



Library of the Theological Seminary.

PRINCETON, N. J.

Collection of Puritan Literature.

Division

Section

Number

3/6

PL

SCC

9002

THE
Arminian Doctrines

Condemn'd by the
HOLY SCRIPTURES,

By Many of the
Ancient Fathers,
By the *Church* of *England*,

And even by the
Suffrage of Right Reason.

In Answer to the Rev^d. *Daniel Whitby*, D. D.
Chantor of the Cathedral-Church of *Sarum*.

Together with an Answer to his *Four Discourses*.
To which is added an *Appendix*, reflecting
on Mr. *Lightfoot's* Last Pamphlet.

By JOHN EDWARDS, D. D.

L O N D O N :

Printed for JOHN WYAT, at the *Rose*
in *St. Paul's Church-Yard*. 1711.

THE

LIBRARY

OF

THE

UNIVERSITY

OF

CHICAGO

ILLINOIS

1887

NO. 100

ST. CLAIR

STREET

CHICAGO

ILLINOIS

1887

T H E
P R E F A C E

WHEN I first entred on this Work; that is, To take notice of the mischievous Progress of the Arminian Doctrines among us, I foresaw what Usage I should meet with; and accordingly I now find my self and my Writings exposed to the Licentious Tongues and Pens of many of our Clergy. They are frighted out of their Wits with Calvin's Ghost: They are wonderfully disorder'd and enraged, because they see some of his Doctrines revived and restored, though they be the very same that our own excellent Church teaches us. The Vindication of these displeasing Truths hath procured me, among several others, one Adversary in the Church of Sarum; that is, The Reverend Dr. Daniel Whitby, alias Whitbie, as he writes himself at * another time, for he is not fully settled as to his Name; and so we may conceive some hopes that, as he alters his Name, so he may in time change his Opinions. And seeing he submitted to a publick Recantation of one † of his Books, we may expect that

* In the Title-Page of his Book, entitled, [The Certainty of the Christian Faith, &c.] and in the Epistle before it.

† The Protestant Reconciler.

he will Retract this other, the rather because he may shew his Love of Truth in this latter, whereas he shewed only his Cowardise in the former.

It is observable, that after he had renounced his Protestant Reconciler he retracted apace, and abandon'd his former Judgment about all the Five Points, and several others. He * tells us that he hath changed his Opinion about the Number of the Passovers during the time of our Saviour's Ministry: He held them to be Four, but now they are Five, and perhaps in his next Book they will be but Three. He calls to his Reader, in his Additional Annotations to blot out some of his former Annotations. He apprehended Dr. Mills's intended Performance to be very valuable, and applauded his Exact Judgment and great Variety of Learning, as we see in his Preface to his First Volume of Annotations; but afterwards in his Examen Var. Lect. D. Millii, he disparages that very Undertaking, and charges the Author with Negligence and Ignorance and wilful Perverting of the Bible. Thus slippery and variable is Dr. Whitby, he is carried about with every Wind that blows in his unsettled Head. This Chantor is always ready and prepared to sing a New Song, to the Tune of Ecebolius the Turncoat. The Cathedral Church of Salisbury hath been Famous for its lofty Spire; but now it is much more noted for this Weathercock which belongs to it. One tells us that the Dr. refused the Deanry of Sarum, because he could not with a good Conscience subscribe to the Article of Original † Sin: And yet afterwards he very warmly courted this Preferment; as much as to say he had chang'd his Opinion; or if he still retain'd it, then it appears what an Amphibious and Trimming Conscience he hath. No Man knows where to have him, if Ecclesiastical Prefer-

* Annotations on 17 John.

† Pierc. Vindic. F. D. p. 196.

ment, or Secular Interest be his Load-star. He will, like a true Switzer, go over to that side which pays best and most. However, this leaves us not without some Hope (as was said before) that he will think of altering his Mind again, and receding from his Heterodox and Dangerous Opinions.

And indeed he hath broach'd as many of this sort as any one Man of this Age hath done. I will mention some of them. He hath the Confidence to assert in his Preface to the Epistle to the Galatians, that in all the Scripture of the New Testament there is not to be found one Exhortation to any Christian to believe in Christ, or to act Faith on Christ: And he ridicules all those Preachers who are so zealous in their Sermons to exhort Christians to believe in Christ. He tells us that believing in Christ concerns only unconverted Jews and Heathens, and not a Christian Man; that when Persons have once believed, 'tis not required of them in any place in the Apostolical and Evangelical Writings, that they should afterwards act Faith on Christ. Which wild Opinion of the Dr. is confuted by all these following Texts, which have respect to Christians, and not to Unconverted Persons: 14. John 14. Believe in God; believe also in me: Which words the Dr. himself * owns he takes in the Imperative Mood, and they were spoken and directed to Christ's Disciples, and not to Pagans. The Apostles Paul and Barnabas exhorted the Disciples (those that were converted to Christianity) to continue in the faith, 14. Acts 22. and that was the Faith in Christ. In Δ. Rom. 24. If we believe in him that raised up Jesus from the Dead, it is implied, that Faith in Christ is required of Christians, as we gather from the Apostles we. When the Apostle had said, 5. Rom. 1, 2. Being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our

Lord Jesus Christ, *be immediately adds,* By whom also we have access by Faith into this Grace wherein we stand : *Which is a clear Confutation of the Dr.'s fond Conceit ; for the Apostle tells the believing Romans, that as they were justified by Faith in Christ Jesus, so now still they are continued in that excellent State by the Exertment of the same Faith.* In whom (that is, in Christ Jesus our Lord) we have boldness and access with confidence by the Faith of him, *saieth the Apostle,* 3. Eph. 12. *As much as to say ; We who are confirmed Christians are sure of Audience and Acceptance with God ; and this vast Privilege we have thro' our whole Lives by the Faith of him, that is, Faith in Christ Jesus our Lord, mention'd in the immediately foregoing Verse. In the Name of all the true Christians of the Church of Conrith, the Apostle saith, We having the same Spirit of Faith (as David had) according as it is written, I believed, and therefore have I spoken ; we also believe, and therefore speak, 2 Cor. 4. 13. We now, as well as at first, believe and trust in Christ Jesus, and particularly with respect to his glorious Resurrection, which is the great Support of the Christian Faith, of which the next Verse speaks. Thus whilst these Texts stand in our Bibles, it is in vain to talk as the Dr. doth, and tell the World that Christians are not obliged to believe in Jesus Christ.*

There are several other Texts yet behind, as 2. Gal. 20. The life which I now live in the flesh, saith the same Apostle, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me. In which words a perpetual Exercise of Faith in Christ is commended to us by the Apostle's Example. As long as we live in the flesh ; that is, as long as we are in these frail Bodies, we are obliged to act Faith on Christ, for this is the Spiritual Life of every true Christian. The Ephesians are exhorted to take the shield of faith ; 6. Eph. 6. that Faith wherewith they shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked ; that is, the Devil : And this can be no other

other than Faith in Christ Jesus : And this is that Piece of Armour which all Christian Soldiers are to make use of thro' their whole Lives. Again, there is this Exhortation in 1 Thes. 5. 8. Let us who are of the day be sober, putting on the breast-plate of Faith : Which is certainly spoken of Faith in Christ, because 'tis join'd with the hope of salvation in the same Verse, and with obtaining salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ in the next Verse. The Philippians furtherence and joy of faith, 2. Phil. 25. proves the very thing we are now upon ; for this Joy and this Faith are abundant in Jesus Christ, as the next Verse informs us. In the Epistle to Philemon, verse 5. the Apostle doth not mention the Faith which Philemon had, but what he now hath, when he is a confirmed Christian, Hearing of thy faith which thou hast towards the Lord Jesus. That is a plain Exhortation which we meet with in 10. Heb. 21, 22. Having an High-Priest over the house of God, let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of Faith, in a firm and stedfast Reliance on the Merits of our High-Priest Christ Jesus. And what plainer Text can we desire than 1 John 3. 23. This is his commandment, that we should believe on the Name of his Son Jesus Christ. That we who are establish'd Christians, should still act Faith on our Saviour and Redeemer. Lastly, those Words in 1 John 5. 13. That ye may believe on the Name of the Son of God, are spoken to Believers ; for St. John in the former part of the Verse saith, These things have I written unto you that believe on the Name of the Son of God.

Thus I have presented the Reader with a sufficient Number of Texts, some whereof necessarily imply an Exhortation to those that are Christians to believe in Christ, and others plainly express it, as plainly as 'tis possible. And now let us hear what the Dr. saith to me ; He tells me
that

that * if I can shew one Text that contains an Exhortation to those who are already Christians, to believe in Christ, he promises (*he saith*) to renounce his Assertion publickly. I appeal to the Reader whether I may not justly claim the Performance of the Dr.'s Promise, and whether, if he doth not perform it, he may not be charg'd with Dishonesty and Faithfulness. But I believe the Reader will scarcely expect any other from him; when I have told him how obstinate and peremptory he is: For he is so far from Relenting, that he hath the Face to say, that his foresaid † Assertion is as certain and demonstrable as any Proposition in the Book of Euclid. And having mention'd Euclid, he is inspired with a Mathematick Spirit, and comes with his Definition and Postulatum thus, A Christian (*saith he*) is one that believes in Christ; nor can he cease to do so whilst he is a Christian. *This is his Definition: Then he proceeds,* It can't be consistent with the Wisdom of the Holy Ghost, or of the Holy Scripture, to exhort any Christian to do what he knows every Christian must do, and cannot but chuse to do. *That he saith is his Postulatum. And then he concludes, Ergo,* it can't be consistent with the Wisdom of the Holy Ghost to exhort any Christian to believe in Christ.

Not to mention how false and groundless his Postulatum is, but to go on with him in his own way. If he thinks this to be true Mathematic Arguing, then I argue thus, A Christian is one that repents of his Sins, nor can he cease to do so whilst he is a Christian. *But it can't be consistent with the Wisdom of the Holy Ghost, or of the Holy Scripture, to exhort any Christian to do what he knows every Christian must do, and can't chuse to do. Ergo, It can't*

* Additional Annotat. p. 98.

† Additional Annotat. p. 98.

be consistent with the Wisdom of the Holy Ghost to exhort any Christian to repent of his Sins. Yet I find the Dr. and his Brethren in their Sermons calling upon their Auditors to repent of their Sins; and I suppose they thought they spoke to Christians. And the Apostles in their Epistles frequently exhort Offenders, even in the Christian Churches they wrote to, to abandon their former evil Ways, which is the same with Repenting. St. Paul tells the Christian Corinthians, that he rejoiced that they sorrowed to Repentance, 2 Cor. 7. 9. When he saith, he shall bewail many which have sinn'd already, and have not repented, 2 Cor. 12. 21. it is necessarily implied that he would be willing to exhort these Offenders in the Church of Corinth to Repent. The Advice to the Christian Church of Ephesus, is, Remember from whence thou art fallen, and Repent, 2. Rev. 5. And to the Church of Pergamus, Repent, v. 16. And to the Church of Laodicea, Be zealous therefore and repent, 3. Rev. 19. And as for believing, I have before fully and amply prov'd that that is required of those who are already Christians. So the Dr. comes off very ill with his Definition and Postulatum; for 'tis retorted upon him with that Force of Truth which he can never be able to reply to. In the mean time see what a strange Mathematic Divine we have got, who will demonstrate that as soon as we come to be Christians, we must neither believe in Christ, nor (according to his way of arguing) repent of our Sins; we must not exert any Acts of Faith, or of the other Evangelical Grace. Who could imagine that such Thoughts or Language could come from a Christian Divine, and a Divine of the Church of England?

I will proceed to other Particulars, and shew that he is so bold and rude with the Church of England, that one would not take him to be her Son, or her to be his Mother.

*He flatly denies * the Doctrine of Original Sin, and therein directly opposes the Ninth Article of the Church of England, which saith, that Original Sin is the Fault and Corruption of the Nature of every Man that naturally is engender'd of the Offspring of Adam, whereby Man is very far gone from original Righteousness, and is inclined to evil, so that the Flesh lusteth against the Spirit; and therefore in every Person born into the World, it deserveth God's Wrath and Damnation.*

He holds † the Salvation of Heathens, and all that are out of the Christian Church; which our Church condemns as false Doctrine in her 13th Article, where she saith, Works done before the Grace of Christ and the Inspiration of his Spirit, are not pleasant to God, for as much as they spring not of Faith in Jesus Christ. And again very peremptorily in the 18th Article, They are to be had accursed that presume to say, that every Man shall be saved by the Law or Sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his Life according to that Law, and the Light of Nature. For Holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the Name of Jesus-Christ whereby Men must be saved. In the Homily of Justification there are these Words, Without Faith all that is done of us is but dead before God, although the whole Work seem never so gay and glorious. In the Homily of Good Works, Part I. it is largely insisted upon, that the Works of Heathens are not good Works. To maintain the contrary he wretchedly perverts several Texts of Scripture; but more particularly that, 3 John 6. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; from which Words he saith, it can't be inferred that Man in his Natural State can do nothing but what is Carnal,

* Annotat. on 5. Rem. and his Preface to his Discourse of the 5 Points.

† Answer to Three Objections. Chap. 2.

and therefore Sinful, and only can begin to do what is truly Good when he is born again of the Spirit: *But he approves of Tolet's Exposition, that to be born of the Flesh is meant only of that Natural Generation by which a Man is born into the World. He is so pleas'd with this groundless Conceit that he mentions it not only in his Annotations on the Place, but in his Discourse of the Freedom of Man's Will, p. 330. whereas we are plainly directed from the Context, to understand this place concerning the Corrupt and Unregenerate Nature of Man; and all the sober and learned Expositors on this Text agree in this Interpretation.*

In his Preface to the Epistle to the Galatians he confidently averrs, that the applying of Christ's Merits, and apprehending, relying or laying hold on him for Salvation, is an unscriptural Notion.

In his Additional Annotations, p. 68, &c. he vilifies the Reverend Bishop Beveridge for asserting the Protestant Notion of Justification; namely, by the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness.

