

**The incompatibility of the doctrine of the Trinity with that of the Divine Unity : A sermon preached on Sunday, May 1st, 1814, in Union Chapel, Glasgow, before the second annual meeting of the General Association of the Unitarians of Scotland / by T. Southwood Smith.**

### **Contributors**

Smith, Southwood, 1788-1861.  
Aspland, Robert, 1782-1845.  
General Association of the Unitarians of Scotland.

### **Publication/Creation**

Glasgow : printed by James Hedderwick. Sold by ... B. Barrie, Bristol; and by D. Eaton ... London, 1814.

### **Persistent URL**

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/e5cqjng2>

### **License and attribution**

This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.



Wellcome Collection  
183 Euston Road  
London NW1 2BE UK  
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722  
E [library@wellcomecollection.org](mailto:library@wellcomecollection.org)  
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

48747/P  
*The Incompatibility of the Doctrine of the  
Trinity with that of the Divine Unity.*

~~~~~  
**A SERMON,**

PREACHED ON

*Sunday, May 1st, 1814, in Union Chapel,*

**GLASGOW,**

BEFORE

THE SECOND ANNUAL MEETING

OF THE GENERAL

**Association of the Unitarians**

*OF SCOTLAND.*

---

BY T. SOUTHWOOD SMITH,  
MINISTER OF THE UNITARIAN CHAPEL (ST. ANDREWS) IN  
CARRUBER'S CLOSE, EDINBURGH.

---

SECOND EDITION.

