injurious to us.

As to the other part alledged in the Objection of admitting a Contradiction, *Scorus*, with all his School of the *Scotists*, do answer you, That here is no appearance of a Contradiction by reason of a Distinction which they call *distinctionem medium*, or *Ex Natura rei*; that is, not real, but more than formal; which hath no dependance upon the operation of the Understanding. By this they distinguish between the Divinity and the Notional Perfections of the Persons: so that the Extreams of your pretended Contradiction are not the same.

Many other Learned Divines do admit of a Virtual Distinction between the *Deity* and the Notional or Relative Predicates of the Persons; by which your pretended Difficulty vanisheth to Smoak.

But



But because I have in the Treatise of the *Trinity* impugned and rejected both these Opinions, my Answer is, That a formal Distinction, which is made by the Understanding, and supposed by the very Objection, is sufficient to evacuate this pretended Difficulty; for hereby it will appear, that the pretended Contradiction is not *ejusdem de eodem*, as the Philosophers say; that is, both parts are not of the same Predicate, in order to the same Subject, which is necessary to make up a formal Contradiction, as all Philosophers do require. So that we neither do admit *Two Parts really distinct* in the *Deity*, nor are we hereby forc'd to swallow a Contradiction, as our Adversaries do most falsely pretend.

---

SECT.

---

SECT. III.

*A farther Attempt of the same Adversaries is Propos'd and Solv'd.*

**H**ERE the *Socinian* begins to faint, as having run himself out of breath, and spent the best part of the Vigour and Energy of his Intellectual Faculty to support his Position, yet will not leave his Cause so incompletely accomplish'd, and therefore doth summon up the remainder of the Force and Vigour of his Understanding to accomplish his Design. And thus he proceeds.

The Doctrine contained in the Answer to my last Objection is not consistent with what you have formerly acknowledg'd in this Dispute, which is, That there are Three *Hypostases*, which are all Notional Predicates, belonging to the compleat Constitution of the *Three Persons*, which are really distinct from each other, and yet all Three compleatly furnish'd with all the Perfections of the *Divinity*, by a real Identity with it. How then doth this consist with the admitting no more than one singular and numerical Substance in the *Divinity*; for you admit

C

Three

Three distinct Persons really Identified with the same Divinity?

To solve this, I must have recourse to the Doctrine of *Circumcision*. The Object in question may be consider'd several ways; but, to accommodate my self to the Fancy of the *Socinians*, I must consider it by way of *Circumcision*; for when it is so taken, then the Divinity includes the three *Hypostases*, namely, the *Paternity* of the *Father*, the *Filiation* of the *Son*, and the *passive Spiration* of the *Holy Spirit*, as it were enveloped and implicated within itself: and under this Consideration it is numerically but one singular and individual Substance, because all the *Hypostases*, *Relations*, and *Co-relations* of the *Persons* are really identified with the Divinity, and so make but *one Substance* with it.

And it is in this sense the Council of *Laterane*, cited by me at large in the first Section of the first Disputation of the Treatise of the *Trinity*, Cap. *firmiter*, and Cap. *demianus De summa Trinitate*, defines, That the *Deity*, with all its *Relations* and *Personalities*, constitute but *unam summam rem*, that is, but one chief Being; for, in this sense the notional and relative Perfections of the Persons are not to be consider'd. And this is the true meaning of *Circumcision*.

But if you will dissolve the *Circumcision*, and take abroad and unfold all that is in it, then the Personalities of the *Three Persons* will appear really distinct from one another, and yet are the same individual Substance with the *Deity*. And herein consists the *Mystery* of the *Divine Trinity*, which all the

the extent of Nature cannot furnish us with one Example to parallel: so that from the different acceptions of the same Object you raise a different sense of it; and hence ariseth the Difference between you and your Adversary: for, if you do not cautiously distinguish between the absolute and notional terms, you must needs confound the objective Signification of them, which notwithstanding are very different from each other, and this grounds a Confusion in your Understanding.

