



SPECIAL  
COLLECTIONS  
DOUGLAS  
LIBRARY



QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY  
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA





A N  
A P O L O G Y

F O R  
C E R T A I N G E N T L E M E N

I N T H E  
U N I V E R S I T Y O F O X F O R D,

Asperfed in a late

A N O N Y M O U S P A M P H L E T.

W I T H

A short Postfcript concerning another Pamphlet  
lately published by the Rev. Mr. *Heatbcote*.

---

By GEORGE HORNE, M. A.  
Fellow of *Magdalen College in Oxford*.

---

*Thou fhalt not bear falfe witnefs againft thy neighbour.*  
Exod. XX. 16.

---

---

O X F O R D,

Printed at the THEATRE for S. PARKER; and Sold by  
J. RIVINGTON in *St. Paul's Church-Yard*, and E. WITHERS  
at the *Seven-Stars in Fleet Street, London*. MDCCLVI

ms. A. 1. 56. 1167

## *Advertisement.*

**T**HE pamphlet mentioned in the title is called *A Word to the Hutchinsonians*. It may be questioned by many, whether that pamphlet, either for the *matter* it contains, or the *manner* in which it is written, deserves so much notice, as is here taken of it. But the author thought it afforded an opportunity of setting the world right in several points relating to the persons concerned, and stating their real sentiments; which perhaps may make this Apology of some use, when the pamphlet that occasioned it is at rest.





---



---

A N

# A P O L O G Y, &c.

**I**T is observed of Mr. *Hooker*, by the author of his life, that one of the sharpest things that ever fell from his pen in controversy was the following reproof of his adversary — “Your next argument (says he to him) consists of *railing*, and *reasons*. To your *railing* I say *nothing*, to your *reasons* I say what follows.” This Sentence I am obliged to adopt as a rule of my conduct upon the present occasion; the author I am now concerned with having mixed with his arguments a great deal of bitterness and abuse, which must do as little credit to himself, as they can do service to his cause. He gives us to understand, p. 37. that he is in full expectation of being heartily abused in return; tho’ how this would in any sort justify him, it may not be so easy to determine. But I have no *occasion* for that kind of artillery, and have besides learned a lesson, which he seems as yet a stranger to, that *the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God*. Therefore in the words of the excellent *Hooker* — “To his *railing* I say *nothing*, to his *reasons* I say what follows.”

But first I must beg leave to take notice of the name *Hutchinsonian*, an appellation frequently bestowed upon me by this author, who, p. 15. supposes “Mr. *Wetherell* would “*take it ill*, if he was not *complimented* as one “of Mr. *Hutchinson’s disciples*.” What reason he had for supposing so, I cannot tell, since neither Mr. *Wetherell*, or myself, or any of our acquaintance desire to be *complimented* as the *disciples* of any man. Not that we are *nullius addicti jurare in verba magistri*, for *one is our master, even Christ*. We are members of THE CHURCH, which from the first has always gloried in the name of *Christian*, as expressing her unity with Christ, and in that of *catholic*, as distinguishing her from all classes and clans of heretics. That we have read Mr. *Hutchinson’s* books is certain; and if his adversaries had done the same, many of their objections had never been made. That we think ourselves obliged to him for some excellent interpretations of scripture, is likewise certain. If the gentleman will confute any of them, we will give them up. If he will confute the whole, the whole shall be given up. But is it not hard measure, that when a clergyman only preaches the doctrines, and enforces the duties of Christianity from the Scriptures, his character shall be blasted, and himself rendered odious, by the force of a *name*, which, in such cases, always signifies what the imposers please to mean, and the people to hate. There are many names of this kind now in vogue. If a man preaches Christ, that he is *the end of the law*

law, and the fulness of the Gospel — “ You need “ not mind him, he is a *Hutchinsonian*.” If he mentions the assistance and direction of the *Holy Spirit*, with the necessity of *prayer*, *mortification*, and *taking up the cross* — “ O, he is a *Methodist?*” If he talks of the *divine right* of *Episcopacy*, and the *power of the Keys*, with a word concerning the danger of *schism* — “ Just going “ over to *Popery!*” And if he teaches *passive obedience* to King *George* — “ you may depend “ upon it, he is a *Pretender’s man*.” The truth of the matter is, many things may be ridiculed under false titles, which it would not be quite so decent to laugh at under their true ones; as an affront may be safely put upon a person in masquerade, which would produce a duel, if offered to him *in propria personâ*. But thro’ evil report and good report lies the road of a Christian. For a *deceiver* he must be content to pass, ’till a *resurrection* to immortality shall demonstrate him to be none, and *wisdom be justified of all her children*.

As to our being a *sect*, or schismatical combination of separatists from other Church of *England* Christians, we do most sincerely disavow the name and the thing; being fully persuaded of the necessity of being in the *unity* of the *church*, to obtain salvation. In the communion of the church of *England* therefore we intend to die. To every zealous friend and promoter of the interest of *Christ*, the *Scriptures*, and the *Church*, we are ready cheerfully and joyfully to give the right hand of fellowship, whether he reads *Mr. Hutchinson*, or not; tho’ we cannot

but esteem it our duty humbly and meekly to recommend to others, what has been of service to us, in our searches after divine knowlege. If we are found fault with, for not mixing so much with the *world*, as some chuse to do, and not spending our time as the *world* does, we can only say, that it is written — *Be not conformed to this world*; that life is short, and time precious; and that the hours we kill here, will rise with us from the dead, and attend us, as our accusers, to the judgment seat. — But there is an end to be served likewise by representing us as a *sect*, for then the imprudences of some (and where among the sons of men shall we find an exemption from imprudences?) are charged upon the *party*. As therefore we disclaim the notion of any *sect*, but that of the *Nazarenes*, and detest the idea of any *party*, but the church of *England*, I beg leave to protest against that method of proceeding, and to desire that every man may bear his own burden; since if one who has read *Hutchinson* should think proper to talk nonsense at the *Land's end*, or *Berwick upon Tweed*, I see no reason why it should be any thing to me, because I have read *Hutchinson*, when I do not talk that nonsense at *Oxford*. Nor can it surely be agreeable to the rules of *candour* and *benevolence*, that because a whimsical interpretation is given by one writer, therefore a sound interpretation should not be taken from another. By his own words let every man be justified, and by his own words let him be condemned.

The author says, p. 6. “our behaviour is become matter of general *complaint*.” — From whence comes the *complaint*? Not from our superiors in this place; for the gentleman who so worthily fills the chair at present, thought proper to put one of us into the University pulpit; who, tho’ this author and his friends “came in “full expectation of the *marvellous*,” p. 16. out did every thing they could have dreamed of, by having the assurance to preach the doctrine of the *homilies*, on the 30th of *January*. And what makes this beyond any thing we meet with in history, is, that he did it, when he was *probably only in deacon’s orders*! — But who then are these *complainants*? Why *some of the warmest friends of the University*, p. 6. who, it seems, are out of countenance at such monstrous things as these, and are prevented from *standing forth effectually in it’s vindication*. Whether this writer thought it would be a disgrace to him to appear in our company, I do not know: Otherwise, it had been but acting the part of an ingenuous adversary, to have favoured the world with his *name* in his title page, together with those of his adversaries, especially as at p. 40. he talks something about a *protest* that he has entered, and an *anonymous protest* is what one seldom hears of. Had he given us his name, we might have known who these *effectual vindicators of the University* are. As matters now stand, we may suppose them to be persons of many extraordinary endowments; but from the fear they express of being out of countenance for the University, we must

must conclude, that what they are particularly famous for, is their *modesty*.—But after all, with regard to the *complaint* talked of—Sure I am, that if our superiors in the University, and in our respective colleges, have any thing to alledge against our conduct, whereby we hurt the cause of *Christianity*, the church of *England*, the *University*, or the *society* each belongs to, and will be pleased to signify it to us, they shall see we can practice the doctrine we preach, of *obedience* to all that are in authority over us.

I shall next reply to some *general* charges the author has brought against us.

I. The first is, that we set up for the only Christian preachers in the nation. “They tell “men (says he, p. 6.) that they, and they *only*, “are *the servants of the most High God, who shew “forth the way of salvation.*” *The way of salvation* is but one, viz. Faith in Christ, bringing forth the fruits thereof; and none, but those who preach *that*, are *the servants of the most High God, that shew forth the way of salvation.* That none do preach it but the readers of Mr. *Hutchinson*, I never said, or thought, though I wish their number was much greater than it is. If the gentleman can produce any one that he thinks has said so, let him defend himself.

II. Ibid. “They labour to discredit all other “preachers of the Gospel,” &c. By no means. *They labour to discredit all* erroneous tenets, preached by many who SHOULD preach the *Gospel.*

*Gospel.* It is the complaint of hundreds of serious and pious Christians, who have never read or heard of Mr. *Hutchinson*, that there is at present not only a lamentable relaxation of *discipline* in the church, but (what is indeed the consequence of it) as lamentable a falling off from the OLD way of *preaching* and *expounding* the *word of God*. Let any one read the sermons of the primitive fathers, and our divines that lived in the times succeeding the reformation, who preached from the fathers, as the fathers did from the Scriptures, and compare their discourses with those of this last century, and they must pronounce one or other of them to be many removes from Christianity. If offence should be taken at this, I can only say, that if any one will tell me, how truth may be spoken, in such cases as these, without offending *some*, I will spare no labour to learn the art of it. — But it will be said perhaps, these fathers and divines are now of no authority. Perhaps so. — Let it be my lot to tread in their steps on earth, and sit at their feet in heaven. I ask no more, in this world, or that which is to come — What I have to observe farther at present is, that if there be really such a defection from the primitive manner of preaching, the properest place wherein to speak of it is an University, where preachers are educated.

III. “They dare to deny the very *existence* of “*moral duties*, in order to *exalt Christian virtues*” — p. 7. *Moral Duties* are what the Scripture

ture

ture calls *works*. If these are done *in Christ*, they are *Christian virtues*; and then, here is a *distinction* without a *difference*. If they are done *out of Christ*, upon any other than *Christian motives*, they are *nothing* to any *saving purpose*. And if they are done *against Christ*, as *meritorious to salvation*, they are much *worse* than *nothing*. But to state our sentiments more at large, upon this important point of doctrine. We preach the *fall* of man into a state of *sin* and *corruption*, in which state we say, with the 10th article of our church, that he “has no power to do *good works*, pleasant and acceptable to God, without the *grace* of God by *Christ preventing* him, that he may have a *good will*, and *working with him*, when he has that good will: and, art. 13. that as to *works done before the grace of Christ*, for that they are not done *as God has willed and commanded them to be done*, we doubt not but they have the nature of *sin*.” We preach *justification* by the *blood of Christ*, *sanctification* by his *Spirit*, and the *fruits* of that Spirit the *evidences* of *both*. How we can be said to *deny the existence of moral duties*, because we preach *faith*, the *root* from whence they spring, I know not; unless he that plants a *vine*, does, by that action, *deny the existence of grapes*. One thing indeed we do affirm, because we can prove it from Scripture, that whoever preaches and enforces *moral duties*, without *justification* and *sanctification preceding*, may as well declaim upon the advantages of *walking*, to a man that can neither *stir hand* or *foot*: Such is the natural  
*impo-*



*impotence* of the soul to do any *good* thing, till it is *justified* and *sanctified*. Let the declamation be ever so *elegant*, St. Peter's *plain* address, I suppose, would be worth ten thousand of them, to a *cripple* — *In the name of Jesus of Nazareth, RISE UP, AND WALK.* Such is the difference between an *ethical divine*, and a *Christian preacher*. Indeed it is a rule with some, to suppose the people already *sufficiently instructed* in *Christianity*; but why is it not much more probable, that they should be already *sufficiently instructed* in *morality*, than in *Christianity*, if all their ministers preach upon the former, and none upon the latter; which must be the case, if all act upon the same supposition, of their people being already adepts in the Gospel. The *moral*, or *practical* part of the *apostolical* sermons, and epistles, is generally the *last*, and *shortest*, and comes after they have *enlightened* the *understanding* with the *knowledge* of Christ, and *warmed* the *heart* with some great *doctrine* of salvation; as they knew, that one stroke when the iron was *hot*, did more execution than twenty when it was *cold*<sup>a</sup>.