~~~~~  
**GLASGOW,**

*Printed by James Hedderwick.*

SOLD BY THE PRINCIPAL BOOKSELLERS IN GLASGOW, EDINBURGH,  
AND PATISLEY; BY B. BARRIE, BRISTOL; AND BY  
D. EATON, 187, HIGH-HOLBORN,  
LONDON.

~~~~~  
1814.



/P/Sm1

348057



The Rev. R. Aspland  
with the respects of the  
author.



## ADVERTISEMENT.

---

THE object of the following Discourse is to bring clearly into view a very essential consideration, which, as far as the Author's observation and experience extend, is peculiarly apt to be overlooked by the Trinitarian in his controversy with the advocate of the strict Unity of God. At the same time, as it was anticipated that many persons might be present on the occasion of its delivery, to whom, although in itself so trite, the subject might be almost new, it was judged advisable to add the more general grounds upon which Unitarians reject the doctrine opposed. Should any one, already well acquainted with the subject, cast his eyes upon this Discourse, it is not necessary to apprise him that he ought to expect little that is new: should his acquaintance with the productions of the MIGHTY MINDS which have engaged in the controversy, enable him to perceive that even the old is not rendered so efficient as it ought, it may perhaps soften the severity of his censure, to know that the weapons are in the hands of one who is but just putting on the armour, and that therefore it is not possible, that they should be wielded with the energy and skill of him who is putting it off.

If it attract the notice of any who have hitherto had no opportunity of considering the subject impartially (and with the hope of benefiting such only is it published), the Author earnestly entreats,



that whatever impression it may leave upon their minds, they will not rest satisfied with its perusal, but will do themselves the justice more fully to investigate the subject. To enable them to do so, a list of works is subjoined, from the study of any of which, they will certainly obtain sufficient information relative to the doctrines of which they treat, to enable them to form an impartial judgment. All that the Unitarian wishes of his fellow Christians is, that they will consider with candour the evidence he adduces in favour of his opinions. He is too well acquainted with the nature of the human mind, and has had too much experience to expect that every person will be convinced by his arguments; but he does hope, that if all who are interested in these inquiries, would listen to him with that attention which one serious and sensible Christian has a right to demand from another, they would no longer cherish those ungenerous suspicions, those ignorant and contemptible prejudices which he mourns, not on his own account but on theirs.

To the Members of the Society, before whom it was preached, and at whose request it is printed, in the fervent hope that it may contribute, in however small a degree, to the promotion of the enlightened and benevolent objects they are endeavouring to accomplish, this Discourse is respectfully and affectionately dedicated by their fellow labourer in the diffusion of the simple, the holy, the uncorrupted Gospel of Christ,—

THE AUTHOR.



THE INCOMPATIBILITY  
OF THE  
*DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY*  
WITH THAT OF  
THE DIVINE UNITY.

---

1 COR. viii. 6.—*To us there is but ONE God, the  
FATHER.*

SUCH the great Apostle of the Gentiles declares was the belief of the first Christians. In this intelligible manner did they speak of the Deity. Visiting the nations in which idolatry had hitherto held undisputed empire, they ceased not even in the midst of her temples to proclaim that there is *but ONE God, for whom are all things*. Their efforts to enlighten the world, brought upon themselves reproach and suffering; they were branded with the name of Atheists, and because they did not believe in a plurality of Gods, they were charged with denying that there is one.

We, my brethren, have assembled from different parts of our country, publicly to assert, and with firmness, but we hope with the modesty which becomes the disciples of the humble Jesus, to maintain the great principle which held such a distinguished place in the faith of the first Christians. Engaged in the same cause, we incur similar reproach. Because we do not believe that there



are three persons in the Godhead, the same in substance, equal in power and glory, some of our fellow Christians suspect that we secretly deny that there is a God, and many persuade themselves that we reject the Scriptures. We, however, solemnly declare, that we regard these Sacred Books as the standard of faith and practice; and therefore every person of integrity, will receive our affirmation as decisive upon this point. We make our constant appeal to the writings of the Old and New Testament; we found, or endeavour to found, all our opinions upon them, and we object to many doctrines zealously maintained by our fellow Christians, because they appear to us to be in direct hostility to the Law and to the Prophets.

The cause, my brethren, you are now met together to support, yields not in dignity and importance to any which engages the attention of reflective men. Should this public avowal and defence of your opinions lead only one serious person to inquire into this interesting subject, and should the investigation it may induce him to begin, terminate in a conviction that your principles agree with the dictates of reason, and harmonise with the declarations of Scripture, his heart will glow with gratitude to you as long as it is capable of feeling. For, in the view you entertain of the character of God, and the nature of the Christian dispensation, there is much not only to illuminate the mind, but to improve and felicitate the heart. Many such principles, indeed, you hold in common with all who bear the name of the great Messenger of heaven; but the doctrines, by a belief in which you are distinguished, are pre-eminent for the light they pour upon the mind, and the benignant affections they cherish. Such are your opinions respecting the Unity of God, his nature as exemplified in his dispensations to his creatures, the law he has



enjoined upon them, the ability he has given them to obey it, and the final destiny he has allotted to all his rational offspring.

As one great object of our present meeting is, to afford to our brethren of different denominations, an opportunity of learning what our sentiments really are, and what are the arguments upon which we endeavour to support them, perhaps I shall be better able to fulfil this design, by dwelling with a little minuteness upon some one leading doctrine, than by taking a cursory view of several. Were I upon such an occasion to solicit with peculiar earnestness, the candid attention of our brethren, it might be construed into a reproach, which I believe they do not deserve. There was indeed a time, when the most enlightened person would have found it difficult to obtain a patient and respectful audience, upon a subject similar to that to which I am about to direct your attention. But how happy is the change which has now taken place: how worthy of the disciples of one common Master: how amiable in the children of one common Father! and, indeed, why should it be otherwise? Why do we suspect each other of a rooted aversion to the truth, when we have all the same great inducements to love it; and when, if any thing can be judged from the seriousness and diligence of our inquiry (and what human being can form a judgment upon other grounds), we are all equally anxious to ascertain it? Why, when we ultimately come to different conclusions, do we question each other's sincerity, since none are placed in exactly the same situation for the observance of truth, and since every different position from which it is viewed, must necessarily modify in some measure its appearance. Surely, my Christian friends, it is time to cherish towards each other, dispositions more worthy of the disciples of our great Instructor!



The doctrine to which I am about to direct your attention, forms a distinguished part of that system of Christian theology, the truth or falsehood of which is acknowledged, on all hands, to be of supreme importance; and which of all the controversies which have agitated the Christian world, now alone occupies the serious attention of reflective men. What I have to advance upon the subject, I shall endeavour to state in the spirit of candour, influenced, if I know my own heart, by a desire which no one who stands in a similar situation, can attempt to repress without the deepest criminality—a desire to exhibit to you what, after the most mature consideration, appears to me to be the truth as it is in Jesus. I am responsible to Almighty God for the diligence with which I have endeavoured to ascertain the genuine meaning of Revelation, and for the sincerity with which I state the results of my investigation to you. You are responsible to the same great Being for the candour and attention with which you consider the evidence of their truth, which will be laid before you.

*To us*, says the Apostle, that is, to us Christians, *there is but ONE God, the FATHER*. These words appear to express in as precise and exact language as can be formed, that great doctrine upon which Unitarians, as a body, make their stand, and from which they derive their name. With this fundamental principle, that *there is none other God but one*, the doctrine of the Trinity, deemed by the generality of our fellow Christians an essential part of the Christian religion, appears to us to be incompatible. It is of the utmost importance to ascertain whether this position be true or false. Indeed, it is alone by its decisive proof, that we can hope to bear conviction that cannot be resisted, to the minds of our Trinitarian brethren; because, while they maintain the doctrine of the Trinity,



they think they believe also that of the divine Unity. If, however, it can be shown, that these two doctrines are absolutely irreconcilable; that no human mind can possibly believe both at the same time, the grounds of the controversy will be considerably narrowed, and some progress will be made towards its complete decision.

It will, therefore, be the chief object of this Discourse, to establish this point: at the same time, however, embracing a somewhat wider view of the subject, I shall endeavour to show,

I. That those who believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, really believe in three Gods.

II. That the clearness of the evidence of the doctrine of the Trinity, ought to be proportioned to its antecedent improbability.

III. That no such evidence in favour of this doctrine, but the reverse of it, is found in the Scriptures; and,

IV. That the evidence which at first sight seems to favour it, either has no relation to it, or is insufficient of itself to establish it.