#### S E C T. IV.

##### *The Objections against Circumcision Solu'd.*

**B**UT the *Socinian* is not satisfied with this Doctrine of *Circumcision*, but objects, That we grant, with the Council of *Lateran*, but *One Reality* made up of the *Divinity* and the *Three Persons*; and yet we admit, That when the *Circumcision* is unfolded and taken abroad, there are *Three Personalities* really distinct from each other: Which involves a plain Contradiction; for we assert, The whole is but *One Reality*, *una summa res*, *only One Reality*; and yet we likewise assert, That there are

more Realities contained in it : which is a plain Contradiction.

To this I answer,

That these Two Propositions there, is but One Reality.

There is more than One Reality. These two are not contradictory, if taken in a different sense ; for the first is meant by *Circumcision*, the second by *Extension* ; which hinders the Contradiction.

Here the *Socinian* replies, That these several Accceptions, or different Senses of the same Object, are but different Considerations of the Understanding, which constitute only *Formalities* ; why then do you obtrude them in this Discourse, where we dispute only of *Realities*, which is a meer Trick and Evasion to involve the whole matter into obscurity and confusion, which in a fair way of disputing ought not to be done ?

Here the *Socinian* is brisk, and confident of his own Cause ; yet give me leave to answer, That my Solution of the Difficulty propos'd is very proper ; for, the *Divinity* is a *singular* and *indivisible Substance*, and by a real Identity is the same thing with the *Three Persons* ; so that all together constitute but *One Reality* ; whereas, if you consider the *Persons* apart, you will find *Three Realities* distinct, whereof the one is incarnate, the other two are not ; which is an evident sign of a *real Distinction*.

Here the *Socinian* replies again, alledging, That to solve one Contradiction we incur another : for, we say, That one Person is incarnate, the other not : so that of the *same Reality* we say, *This Reality*

*lity*

*lity* is incarnate, and *this same Reality* is not incarnate.

And thus we prove both parts of the Contradiction :

*The Father is not incarnate.*

*This Reality is the Father.*

*Therefore this Reality is not incarnate.*

The affirmative part of this Contradiction we prove thus :

*The Son is incarnate.*

*This Reality is the Son.*

*Therefore this Reality is incarnate.*

I answer by denying the two fore-mention'd Propositions to be contradictory, for the negative Proposition is verified only of the *Father* and the *Holy Spirit*, not of the *Son* : whereas the Affirmative is verified only of the *Son*, not of the *Father*, nor the *Holy Spirit*. Whence you may plainly perceive the pretended Contradiction is not *ejusdem denotem* ; it is not of the same Predicate, in order to the same Subject, which is repugnant to the known Rule of Contradictories, for else these two would be contradictory. Man is like other Animals, and Man is not like other Animals ; for, as being a living sensible Creature, he is like other Animals, and as being endow'd with Reason, he is not like other Animals ; and yet his Animality and Rationality are but two Formalities, distinguish'd only by the Understanding. Now, if the passing from one Formality to another hinders the force of a Contradiction,

Contradiction,

diction, much more will it hinder, by passing from one Reality to another; for the *Father*, the *Son*, and the *Holy Spirit* are really distinguish'd from each other.

But now the *Socinian* is ready to prosecute his Design farther, which we shall declare in the next Section.

## S E C T. V.

*Wherein the rest of the Unitarian's Arguments are Propos'd and Solv'd.*

**H**ERE the *Socinian* pretends to drive us to another great Inconvenience, which is, to deduce out of the precedent Doctrine a necessity of admitting *Three Gods*; for we admit *Three Hypostases* or *Relations* really distinct from each other, and every one of them to be compleatly furnish'd with the Divinity; and each of them constitutes a compleat Godhead, for they being *Three* in number, there must of necessity be admitted *Three Gods*.

To this Objection I answer, That the denomination of *G O D* signifies principally and *in vello* the Divinity, and *in obliquo* the *Hypostases* or *Relations*, and is thus resolv'd; The Divinity subsisting by  
Three

*Three distinct Hypostases*. Now, because there is but one *singular* and *individual* Divinity, there can be but one *singular* and *individual* Godhead. Whereas the denomination of a *Person* signifies principally and *in vello* the *Hypostases* or *Person*, and is thus resolv'd; The *Hypostases* or *Substance* of the Divinity. So that there being *Three Hypostases* or *Personalities distinct*, there must be admitted *Three distinct Persons* of one numerical Divinity.