In short, since, as our church expresses it, in her 10th article — “The condition of man, after the fall of *Adam*, is such, that he cannot *turn* and *prepare himself*, by *his own natural strength* and *good works*, to *faith*, and *calling upon God* ;” and since, as she says in the 11th article — “We are *accounted righteous before God*

<sup>a</sup> See 1 Cor. 15. where after 57 verses upon a *doctrine*, the apostle closes with *one only*, by way of *practical* inference.

“ ONLY for the merit of our Lord and Saviour  
 “ Jesus Christ, by faith, and not for our own  
 “ works, or deservings,” it is certain, that who-  
 ever preaches *works*, or *moral duties*, disjoined  
 from *faith in Christ*, with it's motives, and prin-  
 ciples of action, preaches a doctrine contrary to  
 the whole tenor of the bible, and as far from  
 Christianity, as the east is from the west. To  
 what purpose then serve *good works* which are  
 the fruits of faith, and follow after justification?  
 The 12th article will tell us — “ They (even  
 “ they) cannot put away our sins, or endure the  
 “ severity of God's judgment. Yet are they plea-  
 “ sing and acceptable to God IN CHRIST, and  
 “ do spring out necessarily of a true and lively  
 “ faith, insomuch that by them a lively faith may  
 “ be as evidently known, as a tree is discerned by  
 “ it's fruits.” The fruit receives it's goodness from  
 the tree, not the tree from the fruit, which does  
 not make the tree good, but shews it to be so,  
 because men do not gather grapes of thorns. So  
 works receive all their goodness from faith, not  
 faith from works, which do not themselves jus-  
 tify, but shew a prior justification of the soul that  
 produces them; as it is written — *We know that*  
*we HAVE PASSED — μεταβέβηκαμεν — from death*  
*unto life, because we love the brethren.* 1 John  
 3. 14. The question therefore will be, who is  
 the best husbandman, he who diligently plants  
 the vine, and waters it, or he who spends his  
 time in writing essays upon the nature and pro-  
 perties of grapes in general, and wild grapes in  
 particular; till the vineyard of the man void of un-  
 derstanding

*derstanding is all grown over with thorns, from which, as we observed above, men do not gather grapes.* If the author had a vineyard to let, his choice of a tenant would soon be determined, tho' the latter of the two candidates wrote a *style* like an angel.

But he is pleased to say, p. 7. "*Morality is not within our system.*" Of the truth of this assertion let the whole University be witnesses, and he himself shall be judge. For he says, p. 40. "Were the principles of us all as rational and salutary, as *he is convinced the lives of some of us are serious and exemplary*, he would most heartily join with those who should say, *We wish you good luck in the name of the Lord*; and, *for his brethren and companions sakes, yea because of the house of the Lord our God*, he would wish our *cause*, as well as ourselves, prosperity." But he should not have marked out the word *some*—"the lives of *some* of us are serious"—because that necessarily flurs the characters of *some others*, and leaves the world to imagine, we have *some* immoral persons among us; when he knows, it would puzzle him to shew, we have *one* such, in the whole number of those, whom he calls *Hutchinsonians*. And if the *fruits* are good, they will plead, I hope, for a little more consideration, before the *tree* that bears them be cut down, and cast into the fire. A sentence, he seems to have passed upon us, in his own mind, and calls aloud upon our Reverend governors, to be his executioners of it—and the sooner, the better. Which lets me into another parti-

cular concerning him, viz. that he is a man of *moderation*.

IV. We are still in the same page. “ Under  
 “ pretence (he says) of *glorifying Revelation*, we  
 “ *insult and trample upon reason*, which also is the  
 “ *gift of God.*” That *reason is the gift of God*,  
 no one denies. But if he would talk like a mas-  
 ter of his subject, he should shew the *use* and  
*extent* of reason, and what are the *subjects*, that  
 properly fall under her *cognizance*. The ABUSE,  
 not the USE of reason, is what we argue against.  
 Reason, we say, was made to *learn*, not to *teach*;  
 and therefore, to set her up for a *teacher*, when  
 she was never designed for that office, is cer-  
 tainly wrong. What the *eye* is to the *body*, *rea-  
 son*, or *understanding*, is to the *soul*, as says the  
 apostle, *Ephes. I. 18. Having the eyes of your un-  
 derstanding — τῆς ἀνοίας — the faculty of dis-  
 cernment — enlightened.* The *eye* then is framed  
 in such a manner as to be *capable of seeing*, rea-  
 son in such a manner as to be *capable of know-  
 ing*. But the *eye*, tho’ ever so *good*, cannot see  
 without *light*; *reason*, tho’ ever so *perfect*, can-  
 not *know* without *instruction*. The *eye* indeed is  
 that which *sees*, but the *light* is the *cause* of it’s  
*seeing*; *reason* is that which *knows*, but *instruc-  
 tion* is the *cause* of it’s *knowing*. And it would  
 be as absurd to make the *eye give itself light*, be-  
 cause it *sees by the light*, as to make *reason in-  
 struct itself*, because it *knows by instruction*. The  
 phrase therefore, *light of reason*, seems to be an  
 improper one, since *reason* is not the *light*, but

an *organ* for the *light of instruction* to act upon; and man may as well take a view of *things upon earth*, in a *dark night*, by the *light of his own eye*, as pretend to discover *the things of heaven*, in the *night of nature*, by the *light of his own reason*. Nor do we any more *derogate* from the *perfection of reason*, when we affirm it cannot know without *instruction*, than we *derogate* from the *perfection of the eye*, when we deny it has a power of *seeing in the dark*. Christ only, who is *the sun of righteousness*, has in him the perfection of *light*, even all the treasures of *wisdom and knowledge*. The *perfection of reason* is, to be able to receive of his fulness, to receive the INSTRUCTION of wisdom, *Prov. 1. 3*. Without *instruction* it is impossible for her to do any thing, because *reasoning*, or *induction of inferences*, necessarily presupposes her to be furnished with proper *data*, to go upon. And these *data*, in *spiritual things*, are only to be had from *the word of God*, for — *The commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes — Ps. 19. 8. The entrance of thy words giveth light, it giveth understanding to the simple — 119, 130*. The things which are above cannot be manifested to us, but by the *light* which is above, where those things are, and cometh down from the *father of lights*, by the word of his Revelation; the *divine original* of which was demonstrated, *with power*, by mighty *signs and wonders*, to the *senses* of hundreds and thousands; and that demonstration entered in an *authentic record*, preserved and guarded by an *uninterrupted succession*, first in the *Jewish*, and then

then in the *Christian* church; all this *reason* must be *taught* from *without*, or else live in *ignorance*, which is the curse of God upon all who have rejected his word, apostatized from his faith, or broke from his church, a sin, which indeed always has been and always will be followed by the other two. *Reason* can no more find out, without the help of *Revelation*, the original *state* and *constitution* of *man*, the *changes* that have happened in his nature, and the *counsels* of *God*, that have taken place, in *consequence* of those changes — points, upon which every thing, that can be said about *religion*, turns, — reason, I say, can no more find out these, than she can prove *metaphysically*, that *William the conqueror* vanquish'd *Harold*, at *Hastings* in *Suffex*; and demonstrate *a priori*, without the assistance of *history*, all the *revolutions* with their *effects*, that have happened in the *English* government, from that day to this.

V. Similar to this, is another objection often made, “that we decry *natural religion*.” To be sure, we do; because, at the best, it is a religion without the *knowledge* of *God*, or the *hope* of *salvation*; which is *deism*; and such as it is, it owes it's birth, not to *nature*, but a *corrupted tradition*; i. e. in one word, instead of *natural religion*, it is *traditional infidelity*. For as a *revelation* was made to man, of the covenant of works, *before* the fall, and the covenant of grace, *after* it; and as we are certain, that all mankind came from *one common stock*, it is a plain and evident

vident *matter of fact*, that from *Adam* to this day, there never *was*, or *could be* a man left to *himself*, to make a *religion of nature*. It is, I know, a received notion, that man, *by a due and proper use of his rational faculties*, may do great things; and so, *by a due and proper use of the organs of vision*, man may arrive at a *knowlege of the objects* around him. But still, the *pinching* question returns — Is it not *light*, that *enables* him to make a *due and proper use* of the one, and *instruction* of the other? Shew us the *eye* that *sees* without *light*, and the *understanding* that *reasons upon religion* without *instruction*, and we will allow, they *both* do it by *the light of nature*. Till then, let us hear no more of *natural religion*, but give the glory where it is due, by owning ingenuously and gratefully, as we ought to do, that as all *light* comes from the *sun*, tho' we receive it often by *communication* from *other bodies*; so, that all *instruction* has come from the *beginning*, at *sundry times*, and in *divers manners*; from the *sun* of righteousness; and has been only *reflected*, more or less, pure or tinged, from one *man* to another. And let us intreat him, whose *countenance is as the sun shineth in his strength*, to *anoint our eyes with eyesalve*, that we may see; which, otherwise, we shall not do, even when we *have the light*; because by *sin*, not only the *light* was *darkened*, but the *organ disordered*. And the *physician* of souls, is *the sun of righteousness*.

Upon the subjects of these two last articles, let me recommend to the reader's careful and  
 atten-

attentive perusal, two books. The first shall be the inimitable Mr. *Lesly's short and easy method with the deists*; where the debate between them and the Christians, upon the *evidence* of revelation, is brought to one single point, and their cause overthrown for ever. This most excellent piece, with the other tracts of the same admirable author usually bound with it, have, I thank God, entirely removed every doubt from my mind; and, in my poor opinion, they render the *metaphysical* performances upon the subject, entirely useless. Since, if the Scriptures are once proved to be the word of God, (as I think they are *infallibly* in that book) we have nothing farther to do, but to lay them together, and explain them, according to the measure of knowledge given unto every one. The second book I would recommend, is — Dr. *Ellis's knowledge of divine things from revelation, not from reason, or nature*. In this book, *natural religion* is fairly demolished; and her greatest admirers and advocates, after all the panegyrics made, and compliments passed upon her, are seen confessing, that she has borrowed every thing from the corrupted tradition of an original *revelation*; nay they even despise her, (which is rather too cruel,) when she has decked herself out with these borrowed ornaments, to the best advantage, they themselves assisting at her toilette. Indeed, by the accounts of *Wilkins, Tillotson, Clarke, Wollaston*, and all the rest of the writers in that way, the point in dispute between modern divines and the deists seems to have been, whether *twilight* was preferable



preferable to *sunshine*? And I know not how it happened, or what could be the reason, that they neglected to *urge it home* with *full force* upon the *deists*, (as they might have done, since, at times, they all owned it,) that the *sun* himself was the *cause* of the *twilight*; which had put an end to the dispute at once.