He hath shew'd himself so far Civil to the Church of Rome, as to clear her and the Papal Power and Hierarchy from being Antichrist; in his Annotations on 2 Theff. 2. although all the Protestants in the Reformed Churches Abroad, and our own Church in her Homilies, and our Learnedest Writers in their Sermons and Discourses, have given another Exposition of that Chapter, and have applied it to the Papacy.

In his Annotations on 2 Pet. 6, 3, 7. and on the Epistle of Jude v. 7. he holds that there is no Hell, and that neither Devils, nor the Souls of the Wicked who are deceas'd are in Hell, or are punish'd there; and how indeed can they when there is no such Place?

In his Annotations on 2 Cor. 5. 1, 8. he lets us know that it is his Perswasion that there is no Heaven where the Souls of the Righteous are at present. A very hopeful Divine, that believes neither Heaven nor Hell! As before

we observed, that he requires neither Faith nor Repentance in a Christian. Certainly the late Managers in Westminster-Hall might have produced the Dr.'s Books with equal Reason, that they exposed those which contained Impiety and Profaneness in them.

He hath the Front to contradict the express Words of Scripture, as might be shewed in a vast Number of Texts: I will content my self with Two or Three. The Words in 1. Luke 44. are these, The babe leaped in my womb for joy; but Dr. Whitby saith, there was no such thing. There is not any Infant in the Womb, saith he, capable of any Joy, as having no Apprehensions of Good to be enjoyed, or Evil to be avoided, and so he cannot be capable of that Joy, which results only from these Apprehensions. The Holy Woman said the Child leap'd in her Womb for Joy, the Dr. saith it did not, and it is impossible there could be any such thing. If he had consider'd (as one would think he should) that this was an Extraordinary Case, the Angel having foretold, that this Child should be filled with the Holy Ghost from his Mother's Womb, 1. Luke 15. this surely must have cured his Infidelity. But we see that he is void of all Consideration when he hath a mind to oppose a plain Text of Scripture.

See this in another Instance: It is the Apostle's Doctrine that we are by nature children of wrath, 2 Eph. 3. as being the Offspring of Human Nature lapsed: But the Dr. directly denies this, and in his Preface to his Discourse of the Five Points, he saith, we do not become Sinners by our Birth: It is not our Nature that is the Root of Wickedness. Doth not the Dr. endeavour to render the Scripture Ridiculous, as well as False, by such an Assertion? The Apostle saith, By one man's disobedience many are made Sinners, 5. Rom. 19. And he had said before, By one man sin entred into the world, and death by sin, and so death pass'd on all men, for that all have sinn'd, v. 12. But Dr. Whit-
by

by expressly denys this in his *Additional Annotations*, p. 86. It cannot be truly affirmed, saith he, that we all sin in *Adam*, and by his Disobedience were made Sinners. *The Business is come to this Issue*, St. Paul had said that we are made Sinners by one Man's Disobedience: But this was not truly affirmed by St. Paul, saith the Chanter of the Church of Sarum. Now, whether this be to Interpret, or to Contradict Scripture, let any Rational Man judge.

In several other Respects Dr. Whitby hath distinguish'd himself by his strange and extravagant Notions and Opinions, and by endeavouring to pervert the received Doctrines of our Christian Faith. In vain have our Pulpits and our Presses been roaring against Atheism and Deism these Twenty Years and upward, when at the same time the Dr. and some of his Brethren have printed and preach'd up those Doctrines which encourage the Deists and Atheists of this Generation, and strengthen the Hands of the bold Sceptics of this Age: Yea, by disparaging the Scriptures, and lessening the Authority of them, by their Misrepresentation of the Sense of those Sacred Writings, they not only gratify the Persons before-mentioned, but those of the Church of Rome, who have mean Thoughts of the Bible, and are wont to cry out of its Imperfection and Obscurity. It can't but be taken notice of, that the Dr. is so in love with his Annotatorship, that he hath lately publish'd some Scraps and Shreds to be added to what he formerly presented the World with: And here, as well as in the former Performance, he hath by his Variety of Glosses and Scholia's, and the Discrepancy of them, by his propounding of sundry unsafe Expositions, by his Retracting of some of his former Interpretations, by his Senses that contradict themselves, he hath, I say, by these ill Practices endeavour'd to shake the Credit of the Holy Scriptures, and the chief Truths contain'd in them. And if any Man observes how he lays hold on all Places to assert the Arminian Doctrines, he will be persuaded that the
main

main Design of his Three Volumes of Annotations was to distort and wrest the Scripture, in order to the maintaining of these Points. Else it is impossible he should have had the Confidence to fetch in such a vast Number of Texts : There is scarcely one Chapter, but he hath made use of some part of it to his purpose, and sometimes whole Chapters are press'd into the Service.

It is remarkable that he hath done a great deal of Mischief with his Greek Commentators ; for whatever was ignorantly said by them, whatever was imprudently and rashly borrow'd by them from the Principles of Pagan Philosophy (in which most of them were bred up) and what was said by them only in way of Surmise and Conjecture, and sometimes in the way of Allusion, he lays bold upon it, and stuffs his Annotations with it. Indeed any Man may observe, that he hath all along in his Writings weeded the Fathers for Sayings and Expressions that he thought favour'd his Opinions. If I am not mistaken, he had better have let this Expounding and Paraphrasing Trade alone, for it can't escape the Observation of Judicious and Knowing Readers, that where he hath any thing considerable, he is a Plagiary ; and where there is any thing of his own, he is very Fallacious and Tricking, and plays the Sophister, and perverts the Words of the Scripture to serve his Humour. It is true, he is a great Pains-taker, and may be said to slave at the Work of Book-making : But the Labour consists chiefly in Transcribing and in Repetitions. Of this latter the Instances are almost innumerable : Whole Pages in his Annotations, and in his other Writings, are twice, yea thrice, and even four times over repeated, as the observing Reader will find : So that he is a double Plagiary, he steals not only from others, but from himself. Yea, he is in love with the Repetition of the same Phrase, as to instance in that of *δολοῦν ὑποδίστα*, which he applies in his Annotations on 1 Phil. 1. to Bishop Pearson, in his Additional Annotations to Mr. Whiston ; and in another

Place

Place to Mr. Dodwell, He is a Man, saith he, who will say any thing, ἰστέμειν ὑποδέσει, to serve his Hypothesis. And he is so delighted with this fine Phrase that he brings it up whenever he pleases, and applies it to whom he will.

I might have taken notice of his Ungrammaticalness, his Quibbling, and his Nonsense, and his bordering on Prophaneness. Jeeringly he desires Mr. Whiston * to be merciful to such blind Creatures as he is. But where is the Grammar and Sense, good Dr., in making your self blind Creatures?

You tell us, that God styles himself not only the First, but the Last, Isai. 46: 6. † Because his Being lasts to all Eternity. Good Sir, you should not deal in Puns when the Subject is of this Nature.

That is an odd Saying for a Divine, * Mr. Whiston hath the Glory of being the Inventor of an Observation manifestly false, and not worth a Rush were it as true as the Gospel. And that other, ∴ As in two Apples of equal goodness, no Reason can be given why I should chuse one rather than the other; so neither can any Reason be assigned, why all or any Persons are elected to Salvation, rather than all or any that are not elected. Such Comparisons surely are Odious. What Savoury Notions, what precious Similitudes hath this sort of Divines got into their Heads!

That is another Decent Saying, ** To say God requires the not Elected to make their Calling and Election sure, and to work out their Salvation, is what we call a Bull. Again, is not that very reve-

* Additional Annotat, p. 117.

† Sermon on the Attributes, Vol. 1. p. 50.

* Additional Annotat. p. 27.

∴ Disc. concerning the Decree of Election, p. 36.

** Ibid p. 76.

rently express'd, †† Is it not very strange that our Blessed Lord should be so much an *Ignoramus* as to imagine, &c. *What think you? Is not the Dr. a Writer of a very Pious and Correct Style?*

Further 'tis to be noted, that the Dr. puts us off with any poor Snips of Philology and Criticism; as thus, * Moderation, saith he, is not derived from the word *Medium*, but from *Modus*, and that is from the Hebrew *madad*, he measured, or *middab*, a Rule or Measure. *Wonderfully Learned is the Man!* And so again, † sometimes the Adjective *moderate*, or Adverb *moderately*, hath respect to Measures either of things dry or liquid: And then it is not a Measure of things Moral, or as they are capable of being Good or Evil, but as they are more or less, great or small, high or low, long or short, or of a middle Nature between both; and in this Sense a Man is said to be Moderately Learned, Wise, or Rich.

What Plenty of Learned Nonsense is here, and yet with a Critical Air? It is, and yet nothing in the singular Number went before to which we can refer it: But if he will needs refer this to Measures of things dry or liquid (as we suppose he doth) then this is his noble Meaning, that a Bushel or a Quart-pot is not the Measure of Vertue or Vice, of Good or Evil: But you may measure Things high or low, long or short by them, and things of a middle Nature, as these Three Things, Riches, and Wisdom, and Learning, which are betwixt long and short, just in the middle of them. How the Dr. is qualified as to the first of those Three I can't tell, but no Man disputes his Moderation as to the two latter.

†† Additional Annotat, p. 114.

* Ibid. p. 108.

‡ P. 110.

What doth the Reader think of his Words in his *Additional Annotations on 2 Cor. 5. 9*? That the wicked shall have immortal Bodies at the Resurrection, I no where find clearly delivered in the Holy Scripture, but only that the Destruction of their Bodies will be everlasting. Is not this clever Sense, that the Bodies of the Wicked shall not be Immortal and Everlasting, but the Destruction of them shall be Everlasting: Their Bodies shall be punish'd for ever, tho' they shall not Exist for ever. The Dr. more than once in his Writings complains of his Age; and truly now we see that he had Cause to do so, for we find that he hath out-liv'd his Reason, and dotingly puts upon us the most senseless Propositions that can be thought of.

But it is his late Book concerning the Five Points that I am chiefly concern'd in at present, wherein he hath signal-ly contradicted the Church of England's received Articles, and opposed her most avowed Principles. A great part of it is no other than a nauseous Repetition of what he had deliver'd before in his Annotations, as the Reader may be convinced by comparing Paragraph with Paragraph, and even Page with Page sometimes. Throughout the whole there is nothing but the old Arminian Cant over and over again. Hoard, of God's Love to Mankind is his perpetual Fund and Magazine: There is nothing Material said by him but what is fetch'd thence. He thought he had Reason to borrow lustily from him, who, like himself, was a Calvinist at first, and afterwards revolted from that Opinion. It seems he would rather be an Apostate than a Predestinarian.

As to this Book in general, I believe I may say with Truth, that there is not any one Argument in it which was not foreseen and before-hand answered in my *Veritas Redux*; and therefore I shall not now be guilty of that Fault which I blame in him, that is, needless Repetition.

I will only take notice of a few Passages in his Preface to the whole Book, wherein the Humoursome and

Fantastick (as well as the Heterodox) Genius of this Writer will be perceiv'd. He tells us, that he was bred up a Calvinist in the University Seven Years, and firmly entertain'd those Doctrines. Surely not very firmly; as appears from what follows: For he saith he was first made a Convert by Reading Joshua Placæus, who put him out of Conceit of the Doctrine of Original Sin: And this, like the First Transgression, was the Spring of all his other Disorders: This made him run into all the Opinions of the Remonstrants afterwards.

You must know that this Placæus was Professor at Saumur, and fell into some of the Errors of the Remonstrants, for which he was Censured by the Protestant Churches in France; and particularly his Pernicious Notions about Original Sin, which Dr. Whitby hath lick'd up, were condemned by the Synod at Charonton, and by the Divinity-Professor at Leyden. This is the Man, whom our English Protestant Dr. of Divinity thought fit to make his First Guide, when he was going to change his Principles.

The other Gradual Steps of his Conversion, or rather Apostasy, were these:

He was, he saith, confirm'd in this Opposition against Original Sin, by a Conference which he had with a Deist, who scornfully rejected the Doctrine of Imputation. And no wonder, seeing as a Deist he must as scornfully reject the Scriptures, on which it is founded.

Next, he saith, he held Discourse with a Physician, who was not able to reconcile the Ninth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, with the Common Notions of Mankind concerning God; and thereupon the Dr. was further established and settled in all the Arminian Points, and gave himself up wholly to the Deist and Physician, who have ever since been the Directors of his Judgment and Conscience in these Matters. Is not this Pleasant

Enter-

Entertainment for a Serious Reader? Is not this very Comical from a Reverend Professor of Divinity? Doth he not assign very Laudable Authors of the Change that is in him?

*Who would take him to be in good Earnest? It may be, we must not look for any such thing from him: He hath been a Merry Man in his time: And I remember, in his * Discourse of Idolatry, his Answer to an Objection is, Ha, ha, he. This Laughter is a bad Symptom. It is thought by some, that if the Physician he speaks of, had directed the Dr. to a Dose of Helebores, he had acted suitably to his Faculty, and to the Dr.'s Condition.*

Thus, it is very requisite to be acquainted with the Disposition and Genius of the Person whom we encounter. It is good to see what Sort of Men we have to deal with; and that hath been the Design and Business of this Preface. Which will be a great Help to the Reader, towards his Forming a Right Apprehension concerning the Attempts of this Author, which I am now to consider in the following Papers, and concerning my Performance in them; which I here submit to the Judgment of the Intelligent and Unprejudic'd.

One Word more, and I have done. I hope the Reader will not be surpriz'd, when he meets with some Sharpness of Stile which I have used upon Occasion. That shameful Mixture and Conjunction of Weakness and Confidence, which I observ'd in the Dr.'s Writings, rais'd in me sometimes (as it could not but do in any other Person) more than Ordinary Resentments: And besides, the Wisest of Men hath authorized us, in some Cases, to answer some Men according to their folly.

* P. 171.

E R R A T A.