I. In the first place, I am to endeavour to show, that those who believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, really believe in three Gods.

The precise notion of the Trinity, I suppose to be, *that there are THREE persons in the Godhead, the same in substance, equal in power and glory*: and in order to avoid the confusion which may result from the use of an indefinite term, I wish it to be understood, that this is the exact meaning which in this Discourse I attach to it. This definition is very precise, and I apprehend, every person



who believes the doctrine will allow, there is little reason to hope that a more exact account of it will ever be given.

It is then affirmed, that there are *three* persons in the Godhead, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; that the substance which composes each is the same, and that the power and glory of each are equal. These persons, therefore, must be *distinct* from each other, since they are, taken together, three; and since the attributes of power and glory belong to each, each possessing them in an equal measure.

Let us then endeavour to conceive of a Deity thus constituted. Let us imagine that there is a distinct person, having a distinct name, a distinct substance, and distinct attributes, and that these taken together, constitute God. Let us imagine that there is a second distinct person, having a distinct name, a distinct substance, and distinct attributes, and that these also taken together, constitute God. Let us imagine that there is a third distinct person, having likewise a distinct name, a distinct substance, and distinct attributes, and these again taken together, constitute God. Let us suppose that while each of these persons considered by himself is God, the three taken together are no more than exactly that one God: each considered by himself, is perfect God; the whole taken together, are no more! By any effort of our faculties, can we conceive of this? It is impossible. *We must* suppose that there are *three* Gods, or we can have no ideas upon the subject!

Certain properties are necessary to constitute a man. One combination of these will constitute one man; another combination of the same kind and number of properties will constitute another man, and a third will constitute a third man. In like manner, certain properties are necessary to



constitute Deity. If a being possess all these, he is properly and truly God: if another being, distinct from the first, possess the very same, he also is truly and properly God: if again they are possessed by a third being, he is likewise truly and properly God: in the same manner, as three different persons, each possessing all the properties of a man, must necessarily be *three* men.

Now, the advocates of the Trinitarian doctrine affirm, that the Father is God, being possessed of all the divine attributes; that the Son is God, being possessed of the same perfections; and that the Holy Ghost is God, having every thing in him which is necessary to constitute Deity. Whether, therefore, they are called persons or beings, or by whatever name they are distinguished, they must, in the nature of things, be *three* Gods.

It is true, indeed, these three persons may have some properties in common with each other, and in regard to these common properties, they may, in a certain sense, be said to be one. They may be one, for example, in as much as their properties are of the same nature, or in so far as they devote them to the same purposes; but then this oneness is altogether figurative. These properties, though they have them in common, are not, and cannot be, one and the same.

The converse of this is also true. If these three persons agree in this circumstance, that each is perfect God, but differ in other respects—differ in relation to each other, and to us, still they must be *three* Gods; and to say that they are only *one* God, is as much a contradiction as to affirm, that three men, though they differ from one another as much as is possible, are not three men, but only one man!

Indeed, my brethren, I find myself incapable of conceiving of a more direct contradiction than that



with which this doctrine is chargeable. Our Trinitarian brethren, when pressed with reasoning of this kind, sometimes say, that if they affirmed that one is three, and that three are one *in the same sense*, this charge would be just; and that, therefore, since it is impossible for a contradiction to be true, the controversy would be at an end. This is an important concession, and I beg to direct your attention particularly to it.

It appears to me, that the position here denied, is precisely that which our brethren affirm. It is said that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, are three, and that these three are one. Now, in what sense are they three? They are three in the sense that they are truly and properly God. In what sense are they one? They are one in the sense that they are truly and properly God. Consequently, these three are declared to be one, precisely in that very sense in which they are, at the same time, affirmed to be three, namely, in that of being truly and properly God. \*

To call this doctrine a mystery, therefore, is a prostitution of language; for a mystery is that which is unintelligible, but which may be explained, but this is a direct contradiction, and is, therefore, incapable of proof even by miracles.

---

\* The question here does not in the least relate to the nature of the divine essence. Whatever that essence be, the doctrine of the Trinity declares that it is possessed by three distinct persons! Although, therefore, we know nothing of its nature, we are able with certainty to affirm, that it is a contradiction to say, that there are three persons each possessing this essence, together with all divine attributes, while yet there is only one God. Indeed, the doctrine, that we can prove nothing to be contrary to reason which is above it, is truly marvellous! There is no object in nature, which, in the sense here meant, is not above our reason; there is no object whatever, with the essence of which we are acquainted; according to this principle, therefore, there is not a single object with regard to which we can affirm any thing to be a contradiction!



There is a difficulty of another kind, which seems connected with the doctrine of the Trinity. Almost any of the divine attributes will illustrate the idea I wish to convey. Take, for example, that of infinity. Infinity has been justly described as a negative idea clothed with a positive name. It is a negation of limits. If, then, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, be distinct from each other, and be each God, neither can possess the attribute of infinity; otherwise, there must be three distinct persons in possession of infinity, and, consequently, there must be three infinities,\* which is absurd. For, infinity being without limits, there cannot be two infinities; since, if there were a second, we could assign limits to the first, namely, the point at which the second infinity commences. There cannot, therefore, be three persons in the Godhead each possessing *all* the attributes of Deity, since to suppose three persons in the possession of the attribute of infinity is absurd.

But to return to the more immediate object of this particular. From what has been said, I think it is obvious that we cannot believe that there are three persons in the Godhead, the same in substance, equal in power and glory, without concluding that there are three distinct intelligent beings in the Deity; and that we cannot possibly believe this, and, at the same time, maintain the doctrine of the divine Unity, since it involves a direct contradiction.

Many perhaps will endeavour to evade the force of this reasoning, by declaring that they do not believe that there are three distinct intelligent beings

---

\* The term infinity, is here used in its most general sense, as applied to all the divine attributes. The argument is, that there cannot be two beings, each possessing infinite perfections, as infinite power, infinite goodness, &c.



in the Godhead. Let us then inquire, whether, rejecting this opinion, they can believe the doctrine of the Trinity.

The Father, say they, is to be considered as the fountain of Deity, and the Son and the Holy Ghost are derived from him. We are not to suppose that the Son and the Holy Ghost are created by the Father, they are only derived from him. What, then, is the meaning of derivation as distinct from creation? No one seems to have any ideas upon the subject!

But supposing that these distinctions are intelligible and even just, if the Son be derived from the Father, and the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son, they cannot all be equal. They cannot be equal in point of origin; they cannot be equal in point of rank. That which is derived cannot be equal in point of origin, with that from which it is derived; since that which is underived, must have existed before it could give being to the derived. That which is derived cannot be equal in point of rank, with that from which it is derived; since that which is derived can only be an effect of the underived. If the Son be derived from the Father, however exalted the Father may have made him, he is still nothing but a creature of the Father's will; his very existence is the result of the Father's exertion of his power, and had that power not operated, he would have had no existence. How, then, can he be equal to the Father? or how is it possible to conceive of him as God, in the strict sense of the word? For, how can *he* be properly God whose very existence depends upon the will of another?

Could the Son produce the Father? If this question must be answered in the negative, if the Father could produce the Son, but the Son could *not* produce the Father, the Son is inferior in power to the



Father. How, then, can he be equal to him who is thus confessedly his superior?

But, indeed, the original advocates of the doctrine of the Trinity, do not appear really to have believed that the Son was equal to the Father: for the very name they give the Son, recognises the supremacy of the Father. The Son they designate by the name of God of God: the title they give the Father, is God of himself. Now, he who is God of God, that is, God only as he is derived from God, is certainly inferior to him who is God of himself. It is obvious, then, that this scheme is incompatible with the notion that there are *three* persons in the Godhead, the same in substance, *equal in power and glory*.