VI. We are charged with “a great *contempt* “of *learning*.” That depends upon the *nature* and *kind* of the learning. Because sometimes a man is called a *learned* man, who, after a course of several years hard study, can tell you within a trifle, how many *degrees* of the *non entity* of *nothing* must be *annihilated*, before it comes to be *something*.—See *King’s* origin of *evil*.—Ch. 3. p. 129. with the *note*. That such kind of *learning* as that book is filled with, and the present age is much given to admire, has done no service to the cause of *truth*, but on the contrary, that it has done infinite disservice to it, and almost reduced us from the *unity* of *Christian faith*, to the *wrangling* of *philosophic scepticism*, is the opinion of many, besides ourselves; and too surely founded on fatal *experience*. I shall set down the sentiments of one person only, whose reason for speaking slightly of metaphysics, certainly was not a want of skill in them. I mean, the good and great Bishop BERKELEY—“From the “time (says this excellent prelate) that *divinity* “was considered as a *SCIENCE*, and human “*REASON* enthroned in the *SANCTUARY* “OF *GOD*, the *hearts* of it’s *professors* seem

“to have been less under the *influence* of GRACE.” —Miscel. p. 232. In another place he assigns a reason for this —“The METAPHYSICAL know-  
 “lege of God, considered in his ABSOLUTE NA-  
 “TURE, or ESSENCE, is ONE thing; and to  
 “know him, as he stands RELATED TO US,  
 “AS CREATOR, REDEEMER, and SANCTIFIER,  
 “is ANOTHER.” p. 216. Here this acute and  
 judicious writer has reached the *jugulum causæ*.  
 For first, the knowlege of God, *as he stands  
 related to us, as Creator, Redeemer, and Sanc-  
 tifier*, is the only knowlege of him, that can  
 be of any service to us. Because the know-  
 lege of him considered in his *absolute nature, or  
 essence*, (supposing we could attain to it without  
 the revelation of Jesus Christ,) must only fill  
 our souls full of *tribulation and anguish*, horror  
 and despair; and make the world a dungeon of  
 condemnation, where nothing is heard, but *weep-  
 ing, and wailing, and gnashing of teeth*: since  
 God *out of Christ* appears armed with all the ter-  
 rors of omnipotence, *a revenger to execute wrath,  
 to the uttermost, upon every soul that doth evil*;  
 that is, upon every soul of man, inasmuch as  
*there is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good,  
 and sinneth not. Our God is a CONSUMING FIRE.*  
 —But secondly, all disquisitions into the *abso-  
 lute nature and essence* of God, without the Scrip-  
 ture; all endeavours to speculate upon his *eternal  
 power and Godhead*, otherwise than as they are  
*clearly seen by the eye of faith, being understood,*  
 or made intelligible, by analogy, thro’ the me-  
 dium of *the things that are made* —all such  
*learned*

*learned enquiries* have always ended in *materialism*, and fallen short of the knowlege of the eternal *Jehovah*, who *made the heavens*, which the nations, and all their philosophers, worshipped as *the Gods that govern the world*. And it is a truth, that calls for the most serious consideration of all those, who draw up systems of *religion*, exclusive of *Christianity*, that neither *Heathens*, *Jews*, (in their present state of unbelief) *Mahometans*, *Deists*, *Arians*, or *Socinians*, worship the TRUE GOD. For all that is manifested of the *true God* in his word, is manifested of him, as existing in *three persons*, *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*. The *Son* and the *Holy Ghost* they have not, for they deny them; and — IT IS WRITTEN — *Whosoever denieth the SON, the same HATH NOT THE FATHER*. 1 John 2.23. And if he has neither *Father*, *Son*, or *Holy Ghost*, he has not the *true God*; and if he has not the *true God*, he has *no God*, because there is but ONE GOD. And so he is, in the apostle's *customary phrase*, *without God*; in the *Greek*, ΑΘΕΟΣ; in *English*, an ATHEIST. And since no metaphysical system of *natural religion* has the *Trinity* in it, of what use can this *learning* be, that we object to, and the Scriptures were wrote to *make foolish*, and *bring to nought*? — May they be so preached, as effectually to do it, till the light of *Christian knowlege* triumphs over the darkness of *human ignorance*; and *Christ* only is set forth as the *wisdom* and *power of God*, for *salvation*, to the ends of the earth; that all the kindreds of the nations may re-

*member themselves, and be turned to him who is the LORD their GOD, and all the world may worship him, sing of him, and praise his name. As to those, who are engaged in the study of useful arts and sciences, languages, history, antiquity, physics, &c. &c. with a view to make them handmaids to divine knowlege, we honour their employment, we desire to emulate their industry, and most sincerely wish them good luck in the name of the LORD.*

VII. We are said to be *ignorant* of the *learning* we pretend to *despise*. This charge is supported chiefly by some curious proofs that I am an invincible blockhead, who can neither write *sense*, or *English*. FOR I have written *Revelations*, instead of *Revelation*, no less than *twice* in the same sermon; and make *Lisbon* say sometimes *thou*, and sometimes *you*, because the pronouns were varied in the different *texts* of Scripture I had occasion to quote, and apply. See *Word to the H.* p. 21, 30. — But pray Sir, let me bear my own burden; heavy as it is, I submit to it all, and take shame to myself. Do not lay my ignorance at other people's doors, who certainly have nothing to do with it. We have books wrote by those, whom you will call *Hutchinsonians*, that do not altogether shew the *driveller*. There is the Reverend Dr. *Hodges's Elibu*; there is the Reverend Mr. *Holloway's Primævity of the Hebrew tongue* — there is another book too, which I am sure would incline you to have a little mercy upon us, if you were to read it; and that is

— An answer to Mr. KENNICOTT, by my friend Mr. Comings.

VIII. The last and heaviest charge against us is — *want of charity*. Now the word *charity* is the *English* translation of the Greek word, *αγαπη*, *love*. *Love* is shewn, by consulting the *interest* of the person beloved. And as an *eternal* interest is preferable to a *temporal*, the interest of the *soul* must be consulted before that of the *body*, if they happen to clash; otherwise, a *false love* of the *body* may prove a *real hatred* of the *soul*. Therefore it is written — *Levit. 19. 14. Thou shalt not HATE thy brother in thine heart: thou shalt in any wise REBUKE thy neighbour, and not suffer sin upon him — or — that thou bear not sin for him*. Agreeably to this rule, the author has chosen a text for his motto, which ends with the words — *admonishing one another*. And his rule in admonishing he give us, p. 20. — “In order effectually to expose *ignorance*, and guard against *imposition* from it, (of which to be sure there is great danger!) it should *plainly* be called *ignorance*: and the more effectually to banish *vice*, and prevent it’s *contagion*, (there’s a charitable touch for our *morality* a-gain) it should plainly be called *vice*.” So say I; and in order to expose and guard against *infidelity*, it should *plainly* be called *infidelity*; and in order the more effectually to prevent the *contagion* of a *damnable heresy*, it should *plainly* be called a *damnable heresy*. Otherwise, souls may be sent into torments, to curse to all eternity the cruelty

cruelty of those, who, thro' *fear of man*, forgot *the Lord Jesus their maker*, and did not *speak out*, and warn them *plainly of the wrath to come* upon all who *deny THE LORD that BOUGHT them*. It is a dreadful thing for a man to *dissemble*, when he knows from the *physician*, that the *plague* is in an house, and sees his friends going into it. We know from the great *physician*, that *heresy* is the *plague* of the *soul*; and without repentance, is as inevitably the *death* of it, as the *pestilence* is of the *body*. For heresy is DAMNABLE; and the heresy, that has that epithet in Scripture, is that of *denying THE LORD*, i.e. denying the *Divinity* of him, who is the *LORD JEHOVAH*; *King of Kings*, and *LORD of LORDS*. In all such cases, the greater the danger is, the stronger ought the terms to be that express it, to keep men from running into it. The language, it is true, must often sound *harsh* to the parties concerned, for *physick* is seldom *palatable*. But *whether they hear*, or *whether they forbear*, they must be *openly reprov'd*, and the truth must be boldly and undauntedly oppos'd to their pernicious errors, that *others* may not *fall after the same example of unbelief*. Fear of disobliging here is the greatest of cruelties. It is like suffering a man to drown, for fear you should hurt him in drawing him out of the water. Therefore — Cry aloud (says God to his prophet) *and spare not*. *Lift up thy voice like a trumpet, tell my people their transgressions*. Otherwise — *If the watchman see the sword come, and blow not the trumpet, and the people be not warned, if the sword come,*  
and

and take any person from among them, he is taken away in his iniquity, but his blood will I require at the watchman's hands. Ezek. 33. 6. One thing indeed must be said; that those who undertake to do this office to a sinful people, (which every minister does undertake, when he is ordained) must first determine to expect neither *praise* nor *reward* in this world. And alas, many think *this is an hard saying*; who, say they, *can bear it*? May God increase the number of those, who have *ears to hear*, and an *heart to obey* their master. For tho' — *Take up your cross, and follow me*, be an *hard saying*; — *Go ye cursed into everlasting fire*, is a much harder.

These, I think, are all the general objections I meet with. For as to those of our preaching Christ as the *substance* of all the *legal shadows*, and explaining the *spiritual* sense of the *natural images* in Scripture, with the *Warburtonian* cant, so much in vogue, of *cabalistic theologues, typists, allegorists, &c.* those who read the bible want no answer, and none will satisfy those who do not. Only it may be observed, that a mistake in interpreting a particular, does not overthrow the spiritual interpretation in general; any more than a mistake in explaining a doctrine, overthrows the creed. All that follows from it is, that the man who makes it is *wrong*, and should be set *right*. If those who are able, will do this kind office for us, they shall have our thanks. As to the expositions that are peculiar to Mr. *Hutchinson*, I know not who makes them *articles of faith*, or *terms of communion*; I am sure we do not. But it is unreason-

unreasonable to desire us to quit them, till they are proved to be false. If the gentleman I am at present concerned with, (whoever he be) or any body else can do this, in Gods name let the expositions fall, if they cannot stand. Only I must beg of the gentlemen, if they have any thoughts of succeeding in their attempt, to *confute*, before they *clamour*. Because one page of *proof* is worth twenty of *railing*; which proves nothing, but a want of proof.

I come now to particulars. And here I am almost ashamed to ask the favour of the reader's company, the entertainment is like to be so very indifferent. But for the sake of many, who may be misled and imposed upon by this author's misrepresentations, an answer must be given. For he seems to have regulated his conduct by an old maxim, that *where much dirt is thrown, some will stick*. Therefore, kind reader, if you have nothing else to do, you and I will try, and divert ourselves, as well as we can.