PAGE 5. Marg. line 8. r. verifunile; and for in r. cum. P. 26. l. 18. for Men r. Man. l. ult. read tho'. P. 37. l. 16. after before insert and after. P. 39. l. 21. r. fingulorum. P. 45. Marg. l. 4. r. vires. P. 50. l. 8. from the bottom, r. preserv'd. P. 51. l. 6. from the bottom, for them r. you. P. 69. l. 3. from the bottom, for said r. such. P. 87. l. 4. before or, insert tho' generally they hold that it doth, as was observ'd before. P. 94. l. 11. for is r. in. P. 101. l. 2. for this r. the. P. 110. l. 16. r. Arminius. P. 112. l. 5. from the bottom, for do r. did. l. 4. from the bottom, for did r. do. P. 113. l. 3. from the bottom, for Corruptions r. Conceptions. P. 122. l. 17. after Prelates insert and. P. 135. l. 9. after end bring in what is said in the Margin. P. 141. l. 17. for determin'd r. foreknew. P. 153. l. 10. r. preceptive. P. 162. l. 14. before is, insert of this English Expression. P. 166. l. 14. for Heads r. Hearts. P. 172. l. 16. after is insert as. P. 226. l. 3. from the bottom, r. movens. P. 227. l. 4. r. necessariò. P. 232. l. 23. r. Light.

Faults in the Hebrew.

P. 170. l. 7. from the bottom, r. velo. P. 171. l. 15. r. nasha and nephesh gnal. l. 17. r. gnaloth.

Faults in the Greek.

P. 43. Marg. p. 61. Marg. p. 63. l. 18. r. λογικῶ. P. 157. l. 18. r. ἀφες.

T H E

Arminian Doctrines

CONDEMN'D, &c.

MY main Business at present, is to return an Answer to that Part of Dr. *Whitby's* late Discourse on the *Five Points*, which he calls a *Postscript*; it being something which came into his Head, by way of *Superfætation*, after he had finish'd his Treatise. For he saith, That after he had sent his Book to the Press, he met with mine; which it seems was not very Welcome to him, because therein I had censur'd some Passages in his *Annotations* on the New Testament, which were *the Result of Fifteen Years Study*, as he saith himself. We may well then think that he was extremely Ruff'd at this Usage: And accordingly, now he comes upon the Stage with great Indignation, and exerts all his Might and Vigor in shoring up that weak Cause which he had undertaken. To this purpose, he makes use of that *Sleight and Cunning Craftiness*, which the Apostle observ'd in the Seducers of his Days, and which is his Talent, as much as it was theirs. But I shall with all Plainness detect his studied Sophistry,

B

2 *The Arminian Doctrines condemn'd*

stry, and shew how Unreasonable it is in him to press the Belief of those Notions, whereof there are so slender Evictions. I shall all along let the Reader see how he affects to fill his Papers with Contradictions, to fight against himself, as well as against the Truth. I shall also take this Opportunity to *Enlarge* upon some of those Matters which I had Occasion heretofore to discourse of, and to *confirm* the Truth and Reality of them.

His *Postscript* was chiefly fram'd to reflect on, and refute that Part of my Book entitled *Veritas Redux*; where I assert, that the *Points which I have treated of* (namely, the *Anti-Arminian ones*) are defended by several of the *Fathers*, especially those who were the most *Competent Judges of them*. And now Dr. *Whitby* enters upon the Work, and tells us what he intends to do; he engages to *demonstrate* (for he offers nothing less than *Demonstration*) that not one of the *Doctrines I espous'd*, was maintain'd before *St. Augustin's Time*. And by the by, 'tis observable, that the Dr. was so big, and so transported with this great Undertaking, that he could not afford to write Sense. I shall, saith he, at present only consider, and to demonstrate, &c. He thinks it is below him to speak according the Rules of *Grammar*. This *Arminianism* is above that; and *Predestination*, and its Concomitant Doctrines, can't be opposed without false *Syntax*.

The *Postscript* first undertakes to prove, that the *Absolute Determination of a certain Number of Persons to Life or Death*, is a Novel Doctrine; that is, That none of the *Fathers* who were before *St. Augustine*, say any thing in its behalf; and that all that I have alledged on that Head is inconsiderable, and (as he is pleas'd to compliment me) *impertinent*. But see how this Champion's Valour quails! He declines the Combat after his great Vauntings; For tho' I told

told him that we have it from St. *Augustin* himself, in his Book of the Good of Perseverance; That some of the Fathers who wrote before him, as *Cyprian*, *Nazianzen*, *Ambrose*, held that there is an Absolute Predestination of a certain Number of Persons; and that the Father quotes Passages out of them for this, (and for the Special Grace of God;) yet here is profound Silence; he takes no Notice of it at all; tho' he pretends in this Postscript to make it his Business to prove, that none of the Writers that were St. *Augustin's* Seniors, spoke any thing in Defence of the Doctrines which I asserted. Notwithstanding this, the Dr. stands mute, and hath nothing to say: He neither objects against the Assertion, nor cavils (as we shall see is his Practice at other times) against the Quotation. Which is very Ominous to the Dr. and may incline his Readers to believe, that as he is silent here in the Entrance of all, so he hath as much Reason to be so afterwards. We may be sure, that he would have exerted the Force of his Opposing Faculty in the Beginning, for his own Credit, if he had found the least Ground for it. He must either have granted, that these Doctrines were taught by others before St. *Augustin*; or he must have said, that St. *Cyprian* and *Nazianzen* were not before that Father: But the former he knew would be too plain a Confutation of himself, and the latter he was ashamed to averr; wherefore he chose to say nothing. Thus his great Bravado's, which he had made in the Beginning of his Postscript, are come to this; and the Absolute Predestination of a certain Number of Persons stands impregnable, and he does not here offer any thing against it, or against the Ancient and Learned Father who deliver'd it.

But now he begins to open; and saith, that I absolutely deny that Election to Life and Salvation is on the Account of Faith or Works foreseen. You must

4 *The Arminian Doctrines condemn'd*

know, that all along he pretends to set down my *very Words* in the several Articles I maintain: But I have not these Words; and therefore he is not true to his Pretensions. However, I grant that the Words contain my Meaning; for I hold that it is not *upon the Account* of Faith or Works foreseen, that any Man was chosen to Everlasting Life. And this is the Doctrine not only of St. *Augustin*, but of other Fathers before him; as is evident from this, that St. *Augustin* reckons it among the Heresies held by *Pelagius*, that he maintain'd, in Defiance of the True Doctrine of the Church, that Eternal Election was founded on the Foresight of Faith and Good Works. This is as clear as the Noon-light in the Writings of St. *Augustin*, who writ against the *Pelagians*. * There we may see that it was Part of the *Pelagian* Heresy, that God therefore chose some to Life and Glory, because he foresaw that they would be Holy and Upright: Whereas the *Catholicks*, on the contrary, held, That God chose them to Life and Glory, that they might be Holy.

I do not deny that the Fathers frequently say, that God *foresaw* who should be holy; but I do not remember that it is maintain'd by them, that God was moved to predestinate Men to Life *because of* their foreseen Holiness, or *on the account* of their foreknown Faith and Repentance; for they frequently alledge those Words of the Apostle, 1 *Eph.* 4. *He hath chosen us in him before the Foundation of the World, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love:* And therefore Holiness is the Fruit of Election, and consequently not the Cause of it.

* *Augustin. de Prædestinatione Sanctorum. De Bono Perseverantiæ. Lib. cont. Pelag.*

And now, what is the Doctor's Quotation out of *Vossius* to his Purpose? *That Author*, saith he, declares † that all the Greek Fathers always, and all the Latin Fathers (tho' the Word *all* is in neither of these Parts of the Quotation, but is clapt in by the Dr.) who lived before St. Augustin, held that they were predestinated to Life, (the Dr. can't construe a plain Piece of Latin; for 'tis not said, they held, but only, they are wont to say) whom God foresaw that they would live piously and righteously; or, as others say, whom he foresaw would believe and persevere to the End. But the Dr. doth not tell you what this Learned Man adds immediately; namely, That the Fathers ∴ did not think that on Man's Part there is any Cause of Predestination unto Preventing Grace. And presently after, * It is very probable that all, or most of the Catholic Fathers, when they make Faith prior to Election, do not consider Faith as a Cause properly so called of Election. Let us also hear what he saith in his Preface to his *Pelagian History*, which he publish'd in that very Year in which the Synod of *Dort* began: The Words are in Substance, That † he thought it would be worth " his Labour to shew, from the Sense of the Ancient Church, that he is to be taken for a *Pela-*

† *Vossius's own Words are these*: Græci Patres semper, Patrum Latinorum vero illi qui ante Augustinum vixerunt, dicere solent eos esse prædestinatos ad vitam, quos Deus piè rectèque victuros prævidit; sive, ut alii loquuntur, quos prævidit credituros & perseveraturos. *Hist. Pelag. Lib. VI. Thef. 8.*

∴ Nec putarunt ex parte hominis Causam dari Prædestinationis ad gratiam prævenientem.

* Perquam verisimilis est vel omnes vel plerosq; in fidem electioni faciunt priorem, non tamen considerare fidem ut Causam electionis propriè dictam.

† Operæ me præmium facturum existimavi, si docerem ex Veteris Ecclesiæ sensu, pro Pelagiano & Hæretico habitum esse, &c. *Epist. ad Lector.*

6 *The Arminian Doctrines condemn'd*

“ *gian* and a *Heretic*, who believ'd that God hath
“ predestin'd Men to Life, who he foresaw would
“ by their natural Strength believe and persevere:
“ Also I have shew'd, saith he, from pious Anti-
“ quity, that those Mens Opinion was rejected,
“ and condemn'd as Erroneous, who held an E-
“ lection of some to Glory, partly on the Fore-
“ sight of Natural Works, by which they begin to
“ believe and will aright, and partly on the Fore-
“ sight of the Works of Grace, by which their
“ Faith and Godliness are compleated. Not but
“ that all Catholicks did agree in this too, that
“ God did predestine none to Eternal Salvation,
“ but such as he foreknew would by the mere
“ Gift of his Grace begin in Faith and their Good
“ Will, and persevere in Good unto the End.
So then, that foregoing Testimony of *Vossius*, and
of the Writers that he cites, is nothing to the
Doctor's Purpose; for who doth not grant that the
Omniscient God *foreknew* what Persons those would
be, whom he predestinated to Life and Salvation?
He *foresaw* their Faith, and Piety, and Perseve-
rance; but this doth not prove, that it was *on the*
Account of these Qualities that he predestinated them
to Life.

And the Dr. might have observ'd that *Vossius* doth
not mention *Origen*, who was one of the *Greek Fa-*
thers, and was *before St. Augustin*, and who in plain
Terms owns that Predestination is wholly founded
on the good Will and Pleasure of God; as we may
see in his Words set down at length by *Petavius*,
Tom. 1. Lib. 9. P. 578. which this Author acknow-
ledges to be a full Testimony. And the Learned
Huet in his *Origeniana*, Lib. 2. Quæst. 7. produces a
Passage out of *Origen*, on 9. *Rom.* 11, 12. which
shews that he can sometimes approve of their Opi-
nion, who hold that Predestination is not grounded

on the foresight of good Works, but on the mere Pleasure of God. We see then the extreme Vanity of the Dr. in quoting *Vossius*, and in depending on the *Greek Fathers*.

When I alledg'd, that *Prosper* reckons it as the Doctrine of the Favourers of *Pelagius*, that Election is upon foreseen Faith; and when I quoted an Epistle which he wrote to *St. Augustin* to prove it, the Dr. overlooks my Allegation: But produces a Passage out of that Epistle which he calls an *Ingenuous Confession*, but in Truth he most disingenuously perverts the Words of *Prosper*; for he tells us, That *Prosper* enquired of *St. Austin* how he may avoid this Imputation of Novelty; For, saith he, having had recourse to the Opinions of almost all that went before me concerning this Matter, I find all of them holding one and the same Opinion, in which they have received the Progress and Predestination of God according to his Prescience. which is not only falsely render'd by the Dr., but he hath also left out that in the beginning which enlightneth the whole Passage. The true English of the * *Latin* is this; We beseech you that you would patiently bear with our Foolishness, and shew how that Objection may be clear'd; namely, that they having again perused the Opinions of almost all that went before them concerning this Matter, one and the like Opinion is held by them, in which, &c. Where we see that *Dr. Whitby* hath chang'd the Sense of the Words by a false and unskilful reading of them: For it was not *Prosper* himself, but the *Massilians*, whom he speaks of, that found this to be the Opinion of the Ancients: And yet the Dr., against the very Words

* Illud autem qualiter diluatur, quæ sumus patienter insipientiam nostram ferendo demonstræ, quod retractatis priorum de hac re opinionibus pene omnium, par invenitur & una sententia quæ propositum, &c.

8 *The Arminian Doctrines condemn'd*

and plain Meaning of them, attributes it to *Prosper*, and calls it his *Ingenuous Confession*: Which he would not have done, if he had been careful to understand the Words, and give the true *English* and Meaning of them: For we see here that when they are translated aright, they are nothing to his Purpose; yea, they are much against it.

The Dr. pretends to be a great Reader of the Fathers, and he makes a great shew of them in his *Annotations*; but I advise him for the future, that when he takes them down from his Shelves, he would not return them to the Place too soon, but take care to understand the Import of those Quotations he produces out of them. When he takes down *Prosper* again, let him remember that in the forecited Place he tells us what some *French Divines* objected against *St. Augustin's* Opinions, not what he thought himself. And let him take notice that these cavilling Divines pretended not to have perused *all*, but *almost all* that went before them: So that 'tis implied, that there were *some* that held otherwise concerning Predestination; that is, they held it to be Absolute and Unconditional. If the Majority were of another Opinion, that doth not hinder the Validity of what I said, that these Points *were asserted by several of the Fathers*: And tho' these were the fewer, yet they might be the more Judicious, as certainly they were. It is plain then, that the Dr. confutes himself by this Quotation out of *Prosper*, wherein 'tis own'd that some of the Ancients *before St. Augustin* asserted Absolute Predestination; that is, without regard to Faith or good Works. Now let the Reader judge whether the Dr. had any Reason to question (as he doth) whether *Prosper was fit to be produced by me as a Witness of the Antiquity of these Doctrines*.