Another opinion pretty generally received amongst men of reflection, who still adopt the language of human creeds is, that there is only one intelligent Agent in the Deity: but that he has three different modes of operation, or that he has revealed himself to *us* as sustaining three different characters. With respect to the first of these modes or characters, the Divine Being is called the Father; with respect to the second, the Son; and with respect to the third, the Holy Ghost. This opinion is not capable of being reduced to the contradiction of the first, but it is incompatible with the doctrine of the Trinity. For the doctrine of the Trinity is not that there are three modes of operation in the Godhead, nor that the Godhead sustains three different relations to his creatures; *but that there are three persons in the Godhead, of one substance, and of equal power*.

If the Deity consist of one intelligent Agent alone, and if the only sense in which he is three, be, that he sustains three different relations to his creatures, it seems in the highest degree preposterous to call *this circumstance, this fact*, a Trinity!



Upon this principle, there is scarcely any object whatever, which may not be said to be a Trinity. A human being who fills three different offices, or bears three different relations, is a Trinity, of the very same kind. And a person who is a magistrate, a father, and a son, is no longer one man, but a Trinity, having in himself three persons, the same in substance, equal in power and glory!

The generality of Christians, however, who style themselves orthodox, exclaim vehemently against this opinion, which they seem to regard with almost as much horror as the Unitarian doctrine itself. Yet it is certain that they themselves must adopt it, or that they must believe in three infinite minds, or in nothing!

They say, that in discoursing of the mystery of the Trinity, they do not use the term *person* in what is now the common acceptation of the word. It is difficult, however, to show that this term will admit of any other signification, but the common one. Let any person endeavour to affix another meaning to it, let him try to express that meaning in intelligible and precise language. If he can do so, he will have achieved what no one seems as yet to have effected, and what will place the defender of the Trinity, upon new and more advantageous ground than any which he has hitherto been able to assume.

Though, say our brethren, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, are not three different individuals, there is a distinction between them which may be represented by that of three persons: they will not, I believe, always admit that there are three beings in the Trinity; they steadily adhere to the terms of the common definition. Since, then, it is proper to use the term *person*, and improper to employ that of *being*, each must have a specific meaning, upon which the propriety or impropriety



of its application depends. What is that meaning? Can our brethren point it out in intelligible and precise language? If they will make the effort, and candidly acknowledge the result, they will confess that they cannot: they will perceive that they must come to one or other of these conclusions:—either that they have no ideas whatever upon the subject,—or that there are three infinite minds in the Deity,—or one infinite mind sustaining three different characters,—or one infinite mind, in the simplest and strictest sense of the words, the author and sustainer of every thing else in the universe.

We think, then, it must now be clear, that the doctrine of the Trinity is incompatible with that of the divine Unity, since no ideas whatever can be annexed to the words of its definition, unless we suppose that there are three intelligent beings in the Godhead; since, if each of these beings be God, it is an absolute contradiction to affirm that there is only one God, and since every modification of the doctrine which denies the existence of these beings, is as much an abandonment of it as the simple Unitarian belief.

If, then, these things be really established, (and it is the solemn and indispensable duty of every Christian seriously to think of them, until from the most impartial and complete examination of which he is capable, he has satisfied himself respecting their truth or falsehood,) if these reasonings be indeed conclusive, the controversy is at an end. For if we cannot really believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, without concluding that there are three distinct intelligent agents in the Godhead, that is, without concluding that there are three Gods, no Christian will long maintain the opinion. It is the conviction that we are able, somehow or other, to believe that there is, properly and truly, but one only God, while we, at the same time,



maintain that there are three distinct intelligent persons in this one God, which has caused this doctrine to be so generally received. It seems, then, absolutely necessary to determine this previous question, before it is possible to proceed in the inquiry with that clear and distinct conception of the subject, which is likely to lead to a just conclusion.

II. But in the second place, let us *suppose* that all which has been disproved is true, that the doctrine of the Trinity is perfectly consistent with that of the divine Unity, and that it is one great object of Revelation to disclose it. Since it is in its own nature so extraordinary, the clearness of its evidence, we maintain, ought to be proportioned to its antecedent improbability. Without a divine Revelation it could never have been known. There is no analogy in nature which could give to unaided reason the faintest clue to guide it to the truth. Upon whatever objects he turns his eyes, indications of a God arrest the attention of a contemplative man, but none speak to him of a Trinity. The simplicity of design amidst the wonderful variety of combination that prevails, the steadiness of the laws of nature, and the harmony of the great whole, amidst the millions of opposite and opposing operations which are continually going on, would, if properly considered, necessarily lead him to believe that all is the work of one intelligent Agent. \*

---

\* That the generality of those who never enjoyed the advantage of a divine Revelation, did not actually come to this conclusion, does not disprove that it is natural and obvious. They neglected the exercise of the faculties with which they were endowed, and the improvement of the advantages with which they were favoured. Individuals amongst them, who observed and reflected, *did* believe that there is only one supreme and perfect Being; and if all had been equally contemplative, all would have become equally enlightened.



He could not account for what he saw, without supposing that there is one infinite Being seated at the helm of affairs, who produced and who governs all things; he could not account for the harmony that pervades the whole, if he believed that there are more than one.

But if the doctrine of the Trinity be true, this natural conclusion is false, and the grandest effort of the human understanding establishes a fatal error! A revelation from the God of the universe, disclosing what his nature really is, is given to the world—given, as is supposed, for the express purpose of showing that the most sublime conception which reason can form of him, is imperfect and erroneous!

How, then, would it proceed to fulfil its object? would it speak of this new doctrine obscurely and doubtfully? would it satisfy itself with alluding to it while treating of other topics? would it deem it unnecessary to express it even so much as once in a distinct and unequivocal manner? would it not, on the contrary, begin by declaring that the natural deduction of reason is false, and then disclose, in the most explicit terms, the wondrous truth? If, as many of its advocates affirm, a belief of it be essential to salvation, this clear revelation of it, is indispensable to exonerate the character of God.

III. Let us then, in the third place, examine whether, in the writings of the Old and New Testament, it be really disclosed with this clearness which removes all possibility of doubt.

On examining the Old Testament, we find that the nation of the Jews was distinguished from every other then in existence, by its belief in ONE God. It was chosen by the Majesty of heaven from all the other nations as his peculiar care, and was taken under his immediate government, in order that the knowledge that *he is one*, and that *his*



*name is one*, might never again be obliterated from the human mind. While this doctrine is every where stated in the Scriptures in the most absolute terms, there is not a single exception made to the doctrine of the Trinity; never once is the least hint given of any modification of this great principle; but the object at which they always seem to aim, is to lead the mind to affix to the notion of the Deity, that of the most strict and absolute oneness of which it is possible to conceive.

Moses, the great lawgiver of this peculiar people, perpetually declares this truth in language which cannot be made more explicit. That memorable passage in Deut. vi. 4. *Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is ONE Lord*, is only an example of the manner in which he uniformly speaks on this subject. And can any thing be more decisive than that passage? *The Lord our God is ONE Lord!* When, my brethren, you find such language employed in the Scriptures, and are told that they, nevertheless, teach that this simple notion of the Deity is not just, or at least is imperfect, you naturally conclude that this extract is not a fair quotation: you expect that Moses, in what follows, goes on to explain his meaning, that he proceeds to speak of one God in Trinity, of Trinity in Unity, of one substance in three persons, of glories equal, and of majesties co-eternal! If you read with the utmost attention every page of the Jewish and the Christian Scriptures, you will not only *not* find such language, you will meet with nothing that resembles it.

In addition to such clear and express declarations as that of the great Jewish legislator, the Deity, in these Sacred Books, is represented as speaking of himself as one person; he is uniformly spoken to, he is invariably spoken of as *one*. What else, then, can be necessary to prove that



he is no more? If a being *speaks* of himself as only one, if he be spoken *to*, if he be spoken *of* in the same manner, how is it possible to conceive that he is more, and that he is known to be so by the persons who adopt such language!

When God is represented as speaking of himself, it is in such language as the following: *I am the Lord (Jehovah) thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt*, Exod. xx. 2. And God spake all these words, saying, *I am the Lord (Jehovah) thy God, thou shalt have none other Gods BUT ME*, Deut. v. 6, 7. *I the Lord thy God am a jealous God*, Exod. xx. 5.

When he is spoken to, it is always in the singular person,—*thou, thee, thine, and thyself: thou art the God, thou alone. That all the kingdoms of the earth may know that THOU art the Lord God, EVEN THOU ONLY*, 2 Kings xix. 19. *THOU, EVEN THOU, ART GOD ALONE*, Isa. xxxvii. 16. *Thou alone art most high. Thou art my God, &c.*