The subject of the first complaint is an affair of a very *malignant* nature. Somebody, or other, it seems, has "extracted *Christianity* out of "*Sampson's riddle*." p. 8. Now I own, for my part, as times go, I rejoice to hear of *Christianity*, let it be *extracted* from whence it will. The history of *Sampson* is a part of those *Scriptures*, which were *written for our instruction in the righteousness which is by faith*. He was an illustrious figure of the *almighty Saviour* of the *Israel* of God; and never more so, than when *thro' faith* in him, and his victory over the *devil*, he  
*stopped*



stopped the mouth of the Lion, and slew him, without any weapon in his hand. Of this act of heroic *faith*, which was the subject of his riddle, thus speaks St. *Jerom*, who, by the way, has stolen several of *Hutchinson's* thoughts, tho' this is not one of them — *Venit enim verus Sampson ad Allophylos, & dum pergit Thammias, ut pauperulam de gentibus duceret Dalilam, interfecit leonem, & illo mortuo comedit mella dulcedinis* — Comm. in *Nabum*. — Cap. 2. ad fin. And to come nearer home, thus speaks the *Homily on the resurrection* — “ This mighty conquest of Christ's resurrection, was signified before, by *divers figures* of the *old Testament*, “ as by *Sampson*, when he *slew the lion*, out of “ *whose mouth came sweetness and honey*.” It were to be wished these very *learned* censurers of our *ignorance*, could be brought to *read* a little, before they *write*.

But to shew that we are determined never to be easy, as long as there is any religion left, we have a dreadful story in the same page, enough to make one's blood run cold, of somebody else, that had almost frightened his whole parish, men, women, and children, into fits, (only indeed they had been pretty much used to be frightned of late) by *abusing the society for propagating the gospel*. — People that find fault with others for printing what is *true*, should be particularly careful *they* print nothing that is *false*; as this story is, from beginning to end; the gentleman here meant, having reflected, not upon the *society*, but upon certain *infidels*, who,

he said, had *counteracted the GODLIKE design of the Society*, and sent over cargoes of their *blasphemy*, to poison the *continent*. So that if any of the parish were *surprized*, it was a *surprize* altogether of their *own manufacture*; and a good deal of the same cast with that of an *old woman*, in King *James the second's* time, who, after the minister of the parish had spent several discourses in confuting the errors of the *Romanists*, said, "she was *sure* their parson *must* be a *papidge*; "for he was always talking *about* the Pope." — That what my friend said upon the occasion, with regard to the spreading infidel books in our plantations, is true, I am assured by some gentlemen lately come from thence; two of whom, our University hath created masters of arts by *diploma*; the Rev. Mr. *Johnson*, son of the excellent Dr. *Johnson*, president of the EPISCOPAL college in *New York*; and the Rev. Mr. *Fayerweather*, a happy convert from the *schismatics* to the *church of England*. And indeed, as I have had the pleasure of much conversation with them, I must take this opportunity of saying, they will reflect honour on the University, as they do on the country from whence they came. Their *knowlege* and *piety*, their *zeal* and *sincerity*, their *love of Christ*, and *contempt of the world*, together with their *unfeigned desire* to serve the *church*, and their *unwearied diligence* in doing it, give us ideas of our *episcopal brethren* in *America*, to which we were before strangers. May the great God our Saviour prosper the glorious work of their hands upon them, till the clouds  
of

of infidelity disperse before *the sun of righteousness*, rising to the *American*, perhaps, as he sets to the *European* world; and till the unhappy, misguided *wanderers*, having their eyes opened by the shining of *his marvellous light*, return to the *church*, and all become *one fold under one shepherd*, even the BISHOP of their souls, ruling in every *church* that is *his*, by an earthly *representative*. And O come that happy day, when God shall put it into the hearts of our governors, to remember *the groanings of such as are in captivity* under the bondage of sin, and to consider the cries and tears of the hundreds and the thousands, who would receive a BISHOP of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND, *as an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus*; that he might *ordain them elders in every city*, who being SENT forth, might *preach liberty to the miserable captives*, and *the opening of the prison doors to them that are fast bound in darkness and the shadow of death*; calling them forth into *the light of the Lord God and the lamb*, to behold him shining in his *church*, in *the beauty of holiness*. For whom this glorious work, of establishing *Episcopacy in America*, is reserved, God only knows. Blessed is he, whose heart shall conceive, and whose hands shall accomplish it. His *works* done in the faith, and for the love of his master, *shall praise him*, when that master sits in judgment, *in the gates of the new Jerusalem*, and *all generations, arising from the dust, shall call him blessed*.

Of the Rev. Dr. Patten this author says —  
p. 9. that “ he is *perhaps* endowed with a great-

“er share of learning, than both the other gentlemen,” meaning Mr. *Wetherell*, and myself. I have an objection to the word, *perhaps*, in this sentence; and beg leave to say, he *certainly* is endowed with a *much* greater share of *learning*, and we wish we may attain to half the *piety* that *sanctifies* his *learning*. And yet, says this writer, — “he seems to hold learning in more sovereign contempt, than either of them.” No *true* learning is the object of the Doctor’s contempt. *Metaphysical* learning, which is *science falsely so called*, he treats as it deserves. And he had the best right to say what he has said of it, because — *intus & in cute novit* — and he has proved it all to be stark naught. And, for the sake of multitudes, whose eyes *the Christian Apology* has opened, the reader will rejoice to hear, that the author of it intends to proceed, in establishing Revelation on it’s proper basis of the *works*, which bear witness to the *mission* of the *worker*.

We proceed next to consider what is said of Mr. *Wetherell*. His crime is, preaching *passive obedience* on the 30th of *January*. What would the author have had him preach; the principles of *resistance*, that brought the blessed martyr to the *block*? A doctrine which might justly have brought upon him the animadversion of his superiors: for certainly, his majesty can have no security from men of such principles. The *church of England* disclaims them, and in her *homilies* has answered all the *pleas* for *rebellion*, that ever were, or can be brought; and determined this point, fully, and fairly from *Scripture*.

ture. And to them I refer the reader, as the only *system of politics* a *Christian* need to study, in order to *live a quiet and peaceable life, in humble obedience to the king, and all that are in authority under him.* If this writer will tell me the mischief done by *passive obedience*, I will tell him the mischief done by *resistance*; and will enter the *comparison* with him, as soon as he pleases. To his present majesty King GEORGE the II. we have sworn *allegiance*; and him we will *obey*, by *acting* in things lawful, and *suffering* in those that are otherwise, should any such be enjoined. Let this author say *more*. I wish I could hear him say *as much*. I shall take my leave of this subject, with observing only, in favour of *obedience*, that *Lucifer* had not *lost* heaven, if he had *practised* this doctrine, nor *Christ* *gained* it, if he had *not*.

I am now obliged to trouble the reader with my own concerns, the author having thought proper to make his remarks upon a *sermon* of mine, published on occasion of the late *earthquakes*. Of his *verbal* criticisms I have given two specimens above, and shall say no more of them, but — Peace be to their *names*. For surely, when he wrote them, he must have had as little to *do*, as he had to *say*. Some other things I shall take notice of.

P. 8. He seems to be offended with me for preaching the sermon *so often*. I have nothing to accuse myself of, on that head, unless it be that it was not preached *much oftener*; as it is

to be feared, we have had our *warnings*. May they answer the end they were sent for!

P. 21. He says, I “*intimate* the text to be a “*prophecy* in one verse of the *earthquake at Lisbon*, and in the very next verse of the *earthquakes in London*.” I *declare* the contrary at the beginning of the sermon. And drawing a *parallel* between two events, so far forth as they are parallel, is not making one a *prophecy* of the other.

Ibid. He informs the reader, I am “one of those, who *arrogate to themselves greater knowledge, as well as purer religion*.” Pardon me, Sir. We *arrogate them not to ourselves*, but *claim* them for our *master*, and his too much neglected *word*, where are contained *all the treasures of knowledge, and religion*. *Thro’ his commandments*, it is certain, he can and will make those that study them *wiser than their enemies*. Men may have *more understanding than their teachers*, if his *testimonies are their meditation*; and *understand more than the ancients*, if they *keep his precepts*. Let every one that *has* attained to this wisdom, give the glory to God, and pray for us, that we may be *led* to it. This will be a much more *Christian* employment, than that of endeavouring to *hinder* and *slander* the little good we endeavour to do.

Ibid. “And are *fond* of charging other ministers of the Gospel with *irreligion* and *ignorance*.” Let us hope not; because this is the characteristic of *Satan*; and the author should not have said it, till he had proved it impossible  
for

for one person to *convince* another of *sin*, without taking a *pleasure* in finding him *guilty*. The meek and pious Bishop *Kenn* himself, in his time, *charged* many *ministers of the Gospel*, very home, both with *irreligion* and *ignorance*. It was the *grief* of his *heart*, that he was *obliged* to do it. And had this writer *the discernment of Spirits*, which alone can qualify him to pass sentence in this case, there would be no occasion for us to tell him, that it is very far from being the *joy* of our's. But to reprove the sin, without making the sinner your *enemy* — *hic labor!* — *I pray you brethren, deal not so wickedly*, says *Lot*, in the mildest manner possible. And what return was made him? — *He will needs be a JUDGE.*

P. 22. *I remembered thine everlasting judgments O Lord, and received comfort.* In this text, he says, by *judgments* are meant God's *laws*. But 1st. This does not appear. The person speaking complains in the verse before — *The proud have had me exceedingly in derision, yet have I not declined from thy law.* Then follows — *I remembered מִשְׁפָּטֵי מֵעוֹלָם thy judgments from of old, and received comfort.* So then, the *comfort* he received, when the *proud* had him in *derision*, was from *remembering God's judgments from of old*, i. e. his judgments from the beginning decreed and executed against the enemies and persecutors of Christ and his church. For these are the fruitful sources of *consolation* to Christians in distress, sympathizing with their afflicted master in the day of his humiliation. In what God *has* done, they

they see, by the eye of *faith*, what he *will* do; and therefore, in the darkest night of sorrow, chant forth these notes of triumph over their spiritual enemies — *As for Pharaoh and his host, he overthrew them in the red sea: He smote great nations, and slew mighty kings, for his MERCY endureth FOR EVER.* *Affection* must grieve for the sinner, and *sense* be astonished at his fall; but *faith* views the Redeemer glorified in judgment; *hope* despairs not of mercy, in the midst of judgment, to all who are objects of it; and *love* endeavours to make the fall of some the salvation of others, till it's work be perfected; when all carnal *affection* and *fear* shall be *cast out* for ever, and the *love* of Christ and his church be *all in all*. 2dly. If by *judgments* are meant God's *laws*, it comes to the same. For his laws contain his *judgments* on sin and sinners; and so they take that *name* from their *contents*.

P. 23. “*Figurative* cloud pierced by *real* “prayers.” No; the *thing* is *real*, tho’ *expressed figuratively*.

Ibid. “Impropriety of calling this *cloud* an “*event*.” Not the *cloud*, but the *breaking* of the cloud is the *event* spoken of.