As for *Prosper*, his *own* Opinion is well known, tho' the Dr. wilfully disguises it: He plainly asserts that Predestination is from Free Grace, and not from the Consideration of what shall afterwards be in Man, as we may see in his *Epistle to Rufinus* concerning *Grace and Free Will*. Even * *Petavius*, who was of the Dr.'s Sentiment as to Predestination, acknowledges that this was *Prosper's* Sense in this Place. And the same † Author owns that *Prosper* held in many other Parts of his Writings, that Predestination is Absolute, and flows from the mere Will of God, without any Regard to Faith or Works. Who now can have any Regard to the Dr.'s Quotation? Yea; who can think any otherwise than that he never read *Prosper*, but that he quotes him at second or third Hand? Surely, it must be a very sorry Cause that is defended by such *unfair* and *unscholarlike* Means as these. It is a sign that the Dr. will (as he charges Mr. *Dodwell*) say any thing to serve his Purpose. From him we learn that there is nothing so Braving and Assuming as a *Renegade Calvinist*, such as the Dr. confesses himself to be.

- But he asks, *to what end I cite St. Augustin as a Witness of the Antiquity of these Doctrines, who manifestly owns that he was formerly of another Opinion*. If it had been so *manifest*, I suppose the Dr. would have given us that Father's Words, but he could find none; and therefore he doth as good as own that he imposed on the Reader, when he told him that *St. Augustin* manifestly acknowledges that he had been in former times of another Persuasion. But say that he had

* Dogm. Theol. Tom. 1. l. 9. p. 653.

† Prosper in plerisq; locis illam quam Augustino esse consentaneam ostendimus de Prædestinatione sententiam affirmat. Ibid.

acknowledged this, (and I do not deny it) may it not with as good Reason be ask'd of Dr. *Whitby*, To what end is his Testimony to these other Doctrines, who manifestly owns in his Preface to his Book, that he was formerly of another Opinion; and was a staunch Calvinist till the *Deist* and the *Physician* set him right. If his Argument against St. *Augustin* be good, then on the same ground nothing that this Dr. saith is to be regarded. Let him champ upon that.

Next he quotes *Ferome*. But the first Passage out of him is so doubtful, and so easy to be understood on either side, that it will be of no Service to him. The other Two, for which he refers to *Ferome's* Commentaries on the Epistles to the *Galatians* and *Ephesians*, (which I need not here set down) attribute the different State of Men to the *Prescience* of God, but they exclude not his *Predestination*; yea, the latter Quotation expressly mentions it; and there is a good Reason for it, because Foreknowledge is founded on the Decree. So that it remains still impregnable, that it was *Ferome's* Opinion, that Election is without the foresight of Good Works; that is, as they are a *Motive*, *Inducement*, or *Cause* of Election. But it is wonderful, he saith, that I should attempt to prove this was St. *Jerome's* Sentiment from his 1st. Book against *Rufinus*: But the Reader will find these express Words there, (and then he will find that the Dr. wonders without any Cause.) * *The Apostle doth not say*, [He hath chosen us before the Foundation of the World, when we were Holy and without Blame,] but, [He hath chosen us that we might be Holy and without

* Non enim ait Apostolus, Elegit nos ante Constitutionem Mundi, quum essemus sancti & immaculati, sed, Elegit nos ut essemus sancti & immaculati; hoc est, qui sancti & immaculati ante non fuimus, ut postea essemus.

Blame;] *that is, That we who before were not Holy and without Blame, might be afterwards.* And presently after he saith, † *Paul, and those that are like him, are not chosen because they are Holy and without Blame, but they are elected and predestinated, that by their Works and Vertues in their succeeding Lives they might be Holy and without Blame.* Have I not Reason then to quote this Passage out of St. *Jerome's* first Book against *Rufinus*, seeing here is sufficient Proof of that Assertion which I cited it for; namely, That Holiness is the Consequent, not the Cause of Predestination? And we gain this by the Quotation, that hereby we discover the Unreasonableness of our Adversaries, who separate the *Eternal Decree and Holiness*, whereas the Apostle joins this to that. Yet they are so Stupid and Senseless as to say, That if Persons be absolutely Elected to Life and Salvation, then they may do what they will; they may curse and swear, and live in all Dissoluteness of Manners, for they shall certainly attain to Eternal Happiness, and can't miss of it, whatever their Actions and Behaviour are.

I might observe that Dr. *Whitby* outdoes *Arminius* himself in this Point about Predestination; for he expressly owns, that † *the Decree of Election excludes all Causes in Man*; yea, he outdoth the rankest *Papists*, he is not so Orthodox as one of the Chief Champions of the Church of *Rome*, who, from the mere Prevalency of Truth, acknowledges in plain Words,

† Non enim eliguntur Paulus & qui ei similes sunt, quia erant sancti & immaculati, sed eliguntur & prædestinantur, ut in consequenti vita per Opera aliaq; Virtutes sancti & immaculati fiant.

† Disputat. 15.

that

that † *there can be no Cause of Predestination assign'd on our part.* Yea, the Dr. presumes to averr, that ∴ *the Scripture no where speaks of any Personal Election.* He then that saith the Dr. is not a Hightlyer will scarcely be believ'd.

I will now take notice of the more *Particular Opposition* which is made by him to the Doctrine of the Decrees, as explain'd by the *Calvinists*. And first, the Doctrine of the Decrees is exclaim'd against by our *Arminian Profelyte*, because it for ever excludes the greatest part of Mankind from *Mercy*. To which I answer, This Objection is easily return'd on those that made it; for they themselves own, that the greatest Part of Mankind are excluded from *Mercy*, and this must be by the Will or Permission of God, for otherwise it could not happen. And they likewise grant, that God is not pleased to vouchsafe to all Men that Aid and Help, without which they are no more capable of being Converted, and finding *Mercy* with God, than a Blind Man is able to see, or a Cripple to walk, or a Stone or a Stock to hear or speak, or an *Arminian* (while such) to have a due Reverence for the Holy Scripture, and a Sense of God's Sovereignty, and not to idolize his own shallow Reason. It is true, they say that God invites and calls upon Sinners to repent and believe; he exhorts and beseeches them, and he expostulates the Case with them, *Why will ye die?* But they confess that he doth not by his Spirit change their Hearts, and make them capable of *Mercy* and *Pardon*. Now, This cannot be accounted for on *Arminian* Principles, but may very well on those of the *Calvinists*;

† Bellarm. de Grat. & Lib. Arbit. l. 2. c. 11, 12, 13.

∴ *Annotat. on 9. Romans, and Discourse on the Five Points.*

for they resolve it into the Sovereign Disposal of God, *the purpose of him who worketh all things after the Council of his own Will*, 1. Eph. 11. *Who bath mercy on whom he will have Mercy ; and whom he will, he hardneth*, 9. Rom. 18. All Men in his Eternal View being before him in a laps'd and sinful State, he chose out from among them whom he pleas'd to extend his *Mercy* and *Favour* to, and the rest he left to perish in and for their Sins which they commit. Hence it is that he doth not allow every Man that special Assistance, without which 'tis impossible they should believe and repent, and consequently be saved. And this is own'd by our Adversaries; they can't deny that God witholds from the Generality of the World that Peculiar Grace which is absolutely necessary to their Salvation : For else they would all actually be saved. Now, is not this the same thing in effect with an *Absolute Decree of Reprobation*, and putting Men under a Necessity of being eternally Miserable for their Sins ? Yea, certainly 'tis the same in all reasonable Construction, and therefore they who admit of the one, can't with any Reason speak against the other.

The Second Objection, and which is often repeated by the Dr., is, That if there be Absolute Decrees, then it follows that Men are under a Necessity of being *Wicked*. He and his Friends think this is shrewd Arguing ; but there is nothing in it, for Men are under the same Necessity of sinning from the *Foreknowledge* of God. The most stiff and eager Patrons of *Arminianism* grant this. So then the Truth of the Case is this ; these Men can't digest God's *decreeing* the Fall of *Adam*, or the Sins of other Men ; tho' this is not more liable to Objection than what they themselves hold ; namely, That God *foresaw* this Fall of *Adam*, and all other Men's Sins ; and that this *Foresight* induces a Necessity of
 Sinning ;

Sinning ; that is, the Event shall be Certain and Infallible, or else it was not a real *Forefight*. And let me add, *Foreknowledge* is founded on *Predestination* ; and then what hath the Dr. and his Accomplices to say ?

But still their common Cry in the Pulpits against the *Calvinists* is, That they impute the Sins and the Misery of Men to God's Decrees, and so make him the Author of the one, and the unmerciful Inflicter of the other ; whereas they should wholly lay both on the Sinners themselves : And this they inculcate upon their ignorant or prejudiced Hearers with great Earnestness and Zeal, and then ever afterwards the *Decrees* are cried down, exploded and laugh'd at by them. Such *Cheats* do these Men put upon the People, (for I can give 'em no better Name) they wretchedly impose upon their Auditors when they endeavour to persuade them that we attribute Men's Sins and the dreadful Effects of them to God. We utterly abhor such an Imputation ; and we profess and declare that the Sin and Destruction of Sinners are wholly from themselves. All Men that sin, sin voluntarily and freely, and thereby it becomes their own proper Act : And for that very Reason there can be no Pretence of ascribing it to the Divine Being. This all *Calvinists* assert and avow, and consequently 'tis a Slander that is cast upon them, that by asserting the Decrees, they maintain that Men are compell'd by God to sin. There is no Colour at all for this Inference ; because the Divine Predetermination is consistent with the Freedom of Men's Actions : And it necessitates no one to the Commission of Sin and Vice, any more than the *Eternal Foreknowledge* doth.

The Third Objection is ; If the Divine *Decree* extends to Men's Commission of Sins, and their being damn'd for it ; why doth God admonish, exhort, and command Men not to commit those
Sins ?

Sins? And on the other hand, why doth he command them, and excite them by Promises, to do those Things which he hath determined they shall not do? And why is he concern'd to prevent the doing of Evil; why doth he use Methods in order to the Salvation of those that are decree'd to be everlastingly miserable? I answer, The same *Objection* will hold as well against God's Eternal *Foreknowledge of all Men's Sins*, and the miserable Issue of them; which yet is own'd and acknowledged by these Men. If God *foresaw* that such and such Persons would sin, and commit such and such Enormities; what is the Reason that he commands the contrary, and uses Means to prevent and hinder their Sinning, and is concern'd for the Salvation of those who he foreknows will be damned? To this Purpose St. *Austin* tells us, That * one of the same Religious House that he was of, made use of this Plea, when his Brethren reproved him for his Faults; namely, that how bad soever he was, and could be, he was no other than what *God foreknew he should be*. Whatever Reply our Adversaries make to this, will be as applicatory to the present Purpose, and give as good an Account of the *Divine Predetermination*, as of *Prescience*.

Another Objection of the Dr. and his Associates is, that Predestination is inconsistent with the *Freedom of Man's Will*, yea, that it utterly destroys it. I Answer, So the *Socinians* say that the Doctrine of *Prescience of all future Events* destroys Man's Free

* Fuit quidam in nostro Monasterio qui corripientibus Fratribus cur quædam non facienda faceret, & facienda non faceret, respondebat, Qualiscunq; nunc sum, talis ero qualem me Deus esse futurum præcivit. De bono Persev. C. 15.

Will; for if God foresees that Men will act thus and thus, there is a Necessity of their acting in that manner, (else God's Foresight is fallible, and indeed is no Foresight) and so Liberty is taken away. But what Answer do the Dr. and his Friends make to this? They say that the Divine Foreknowledge doth not influence on Men's Actions, and therefore *lays no Necessity on them of acting*. This is the very Reply which † the Dr. returns to the Objection about *Divine Prescience*; and he thinks (and that justly) that it is good and valid. The same say we as to *Predestination*, it only fixes the Certainty of the Event, but induces no Coactive Necessity in the Agent, and consequently takes not away the Freedom of the Will, but is consistent with it. With what Face then can it be objected to us, that by holding *Predestination* we annul the Liberty of Man's Will, when the same thing may as reasonably be said concerning the *Divine Prescience*, which yet our Adversaries say they acknowledge?

Thus I have briefly return'd a Satisfactory Answer to those Cavils which Dr. *Whitby* hath rais'd against the Doctrine of the Divine Decrees. And I cannot by any means prevail with my self to believe that the Intelligent Reader hath any other Apprehension, than that all which the Dr. hath said is mere Amusement, and that the Consequences which he charges our Doctrine with, are the same with those that attend his own; and that therefore what he alledges against the *Calvinian* Scheme, doth rather establish and confirm it, than any ways weaken it. Especially we must entertain these Thoughts when we consult the Divine Oracles, and see there how plainly these grand Truths are asserted.

† *His Sermons on the Attributes*, Vol. I. p. 214, 215.

Yea, even the Decree of *Preterition*, and the necessary Consequent of that, *Condemnation*, is founded on the Revelation which we have in the Holy Writings. We are informed there, that *the Lord hath made all things for himself*; that is, for his own Glory; yea, even the wicked for the day of evil, 16. Prov. 4. thereby glorifying his Justice in their Punishment. On which Text Dr. *Whitby* hath one Exposition, Dr. *Tillotson* another, and two or three other Divines have their several Conceits, all of them widely differing from, and contradicting one another, and perverting the very Grammatical Import of the Words, merely to evade the plain Force of the Wise Man's Aphorism.