The passages also are numberless which speak of God by the pronouns *he, him, himself, and his*. This form of expression occurs so incessantly, that it is wonderful how any one can imagine that the Scriptures inform us of a plurality of persons in the Godhead! \*

---

\* Where do the Scriptures affirm that there are *three persons* in the Godhead? Where is the passage that even seems to disclose this amazing truth? The way, the only way in which it is attempted to be proved, is most inconclusive. A passage or two is adduced in which Jesus Christ is called God; and a text occurs in which the name of the Holy Ghost is joined in the same formulary with that of the Father and the Son; it is therefore *inferred*, that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, are each truly and properly God, and, consequently, that there must be a Trinity! If the principle upon which this reasoning is founded were just, which is not the case, because Moses is called God, and because all to whom the word of God came are dignified with that appellation, John x. 35; but, supposing that the principle of the reasoning were just,



But, as if to place this matter beyond all possibility of doubt, there are added to these affirmative texts, others, which positively deny that God is *more than one person*. *Besides me there is no God*, Isa. xliv. 6. *Is there any God besides me? Yea, there is no God. I know not any*, Isa. xliv. 8. *I, even I, am he, and THERE IS NO GOD WITH ME*, Deut. xxxii. 39. *I am the Lord, and THERE IS NONE ELSE*, Isa. xlv. 5. *I am God, and THERE IS NONE LIKE ME*, Isa. xlv. 9.

Is it possible to conceive of language more exclusive of the notion of any more persons in the Godhead than one? I, even I—none but me—none with me—none beside me—none else. When, then, in the Old Testament, God himself expressly affirms, *I, even I, am God*, and then positively denies that any other person is God besides himself, let any serious man put his hand upon his heart and declare, whether if he conceive himself bound to follow the declarations of the Old Testament, he ought not to believe that God is *one person*, and *no more than one person*, and that *no other person beside is God*.

Such is the language of the Old Testament in reference to this subject: let us now examine that of the New.

When our divine Master was asked, Mark xii. 29. by one of the Scribes, which was the chief commandment of the law, he cites the very words

it would inevitably prove, not that there are *three persons* in the Godhead, but that there are *three Gods*! For is there any thing here said about persons? In the whole Bible is any mention made of these three persons, of whom we are taught to believe the Godhead consists? No—neither this language, nor any thing that resembles it in the least, is to be found from the beginning to the end of the Scriptures! How seriously ought the believer in the doctrine of the Trinity, to consider this important and singular, but I fear, unthought of fact!



of the great Jewish legislator. *Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is ONE Lord.* The Scribe, perfectly satisfied with the answer, replied, *Master, thou hast said the truth: for there is one God, and there is none other but he.* Now, if our Lord knew that this was a false, or at least an imperfect conception of the Deity; if he knew that God was not simply and absolutely one, but in a most important and essential sense three; if he were conscious that he himself was one of these three; if one great object of his mission were to disclose this new and amazing truth, why did he observe such a profound silence upon this occasion? In the whole history of his ministry, no opportunity, of which we are informed, appears so admirably adapted for the accomplishment of an essential object of his mission; yet he suffers it to pass away unimproved, and leaves the mind of the Scribe under an impression which he himself endeavours to confirm, knowing it all the time to be false!

In one of the most interesting moments of his life, in that most solemn prayer which he addressed to his Father in behalf of his disciples, when he was about to be separated from them, he says, *Father, the hour is come, glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee. As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him. And this is life eternal, that they might know THEE THE ONLY TRUE GOD, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent,* John xvii. 3. I beg to direct the attention of every serious person to this passage. It appears to me to be decisive of the whole controversy. I think it is absolutely incapable of being reconciled to the doctrine of the Trinity.

St. Paul says, Rom. iii. 30. *It is ONE GOD who will justify.* We, says he to the Corinthians, *know that THERE IS NONE OTHER GOD BUT ONE,* 1 Cor.



viii. 4. and then comes our text, *To us there is but ONE GOD, the FATHER.* He does not say, to us there is but one God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, three persons in one God! He affirms, that there is but *one* God, and that *that* God is *the Father*. If, then, the Apostle be right, how can the doctrine of the Trinity be true? No one ever supposed that the Father *includes* the Son and the Holy Ghost. Neither the Son nor the Holy Ghost is ever called the Father, nor does any imagination confound them together. If, then, as the Apostle affirms, there is only *one* God, if, as he also declares, *that* God is the Father, and if, as every one confesses, the Son and the Holy Ghost are *not* the Father, but different persons, how can the Son and the Holy Ghost be likewise God? This is another passage which appears to me to be decisive of the controversy, and I apprehend little danger in affirming that it is incapable of perversion: that it cannot be made to speak any language but that of the simple Unitarian doctrine.

Such, then, is the language of the Scriptures upon this subject, and I beseech you to compare it with that which must have been employed, had it been the design of the Sacred Volume, to teach that God is not simply and truly one, but three at the same time that he is one. As I have before observed, there is nothing of which the human understanding can conceive more wonderful, or in itself more incredible, than this doctrine. I ask again, then, Whether, when it was the very object of Revelation to disclose it, it would not do so in the most clear and explicit terms? Does the fact correspond with this natural expectation? Do the Jewish and the Christian Scriptures, employ language which harmonizes with it? On the contrary, do they not invariably speak as though the doctrine of the Trinity had no existence; as though the



natural suggestion of reason were correct; as though God were, in the simplest sense of the expression, *one*, and *one only*?

How is this to be explained? It was one great object of the Assembly's Catechism, and of some of the Articles of the Church of England, to teach this doctrine, in opposition to that of the simple Unity of God. Is it possible to doubt that this doctrine is inculcated in these books? Do they not expressly state, distinctly define it? Do they not exemplify the very thing which I have been endeavouring to show must necessarily accompany the inculcation of every new and extraordinary opinion? Why, then, is not this doctrine as clearly revealed in the Sacred Scriptures? Shall we suppose that the writers of the Old and New Testament, were not as anxious for the welfare of mankind as the Assembly of Divines? Shall we imagine that they would state indistinctly, a doctrine which they knew to be essential to the salvation of the world? Have they done so in other instances? They believed that purity of heart and holiness of life are indispensable to substantiate a claim to the Christian name, and to qualify for a participation of the Christian's happiness. Can any one remain in doubt concerning their opinion upon this subject? Have they not placed it beyond all dispute, by the urgency with which they have inculcated the momentous truth, the frequency with which they have alluded to it, and the abundant and earnest exhortations they have founded upon it? Why, then, is the doctrine of the Trinity so wonderfully distinguished from every other? Why is it the only important doctrine to which no allusion is made, and the only essential doctrine which is never distinctly stated?

IV. But, in the last place, it will be said, that if there are no passages which expressly reveal the



doctrine of the Trinity, there are several which countenance it, at least, and that it behoves those who deny the tenet, to give a satisfactory account of these. It is certainly incumbent upon the Unitarian to show, that these texts are insufficient to establish the doctrine. I therefore solicit the favour of your attention a few moments longer, while I notice two or three of the passages which are supposed chiefly to countenance it.

1. An argument, in favour of this opinion, is sometimes derived from the occasional use of the plural number, when God is introduced as speaking, as in Gen. i. 26. *God said, LET US make man in OUR image.*—xi. 7. *Let US GO DOWN and there confound their language.*

Inadequate, indeed, is this foundation to support so mighty a fabric! Nothing can be more common in all languages than for an individual, when speaking of himself to make use of the plural pronoun *we*. By persons of high rank and dignity it is used as an emphatical and majestic mode of expression. It is the language of sovereigns.\* While in a solitary instance or two it is employed in the Scriptures by the Eternal Sovereign, the examples are numberless in which he speaks of himself by the singular pronouns *I* and *me*. Now, it is common in all languages for a single individual to call himself *we*; but in no language that was ever known, is it usual for a number of persons to call themselves *I* and *me*! There never was an instance of the kind.

---

\* It is well known that it was one great object of the Koran to establish the doctrine that God is *one person only*, in opposition to the notion that there are *three persons* in the Godhead. Yet, wherever Mahomet introduces the Supreme Being as speaking, it is always by the pronoun *we*. A more decisive proof that this term does not denote a plurality of persons, but is merely expressive of majesty and authority, cannot be conceived.