But now, what will be the reader's surprize, to hear I prayed publicly in St. *Mary's* pulpit, for a happy restoration of the family of *James*? Which it is plain I did, FOR *I beseeched the Lord to be gracious unto his land, and to turn away captivity from JACOB*; ergo, I am a JACOB-ITE. For shame, my good Sir, for shame! If you mean



mean this in *earnest*, it is a piece of gross *calumny*; if in jest, it is as full of *prophaneness*, as it is empty of *wit*. Such arguments as these will hardly persuade *all Christians and scholars to unite as one man against us*, p. 40. Tho' they may persuade us to unite as one man in saying—*Long live the author of the word to the Hutchinsonians*.

P. 24. I am taken to task, for *rashly correcting the liturgy*, by inserting the word *shortly*. *We believe that thou shalt shortly come to be our judge*. As the word *shortly* does not please, we will change it for another, the word *quickly*. And lest the author should except against that, I will quote my authority—*Rev. 22. 12. Behold I come quickly*. And if it was to be *quickly*, when that was spoken, there can be no harm in saying, it will be *shortly*, now. But *how is it, that we do not discern the signs of the times*, that we may be ready to give the proper answer to him that asketh us—*Watchman, what of the night? The night is far spent, the day is at hand*. Why should we be desirous of removing far from us that day, when *our eyes shall behold the king in his beauty?* A day, *glorious* certainly to vigilant and zealous believers, tho' *terrible* to infidels, and lukewarm disciples, who act with a view to the *world*, and not to that *day*, when the *world* shall be *destroyed*. But alas! the *love* of many is *waxed cold*, because the *faith* of many is *waxed weak*, thro' *lack of Scripture knowlege* to support it. *As to this Moses, that brought them up out of the land of Egypt*, they are ready to say, *they knew not what is become of him*; and their

hearts have lost all taste and relish for the apostle's exhortation to patience and perseverance — FOR yet a little while, and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry.

Ibid. "The assertion of God's having spoken "to all the dwellers upon earth, seems too extensive, by being *universal*." God spoke to all, tho' the judgment fell only upon *one* place.

Ibid. There is a jumble of *author* and *cause*, and *cause* and *author*; and *first* and *second*, and *second* and *first*; which I have read over several times, but confess it to be far above my comprehension. To talk with the gentleman a little in his own way—I take it for granted, *the Word to the Hutchinsonians* must have some *author*, and there must be some *cause* why it was wrote; but who is the *author*, or what was the *cause*, we are left to guess, as well as we can.

Ibid. "It is a pity, he says, I should have "inserted the *irony* upon *reason*, at p. 16. after "I have so properly connected the epithets *rational* and *defensible*, in p. 5." But does it follow, that because the truth of God, when rightly explained and understood, will always be rational, and fit, and proper, that therefore reason is to pronounce the truth of God, which, thro' her natural blindness, she does not understand, to be irrational, unfit, and improper? There is a *judgment* of *authority*, which *makes* a thing to be what it *judges* it to be. This belongs only to *God*. And there is a *judgment* of *discretion*, which is *opinion*. This is the *judgment* of *reason*; and may be *wrong*, as well as *right*; nay, it will certainly

certainly be always wrong, in divine matters, when not formed upon *revealed* principles; because *Revelation* only can make known to us the *plan* upon which God *aëts*. Without this, it is impossible to judge of the *fitness* of the action. Now — *Who hath known the mind of the Lord?* *But we* (says the apostle) i. e. believers — *have the mind of Christ* — 1 Cor. 2. 16. because it is revealed by the *Spirit*, in the *word*. This is the source of true instruction to a Christian; and as he receives it with humility, or rejects it with pride, he becomes wise, or foolish. The *judgment of reason* has no sort of influence upon the truth of God, which is always just, fit, and rational in itself, whatever my reason, or your reason, or the reason of the whole world thinks of it; as it is written — *What if some did not believe? shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect? God forbid; yea let God be true, but every man a liar.* Rom. 3. 3.

P. 25. Mr. *Hutchinson* is answered, in the old way, by making nonsense, and then fastening it upon him. And this writer, to avoid detection, has referred, at large, to a book of 554 pages, without naming any page. He is desired to shew, where Mr. *Hutchinson* talks about *grains of light*, and their becoming so *large* as to be *invisible*. He talks indeed of the *convertibility of light and air*, which he says are the same *substance*, in different *conditions*. And, as a very learned and able defender of Sir *Isaac Newton* told me once, when I had the pleasure of some conversation with him upon the subject, if this

point of the *consubstantiality* of *light* and *air* be proved, the truth of Mr. *Hutchinson's* philosophy can hardly be disputed. There is much said, and many experiments brought by Mr. *Hutchinson*, and since, by Mr. *Bate*, to prove this important point. The reader may consult likewise a well wrote piece, published lately at *Edinburgh*, called, *An Enquiry after philosophy and theology &c.* And what is very remarkable, not one of any note amongst all Mr. *Hutchinson's* opponents, has enquired into the merit of the physical part of his works, tho' the age is so fond of philosophical discoveries: and yet in the number and acuteness of his observations and experiments, he certainly was inferior to very few; as any one may see, that will but look into his 11th and 12th Volumes. The objections and prejudices with regard to the *immortal Newton*, are no more; for he proves to be an *Hutchinsonian* all over; and his *vacuum* is delivered of as a fine a *plenum* as one would wish to see. I hope his followers will not throw it upon the *parish*, because it was born after the *death* of it's *immortal* father.

Ibid. "The last chapter in the Revelation declares God shall destroy the world. No such declaration in that chapter." There is a declaration of Christ's *coming quickly*; and his *coming* implies the *destruction of the world*, because to *destroy* the world is what he *comes* for.

Ibid. "The destruction of the world by *water* is called an *earthquake*" — It is so; because when the world was destroyed by water, the earth

earth was dissolved ; as may be demonstrated to sense at this day, by some sea shells found in the midst of solid blocks of marble ; and others filled with stone, tho' they have not an orifice in them, bigger than a pin's point ; the marble and stone therefore must once have been in a fluid state. If this author thinks the *fountains of the great deep* could be *broken up*, and the *earth clean dissolved*, without an *earthquake*, he is at liberty doubtless to enjoy his own opinion. As to the description in *Isaiab*, it is evidently couched in terms taken from the history of the *flood*, tho' the destruction there spoken of may in some things go beyond it, and the earth may not recover again out of it, as it did out of the flood.

P. 26. He says, the repetition of the pronoun in *Gen. 6. 17.* is nothing to infidels, *because they deny the authority of the bible.* But were not *these things written that they might believe ;* and will not the word spoken condemn them at the last day, because they presumptuously and audaciously *make God a liar, by denying the record that God has given?* At this rate, a man need only blaspheme the bible stoutly, and it can never be brought against him, *because he denies it's authority.* If any one was to argue in this manner, with regard to the *law* of the land, would the judge set the law aside, and submit to try the criminal by certain *reasons* and *fitnesses*, that the criminal himself had framed, independent of the law? No certainly ; he would *prove* the authority of the law, and proceed to try him upon it. Now, either there is evidence to prove the

the authority of the bible; or there is not. If there is, the dispute with *infidels* is at an end; and the truths of Scripture should be pressed home, with the consequence of rejecting them. If there is not, the labour of the preachers and the faith of the hearers are both *vain*. *Let us eat and drink, for to morrow we die.*

Ibid. "How does *Amos* foretell this earthquake? The words cited to express this prophecy are — *The Lord will roar*" &c. But do not the words immediately preceding plainly point to the event foretold — *The words of Amos — which he saw two years before the EARTHQUAKE. And he said — the Lord will roar* &c.

P. 27. "Is it possible for a man in his senses to pronounce that *Christians* will not own *Christ*?" Yea verily, and to prove it too. Christ was a preacher and practicer of *passive obedience*. And I know one that would take it amiss if I was to say he is *no Christian*, who affirms it is a doctrine *justly exploded*, tho' he himself has subscribed to it's being a *godly and wholesome doctrine*. And so in many other instances, there are numbers of *nominal Christians*, who are ashamed to own their *crucified* master, in his *doctrines* and *institutions*, before a *world* grown so *wise*, as to *explode* them. But

Ibid. "By *owning Christ*, HE MEANS, *owning the Divinity of Christ*, owning him *equal to God the father*." I do mean so indeed. For to say any thing less of his person, is not *owning*, but *blaspheming* him, and robbing him of the honour

honour due to his *name*; which is, — <sup>1</sup> *Jehovah* — <sup>2</sup> *The Lord of hosts himself*, — <sup>3</sup> *Most high*, and <sup>4</sup> *mighty God* — <sup>5</sup> *The only wise God* — <sup>6</sup> *God over all* — <sup>7</sup> *The Lord God of the holy prophets* — <sup>8</sup> *The Lord Almighty, which is, which was, and which is to come*. Such, as he is here set forth, I hope and trust, thro' the power of his grace, I should rejoice to *own him*, before the world, in the face of death itself, to the joy of angels, and confusion of devils, and their accursed doctrine, propagated on earth thro' *Arius* and his followers; which has destroyed the *eastern*, and now threatens the *western church*.

Ibid. “Was the *earthquake* calculated to “prove *this*?” I think it was, as that, and the other signs attending the crucifixion, shewed all nature to be in pangs, and sympathizing with the sufferings of her *Lord*. And something like this said the heathen philosopher, upon the occasion — *Aut Deus naturæ patitur, aut mundi machina dissolvitur*.

Ibid. “It made the centurion own the divinity of Christ; but *in what sense*?” I am much concerned to meet with this question, in the performance of one, whom I suppose to be a *Christian*. Because I never before heard any but *Arians* talk of a *divinity* in *different senses*, which (as they very well know) is no divinity at all.

1 Jer. 23. 6.      2 Isaiah 3. 13.      3 Ps. 78. 17, 18. conf.  
 1 Cor. 10. 9.      4 Isaiah 9. 6.      5 Jude ult.      6 Rom. 9. 5.  
 7 Rev. 22. 6—16.      8 Rev. 1. 8, 11. The reader will be to good as to turn to these awful and concerning texts; and may he, whom they treat of, give him understanding to the acknowledging of the *SAVING truth* contained in them.

The Scripture says, there is but *one* Jehovah, *Deut. 6. 4. Jehovah our God is ONE Jehovah.* And the same Scripture says, *Christ is Jehovah— Jer. 23. 6. This is his name, whereby he shall be called, JEHOVAH our righteousness.* This single argument will for ever baffle and defeat the sophistry of the whole *Arian* party, being every way absolutely impregnable by human or diabolical strength or cunning.