Again; We read of *those that stumble at the word, being disobedient, whereunto also they were appointed*, 1 Pet. 2. 8. And immediately it follows in the next Verse, *But ye are a chosen Generation*. Here is a plain *Antithesis*: The Decree of *Election* is oppos'd to that of *Reprobation*. Which I the rather mention, because I do not find that any have taken Notice of it in this Place of Scripture: Which confirms the Sense of the Word *appointed*, in the former Verse, that I now offer. In 1 *Thess.* 5. 9. it is implied, that God hath *appointed some unto wrath*. St. *Jude* in his Epistle, v. 4. speaks of some *before of old ordain'd to Condemnation*. We must tear these Texts out of the Bible, if we renounce the Damnable Decrees.

We must know that God delights in Punishing of Sinners, as well as Rewarding the Righteous: His Acts of Vindictive Justice on Offenders in the other World, are as pleasing to him as those of his Mercy: And certainly then, they should not be displeasing to us. One of the Ancient Pious Fathers of the Church, hath taught us our Lesson on

this Occasion: " There was (saith * he) one Mass of
 " Perdition from *Adam*, to which nothing was due
 " but Punishment: But there are made out of that
 " very same Mass Vessels unto Honour. Be thank-
 " ful that thou hast escaped; for thou hast escaped
 " Death which was due to thee, and thou hast
 " found Life which was not due to thee. But you
 " perhaps will say, Why did he make me a Vessel
 " unto Honour, and another a Vessel unto Disho-
 " nour? What shall I answer? Will you hear *Au-*
 " *gustin*, who have not heard the Apostle saying,
 " O man, who art thou that repliest against God? You
 " would dispute with me, but rather admire with
 " me, and cry out with me, O the Depth of the
 " Riches!

I have one thing to observe concerning the Dr. which I will mention in this place, before I proceed further. They who have perused his *Annotations*, especially on the *Epistles*, cannot but take notice, that whereas all along he fastens on those Texts which look towards the Doctrine of *Predestination*, and labours to pervert the Sense of them, and then calls in the Help of the *Greek Fathers*, and fills up his Pages with Citations out of them; they cannot, I say, but take notice of his contrary Practice in his *Annotations* on *1. Rom. 1.* where the Word ἀφωρισμένῳ, *separated*, is remarkable: But not a Syl-
 lable of the *Greek Fathers* do we hear of from the Dr. tho' their Notes on this Text are very observa-
 ble. *Origen*, on this place, expounds this *Separation*

* Una erat massa perditionis ex Adam, cui non nisi supplicium debebatur: Facta sunt vasa inde in honorem ex eadem massa. Gratulare quia evasisti, mortem quippe debitam evasisti, & vitam non debitam reperisti. Sed dicis, Me quare fecit in honorem,

by Election: * In Paul (saith he) not only his General Calling to the Apostleship is assign'd, but even his very Election according to the Divine Foreknowledge: And he explains it by 1. Gal. 15. When it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb. He adds soon afterwards, (to obviate any Mistake about what he had before said concerning God's Foreknowledge) that † it must not be thought that that Foreknowledge is the Cause of Predestination. The Dr. was asham'd to produce such a Quotation as this.

And he was afraid to give us this following Exposition of St. Chrysostom on the Place: ∴ The Apostle, saith he, seems to me not only to signify by this Word (namely, Separated) a mere Sortition, but that he was of old, and from above, ordained or decreed to this: Which is the very thing that Jeremy tells us God said concerning him [Before thou camest out of the womb, I sanctified thee.] And, by the by, this Father's Comment on that place, is useful to shew the true Meaning of these Words; As many as were ordained to Eternal Life, believ'd, 13. Acts. 48. For the Greek Word which we translate ordained; is τεταγμένοι; which

& alium in contumeliam? Quid responsurus sum? Auditorus es Augustinum, qui non audisti Apostolum, dicentem, O homo, tu quis es, qui respondeas Deo? Disputare vis mecum: Imò mirare mecum, & exclama mecum, O altitudo divitiarum! August. Serm. II. de verbis Apostol.

* In Paulo non sola generalis Vocatio ad Apostolatam designatur, sed Electio protinus secundum Dei Præscientiam.

† Nec tamen Prædestinationis Causa putabitur Præscientia.

∴ Ἐμοὶ δὲ ἐν ταῦτα ἡ τὴν ἀποκλήρωσιν δοκεῖ μόνον ἀνέθεσθαι, ἀλλ' ὅτι πάλαι καὶ ἀνωθεν περὶς ἴετο ἢν τεταγμένοι, ὅσπερ καὶ Ἱερεμίας φησὶ τὸ Θεὸν εἰρηκέναι πρὸ αὐτοῦ, Πρὸ τῆς σε ἐξελεῖσθαι ἐν μήτρᾳ ἡγιασμένῃ.

Dr. *Whitby*, and those of his Perswasion, would have us render *dispos'd* or *fitted*; but *Chrysoftom*, who it is thought understood *Greek* a little better than the *Chantor of Sarum*, uses this Word here to denote God's *Eternal Decree*, or *Ordination*: Which is conformable to his Exposition of that forenamed Text, *As many as were ordained to eternal Life, believ'd*: That is *, saith he, *As many as were separated and determin'd to Eternal Life by God*: Which baffles the jejune and sorry Interpretation of the *Arminian* Expositors.

Another *Greek Father's* Note upon the Place, is this: *The Word † [Separated] is put here for [predestinated]*; as when God said to *Jeremiah*, Before thou camest forth out of the womb, I sanctified thee. And *Paul himself* in another place saith, When it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb.

This is the Interpretation which these Three *Greek Fathers* give of the Text; explaining ἀφωρισμῶ by προωρισμῶ, Separation being the same with Predestination: But the Dr. who uses to overwhelm the Reader with Quotations out of *Origen*, *Chrysoftom*, and *Theophylact*, here wilfully omits and leaves out the Expositions of these Three on the first Verse of the Ist. Chapter of the Epistle to the *Romans*; which is very Ominous, and foretells how Partial

* "Οσοι ἦσαν τεταγμένοι εἰς ζῶην αἰώνιον τῶν ἐστίν, ἀφωρισμῶ τῷ Θεῷ. Homil. 30. in Act.

† Τὸ ἀφωρισμῶν ἀπὸ τῶ προωρισμῶν εἰς τῶτο ὡς καὶ πρὸς *Jeremiah* φησὶν ὁ Θεός, Πρὸ τῶ σε ἐξελεθεῖν ἐκ μήτρας, ἠγίακά τε. Καὶ ὁ *Paul* δὲ ἀπ' αὐτῶ ἀλλαχῆ φησιν. Ὅτε εὐδίκησεν ὁ Θεός, ὁ ἀφορίσας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου. *Theophilact*. in 1. Rom. 1.

he would be in his following Annotations on the Epistle, especially when the Doctrine of *Predestination* is concern'd.

I take leave of this First Head of the Dr.'s *Postscript*, after I have reminded the Reader, that it is no very Commendable thing in a Profess'd Churchman, (such as the Dr. is) directly to opugn and deny the 17th Article of our Church; namely, *Eternal Election and Predestination*; which ∴ one of the most Eminent Prelates of this Nation styled *the Cause of God*. The express Words of the Article are these: *Predestination to Life is the Everlasting Purpose of God; whereby, before the Foundations of the World were laid, he hath constantly decreed by his Counsel secret to us, to deliver from Curse and Damnation those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of Mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting Salvation, as vessels made to honour*. Is not *Personal Election* here plainly set forth? And why then doth this Man deny it? I hate to see one who is a Cathedral Priest, and should maintain the Character of a True Son of the Church of *England*, and should be ashamed to renounce those Articles which he hath solemnly Subscribed; I hate, I say, to see such a one preach and write against the Doctrines, which he formerly own'd by his voluntary Subscription.

The next Doctrine which I asserted to have *Antiquity* to favour it, was that of *Original Sin*. And here our Champion doth not, dares not shew his Head; tho' he had undertaken to *demonstrate, that not one of the Doctrines which I had espous'd, was main-*

∴ Tho. Bradwardine, *Archbishop of Canterbury*.

tain'd before St. Austin's Time. We see there is no trusting to the Dr.'s large Promises and Pretensions. And whereas I appeal'd to the numerous Testimonies of the Greek and Latin Fathers, recited by *Vossius* in his *Pelagian History*; he passes this by, and saith not a Word to it: And yet this is the *Vossius* to whom he so often refers his Readers; and tells them, that it appears from that Author's Book, that the *Ancient Church* had none of those Doctrines that I maintain. How false this is, we may particularly see in this Doctrine of Original Sin; for *Vossius's* Words are these: * *There being these two things enquir'd into by us, Whether the Sin of our first Parents be imputed to all their Posterity; and, How far it is imputed; the Catholick Church hath always thus judg'd, That that first Sin is imputed to all; that is, by the just Judgment of God, it is transmitted as to its Effects to all the Sons of Adam; And the Church believed the Effects of it to be these; namely, that therefore it is that we are born destitute of Original Righteousness, that we are subject to the Necessity of Death, that we are liable to an eternal Separation from God.* And in his next *Thesis* he shews, what Texts of Scripture the Catholick Church made use of to prove this Doctrine, against the *Pelagian Writers*. And in his *6th Thesis*, he produces the Testimonies of the Greek and Latin Fathers, that liv'd before St. *Augustin's* Time.

¶ *Cum duo querantur, An primorum parentum peccatum imputeretur omni posteritati, & quatenus imputeretur, Ecclesia Catholica sic semper judicavit, Primum illud peccatum omnibus imputari, hoc est, justo Dei judicio secundum effectus suos in omnes Adæ filios transmitti; Effectus verò ejus esse credebatur, quòd propterea nascimur expertes justitiæ originalis, necessitati mortis subjecti, & æternæ à Deo separationi obnoxii.* *Hist. Pelag. L. 2. P. I. Thes. 1.*

Is it not then strange Confidence in Dr. *Whitby*; to say in his *Preface* to his Book (for there he handles this Point, tho' he takes no Notice of it when it comes in his way in his *Postscript*) that the Doctrine of Original Sin is the Invention of the *Scholastical Divines*; and that it is *School-Divinity* to say, that *Adam sustain'd the Persons of all Mankind*; and that *the Sin of Adam was the Sin of all his Posterity*? But was *Origen* a Schoolman, who said, † *As Levi was in Abraham's Loins when he paid Tithes to Melchisedech, so all Men were in the Loins of Adam*? Was *St. Ambrose* a Schoolman, who said, *It is manifest that in Adam all Men sinn'd, as in the Mass or Lump: For he being corrupted by Sin, all those who descend from him, are born under Sin: Therefore are we from him all Sinners, because we are all from him*? And was *Ferom* a Schoolman, when he said, *It is not to be wondred at, that what was done before in our Parent, is condemned in us his Children*? These, and other Quotations, are so well known, that I need not refer the Reader to the particular Places where they occur. Was *Augustin* a Schoolman, when he declared, *That ∴ after Adam had voluntarily sinn'd, we were precipitated into a Necessity of Sinning, because we descend from his Offspring*? And were all the other *Latin Fathers*, as well as the *Greek ones*, whom *Vossius* quotes, *School-Divines*? No Man, before *Dr. Whitby*, was of this Mind. And the said *Vossius* tells us in his *Preface* to the *Pelagian History*, that he hath shew'd how truly *Vincentius Lirinensis* writ, that none before *Cœlestius*, that prodigious Disciple of *Pelagius*, denied

† Comment. in 5. Rom. 12.

∴ Postquam liberâ voluntate ipse peccavit, nos in necessitatem præcipitati sumus, quia ab ejus stirpe descendimus. Contra Fortunat. Disp. 11.

24 *The Arminian Doctrines condemn'd*

that all Mankind is guilty of Adam's Prevarication. And he shews further, in the 2d. Part of his Ist. Book, That it was one Part of the *Pelagian* Heresy, that there is no Imputation of Adam's Sin to his Posterity. Which is the thing that St. *Austin* long since shew'd in sundry Places in his Writings against the *Pelagians*. Yea, this was the very Foundation of *Pelagianism*, that the Guilt of Adam's Sin was not transmitted to his Race. We may observe then, what Character the Dr. bears, according to the Decision of the Learned Fathers of the Church, and of the Learned *Vossius*. But, it seems, he chuses rather to be a *Pelagian* than a *Calvinist*: And he had rather herd with *Socinians*, than with Orthodox Divines.

But concerning the next Points; namely, *Free Will* and the *Grace of God*, he is very copious and blustering, and now thinks to make amends for his Brevity and Neglect in the former Article: He undertakes to shew the *Falseness* of my Assertion, That the Opinion of several of the Fathers concerning Men's *Free Will* and God's *Grace*, is the very same that I have maintain'd. For this I alledg'd the Suffrages of some Ancient Writers before St. *Augustin*, who assert the Necessity of the *Grace of the Holy Spirit*, in order to the Prosecution of good Works acceptable to God. To which the Dr. replies, *This is artificially said*; and further, *This is nothing to the purpose*, (two strong ways of confuting a Man,) and adds, *No Remonstrant or Arminian that I know of denies the Necessity of Divine Grace in order to the Prosecution of good Works*. Whence it appears that the Dr. doth not know himself, for in that part of his *Discourse* on the Five Points, where he treats of the *Salvation of Heathens*, he fiercely contends that they are able to do good Works, properly so call'd, by the mere *Light of Nature*, and he swaggers against *Vossius* (that *Vossius* whom he so applauds

at other times) for holding the contrary in several of his *Theses*. And as for the whole Tribe of *Remonstrants* and *Arminians*, they all of them more or less agree with the *Pelagians* in magnifying the *Strength of Man's Will*, and excluding *Supernatural Aid*.