2. The Hebrew word ALEIM, which is commonly translated God, and which, in the original, has a plural form, is sometimes urged as a decisive argument in favour of the doctrine of the Trinity. But how can it relate to this opinion? Allowing that the term ought always to be translated by the plural number, it must then be rendered *Gods*. But how does this convey any information respecting the doctrine of the Trinity? The doctrine of the Trinity is, that there are *three* persons in the Godhead; but the term *Gods* does not teach us that there are three. There may be thirty—there may be thirty thousand! The utmost, therefore, that can be said respecting this word, supposing it were necessary always to render it by the plural number, is, that it would harmonise with the doctrine, were it fully established by other arguments. No one surely will affirm, that it is of itself sufficient to establish it.

But the fact is, that the word is constantly applied to objects which every one must acknowledge to be singular. In *Exod. vii. 1.* it is applied to Moses, in whose nature no one supposes there was a plurality of persons. *And the Lord said unto Moses, See, I have made thee a God (ALEIM, Gods) to Pharaoh.*

The same word is used to denote one angel. *Judges xiii. 21, 22. But the Angel of the LORD did no more appear to Manoah and his wife. Then Manoah knew that he was an Angel of the LORD. And Manoah said unto his wife, we shall surely die because we have seen ALEIM.* They did not see three angels, or three angels in one; but one only!

Moses himself applies the word to the golden calf. *Exod. xxxii. 31. And Moses returned unto the LORD, and said, Oh! this people have sinned a great sin, and have made them an ALEIM of gold. They did not make to themselves three golden calves, or three golden calves in one!*

From these passages, then, it is evident, that



this word, though it has a plural form, is used to denote one person, or one object only. But what is decisive of the truth is, that wherever it is applied to the Supreme Being, it is connected with a singular verb. I think, then, we must acknowledge, that hitherto we have come to no passage upon which the doctrine of the Trinity can be founded.

3. Another text which is frequently adduced to prove the doctrine of the Trinity, is Mat. xxviii. 19. *Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* Most of our brethren consider this text the chief proof of the doctrine, and many deem it triumphantly decisive. If this be true, it must arise either from the names of the Son and of the Holy Ghost being introduced into the rite of baptism, or from their being connected in the same formulary with the name of the Father. All the force which the passage has, must depend upon the truth of one or other, or both, of these circumstances.\*

That baptism into the name of a person does not prove his divinity, is evident from 1 Cor. x. 1. where the Apostle says, *Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized into Moses in the cloud, and in the sea.* Now, if baptism into the name of a person prove his divinity, it inevitably follows, from this passage, that Moses is truly and properly God!

If the mere junction of the name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost with that of the Father, can prove that the Son and Holy Ghost are equal to the Father, the strangest consequences will follow. It is said, 1 Chron. xxix. 20. *And all the congregation bowed down their heads, and worshipped the LORD*

---

\* See Dr. Carpenter's admirable Work, entitled, "Unitarianism the Doctrine of the Gospel."



*and the king.* If this principle be just, because the LORD and the king are associated in the same sentence, the LORD and the king must be equal! In 1 Tim. v. 21. it is said, *I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels, that thou observe these things.* Had the term *Holy Ghost* been used instead of that of elect angels, what a triumphant proof would this have been deemed that there are three persons in the Deity, and that all the three are equal! But every person perceives that the mere circumstance of the elect angels being coupled together in the same sentence with the name of Jesus Christ, can be no proof of their equality with him; and how, then, can the mere junction of the name of the Son and Holy Ghost, with that of the Father, prove that they are equal to him?

4. Upon the celebrated text in 1 John v. 7. *For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one,* I shall offer no comment, since the evidence of its spuriousness is irresistible, and since every person, whose knowledge qualifies him to engage in the controversy, now passes it by in silence.\*

Such, then, are all the texts which appear to favour the doctrine of the Trinity. Other passages, indeed, are brought forward to prove separately the Deity of Jesus Christ and of the Holy Spirit; but these are all upon which its judicious advocates insist as relating to the Trinity. These alone contain *all* the positive and direct evidence in favour of it, which is to be adduced; these alone are deemed sufficient to outweigh the testimony of *all*

---

\* The evidence of its spuriousness, as well as the feeble arguments by which its genuineness is attempted to be supported, are fully stated in Belsham's *Calm Inquiry into the Scripture Doctrine concerning the Person of Christ*, p. 236, &c.—a work which must not only be read, but studied by every person who wishes thoroughly to understand the interesting subject of which it treats.



the passages which have been quoted to prove the absolute Unity of God, and to obviate *all* the objections which press upon the doctrine! Surely, my brethren, when we impartially consider these things, we shall be obliged to acknowledge, that it cannot be true, or it would be established upon a more solid foundation.

And why, after all, should we be so reluctant to admit the consequence? In viewing the Supreme Being in the simple and intelligible light in which he is represented in the Scriptures, there are many important advantages. The mind is not distracted by a multiplicity of objects, to which it is taught to cherish *equal*, though *different* regards. It traces at once to their source all the blessings it enjoys. It fixes at once upon the object of its worship and its love. Bowing before the Eternal Majesty, it is disturbed by no doubt to whom to address its supplications,—to whom to offer the homage of its thanks.

Even the conviction that God is the merciful Parent of his creatures, is closely connected with the persuasion of his strict and proper Unity. It is his *division* into substances and parts, that has led to the belief that he is partial in his affections and limited in his goodness! So long as we connect with his image the notion of absolute oneness, we shall necessarily consider all his perfections as infinite; but the moment his nature is divided, the conviction of the infinitude of his attributes, exists no more!

How melancholy have been the consequences of losing sight of this important truth! Into what absurdities have mankind been hurried, through a forgetfulness of it! One part of the Deity has been represented as implacable and revengeful; and another, as benignant and merciful, taking upon itself a different nature, and enduring the most dreadful sufferings in order to make satisfaction to that portion which is clothed with vindictive wrath,



and the favourite emblem of which is, *a consuming fire!* To a few favoured individuals, he has been described as good; but to the great majority, a dreadful and omnipotent foe, dooming them from all eternity, by an irreversible decree, to intolerable and unending torments!!

Horrible thought! Turn your eyes, my brethren, from contemplating your benignant and holy Father through the distorting and disgusting medium of human confessions and creeds. Fix your attention upon his character, as depicted in the great volume of nature, and as still more clearly and beautifully delineated in the Sacred Scriptures. There, how amiable, how lovely does he appear! The kind, the merciful, the just, the Father of all his creatures; the wise and mighty God, who is seated at the helm of affairs, and regulating all that happens, so as to cause every thing to terminate in the production of the greatest good to all his intelligent creation! How delightful to feel ourselves in the hands of so benignant a Being! How consoling to know, that the very essence of his nature is LOVE, and that he is equally love to all! How is every grateful and good affection of our nature cherished by this persuasion! With what a confiding mind does it enable us to assemble around his throne, to raise our thoughts to his most perfect Majesty, to express unto him our thanks, and to lay before him our wants! How little do *they* know of religion, who represent it as foolish and visionary in its nature! How little have *they* felt of its influence, who describe it as gloomy and repulsive in its effects! Can there be a more exalted pleasure, than that which the mind experiences when in moments of reflective solitude, in those moments when it becomes tranquil, and disposed to appreciate the real value of objects, it dwells upon the thought, that there is seated upon the throne of the universe, a Being whose eye



never slumbers nor sleeps, and who is perfect in power, wisdom, and goodness? How little can the storms of life assail *his* soul, who rests his happiness upon this Rock of ages! How little can death itself appal *his* mind who feels that he is conducted to the tomb, by the hand of the Sovereign of the universe!—Yes, my brethren, there is a reality in religion, and if that happiness which is so often sought, and so often sought in vain,—that happiness which is worthy of a rational being, and which at once satisfies and exalts him, be ever tasted upon earth, it is by him who thus, in the solitude of his heart, delights to contemplate the idea of a Presiding Bignity, the extent of whose dominion is without limits, and the duration of whose kingdom is without end. It is a felicity which our Father sometimes sends down to the heart that is worthy of it, to give it a foretaste of its eternal portion. Unhappy *he* whose sensibilities have been so destroyed by the constant pursuit of speculative opinions, as to have lost all capacity for this pure and exalted pleasure! Unhappy *he* whose views of our common Parent are so gloomy and appalling, as to make these moments the most disturbing of his life!—May we, my beloved brethren, exercising the faculties with which we are endowed, and worthily improving the Revelation which has been given us, at all times entertain such sentiments of our heavenly Father, as will purify and elevate our minds, inspire them with sober but fervent devotion, console them under all the calamities of life, and lead them to anticipate with ardent hope, and to prepare with unwearied diligence, for the happiness of heaven. Thus may we be enlightened, pious, and happy here, and hereafter be blessed with *a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory.*—*Happy are the people who are in such a case.*—*Happy are the people whose God is the LORD!*



*Minutes of the Second Annual Association, &c.*