P. 29. “Was the law given before *Sinai* thus “trembled? Was the law transgressed before it “was given? If not, how was this *earthquake* “occasioned by *sin*?” This is close and home. And if it had not been for *St. Paul*, I had been in a scrape. But I believe he will help me out. For he says—*Rom. 4. 15. Where there is no law, there is no transgression.* And yet, there is no doubt but men *transgressed* before the giving the *Mosaic* law at *Sinai*; for *Rom. 5. 13. Until the law, sin was in the world—* and just before—*death passed upon all men, for that ALL have sinned.* So the author must solve this, as his skill in divinity will give him leave. Not that it does indeed overthrow my position, any way; for *sin* was the *cause* of the terrible manifestation at mount *Sinai*, even tho’ it was only designed to shew the wrath that *would* follow the *future* transgression of the law *then* given. But, says our author,

*Ibid.* “The *giving of the law* was never considered as an *act of vindictive judgment.*” An *act of vindictive judgment* it was not, because a *mediator* was suffered to *interpose*; and they  
heard



heard the law by the ministration of a *man*. But the giving of the law, which had in it every thing that is terrible to man, was a most lively *portraiture* of that *vindictive judgment*, which will be executed, when the same God that gave it shall come, in the full power of his majesty, to require an account of it. The comparison is made by *St. Paul*, *Heb. 12. 25*, & seq. and the reader may see the parallel between the circumstances that accompanied the *giving the law*, and those that will attend upon the *last judgment*, finely drawn, in that magazine of learning, and sound divinity, *Bishop Andrews's* book on the *commandments*; which, with his incomparable *sermons*, I do humbly recommend to the careful perusal, and deep meditation of all those, who read to be made *wise unto salvation*, instead of cavilling at forms of expression. I cannot expect the author of *the word to the Hutchinsonians* will take any thing upon *my* recommendation. But if he has not already got *Bishop Andrews*, I am sure he will not delay making the purchase an hour, when he hears that the blessed *martyr King CHARLES* the 1st. recommended his sermons, a little before his death, to the constant study of his children.

*Ibid.* "Can it be said with propriety, that "the earthquake at Christ's death was a judgment or punishment for sin?" With the greatest propriety; for then it was, that *judgment and punishment* were executed on us all, in the person of our *surety* Christ, who *was made sin*, and *a curse for us*, and *bore our sins* which *God*

*laid on him, in his own body, on the tree.* He bore the sin of his murderers, which otherwise must have brought immediate destruction on the world, seeing they *crucified the Lord of glory.* Nor is it any absurdity, as this writer thinks, to say, the earthquake at the *resurrection* was a *judgment or punishment for sin.* He who died to atone for the guilt, arose to *destroy the power of sin,* and manifested his victory over it by inflicting this *judgment and punishment* on his enemies, who did *shake and become as dead men.* At his death, sin was punished *in him;* at his resurrection, it was punished *by him.*

P. 30. I speak of the *skrieks and cries* of the unhappy sufferers, *entombed* in the ruins of their city. Here my Censor seemeth to himself to have discovered a grievous blunder, for “*entomb-  
ed, he says, implies death and silence.*” But suppose, learned Sir, the people were buried *alive,* which was the case here. — O this same *Ars critica!*

Ibid. He has found out contradiction upon contradiction. First, I say, “we can assign no reason for God’s not dealing with us, as he did with the people at *Lisbon,* seeing we are far perhaps from being more righteous.” Then I assign a reason myself, because *London standeth by faith,* and then destroy that reason again, by saying, *the faith is ridiculed.* This, reader, is the contradiction, as it appears to him, thro’ his critical spectacles. But I shall shew they are of the *magnifying* sort. For, in the first place, taking it as he quotes it, there is no contradiction.

tion. It is asserted, that *London stands by faith*, as every Christian state and city does. And if that *faith* be *ridiculed, and blasphemed*, there is great reason to apprehend a *fall*. This is the whole of the contradiction, as stated in his way. But secondly, to state it in mine, I must observe, he has misquoted the first sentence, upon which the supposed contradiction is built. For I am there addressing myself not to *London*, or to the *church*, or *nation*, collectively, but to the cases and consciences of *individuals*, (which he quarrels with me for not doing, p. 39.) and it stands in the sermon in the *singular* number, *he*, whereas it is quoted in the plural, *we*, and then applied to *London*. The objection therefore vanishes at once, and leaves the reader to employ his meditations upon the *author* of it.

But now I must gird my armour close, and look to my guard. For the gentleman is determined to give me no quarter.

P. 31. I say, *Has not a complaint against Arianism been followed by the preferment of the offender?* “An insinuation, he affirms, that this “preferment was the *reward* of *Arianism*.” The words *insinuate* nothing; but only *declare* a *fact*, that an *offender* in the *Arian* way was *preferred*. Upon which people must form their own judgments. No names are mentioned, or persons characterized. I thought it my duty to speak of this, before an audience, consisting chiefly of such as were, or were to be in the office of the ministry; and no reasonable Christian, I believe, will say, I have been guilty of any breach of

my duty, in my manner of doing it, which was as respectful, and inoffensive, as the nature of the case would admit of. To avoid giving any offense, I well knew was impossible; and therefore endeavoured so to discharge my duty to God, as not to transgress that to man; and so to perform that to man, as not to shrink from giving testimony to the truth of God, and his church.

P. 32. "How frequently are complaints *ill grounded?*" How frequently are they *well grounded?* is all the answer that deserves.

Ibid. "The Divinity of Christ, without which, *he says*, our redemption is absolutely void, and "we are yet in our sins." And do not *you say* so too, Sir?

P. 32, 33. The author's style shews him to be in some perplexity;—"Mr. *Horne* will PERHAPS betake himself to the circumstance of "not reading the *Athanasian* creed. — The omission MAY have been occasioned by the objections of *other people*. PROBABLY, by *many*, he means a considerable part of *his own congregation*." So the people teach the priest, I find, instead of the priest teaching the people. — "POSSIBLY he MAY think the damnatory clauses, tho' *lawful*, yet not *expedient*. — And "even, SUPPOSING that he does not approve "of these damnatory clauses, is he, or is any "man, therefore, and for that *single reason*, to "be called an *Arian?*" That *single reason* contains a great many more in it. For no man can object to the *damnatory clauses*, if he believes the *doctrine*

*doctrine* of the creed to be *true*. Now the doctrine of the creed is, that there are in one essence, or substance, three persons of equal power, majesty, and eternity, subsisting in the relations of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; i. e. in other words, what the Scripture expressly declares, that there is but *one Jehovah*, or *self-existing essence*; yet the *Father* is *Jehovah*, the *Son* *Jehovah*, and the *Holy Ghost* *Jehovah*. Into this faith the whole world was baptized, according to the commission given to the apostles — *Matt.* 28. 19. *Go ye, and teach, or make disciples, or Christians of all nations. How? — Baptizing them eis το ONOMA, into the NAME of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. And these three are one: for, Ephes. 4. 5. There is ONE Lord, ONE faith, ONE baptism. Faith in the Trinity in Unity therefore is the catholic faith, which all nations were baptized into: and which except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved.* For *St. Mark* adds to his account of the commission — *Whosoever believeth not, shall be damned.*

*Ibid.* “This young divine.” That is a fault which will mend every day.

*Ibid.* There is an argument advanced against me upon my own principles, which is, that because I say the centurion owned *the Divinity of Christ*, when he called him *the son of God*, therefore every one, that calls him *the son of God*, owns it *now*. Which by no means follows. For the phrase, *son of God*, among the *Jews*, from whom the *centurion* had it, implied an equality with

with God; as appears from *John* 5. 18. where they accused Christ of saying, *God was his FATHER, making himself EQUAL with God.* But it is well known, that now, both *Arians* and *Socinians* will subscribe to Christ's being *the Son of God*; and yet the one mean that he is an *exalted creature*, the other that he is a *mere man* only; neither of them believing, that *the son of God* is likewise *IMMANUEL, GOD WITH US.*

As this writer has thought proper to introduce *Dr. Carter*, I shall offer two or three short remarks upon that gentleman's *Sermon*, and the *preface* to it.

The 1st shall be with regard to the *Arian* pamphlet called — *a letter to the mayor and corporation of Deale &c.* *Dr. Carter* does indeed disclaim being the author of it, but “takes the opportunity of *sincerely thanking* the author, for “*the kind opinion* he appears to have of him;” and says, “the *argumentative* parts of his letter “will *speak for themselves.*” Pref. p. 1, 2. Upon which I shall only observe, that these are very extraordinary terms for a *Christian priest* to use, when speaking of an *heretical* and *blasphemous* performance.

But 2dly in the 14th page of the sermon, there are texts brought to shew, that *absolute supremacy* is ascribed to *God only*; i. e. exclusive of *Christ*. But why is no notice taken of the numberless texts that ascribe *absolute supremacy* to *Christ*; and thereby shew him to be a person in that *God*, who is *God only*? E. g. One of the expressions he quotes, as proving *absolute supremacy*

*premac*y to belong to *God only*, is from 1 *Tim.* 6. 15. *King of kings, and Lord of lords.* But the margin of our *English* bible refers us to *Rev.* 17. 14. and 19. 16. where *Christ*, the *Lamb* that was slain, the *Word of God*, has this title, *King of kings, and Lord of lords.* And therefore, the expression being the same, if it proves absolute supremacy to belong to *God*, it proves it to belong to *Christ*, who therefore is *the supreme God*; or else there are two *supremes*, the one *subordinate* to the other. The same might be said of the other titles of *God*, which in one part or other of the Scriptures are all given to *Christ*. And when they are collected, and set in opposition to those passages which imply a *subordination*, the result of the whole will always be, that he is *equal to the father, as touching his Godhead, and inferior to the father as touching his manhood.*

Thirdly, in p. 16, the doctor shews plainly, he has no great affection for our *articles*, by dwelling so much upon the old *Arian* evasion, of subscribing to the *use* of the book of common prayer, not to the *truth* of the *doctrines* in it. Whereas our *articles* are *articles of doctrine*; and the *prayers* are built upon those *doctrines*, and recognize them; so that no honest man can *use* the *prayers*, if he does not *believe* the *doctrines*, both being conceived in the same terms.

Fourthly, in the same page, he says, that supposing the declaration does express an *assent* and *consent* to the *doctrines*, “yet still, those  
“doctrines must *have been* taken by the minister, in no other sense, than what he, accord-  
“ing

“ing to the best of his judgment, *admits* to be “conformable to the holy Scriptures.” But he plights his faith to God and his church, at the *time* of subscribing, that *according to the best of his judgment*, (which it is supposed he has taken care to inform properly) he DOES *admit them to be conformable to the Scriptures*, as they stand *expressed* by the church, in the sense that she *intended* them, not in a *reserved sense* of his own. As e. g. Every man that subscribes to the 8th article, declares, that the *three creeds may be proved by most certain warrants of holy Scripture*. And these gentlemen all know, the church of *England* services can never be reconciled with their heretical misconceptions of Scripture, by all the reserves and evasions in the world. The great *Dr. Clark* carried matters a little too far, and would needs be trying the experiment; which blew him up, and put his friends out of countenance for him. They are grown wiser now; and as the liturgy will not speak *for* them, they will take care it shall not speak *against* them. It is much out of order, they tell us; a REVIEW is the only medicine, and they the only persons that can administer it. Kind and benevolent Sirs, we thank you; but we know you rather too well; at least, it is not *your* faults, if we do not. We have not forgot some predecessors of yours, in the last century, certain quack doctors, who came over, with a nostrum, spick and span new, from *Geneva*; they persuaded the poor credulous church she was much troubled with the *tooth ack*, and cut her *head* off, to cure it.

Only



Only let her alone, gentlemen. There is nothing can hinder her doing well, but — too much of *your* attendance.