I grant that the *Arminian* Divines speak sometimes of this latter, and seem to own it; But as the *Soci-nians* do in the Point of Christ's being an *Expiatory Sacrifice*, so do these Men in this Matter; they pretend to assert it, but when you come to look into it, you will find that this is but a Flourish and a Cheat and hath no Reality in it. They talk of the *Grace of God*, and profess to own that it is necessary to the doing of any good Action: But as *Pelagius* did, so do they; they mean by it no more than the Natural and Rational Illumination of the Mind, and the Freedom of Will which Man hath received from God, together with outward Instruction and Information out of God's Word. This the *Pelagians* meant by *Grace* or the *Divine Help*, as we learn from *Vossius's Pelagian History*, and *Petarvius's Dogmata Theolog.* and other Authors out of *Augustin*, *Ferome*, and *Prosper's* Writings: And the *Remonstrant* and *Arminian* Divines acknowledge no more. They confound *Grace* and *Nature*, for *Nature* is common to all Men, so is the *Grace* which they speak of, which they call *Sufficient Grace*; and they say it is given to every Man: And we see in the Lives of Men what are generally the Effects of it. I think this is a clear Demonstration that the *Arminians* make *Nature* and *Grace* to be the same; that is, to be *Natural* and *Common* Assistance, for if it were *Supernatural*, it would always do more than *Nature* can do: But we see the Contrary. These Men tell us that God affords his Help to all Men, but it is their own natural Free Will that renders it Effectual to some, and not

not to others. There is indeed a General Influence from God, but the Particular Determination of the Will is from the Man himself, after God hath done what he can. So these Men deny not that the *Divine Aid* and *Assistance* is absolutely necessary to the producing of all Good Actions: But by this they mean no more than such Ordinary Assistance and Concurrence as God bestows on any other Creatures and living Beings. God endows Men with Faculties, and upholds and sustains them; that is all: The same that he doth to Brutes. He furnishes every Man with a Free Will, (that is, his peculiar Faculty) and he leaves him to act it: And so if he uses it well, he Converts himself and Regenerates himself. They are so far from saying that the Will is efficaciously acted and influenced by God, that they affirm that the Grace of God, and all its Operations depend upon the Will of Men, Whereby he can believe and repent, if he pleases, not else; for the very Nature of his Will is such, that it is indifferent to Good or Evil. So that whenever he believes and repents, these are natural Exertments of his Will, and depend not upon Supernatural Aid. God cannot turn our Hearts and change our Wills unless he first asks us leave: And we with the Omnipotency of our Wills are able to resist him, though he sincerely designs to convert us. These are the *Arminian* Notions, and they are perfectly *Pelagian*.

I know there is one or two of these Divines that talk of *Special Grace*, but when you come to examine what they say, you will find that they intend no more than what hath been before mentioned; for they resolve the *Difference* between one Man and another in the point of Conversion into the Self-determining Power of the Will. This is observable in the Writings of those of the Church of *Rome*; thmost of them freely own the *Grach* of God; and
Bellar-

Bellarmino particularly in some Places of his Book of *Grace and Free Will* asserts, that nothing can be done in Matters appertaining to Salvation without the Assistance of God's Grace, yea, his *Special Assistance*, Lib. 6. cap. 4. But in other Places he destroys this, and utters things that are wholly inconsistent with it, and attributes Conversion to the *Efficacy* of the *Will*. This, this is that alone which makes the Grace of God Effectual. Thus though Dr. *Whitby* talks (as some of his Brethren do) of *Special Grace* in one of his Discourses, and seems to allow of such a thing, yet he resolves it all at last into the Man's Power and Action. The Operation which he calls *Special Grace*, consists in these Two Things, he saith; * first, *Representing Divine Truths to our Understandings*; and secondly, *Bringing these Truths to our Remembrance*; that is all: But it is our *Attending to them, and Improving them* that makes them Effectual. But how is this *Divine and Supernatural Grace*, when the Efficacy of it depends upon our own Compliance? And how is this *Grace Special*, when 'tis *common* to all Men, when it is in every Man's Power, and when every Man is able to exert it? And how is it *Special*, when 'tis only a *General Aid and Assistance*? Briefly, from what hath been said it is evident that my former Assertion was well grounded; namely, that our *Remonstrants* and *Arminians*, and our Dr. amongst the rest, *deny the Necessity of Divine Grace, truly and properly so call'd, in order to the Prosecution of good Works*: They attribute Conversion and Regeneration to their own Wills, not to Divine Grace, (which is purely *Pelagianism*.) Though the Dr. is pleased to say that *he knows of none of his Friends* that are guilty of it.

* Appendix to the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. And Discourse on the Five Points, p. 226.

Here I might observe that the Dr. is pleas'd at other times likewise to depretiate the Grace of God. He tells us, that † *Supernatural Habits or Christian Virtues are never stiled Grace in the Scripture*; and he will not allow that there is any such thing as Grace (as it denotes the Exertment of *Divine Power in Conversion*) so much as mention'd in the Sacred Writings. Of the Fallshood of both which he may be convinc'd from these following Texts; *Of his fulness have we received, and grace for grace, 1 John 16. We have received grace, 1. Rom. 5. The grace of God which is given you by Jesus Christ, 1 Cor. 1. 4. Abound in this Grace also, 2 Cor. 8. 7. To every one of us is given grace, 4. Ephes. 7. That it may minister grace unto the hearers, Verse 29. Singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord, 3. Col. 16. Let us have grace to serve God acceptably, 12. Heb. 28. He giveth more grace, 4. Jam. 6. Grow in grace, 2 Pet. 3. 18.* In which and other Places, the Supernatural and Christian Virtues produc'd in us by the Exertment of Divine Power, have the Name of *Grace* given to them, which Dr. *Whitby* peremptorily denies, in defiance of all these manifest Texts. He is pleas'd to assign only this one Signification, that * *it imports God's Favour and Kind Affection to us*; for tho' he mentions other Senses, yet he reduces them all to *This*.

This is the Interpretation of the *Socinians* and their Well-willers, and particularly of Mr. *Le Clerc*, who ridicules the *Grace of God*, and scoffingly exposes the very Word it self, as it hath relation to the Conversion of Sinners. Therefore one would wonder to see Dr. *Whitby* so sharp every where in his 2d Volume of *Annotations* upon that Writer, whose

† *Discourse of Sufficient and Effectual Grace*, p. 211.

* *Ibid.* p. 209.

Notion of *Grace* he is so taken with, and whose other *Pelagian* and *Arminian* Doctrines he so freely maintains. It is very entertaining to observe how severe he is upon a Man who is so like himself on several Accounts, as in his affecting of Grammatical Niceties, in his audacious Criticising (though not with the like Acuteness), in his Correction of the Copies of the Bible, in his claiming Acquaintance with all sorts of Authors, and finding Fault with them all; his straining and wresting the Scriptures, and affixing what Sense he pleases on them. Seeing they are thus very good Friends, and perfectly agree in so many Things, it can't but be somewhat surprizing to see how the *Chantor* falls upon the *Frenchman*, and reproves and chastizes him after a very Magisterial sort.

Here under this Head, the *Converting Grace of God*, I will take notice of one thing which frequently of late occurs in the Sermons and Discourses of our Divines, especially those that are the greatest Asserters of Free Will; and which (as I apprehend) doth, among other things very usual in their Sermons, shew their mean Thoughts of the Almighty Power of *Divine Grace* in the reclaiming of Sinners. They declare that *no late or Death-bed Repentance, tho' never so serious, is accepted of God*. They speak as if there were no Hopes of those that have spent all their Days in Sin and Wickedness, as if * *Despair* doth best become such Persons. The Reason that they give is, because the Dispositions of Men's Minds cannot be chang'd on a Death-bed. But this, I conceive, favours too much of an Opinion of Man's Strength, as if his own Power would serve him before, for that great work of Repentance, though

* *Dr. Pain's Practical Disc. of Repentance.*

not now. But 'tis certain that God's Grace is not confin'd : Old Age and a Death-bed do not exclude the converting Influence of the Holy Spirit. *Abraham* was almost Fourſcore Years old before God call'd him. *Solomon* and *Manasseh* were converted when they were advanced in Years. So was *Paul* : And of those Three thousand who were converted by *St. Peter's* Sermon, some of them without doubt were Ancient. And as to Conversion it self, we must know that the most vicious Inclinations and Affections, and even the most inveterate Habits of Vice, can be extirpated on a sudden by the Divine Grace. God can make a bad Man good at his last gasp : He can fill his Soul with all saving Virtues and Graces in a Minute. We know of those that have as it were in an Instant broke off their Sins, and abandon'd their former Vices, and have been chang'd in their Hearts and Lives. Of this we have many Examples and incontestable Proofs. This is to shew that the Grace of God is the Cause of that Change. This is to convince us that Repentance is the Gift of God, and wholly owing to the Divine Aid and Grace. The Reformation of some Men's Lives is thus suddenly effected, that God may have the Glory of Men's Conversion.

I cannot therefore applaud those Preachers who vigorously urge the Impossibility that a late Repentance should be Good and Available ; as if the Goodness of it depended wholly on the Natural Strength of our Faculties when they are in their Vigor, and not on a Supernatural Power. I have some suspicion that such a Notion is entertain'd, because I see that the foresaid Doctrine is chiefly urged by those Preachers and Writers who are known to be no great Patrons of Grace, but to have too great an Esteem for the Natural Power of Man. I am as much as any Man for the pressing of a *speedy Repentance* ;

tance ; I am as much against *deferring* it to a sick or a Death-bed ; I would have the *unspeakable Danger* of it set forth in the most lively Terms. But what I now say is to correct the Mistake on the other hand, and to discountenance that overweaning Opinion which too many entertain of Human Strength and Abilities, and in the mean time have not true Apprehensions concerning the Transcendent Power of Grace. They hold that God's Spirit assists those only that are willing to be Good, as if it was not necessary that he should render them willing. They say the Divine Grace works upon none but those that have fitted themselves before-hand to receive its Influence. When God finds Persons inclined and disposed to believe and repent, then he strikes in, and helps them. But they hold that the Primary Work is their own : The first Motion is from Themselves. Which is contrary to that plain Discovery made to us from those words in 31. *Jer. 18, 19. Turn thou me, and I shall be turned. - - - Surely after I was turned, I repented.*

The Dr. next reproves me for saying, that *the Liberty of the Will to good was taken away from all Men by Adam's Fall.* For which I quoted St. *Augustin's* 47th Epistle, and whether I have left out any thing considerable, so as to alter the Sense of the Father (as the Dr. objects) let the Judicious Reader judge ; for it would have been superfluous to set down every word that this Father hath on that Occasion , especially when I inserted in the same place other Passages out of that Writer of the same Import ; such as these, * *What good can lost Man do, but only so far as he*

* Quid boni operari potest perditus, nisi in quantum à Perditione liberatus? Enchir. Cap. 30.

is delivered from his lost State? † *The Free Will of Man being captivated, hath power only to sin.* And other Testimonies out of this Father may be added; as, ∴ *Man abusing his Free-Will, lost himself and it too:* * *The Will of Man is so far free as 'tis made free by God.* And St. *Augustin* to this purpose applies that of our Saviour, *If the Son shall make you free, then are ye free indeed,* 8. *John* 36. Notwithstanding these clear Testimonies the Dr. hath the Confidence to averr, that St. *Augustin* holds the Liberty of the Will to spiritual Good in all Men after the Fall. What shall we say to such a Writer as this, and who will give Ear to him when he treats on any other Subject? For he spoils and perverts all with his gross Partiality and Prejudice; or either reads but one part of an Author, or dissembles the other.

And here we may observe that what he fetches in about *Freedom from Coaction*, and *from Necessity*, in the beginning of his Reflections on this Head, as it is nothing to his Business, so it shews that he is ignorant of the little Distinction which some of the Ancients made between those Terms; yea, they often confounded *Coaction* and *Necessity*: Wherefore we can draw nothing from thence. But this we are sure of, that *the Liberty of Indifferency*, which the Dr. stands up for, is the very same Doctrine that the *Pelagian* Hereticks maintain'd. The Learned *Jansenius* hath a † whole Chapter to prove that *it was the*

† *Liberum arbitrium captivatum non nisi ad peccatum valet.* Serm. 2. de Grat. & Lib. Arbit.

∴ *Libero arbitrio malè utens homo, & se perdidit, & ipsum.* Enchir. Cap. 30.

* *Voluntas in tantum est libera in quantum est liberata.* De Perfect. Justic.

† De Grat. Christi, Lib. VII. Cap. 11.

Pelagian Error, that Indifferency to Good and Evil is requir'd to Freedom of Will. Every one that hath been acquainted with the Ancient Writings, and is not corrupted by Prejudice, but is a sincere Lover of Truth, can't but yield to this. Yet the Dr., who would be thought to be well vers'd in the Fathers, hath no Apprehension of this: And truly it is his constant Infirmary to see with one Eye only, and very poorly with that.

Which appears further in those small Fragments which he hath pick'd up out of St. Cyprian, and St. Basil, but hath neglected to cast an Eye on other Passages which go along with what he cites, and whence he might plainly have gather'd, that those Fathers speak of that Liberty of the Will to Spiritual Good which is in the Regenerate, and that Liberty to Evil which reigns in those of the contrary Character: And so what the Dr. trumps up here is *nothing to the purpose*, to return him his own kind Language. He saith, Cyprian proves that Man hath *credendi vel non credendi libertatem in arbitrio positam*; which can't be meant in the Sense which he supposes; for that so he hath a Liberty to believe or not to believe, is plainly confuted by Cyprian himself, in his first Epistle that he wrote, namely, to *Donatus, concerning the Grace of God*; where he gives an Account of the *Second Birth*, which he owns to be wholly due to the *Light infused from above, the Spirit derived from Heaven*. It was not, he saith, to be ascribed to the Power of Man, but to the Gift of God; and then concludes (after more of the same sort) *Dei est, inquam Dei, omne quod possumus*. All that we can do is to be attributed to God, I say, to God. So favourily doth this Pious Writer speak of that *Change* which he found in himself.