Another Objection which they muster up against us is this: We teach that the Persons of the *Father* and the *Son* are really identified with the *Deity*, and the same thing with it, and yet we declare, that the *Father* and the *Son* are *two Realities* really distinct from one another; which contradicts that first Principle, known by the Light of Nature, *Que sunt eadem uni tertio sunt eadem inter se*; They that are the same thing with a *Third*, are the same thing among themselves. Wherein all the Art of Syllogisms is grounded.

I answer by admitting that Principle, as being known by the Light of Nature, and that the Syllogistical Art is grounded in it; but, I deny that our Doctrine is not consistent with the Verity of it: for, if you consider the *Three Persons* as contained in the *Deity*, and really the same thing with it, they all together make up but *One Reality*, for in this manner you do not consider the *Persons* as related to one another, but only as identified with the *Deity*, which is by *Circumcision*. And in this sense the Council of *Lateran* hath defined it to be but one thing,

thing, or one individual Substance, by reason of the identity of the Persons with the Deity.

And here I leave the *Socinians* to consider more nicely and minutely the Difference between the *absolute* and *notional* Expressions in this Matter, and their Objective Significations, which will prevent any farther progress in framing any more Objections in this matter against us.

---

SECT.

---

S E C T. VI.

*Certain Absolete Opinions of another Novelist are Propos'd and Solv'd.*

A BOOK fell lately into my Hands, in the perusal whereof I found certain Paradoxical Opinions destitute of *Reason*, and back'd only by the single Authority of the *Author*, whereof one was, the description of the Essential Parts and Nature of an *Individuum*, which he defines to be nothing else but a *Self-Consciousness*, or an exact *Correspondence with it self*; which he produceth no Reason to prove, neither did I ever hear or read of any such definition of an *Individuum*; for, all Antiquity doth agree in this definition, That an *Individuum* is *Indivisum in se & divisum à quolibet alio*; that is, it is undivided in it self, and divided from any thing else: of which Definition this Author makes no mention, and therefore doth not impugn it.

The first Refutation of this Author's new Opinion is as followeth:

A *Self-Consciousness* of a thing with it self, argues relation of the thing to it self, which is

D

im-

impossible, for a *relation* cannot subsist, except it mediates between two *Extreams* distinct from each other; the one is that whereon the *relation* is founded, the other is that to which it is terminated; but between a thing and its self there is no distinction, for a thing and its self are the self-same numerical Object, which cannot admit of any *relation*, and consequently is incapable of any *Self-Consciousness*.

*The Second Refutation.*

There can be no *Self-Consciousness* but by the Vital Acts produced by the *Internal Faculties*, which must have an exact Conformity with the Natural Inclination of the thing from whence they proceed; so that here can be no *Self-Consciousness* of any Object to itself, but of the Acts to their Cause.

*The Third Refutation.*

This *Self-Consciousness* comes too late to constitute the Essential Notion of an *Individuum*; for, separate this *Self-Consciousness* from the Origin whence it proceeds, and I demand, whether this Origin, as now divested of its *Self-Consciousness*, be not an *Individuum*: if so, then you have the *Individuum* completely constituted independent of this *Self-Consciousness*; for, either you must constitute the whole Essence of your *Self-Consciousness* in a certain collection of Vital Acts, which are really distinguish'd from the Substance of the thing whose *Self-Consciousness* it is, or else you must conceive it to be really

really identified with its Subject whereon it is grounded; if the first, you have the Ground and Subject remaining divested of its *Self-Consciousness*. Now, I demand, whether this Substance that remains separated and divested from its *Self-Consciousness* be an *Individuum* or not? If it be, then you have the whole and adequate Essence of an *Individuum*, independent and precedent to your *Self-Consciousness*: But if it be not an *Individuum*, then it must be a *Plurality*; which is against common sense, for it is a singular numerical Substance, undivided in itself, and divided from any thing else, and therefore an *Individuum*. But if you chuse the second by a real Identity with the Substance, which is the Ground and Foundation of it, then you must by a Metaphysical Distinction prescind it, and slice it as a Formality from its *Subject*. And so, by your Understanding, consider that Substance as mentally separated from its *Self-Consciousness*, and you will find a singular and numerical Substance, which is undivided in its self, and divided from any thing else: which is the essential Definition of an *Individuum*.