Lastly, as *errors*, like *misfortunes*, seldom come *single*, I find, in this sermon of Dr. Carter's, a dash of something else, besides *Arianism*. For, p. 7. there is this strange assertion, that “*virtue* has INTRINSIC excellencies, which “FAITH is *destitute* of, which give it, i. e. *virtue*, a *vast preeminence*.” Faith has one *intrinsic excellency*, which works are *destitute* of; and that is, that it will *justify* a sinner, and carry him to *heaven*, as it did the *thief upon the cross*; this, I think, gives IT a *vast preeminence* over *works*, which cannot *justify*, otherwise than, as *fruits*, they evidence the *faith* that does; for — *we are justified by faith only*, says the 11th article, upon the authority of Scripture. And it is the doctrine of the 13th article, that *works* derive all their *excellency* from *faith*, without which *they have the nature of sin*. Yet, according to Dr. Carter, *virtue* has *intrinsic excellencies*, which *faith* cannot give it, for it has them *not*. The reader will observe, how natural it is for *faith* to sink in its *value*, when *Christ*, who is the *object* of it, is *degraded*. The reason Dr. Carter assigns for the *preeminence of virtue over faith*, is a very extraordinary one. “It is fixed, says he, upon a *more indisputable foundation*.” I am sorry to hear that, because *faith* is fixed upon CHRIST; and OTHER *foundation*, I am told, *can no man lay*. The consequence of this sad fall of the doctor's into

these abominable errors, as it shews itself at the conclusion of the sermon, is very melancholy. He thinks proper to conclude with the 15th psalm; which, as it is there introduced, seems to countenance his notion of the *preeminence of virtue*, and to point it out as a way by which man may be justified, and heaven obtained; no mention at all being made of *faith*. But let us see, what a condition it puts us all into; and whether it will not prove the absolute necessity of *faith in Christ*, very *God*, as well as very *man*, to obtain salvation. The psalm begins with a question — *Who shall abide in thy tabernacle, who shall dwell in thy holy hill?* Then follows a description of a *perfect character*, performing *all righteousness*. And then it concludes — *Whoso doth these things, shall never be moved.* It is very true. *These do*, says the law, *and thou shalt live.* But the next question is, who is there that has *done them all*, and never offended in *one point*? Not one mere man, from *Adam* to *Dr. Carter*. And what is to become of us then? For it is written — *CURSED is every one, that CONTINUETH not in ALL things that are written in the book of the law, to DO them.* Here *faith* alone can help us, which assures us, there is a person who has *done all for us*. This person is *Christ*. And he it is, that is described in this 15th psalm; as appears to a demonstration, by comparing it with the 24th, where the same *question* is asked, the same *perfect character* drawn; and then it follows — *Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and be ye lift up ye everlasting*

*verlasting doors, and the king of glory shall come in. HE was to ascend into the hill of the Lord, to abide in his holy place, till his return from thence, in his glorious majesty, to give his people the blessing, even life for evermore.*<sup>a</sup> Let us his ministers, above all others, take care, that when he comes, we are found in HIM, *not having our own righteousness, which is by the LAW, but the righteousness which is by FAITH in Jesus Christ; ever remembering, that the reason why his righteousness is effectual to save us all, is, because the person who performed it, was Jehovah — This is his name whereby he shall be called, JEHOVAH, OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.*

But to return to our author. The next sentence that he has made the subject of his remarks, is in the same page with the last, and runs thus — *Have we not besides lived to hear of a guardian of Christianity moving the lay powers to expunge a creed out of the service of the church, only because it contains the faith he has subscribed to, and sworn to defend; by which subscription to the Christian faith, he holds the dignity, that empowers him to move for it's overthrow?* At this, he grows very *uneasy*; which I am sorry to see, because it looks as if something hurt him. And tho' we have been all along so very intimate and free, he puts on a most *dismal* face, and *formally* "begs leave to interrogate me solemnly." His first set of interrogatories may be reduced to this

<sup>a</sup> For this reason, our church has appointed the 15th for one of the proper psalms on *Ascension-day* in the morning, as she has the 24th in the afternoon.

one—"Pray Sir, how did you know what you "said to be true?" To which I humbly *crave leave*, in my turn, with all due *solemnity*, to answer, that as it certainly is true, he should in *charity* have supposed that I knew it to be so, when I said it; which, for his satisfaction, I assure him I did, by private letters of indubitable authority. But after all,

"Should the fact be true, (says he, when he "knew it was true,) what is the nature of it?" Why certainly it is only a proposal made to remove the *Athanasian* and *Nicene* creeds, and alter the act of uniformity, to open the way for *heretics* and *schismatics*, which has been so strangely choaked up, for many hundred years, with *creeds* and *liturgies*; and this proposal made by one, who has undertaken to guard the faith, and be a *father* to the church. There is nothing more in it. This is what "*he thinks* would be "an improvement." *St. Paul*, I remember, once *verily thought* he *ought* to do many things contrary to the name of *Jesus of Nazareth*, and endeavour, as much as he could, the extirpation of the *truth*, as it is in *Christ*, and *the church*, *the pillar and ground of it*. And, says the gentleman,

"Has not every bishop a *right*, or is he not "in your own phrase *empowered* to move for a- "ny such improvement?" *Right* and *power* are two things. Otherwise the *power* of speech may give a man a *right* to talk *treason*.

P. 35. "Have not the same powers that made "the liturgy, liberty to alter any part of it for "the

“the better?” The *making* of creeds and liturgies belongs to the *church*. The *secular powers* may recognize and allow the *use* of them among their subjects, or they may refuse to do it; for which, as for their other actions, they must account to *the only ruler of princes*. The church is not to take up arms, and fight it out with them. She is to *hold fast the form of sound words*, and *keep that good thing committed to her*, as a *depositum*, that will assuredly be called for, and demanded at her hands, by him who entrusted her with it. And if she *suffers* for so doing, all that follows from it is, that she is conformed to the image of her Redeemer, who *for this cause came into the world, that he might bear witness to the truth*; which he did, when *before Pontius Pilate he witnessed a good confession*, and sealed it with his blood. This is the true state of the matter; and I never yet heard of a *British* prince, or parliament, that assumed to themselves a power of setting aside the divinity of Christ<sup>a</sup>.

Ibid. “You say, the prelate moved the *lay powers*.” I do, because none of the spiritual Lords were consenting to a motion, the nature of which required, that it should have been laid before them, as the proper persons to take care *ne quid detrimenti ecclesie caperet*. After which

<sup>a</sup> On the contrary, by an Act in the 9th and 10th of *William the third*, it is made *ipso facto* forfeiture of all places and employments, civil as well as ecclesiastical, to deny any one of the persons in the Holy Trinity to be God. The second offence deprives the offender of all benefit of the law, incapacitates him for inheriting, and he is imprisoned three years, without bail.

it had been time enough to apply for the consent and approbation of parliament. But it was not without an infinitely wise reason, that he *whose providence ordereth all things, according to the counsel of his own will*, permitted the motion to be made; whereby the Right Honourable the *Irish* house of Lords had an opportunity of bearing the noble testimony they did to THE TRUTH, by rejecting the abominable proposal with the indignation it deserved, and not so much as suffering the heads of so vile a bill to be read; for which they deserve to be mentioned with honour, *among all posterities for evermore.*

Ibid. He asks me, “if I think Christianity “could not be supported by the Scriptures and “the *Apostolical* and *Nicene* creeds only.” As to the *Nicene* creed, that was to have gone with the *Athanasian*. But to answer directly to the point. The apostles creed was sufficient at *first*. *Wherefore then serve the others? They were added, because of heretics, whose subtle prevarications<sup>a</sup> rendered these creeds necessary to guard the faith; which made Luther, with great propriety, call the Athanasian creed, PROPUGNACULUM symboli apostolici.* And I am very sure this is not a time for the church to part with any of her fences. Rather perhaps we have reason to pray — *O be favourable and gracious to Zion; build thou the walls of Jerusalem!*

<sup>a</sup> The reader may see some of the *Arian* chicanery displayed in it's true colours, in the *appendix to a Vindication of the doctrine of the Trinity from the exceptions of an Essay on Spirit*, by the Reverend and learned Dr. *Randolph*, President of *Corpus Christi* College, *Oxford*.

At p. 36. The gentleman has worked himself up into a most vehement passion, and rates me, as if he could beat my teeth down my throat. "YOU, SIR, say this, and YOU, SIR, say that," when I say no such thing. If he does not compose himself, I shall be obliged to swear the peace against him, for putting me in bodily fear. Besides, for his own sake, I would have him be a little cool, because passion is the worst thing in the world for the *face*. It has often particularly a bad effect upon the *eyes*, and hinders a man from seeing his adversary's meaning; of which we have a very melancholy instance now before us. "YOU SIR, says he, roundly pronounce that the prelate moved to expunge the creed ONLY, for no other reason but, *because he had subscribed to it.*" My words are—*because IT CONTAINED THE FAITH he had subscribed to, and sworn to defend.* Faith in the *Trinity* is the faith into which he was *baptized*, and which, often before, and again at his consecration, he *subscribed to, and swore to defend.* And because the *Atbanasian* creed contained the *faith in the Trinity*, for that reason, and that only, I still say, *he moved the lay powers to expunge it.* And it is no more than what he has himself said, in <sup>a</sup> his *Essay on Spirit*; a book, which, as a learned and pious prelate of the *Irish* church very justly observed, *ought to have been burnt by the hands of the common hangman, as soon as*

a I call the *essay on Spirit* his, because I am assured upon good evidence, which I am ready to produce when called upon, that his Lordship has owned Himself the author of it.

*it was published.* But it has received it's death's wound, <sup>a</sup> and — *I war not with the dead.*

P. 34. For fear of accidents, the author has given us a *confession* of his own, which is as follows — “ I firmly believe, that the *Scripture doctrine of the Holy Trinity* (so far as I can understand a doctrine so mysterious, and certainly attended with *it's share of difficulties,*) is truly exprest in the *articles* of the church of *England.*” Now, tho' I have no right to call upon him for a confession of his faith, yet as he has given us one, thinking I suppose, (and indeed justly enough) that after what he had written, it was high time; I shall take the liberty to say, that I could have wished the *qualifying parenthesis* had not been thrown into the middle of this confession, about the doctrine having *it's share* of DIFFICULTIES; because it is one thing to understand fully the precise manner HOW *these three are one*; a task, to which reason is wholly inadequate; but it is quite another thing, to give testimony to the truth of God, when he tells us, they ARE so; for the doing of which, an adequate knowledge of the *manner* of their existence is by no means necessary. However, I cannot but hope the gentleman believes the doctrine: though it is somewhat odd to see him argue so zealously *against* one who does believe it, and *for* those who certainly do not.

P. 38. There are three sentences more cited from the sermon, without any remarks. What they are cited to prove, I know not, unless it

<sup>a</sup> See Dr. *Randolph's Vindication*, and Mr. *Jones's Answer*.



be, that the person citing them had not read *Scripture* enough, to understand them.

P. 41. "Mr. *Hutchinson* treats the *duties* taught "by *nature* and *reason*, as the *religion of the devil*." 1st, He says, that *nature* and *reason* were made to *learn* duties, not to *teach* them. 2dly, An imperfect system of *morality*, patched together of the broken *fragments* of Revelation, set up and enforced upon *infidel* no principles, against faith in Christ, or to the *exclusion* of it — THIS is what he calls *the Religion of ANTICHRIST*.