If the Dr. had read this First Epistle, he might have saved himself the labour of quoting those Words

of *Cyprian* in another Epistle; *Servans scilicet legem qua homo libertati suæ relictus, & in arbitrio proprio constitutus, sibimet ipsi vel mortem appetit, vel salutem;* which is grounded on that of our Saviour to his Apostles, *Will ye also go away?* 6. John 67. Which Words the Dr. would persuade us are so understood by *Cyprian*; as if they implied, that Christ's sincere Apostles, by Virtue of the *Freedom of their Wills* could go away from him; that is, wholly renounce their Profession of Christianity, and so fall away as never to return again. But there is no such thing implied, for by this sharp *Expostulation* our Saviour stirs up his Apostles to adhere to him with all Faithfulness, and publickly to confess and own him: And accordingly we see that it had this Effect; for the Apostle St. *Peter* in the Name of the rest, testifies their firm and resolv'd Adherence to him, *Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal Life; and we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God.* As if he had said, We are so united to thee that we can't forsake thee, our Wills are so confirm'd by thy Grace, that now 'tis no longer in our Power to go from thee, and forsake thee. And if Dr. *Whitby* had not been too precipitant in his Conclusions (which is his perpetual Fault) he might have observ'd that *Cyprian* asserts this to be the Sense of the Place; for immediately after he had recited St. *Peter's* Words to our Saviour, he adds, that the Apostle hereby * *signifies and shews, that those who go away from Christ, perish by their own fault, but that the*

* *Significans. sc. & ostendens eos qui à Christo recesserint, culpâ suâ perire, Ecclesiam tamen quæ in Christum credat, & quæ semel id quod cognoverit teneat, nunquam ab eo omnino discedere, & eos esse Ecclesiam qui in dono Dei permanent, plantationem vero, &c.*

Church which believes in Christ, and holds what it hath once known, doth not at all depart from him; and that they are the Church who abide in the House of God. This one place of St. Cyprian being compared with the other, explains it, and settles the true Sense: But the Dr. had not patience enough to observe and practise this right Method of finding out the Truth.

And if he had been at leisure to consult Cyprian's Book wherein his former Citation was, he might have found that Passage, † *In nullo gloriandum, quando nostrum nihil sit*; which he proves from 3. *John* 27. *No man can receive any thing, unless it be given him from heaven.* And from 1 *Cor.* 4. 7. *What hast thou that thou didst not receive? &c.* Which sufficiently confutes that *Freedom of Will* which the Dr. and his Party contend for. And so do those other Words of that Father, * *I thank thee, O most merciful God, that what thou requirest of me, thou hast first given me.* The Dr. now can't say (as he did) that 'tis very artificially done to cite the Name of St. Cyprian, without citing either Words or Book.

He quotes *Basil's Commentary on Isaiah*, tho' it is held to be spurious by *Erasmus*, who had a good Taste of Critical Learning: He saith it savours not of that Father's Phrase and Expression; and therefore concludes that his Name was falsely prefixed to it. Neither *Suidas* nor *Ferome* make mention of it in their Catalogues. Besides, it might be shew'd that some Passages in this Commentary are not reconcilable with others in his other Writings. But the Dr. is not solicitous about this, for he catches at any thing that he thinks will make for him. However,

† Testim. ad Quirin. Lib. 3.

* *Gratias ago tibi, Clementissime Deus, quia quod quaeris à me, prius ipse donasti.* Lib. de Baptismo.

supposing this Commentary to be legitimate and genuine, yet what the Dr. quotes out of it is foreign to his Business, for none denies that Man acts *freely* and *voluntarily*, which is all that *Basil* asserts. But it is worth our observing how the Dr. hath done what he can to misrepresent this Father's Meaning by corruptly translating his Words; for whereas according to the Greek it is * *He is here exhibiting or setting forth the Free Will of Man*, the Dr. renders it thus, *He here Establisheth the Free Will of Man*. So he gives us the next Passage in these Words; *First we must Will, and then our Will shall be establish'd*; whereas, according to the Greek, 'tis thus, † *First we must will, and then hearken and obey, that what is in our Power may not violently be extorted from us*: As much as to say, Our Obedience must spring from a willing Principle. So that it appears that the Dr. understands neither the Grammar of the Words, nor the Sense and Scope of them. I think we must have new Grammars for these *Arminian* Writers.

His other Quotation out of this Father is this, *Every Man is able by his own Choice to be a Holy Seed, or the contrary*: Which he fancies makes much for the Power of Free Will. But I must tell him, I shall, for his sake, never believe that one who is Liberal in quoting the Fathers, is therefore to be thought to be tolerably skill'd in them. If he had consulted what this Father had said before in the preceding Words, he would have found this to be his true and only Meaning, namely, That every one whose Will is effectually assisted by the Grace of God, may be an Instrument of *propagating* Holiness to others, for

* Τὸ αὐτεξέσιον ἐντιϋθεν πρῆσιων.

† Πρώτερον μὴ τι δεηθῆται δεῖ, ἵνα τὸ ἐφ' ἡμῶν ἀνατινασκα-

thence the Father saith he may be call'd a *Seed*: And those that are not so Assisted, but left to their own vicious Choice, are a *Seed* in the contrary Sense; that is, they *generate* and *propagate* Vice in others. Accordingly the Words immediately following in this Father are these, *Hear Paul thus speaking, In Christ Jesus I have begotten thee through the Gospel: And that also, as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God: And that, every one that doth sin, is born of the devil.* Which we see doth undeniably confirm the Sense which I give of St. *Basil's* Words; and it is impossible to understand them otherwise, unless, with the Dr. we resolve to fix what Interpretation we please upon them. And here, by the way, the Dr. is to be reminded against another time, to read the Words which go before the Passages which he cites out of Authors, for this will help his understanding of them aright.

I need not take notice of that other Passage he quotes out of *Basil*, for that is as far from the present Matter as this that I have now clear'd. Or if the Dr. could have produced out of this Author some Words in Favour of the *Arminian* Doctrines, I should not be concern'd at it; for though I said St. *Basil* in many Places of his Writings depresses the Power of Free Will, yet I never said he doth so in all Places. Yea, every one that hath read the Fathers who were on the other side of St. *Augustin*, knows very well that they are most of them an uncertain Sort of Men, and often betray the Inconsistency of their Judgments: Therefore if *Cyprian* and *Basil* had been cited in some Places as favouring the Dr.'s Cause, it would have made nothing for him.

Whereas, to shew that St. *Jerom* was an Opposer of the Doctrine of Free Will, as it imports a natural Ability in in all Men to chuse Spiritual Good, I quoted these following Words out of that Father,

38 *The Arminian Doctrines condemn'd*

† *We are not kept by the Power of Free Will, but by the Clemency or Free Grace of God. The keeping the Commandments is impossible to Nature, but it is possible to Grace.* The Dr. hath not a Word to say against this Quotation, though he had solemnly engag'd to answer all the Places which I quote out of the Fathers. We see what a special Regard he hath to his own Pretensions; he picks and chuses as he pleases.

And he was so convinc'd of the plain Truth of that other Citation out of St. *Ferom*, *It is in vain to be always praying, if it be in the Power of our Wills, to do what we will*, that he wholly omits the mentioning of it, thinking it the safest way to smother that Testimony which he was conscious to himself he could not with any shew of Reason gainsay.

But there is one place which I quoted, that he nibbles at, and would persuade the Reader that I have left out something that is material. If he could not say thus much, he were indeed a poor Advocate for his Cause. But if the Reader pleases to see what the *Artifice* (for that is now grown a Common-place word with him) which he charges me with, is, he will find it to be no other than this, that whereas I quoted as much out of that Book of St. *Ferom* as was to the purpose, the Dr. is offended that I did not fetch in those Passages which were not pertinent. To what end should I have cited those Words, that *God hath made us with a freedom of Will, nor are we drawn by Necessity, that is, Compulsion to Virtue or Vice; for where there is this kind of Necessity, there is no Condemnation or Reward?* For this is that which every body grants; and I have expressly affirmed it in my Writings, and it affects not the pre-

† Lib. 2. cont. Pelag.

sent Cause in the least. And what occasion was there to add, that *in evil and sinful Actions there are Seeds in us inciting to those Actions, and the Devil perfects them?* I appeal to every intelligent Reader whether it was not enough to cite those Words of that Father, *In good Works it is God that perfects them; for it is not of him that willeth or runneth, but of God who sheweth Mercy and assisteth us*, without adding those foregoing and following Words. If the principal Part of a Period will be sufficient for my purpose, I do not care to imitate the Dr. in hooking in a great deal of impertinent Matter. And this is the very Case before us: I have labour'd to contract and abridge several Passages in the Writings which I have had occasion to quote: But the Dr. loves dearly to be long-winded: It is his perpetual Talent to eke out every thing, for which Reason many a Page in his Writings might have been spared.

I proceed to *his* Quotations out of *Jerome*; the first of which is this, *Liberum servat arbitrium, ut in utramque partem non ex præjudicio Dei, sed ex meritis singularum vel pœna vel præmium sit*: Which he renders thus, *He prefers the Liberty of the Will to both Parts, that the Punishment or the Reward, &c.* which confirms what I noted before, that the Dr. takes no care at all to render the *Greek* or *Latin* right, whether out of *Disability* or *Design*, I leave others to judge. But he is desired for the future to learn to construe and translate a little better, for the right rendring of the fore-said Words is this, *He prefers the Free Will; that on both Parts the Punishment or Reward, &c.* which amounts to no more than this, that both good and bad Men act freely and voluntarily when they do Good and Evil Actions, and not by Compulsion, and that God deals with them according to their Actings. And his Quotations out of *Jerom's* third

Book against *Pelagius* are of the same Nature, and express only the manner of Men's acting; that is, with Freedom, and without Coaction. I advise the Dr. as a Friend, to be more cautious for the future in his Quotations: And let not Conjecture and Mistakes supply the Room of Judgment and Reason. And indeed if the Dr. had considered *against whom Jerom* was writing in the foresaid Book; that is, against the *Pelagians*; and that it was his Business to oppose what they erroneously held concerning Free Will; he could not but have informed himself aright about the Matter; but it is the Dr.'s way to go plodding on, and scribble something against whom he pleases, without considering any Circumstances of the Things or Persons that are in the Case before him.

He quotes some other Passages out of this Author, which are either not to be found according to his Reference, or they are easily answered from what I have suggested already. The Dr. scrapes up a few broken Sayings and disjointed Sentences, without Connection and Dependance, out of this Writer, which speak of *Free Will*, and he satisfies himself with that, not attending to the *Meaning* and *Drift* of the Author's Words. He runs away with the general Notion of his Party, that because St. *Jerom* asserts Free Will in Man, therefore all Men have a Power to will and prosecute Spiritual Good.

To what I had said of *Prosper*, that *he requires Grace as absolutely necessary to the producing of any Good Work*; the Doctor's Answer is, *And so do we.* But what *we*, I pray? Not himself, or any other *Arminians* and *Remonstrants*, as I have already shew'd; who by *Grace* understand no other than the common and ordinary Concurrence of God, or the Grace of Nature, as *Pelagius* us'd to call it; that is, the Natural and Rational Ability of Mankind, whereby they
chuse

chuse Good as well as Evil. For *Pelagius's* Doctrine was, That *the Will of Man by Nature is indifferent*, and can incline to Good or Evil as it pleases: This was in *Adam*, and this is in all Men since, he saith. And this is the Assertion of the Council of *Trent*; and *Dr. Whitby*, and all his Brethren of the *Arminian* way, hold the same. They stiffly contend that the Liberty of Man's Will, even ever since the Fall, consists in *Indifferency*; so that every Man, as he hath Free Will, hath a Power to sin, or to abstain from it, to do good, or to omit it. They tell us, that this is the very Nature of Free Will in every Man at this Day. Here is the *Pelagianism* of our Divines: They say that this Principle is naturally in Man, as Man; and consequently they exclude the Grace of God as requisite to this Power, whatever they pretend to the contrary. For what is of Nature is not beholden to Grace. There is no need of the Divine Help, if it be of the Essence of the Will to be thus Free. If it be the inseparable Nature of this Faculty to be thus Versatile and Flexible, and to have a Propension to Spiritual Good as well as Evil, then these Men can't pretend to assert the Necessity of Supernatural Assistance. Or if they do, they confound the Distinction between what is Natural and what flows from the Assistance of the Spirit.

See then what horrid Contradictions these Men are guilty of: They tell us that they are as great Assertors of the *Divine Help* and *Grace* as we are; and this they publicly vouch in their Writings; when as this is quite opposite to the very *Definition* which they give us of Man's *Free Will*; namely, that of its own Nature, and by virtue of its essential Quality, it can chuse Spiritual Good, or not; for this is the Nature of its *Indifferency*: Why then
do

do they talk of *Divine Grace*? This is plain Collusion and Sophistry; and 'tis strange, that any Men pretending to good Sense, can submit to entertain such inconsistent Notions. There is no Occasion for *Preventing*, or *Exciting*, or *Concomitant Grace*, (which yet some of the *Popish* Writers talk of, as well as some among *us*) if a Man hath it from the Innate Power of his Will to assent or dissent, to embrace or not to embrace, in Matters of a Divine and Religious Nature. If it be thus with him, the Divine Aid is unnecessary, the Grace of Christ is superfluous. And then, by this Doctrine, the whole Fabrick of Christianity is shock'd and endanger'd: For if we have a Natural Power still remaining in us to do all Good, to what Purpose were the Undertakings of Christ, and his Sending his Holy Spirit? We must conclude then, that the *Arminian* Notion of this *Indifferency of the Will* is a most pernicious Doctrine, and subverts the very Fundamentals of our Religion.

To return back to the Father whom I last named and quoted, *Prosper of Aquitain*, he is clearly on our side, whatever the Doctor silyly insinuates to the contrary. What can be plainer than those Words of his? * *Voluntas nihil in suis habet viribus nisi periculi facilitatem*? The Will hath nothing in its own Power, but a Readiness to endanger it self. And speaking of the Devil, he saith, † *A quo cum homo spoliaretur, non voluntate, sed voluntatis sanitate privatus est*: When Man was spoil'd by him, he was not depriv'd of his Will, but the Soundness of it: So that ever after it became unsound, corrupted and depriv'd,

* De Vocat. Gent. Lib. I. Cap. 6.