~~~~~

ON Sunday, May 1st, was held in Glasgow, the Second Annual General Association of the Unitarians of Scotland. Mr. Smith preached in the morning, on the universality of the love of God, from Acts x. 34. "God is no respecter of persons." Mr. Yates, in the afternoon, on the inferences deducible from the justice of God, Deut. xxxii. 4. "Just and right is he." And in the evening, the Annual Sermon was delivered.

A number of brethren were present, from Edinburgh, Paisley, Carluke, Hamilton, Dalry, Port-Glasgow, &c.

In the morning of the following day, the members of the Association met to transact the business of the Society. After singing and prayer, the Annual Report was read, which contained a brief account of the origin of the Institution,—of the transactions of the last Association,—of the letters received during the last year from the different societies and corresponding members,—and of the objects which appeared to the Committee to claim the chief attention of the Association.

The number of corresponding members are twenty-two. Several of them, in their letters, observe, that the prejudice against the principles of Unitarianism, in their respective neighbourhoods, is very great, and that the friends to the cause must act with exemplary prudence, and prove by their conduct that they are sincere and pious Christians, before serious persons, in general, will pay any attention to their arguments, however forcible in themselves, or however forcibly stated. The accounts, however, in general, are encouraging. It is evident that the terror with which the very name of Unitarianism was wont to fill many well-disposed minds, is considerably diminished, and that the pious anathemas so liberally applied to principles which tend alike to honour the Supreme Being, to exalt our blessed Redeemer, and to cherish every personal and social virtue, have lost much of their power to affright. Unitarians found all their religious tenets upon the Scriptures; their moral and religious conduct will bear a comparison with that of any other body of Christians: it is not, therefore, in the nature of things, possible for impressions which were produced, and which are kept up only by ignorance or calumny, to last for ever. The evidence they adduce in favour of their opinions, *will* attract attention; and every inquiry, though it may not increase the number of their advocates, will diminish that of their detractors.