P. 42. He complains of us, for "turning the "*plainest history* into *sublime prophecy*." <sup>a</sup> As for instance now, the *plain history* of *Hagar* and *Sarah*, into the *sublime prophecy* of the *Jewish* and *Gentile* church; as *St. Paul* has done, quite in the *Hutchinsonian* way, without any ceremony; only prefacing his exposition with a censure of all those who were *ignorant* of that method of interpretation. *Tell me*, says he, *ye that are under the law*, do ye not hear the law? For it is written, — *Abraham had two sons*, &c. Which things are an allegory. Had the spiritual interpretation been a *whimsical* or *imaginary* thing, *St. Paul* had never urged it as an *argument*; which he does, and draws his *inference* from it — so *then brethren*, WE are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free. Stand fast THEREFORE, &c. And

<sup>a</sup> I had determined, as the reader may see by turning to p. 23. to pass by the trite and stale objections on this subject, which have been so often answered by others. But the author's phra-  
teology was so very remarkable in this place, that I could not help taking notice of it.

this shews the error of an axiom among the schoolmen — *Theologia symbolica non est argumentativa*. For so far is this from being the case, that no arguments strike the mind so irresistibly, as those drawn from the graphical delineations of the facts of Christianity in the histories and institutions of old. They constitute a species of evidence, which (as Mr. *Lesly* well observes) no other facts but those of Christianity ever had. This indeed must be said, that such kind of *prophecy is a sign only to those that believe, who by reason of use have their [spiritual] senses exercised, and the eyes of their understanding enlightened, to see wonderful things in God's law*. For those that are unexperienced in the things themselves, and perhaps deny their existence, can never be qualified to discern the prefiguration of them. Others will see, by comparing Scripture with Scripture, that enough of the old Testament is applied in the new, to enable us to apply the rest, if we have but humility to receive *the key of knowledge* from Christ, and diligence to use it, in opening the *secret treasures of wisdom*, which are otherwise for ever locked up, and *bidden from our eyes*. St. Paul, indeed, in his epistle to the *Hebrews*, has in a manner *spiritualized* the whole bible. But his doctrine is growing out of fashion. For besides that his writings are full of *type* and *figure*, he was a preacher of *passive obedience*. And as I find in him, *Rom. 9. 13.* the words, *JACOB have I loved*, I am far from being clear, that he was not a *JACOBITE*.

The author of the *Word to the Hutchinsonians*, in the course of his work, has said many fine things upon the virtue of *charity*. Indeed, by the frequent introduction of it upon all occasions, he seems to have been sensible, it was the subject he was qualified to shine upon. I beg leave to be an humble instrument of communicating to the world the lustre of some of the brightest instances of his shining in the *practice*, as well as speculation, of this lovely grace. It will occasion many pleasing sensations likewise in the mind of the reader, to observe how the *gentleman* keeps pace all along with the *Christian*. And when they unite their beams, and pour upon him in one blaze, I wish they are not rather more than he can bear.

P. 5. IF they were honest as to the end — a little learning, and a great deal of conceit — his own crude notions — vanity and impertinence — establish nothing but their own disgrace — P. 7. step forth public reformers in learning, with no other qualification, but the contempt of it — Morality not within the new system — P. 8. Hutchinsonian, enthusiastic, new reformers — dictatorial, abusive, uncharitable mode of preaching amongst these new reformers, void of meekness and void of fear — P. 14. comfortably self-sufficient — P. 19. scarce attended with common sense, or intelligible language — P. 20. the foolishness of folly — P. 24. gently, not so flaming — insolence armed with arrogance — P. 31. This Hutchinsonian zealot — P. 34. a false accuser of one of his brethren — P. 35. inserted wickedly — likewise inserted wickedly — P. 36.

*absolute violation of Christian Charity — YOU — YOU — YOU SIR — that dangerous, that unchristian disposition of soul — you must be contented to descend, and sink into the deepest humiliation — pretended zeal —* So again, p. 38. *so defective in Christianity, as to want even the prime virtue of it — so defective in human learning, as this author and his brethren —* So, p. 40. *contemners of sound learning — corrupters of genuine religion —* P. 44. *boisterous vain pretenders &c.* P. 37. *You yourself cannot possibly believe what you have asserted.* And then there is an application to me of one of the most tremendous curses ever pronounced against the enemies of God and Christ, by which I am shut out from all hope of mercy, and placed in the number of the reprobate and finally impenitent, for ever and ever — *Be not merciful to them that offend of MALICIOUS wickedness: for the sin of their mouth and for the words of their lips, they shall be taken in their PRIDE, and why? their preaching is of CURSING and LIES.* The gentleman stopped, a verse too soon — *Consume them in thy wrath, consume them, that they may perish.* And in the last page, that I may not be divided in my death from those to whom Christian friendship has joined me in my life, he has shut us all out together from *the light of the Lord God and the Lamb,* and consigned us over to *the mist of darkness;* thinking it proper, (as he says, after a long quotation from the *dunciad*) to conclude an address relative to religion, *powerfully,* in the words of Holy Scripture. And very *powerful* indeed they  
are

are — THESE are spots in your feasts of CHARITY, feeding themselves without fear: WELLS are they without water: CLOUDS that are carried about of winds: TREES whose fruit withereth: raging WAVES of the sea, foaming out their own shame: wandering STARS, to whom is reserved the mist of darkness. Here the author, I perceive, being cautious, left out the words *for ever*. But his caution comes too late; for as it stands there, it can mean nothing less than *damnation*, whether the words *for ever* are added, or not. But to go on—*When they speak great swelling words of VANITY, they allure those who were clean escaped from them who lived in error. And while they promise them LIBERTY, they themselves are the servants of CORRUPTION.* The reader will give me leave to subjoin his motto — *Above all these things put on CHARITY, the very bond of perfectness.*

These, Sir, are *hard speeches* against men, of whom their enemies themselves, being judges, must own, that they are sound in the *faith*, steady to the *church*, and regular in their *duties*. I say not this to boast; for *sinner*s have nothing to boast of. But I am constrained to say it, in our defence. Personal failings and infirmities we have many, from all which *we hope to be saved, even as others, thro' the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ.* But upon as impartial a survey as I can take of all that has been said or wrote against us, (for I pretend not to be without prejudices) I must declare, that *neither against the law, neither against the temple, neither against Cæsar, is it proved that we have*

*offended*

*offended any thing at all.* Consider therefore, Sir, in the sober hour of thought and reflexion, (for much does it deserve your consideration) consider over again, what you have said of us; and particularly the application you have made to us of those most awful and tremendous judgments of the Almighty against the impenitent enemies of his Christ. Think where you would be, if he should deal with you, as you have dealt with us. Consider, that the praise or reproach of the world cannot last long. The world itself grows old, and nature, sunk in years, gives evident signs of her approaching dissolution. But however near the end of the world may be, our end cannot be far off. Then it will be found, (happy for us, if we consider it in time) that *of making many books there is no end, and that much study of worldly wisdom is weariness of the flesh,* without profit of the Spirit. We shall then perceive, that the *bible* only will survive the fire that consumes the world, and be opened in heaven, when the light shall shine thro' every part of it, displaying Christ it's blessed subject to the ravished eyes of all those, who *by night*, in this dark world, have *sought* him in it, under the *veil* of it's sacred and adorable *mysteries*. Experience will then convince us, that Scripture knowlege only lasts beyond the grave, and opens a passage thro' the waters of death, into the promised land, conducting us to the *gates* of the *Jerusalem* above, where is the *throne* of *eternal judgment*. Before that throne, Sir, you, and I, and all of us must shortly stand; and there must  
the

the secrets of all our hearts be revealed, and laid open, before heaven and earth assembled. And then will it be known, what were our motives in preaching, and your's in writing. As to all you have said against us, may God forgive you, as I am sure we do, for endeavouring greatly to injure the characters and reputations of men, who know not that ever they have offended you, or any one else. And if, in the foregoing pages, there is any misrepresentation, or aggravation, it has slipt me unwittingly, and I am sorry for it.

And now, my younger brethren of the university, you see what there is to be said *against* us; and your candour will not pass sentence of condemnation, without reading what is said *for* us. If you find reason to do it then, we submit. The author of the pamphlet we have been considering talks of our *profelyting* and *seducing* you. We want not to profelyte you to any *sect* or *party*; for we never design to constitute a *sect* or *party*; but, as members of the *church*, subjects to the *king*, and *sons* of the *university*, we desire to spend our lives in their service; continuing *stedfast* and *unmoveable*, in the stations *allotted* us. And we hope, there is no harm in wishing that you may do the same, living in due subordination and humble obedience to your *tutors* and *governors* in this place; for the prosperity of which all must pray, that ever *pray for the peace of Jerusalem*. They cannot stand separate, and can only fall together. May you so employ the calm days of peace and quietness you enjoy in this  
happy

happy retirement, that you may be able, when you launch forth into the world, to weather all the storms of *infidelity*, *heresy*, *schism*, and *sensuality*, those four winds, that strive for the mastery, upon that troubled sea. That so, wherever you are sent to preach the Gospel, and wage war with the enemies of man's salvation, your piety may adorn the church, and your learning do honour to the university. If there is any man, into whom we have inculcated principles contrary to these, let him stand forth, and declare it. But if to inculcate these be to *seduce* you — then, we do verily own ourselves to be most exceedingly guilty.



## P O S T S C R I P T.

I Thought I had done here ; but find myself obliged to take some notice of thé Reverend Mr. *Heathcote*, who (as it should seem, by an advertisement of his, in *capitals*,) has entirely overthrown Mr. *Hutchinson*. Upon looking into his book, I find he has indeed made quotations from him. Several of them contain great and important truths, against which Mr. *Heathcote* has said nothing. Some are mangled and misrepresented, as the reader may see, if he thinks it worth his while to turn to, and compare them. And a few more passages are quoted for the severity of the expressions in them. But in order to judge of *their* propriety or impropriety, it is necessary to know who are the persons spoken of, what is the nature and quality of the crimes charged upon them, and what the strength of the evidence that supports the charge. If, when these circumstances are duly weighed, they appear to be unjustifiable, we defend them not. This is a sufficient answer to all that is advanced by Mr. *Heathcote*. — Tho' upon second thoughts, it may not be amiss, just to give the reader a specimen of the manner in which he uses those, who are so unhappy, as to fall under his displeasure. “ We are told, says “ he, p. 85. that Mr. *Hutchinson* never offended “ with his tongue, never spoke with more “ warmth than was strictly justifiable.” And he

refers to the page in the editors\* preface, where he is *told* so. But in that page it stands thus — “That he never offended with his tongue, never spoke with more warmth than was strictly justifiable, WE SAY NOT.” This method of quoting, together with the phrase, *cabalistic theologian*, and other flowers of rhetoric scattered up and down, and above all, the *paradoxes* in his *system*, demonstrate the truth of an assertion in his title page, that he is ASSISTANT PREACHER at *Lincoln's-Inn*.

\* The reader will be pleased to observe, there is but *one* edition of that *preface*.

F I N I S.