Here I might introduce other inanimate Creatures, as, the *Elements*, *Metals*, *Stones*, and the like, which have no collection of *Vital Acts*, wherein to place your *Self-Consciousness*, and yet they are all *Individuums*; as appears by the definition by me given.

Another Opinion I find in this Author, whereby he asserts, That a *Horse* is a *Person*; not regulating himself by any Definition or Description of a *Person*, but goes on in a talking way, and still remains in the *Preliminaris* of the Question in debate, without

ever penetrating into the Heart of the Difficulty, or touching the Sore: so that by this not *arguing*, but *talking* way of Writing, nothing can be substantially proved, nothing efficaciously impugned: Wherefore this Author not having given any definition nor description of a *Person*, I have nothing here to refute, but his *Absolute Position* of introducing unreasonable *Brute Beasts* into the number of *Persons*, in order to which, I must here give an essential definition of a *Person*, which is this: *Rationalis naturæ individua & completa Substantia*; that is, *A Complete, Rational, and Individual Substance*. By which definition all *Unreasonable Creatures* are excluded from the notion of *Persons*; and only *G O D*, the *Angels*, and *Men*, are admitted.

---

SECT.

---

S E C T. VII.

*Two other Opinions of the same Author are Propos'd and Solv'd.*

**A** THIRD Opinion I find in this Author, whereby he affirms to be contained in the *Deity Three Infinite Minds*, not proving nor attempting to prove his Position by any Argument.

This Doctrine, and the Consequence of it, I cannot brook; for, by admitting *Three Infinite Minds* in *G O D*, he will hardly avoid the admitting of *Three GODS*: which were Blasphemy to assert, and which I thus prove:

The *Mind* is a Vital Faculty, belonging and appertaining to the *Understanding*; a Term not notional nor relative, but absolute and singular in the Deity; and therefore to admit *Three Infinite Minds*, is the same as to admit *Three Infinite Understandings*, which being an Absolute Attribute, can no more be multiply'd than the Godhead itself, which is common to all the Absolute Attributes of the Deity, which all together make but one Substance with

with GOD himself; whence I conclude, that the admitting of *Three Infinite Minds* in GOD, is of dangerous consequence, and not easily to be maintained, for it hath a direct Tendency to *Paganism*.

A Fourth Opinion of this Author is, That the Unity of the *Three Divine Persons* consists essentially in the *Mutual Consciousness* of them to each other, whereby the *Three Divine Persons* are made *One* by their mutual correspondence and exact agreeing in the Faculties of their Understanding and Will with each other.

This Opinion is no more prov'd by Reason nor Authority than his former Opinions, but merely asserted, which Opinion I thus impugn: Separate at least with your Understanding this *Mutual Consciousness* from the *Three Persons*, and there will remain *Three Substances* without their Unity: These *Three Substances* are either created or increated; if the first, then the *Three Persons* are meer *Creatures*; which is rank *Socinianism*: if the second, then they must be really identified with the *Divine Nature*; and if so, then in vain do you seek for another Unity, for you have here the strictest Unity that possibly can be, namely, by a real Identity with the *Divine Nature*, which is precedent to your *Mutual Consciousness*. And this is the True Notion and Orthodox Doctrin of the *Divine Trinity*.

Besides, this Unity that you affix to the *Divine Persons* is only moral or metaphorical, no better than it would be between three Men or three Angels; which is a great Indignity to the Infinite Perfection

on of the Great God, who has in himself all Perfections possible, and no Defect.

Note briefly here, That an *Object* of *Three Substances* or *Persons* must first have its compleat Being before it is capable of your *Mutual Consciousness*: Consider it therefore in its original Existency, which was from all Eternity, and ponder with your self if there were not in that state an *Unity* in the *Trinity*, and *Trinity* in *Unity*, without the least mention or cooperation of your *Mutual Consciousness*.

And here I conclude this Treatise of the *Ever Blessed and Most Sacred Trinity*; all which, and every part thereof, I humbly submit to the Judgment and Censure of Those upon whom it is incumbent to regulate the Faith, Belief and Doctrin of the *Protestant Church of England*.

F I N I S