One of the objects that engaged the particular attention of the Association, was that of settling a minister at Carluke, where there are many friends to the Unitarian cause; and it is hoped that it will be possible to station a minister there in the course of the present year.



Another subject, to which its attention was directed, was that of increasing its funds, by a means at once easy and productive, *viz.* that of instituting penny a-week subscriptions. It was calculated, that if the friends who already support the Society, would enter generally into this plan, its funds, for the ensuing year, would be augmented at least fourfold. We see what other societies accomplish by this means; and, without doubt, it is a mode of raising a considerable and efficient sum, in a manner so easy, that the poorest person, who wishes well to the cause, may contribute to its support without inconvenience. "We, therefore, earnestly exhort all our friends," say the Committee in their Report, "to avail themselves of this excellent mode of contributing to the promotion of objects which they believe to be so important: and if any are so situated that they can find but a single individual to join them, we would request them, nevertheless, immediately to begin such an institution, and to transmit the amount annually to the Secretary."

The letters from the correspondents, mention the receipt of books which have been sent, during the last year, from the Association, and the Glasgow Fund. In many places, they have been a good deal read, it is said, with advantage.

A unanimous vote of thanks was given to the late Committee, and to the Secretary, for their able and zealous services.

It was resolved, that the Committee for the ensuing year, shall be the same as that of the Glasgow Fund.

It was unanimously requested, that the Evening Sermon be printed.

After the business was concluded, the friends dined together. Seventy-two gentlemen sat down to dinner.

It was resolved, that the next Association shall be held in Edinburgh, in the beginning of May, 1815.

---

### *List of Unitarian Publications.*

---

By WILLIAM PENN.

The Sandy Foundation shaken: or those so generally believed and applauded doctrines of one God subsisting in three distinct and separate persons, of the impossibility of God's pardoning sinners without a plenary satisfaction, &c. refuted from the authority of Scripture testimonies and right reason.—1s.

By THOMAS EMLYN.

A Collection of Tracts, relating to the Deity, Worship, and Satisfaction of the Lord Jesus Christ.

By DANIEL WHITBY, D. D.

Last Thoughts concerning the Trinity.

By ISAAC WATTS, D. D.

A solemn Address to the Deity.



By JOHN TAYLOR, D. D.

The Scripture Doctrine of Original Sin proposed to free and candid Examination.

The Scripture Doctrine of Atonement examined.

A Key to the Apostolic Writings, or an Essay to explain the Gospel Scheme, and the principal words and phrases the Apostles have used in describing it.—(Prefixed to Taylor on the Romans.)

By NATHANIEL LARDNER, D. D.

A Letter on the Logos, with two Postscripts concerning the Divinity of the Holy Spirit.—1s.

By JOSEPH PRIESTLEY, LL. D. F. R. S. &c. &c.

An Appeal to the Professors of Christianity, on the use of Reason in matters of Religion, the Power of Man to do the Will of God, the Divinity of Christ, &c.—6d.

The Trial of Mr. Elwall for Heresy.—1d.

A familiar Illustration of certain Passages of Scripture.—4d.

History of the Corruptions of Christianity, 2 vol. 8vo.

A History of Early Opinions concerning Christ, proving that the Church was at first Unitarian, 4 vol. 8vo.

By RICHARD PRICE, D. D. F. R. S. &c. &c.

Sermons on Christian Doctrine.

By GILBERT WAKEFIELD, B. A.

An Inquiry into the Opinions of Christian Writers of the three first centuries, concerning the Person of Christ.

By THEOPHILUS LINDSEY, M. A.

An Apology for resigning the Vicarage of Catterick; and the Sequel to the Apology.

A second Address to the Students of Oxford and Cambridge, relating to Jesus Christ, and the Origin of the great Errors concerning him.

Conversations on Christian Idolatry.—2s.

Conversations on the Divine Government, showing that every thing is from God, and for good to all.—1s. 6d.

By THOMAS BELSHAM.

A Calm Inquiry into the Scripture Doctrine concerning the Person of Christ.—14s.

A Review of Mr. Wilberforce's Treatise.

By JOSHUA TOULMIN, D. D.

A Review of the Preaching of the Apostles; or the Practical Efficacy of the Unitarian Doctrine, proved and illustrated from the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of Paul to Timothy and Titus.—1s.

A Sermon on the Scripture Term Mystery.

By LANT CARPENTER, LL. D.

Errors respecting Unitarianism considered.—1s. 6d.

The Importance of the Doctrine of the proper Unity of God.



Discourses on the Genuineness, Integrity, and Public Version of the New Testament.—1s. 6d.

Unitarianism the Doctrine of the Gospel: a view of the scriptural grounds of Unitarianism, with an examination of all the expressions in the New Testament, which are generally considered as supporting opposite doctrines.—6s.

Proof from Scripture, that God, even the Father, is the only true God.—2s.

By T. COGAN, M. D.

Letters on Hereditary Depravity, addressed to Mr. Wilberforce.

By WILLIAM FRENCH, M. A.

An Address to Trinitarians, exhorting them to turn from the false worship of three persons, to the worship of the one true God.—2d.

By RICHARD WRIGHT.

An Essay on the Unity and Supremacy of the one God and Father, and the inferiority of his Son, Jesus Christ.—6d.

An Essay on the Humanity of Christ.—6d.

Letters on Election.—1s.

The Free Grace of God defended.—4s.

Fifteen Discourses on Evangelical Subjects.—6s.

An Essay on the two Natures of Christ.—4d.

The New Testament, in an improved version.—8vo. 16s.—12mo. 8s.—without the preface and notes, 4s.

CHRISTIE'S Discourses on the Divine Unity.—4s.

ASPLAND'S Vindication of Unitarian Worship.—1s. 6d.

GRUNDY'S Christianity an Intellectual and Individual Religion; a Discourse at the opening of the Chapel in Liverpool, for the worship of the One undivided God.

LYONS' Sermon on the Right and Duty of a faithful and fearless Examination of the Scriptures.—1s. 6d.

MARSOM'S Impersonality of the Holy Ghost.

EATON'S Scripture the only Guide to Religious Truth.—2s.

YATES' Grounds of Unitarian Dissent.—1s.

✂ Any of the above Books may be obtained of David Eaton,  
187, High Holborn, London.

James Hedderwick, Printer, Glasgow.