† Ibid. Cap. 7.

and there is a Necessity of its being changed by Divine Grace. The Powerful Influence of which is thus describ'd by this Excellent Writer, in his Poem of the Ungrateful; for so he calls the Pelagians, and those that favour them, because they refuse to own that Grace and Help which are freely offer'd to them by God.

*Non hoc consilio tantum hortatuq; benigno
Suadens atq; docens, quasi normam legis haberet
Gratia, sed mutans intus mentem atq; reformans
Vasq; novum ex fracto fingens, virtute creandi.*

Other Fathers besides are of this Opinion: ∴ Man is fallen, saith Gregory Nyssen, from him by whom he was made, and is gone over to the Adversary, and so hath changed his Freedom and Power, and his own Will, for the grievous and hurtful Servitude of Sin. Chrysofom, who speaks in favour of Free Will very often, yet hath these Words: When Sin enter'd, it destroy'd Man's Liberty, and corrupted that Power given to Nature, and introduced Servitude. Thus Truth will make its way thro' all Opposition, yea even the Opposition of those that utter it.

One thing more let me observe, that the Doctrine of the Necessity of Supernatural Grace is so clearly

∴ Ἐπειδ' ἂν δὲ ἑισῆλθεν ἡ ἁμαρτία, ἐλυμήνατο τὴν ἐλευθερίαν, καὶ διέδεξε τὴν ἀπὸ τῆ φύσεως δεδομένην ἀξίαν, καὶ τὴν δουλείαν ἐπέσημαεν. Homil. 29. in Gen.

profess'd by the *Second Council of Milevi*, and is such a plain Testimony to the *Anti-Arminian* Assertions on this Subject, that the Dr. turns away his Head at my alledging of that *Council*, and dismisses it without so much as taking Notice of it. Which, as it shews his Aversion to that Doctrine, so it lets us see that he hath not the Heart always to oppose it: Yea, very often (as we have before seen) he passes by my Arguments and Allegations, without so much as the least Attempt to offer any Confutation of them.

I will shut up this Head which I have been now upon, with what I have lately met with in Bishop *Beveridge's Thoughts*, newly publish'd: † I wonder, saith he, at the Doctrine that some Men (such as *Dr. Whitby* and his Friends) have advanced concerning Free Will: And it is a Mystery to me, how any that ever had Experience of God's Method in working out Sin, and planting Grace in our Hearts, should think they can do it by themselves, or any thing in order to it. Afterwards, All of us, saith he, too sadly experience what *St. Paul* long ago bewail'd in himself, that what we do, we allow not, 7. Rom. 15. So Orthodox is he in the Explication of that Chapter. Again; I am sure, saith he, to say none shall be saved but those that will of themselves, (by virtue of the natural Indifferency of their Wills) would be sad News for me, whose Will is naturally so backward to every thing that is Good. See how Calvinistical Men are, before they have taken up a Party! When this Learned Man was in his Pure Theologicks, he thought and spoke after this manner. And perhaps *Dr. Whitby* did something

* Article VIII.

like this, before he fell into the Hands of *Joshua*, and the *Deist*, and the *Physician*. It troubles me to see the Poor Man thus metamorphos'd; I pity him with all my Heart.

The Dr. hath not the Boldness (which may be justly wonder'd at) to make any Exceptions against the several Quotations I produc'd out of *St. Augustin* for the *Irresistibleness of Grace*; only he sends us to *Vossius's* Testimonies out of the Fathers, to prove that *God laid no Necessity upon Man's Will to act, as he must do if he act irresistibly upon it; that being Necessary, which can't be otherwise.* Where he not only lets us know that he hath no Understanding of the State of the Question, but he also acquaints us how Partial and Superficial a Reader he is of those Authors he quotes; for even *Vossius* himself hath these express Words: † [It was *Augustin's* Opinion, that God from Eternity decreed to give to certain Men such Congruous or Powerful Grace, that to whomsoever 'tis given, it shall *certainly work* that in them for which it is given: And it is such Grace as not only gives Strength to act, and concurs with the Will in every good Act, but *infallibly* puts a Man on to work.] What do you call this *Certainty* and *Infallibility* but *Irresistibleness*?

† Augustini sententia fuit, Deum ab æterno statuisse certis hominibus gratiam ita congruam sive potentem dare, ut quibuscunque fuerit donata, illud in iis certò operetur cujus causâ confertur; ut quæ non solum rites largiatur ad agendum, & in omni actione bona ex voluntate concurrat, sed infallibiliter hominem ad operandum impellat. Hist. Pel. Lib. 6. Thef. 10.

Again;

Again; this Learned and Judicious Writer (you may be sure then I do not mean Dr. *W.*) after he had shew'd how St. *Augustin's* Opinion in this Matter differs somewhat from that of some of the Fathers that were before him, adds these Words; [Which I would not have to be so understood, as if nothing could be produced out of them (*i. e.* the Writings of these Fathers) that may not seem to insinuate that Grace is conferr'd out of the *Absolute Will of God to convert*, and therefore cannot be frustrated] and he then produces the Testimony of *Basil*, *Thou canst do all things, and there is none that can contradict thee: thou savest when thou wilt, and none Resisteth thy Will.* And another of St. *Ambrose* he also adds. Hence we see the Dr. had little Reason to fly to *Vossius*: And in the general 'tis observable that the Dr. both here and in his *Annotations* quotes Authors at random.

And whereas he saith concerning me, that *I have only one St. Augustin* to produce for the Antiquity of the *Irresistibleness* of Grace; I must remind him that St. *Jerom* asserts the same; for upon those Words, *1. Eph. 11.* *Being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will,* he hath this^t Glos, ** We Men would do many things according to the Counsel of our Wills, but the Effect doth not at all answer to our Wills: But none is able to resist God, who doth all things that he will.* And we have *Prosper* on our side, who declares his Mind thus, *Nihil obsistere divinæ gratiæ potest quo minus id quod voluerit impleatur.* *De Vocat. Gent. l. 2. c. 33.* And further I must tell him that all the Fathers who main-

* Nos homines plerq; volumus facere consilio, sed nequam voluntatem sequitur effectus: Illi autem nullus resistere potest, quia omnia quæ voluerit, facit.

tain the *Omnipotency* of the Divine Being, do in effect assert this Doctrine; for if he be of Infinite and Unlimited Power, it will follow, that Man's Conversion is irresistible. For tho' Finite Power and Strength may be resisted, that which is Infinite cannot. Accordingly Dr. *Whitby*, and every *Arminian*, denies the Infinite and Uncontrollable Power of God: They hold that he hath not an Absolute Command over their Wills. But they themselves have, and are stronger than God, and have more Power than he hath, and do more towards the Work of Conversion than God himself can. These Men hold that they have an uncontrollable Power not only over their own Wills, but over God's Grace; for 'tis they that make it *Effectual* or *Ineffectual*, as they please.

For you must know that 'tis their, Opinion that God furnishes us only with *Means*, and *propounds* things to us, but we our selves render them *Successful*. What God and the Holy Spirit do, signifies nothing as to their Consummating or Conversion, for we, and we alone give the finishing stroke to it. After God hath done what he can, it is the Man himself that effects the final Work of Conversion. When God hath exerted all his Force and Power towards the changing of Men's Hearts and Lives, it is the Sinner that gives Success to the whole. It is the Creed of an *Arminian*, that Man's Will is of greater Force than the Almighty, for 'tis by virtue of this that we are Converted, and not by Strength derived from God, for after he hath *in vain attempted* our Conversion, and *endeavour'd* the Change of our Hearts, we by the natural Energy of our Wills effect that great Work our selves. And tho' God really and sincerely *Designs* to convert and change us, yet it is in our Power to defeat his Intentions, and baffle his Purposes, as well as his Power. It is true these Men do not exclude the *ordinary Concurrence* of God

(as hath been observ'd before) but what is *Extraordinary* is done by the Man himself, by the powerful Efforts of his own Will. Yea; they hold that Conversion and Regeneration are nothing else but a Man's making good use of his Free Will, which he is naturally endued with, and thereby turns himself unto God. What think you? Are we not like to thrive, if we suck in these Principles of our Modern Divines?

And some of these Persons further tell us, That God can't, or will not convert Men by an *Irresistible Power*; because if he should do so, he would destroy Man's *Free Will*; for if a Man be irresistably converted, he is compell'd and forc'd, and then there can be no Liberty of Will. Which is a very false and mistaken Notion; for at such a time the Will is not *forc'd*, but *chang'd*, and thereby determin'd to what is good, by a new Bias or Principle bestow'd on it. The former Bent and Inclination is remov'd, and another is kindly introduc'd by the powerful Grace of God, whereby the Will becomes obedient to the Heavenly Call, and acts most freely and willingly. As for God's bending the Will to one side; that cannot be look'd upon as a *Violation of the Will*, as the Dr. pretends; for one of the greatest * Patrons of *Arminianism* hath granted, that *God may, and doth sometimes determine the Will of Man to one side; and when 'tis so determin'd, the Act may be voluntary.* But when 'tis added by that Author, that tho' the Act is *voluntary*, yet it is not *free*; it is such a Piece of Refin'd Nonsense, as none but Dr. *Whitby* would have approved of: For if, according to him, the Power of the Free Will of

* Bp. *Bramhall*, quoted by Dr. *Whitby*, p. 313.

Man consists in chusing Good or Evil; then if that Choice be not free, 'tis *Coaction* and not *Choice*; and so 'tis Choice and not Choice. Thus he contradicts himself; and he is so accustomed to it, that he seems not to know when he doth it, if that be any Excuse. It is certain, that what he saith of Dr. Mill, may be truly applied to himself: * *There is little heed to be given to the Judgment of a Man, that differs so much from himself.*

Election supposes *Liberty*, and therefore when Good Men chuse to do Good, and Bad Men chuse to do Evil; can any Man of Sense and Reflection imagine, that there is not *Freedom* in this Choice? The Power to *chuse*, and the Power to *will*, are inseparable; and therefore Dr. *Whitby* here (as is common with him at other times) forgets what he had expressly said, *What I chuse, I chuse by my Will*, p. 319. Thus 'tis evident that he understands not the thing he undertakes to assert, or he thrusts wild and inconsistent Propositions upon us by Inadvertency and Oblivion.

If he saith *we can't do otherwise*, and therefore the Action is not *Free*, he talks idly, for then neither God himself, nor the Good Angels, nor the Glorify'd Saints *act freely*; for none of them can act otherwise than they do; that is, they can't do any Evil. They are under a happy *Necessity* of doing Good, and yet they do it most *Freely*. So 'tis with the *Regenerate* here on Earth, who, as they are *such*, can do no Evil; but though their Will is determin'd by the Divine Influx, yet it is *Free*. Even the Pagan Moralist wou'd have taught the Dr. this Truth: He by the Conduct of his own Reason hath told us that a right *Virtuous Man's Will is not the less Free*

† Exam. Var. Lect. D. Millii. p. 94.

* Non ideo minus Vult quia non potest Nolle. — Vir bonus non potest non facere quod facit. Sen. de Benefic.

50 *The Arminian Doctrines condemn'd*

for its Inability to will otherwise than it doth ; yea, a good man cannot but do what he doth. Notwithstanding this, he is a *Free-Actor*, which appears from this, that he acts with Pleasure and Delight, as all good and virtuous Men do. It was excellently said by the Judicious Dr. Jackson, * *The very Life and Spirit of perfect Liberty is a Power of willing that which by God's Law we ought to Will.* Our being determin'd by God to will that which he wills is the Height of the Christian Liberty ; so far is it from Impairing it, yea Destroying it, as the Dr. fondly imagines. By this very thing we approach nearest to God, and to the Glorified Spirits, who can will and chuse one Part only, that is, the Good ; and these without doubt are the *Freest Agents*. I will close this with those Words of St. Augustin †, *The Will is then truly Free when 'tis not a servant to Sin and Vice.*

Now then I return to the main Business before us. From what hath been said, it is manifest, That tho' Converting and Effectual Grace doth not leave the Will of Man at Liberty to *Resist*, yet he acts voluntarily and freely ; for this Powerful Grace of God removes that which wou'd make Resistance : And so the Nature of Man's Will is not destroy'd, his *Free Choice* and *Liberty* are preferr'd, and these are not inconsistent with *Irresistibility*. For certainly God's Infinite and Unlimited Power, is not incompatible with that of ours, which is Finite and Restrain'd ; and this must needs submit to that. It is true, we read of some that *resisted the Holy Ghost*, 7. *Acts* 51. The Meaning of which is, (as is evident from the next Verses, which speak of the Pro-

* Vol. 3. B 10. Ch. 17.

† Arbitrium voluntatis tunc est verè Liberum quum vitiis peccatisq; non servit. *De vera Incarnat.*

phets and the Law) that they gave not heed to the Outward Means of Salvation, to the Word which was preach'd by the Prophets, who were inspir'd by the Holy Ghost; nor to the Law, tho' it was delivered at first from Heaven by the Disposition of Angels, as 'tis there particularly said. Thus they are said to resist the Holy Ghost; but no Man of Sense can gather thence, that the Inward Power of the Spirit may be finally Resisted, when the Spirit designs to Convert any Person. At such a time, when the Almighty makes bare his Arm, and makes the Glory of his Power known, there can be no Resistance; for he hath purposed, and who shall disannul it? He worketh, and who shall let it? 14. Isai. 27. 43. 13.

Wherefore we cannot but condemn the Pride and Insolence of the Arminian Spirit, which doth all it can to diminish the Absolute Power and Sovereignty of God, and to exalt its own Power above it. They assert that God cannot turn their Hearts, unless they give him Leave to do it: They affirm, that by the Efficacy of their own Wills, (which have in them an inseparable Property of Indifferency) they can recover themselves from the Power of Satan, and attain to Eternal Life and Happiness. Whither will not Obstinacy and Blindness carry such deluded Souls? One would think that these Texts of Scripture should fly in their Faces; No Man can come unto me, except the Father, who hath sent me, draw him; John 6. 44. No Man can come unto me, except it were given unto him of my Father, v. 65. By the Grace of God, I am what I am; 1 Cor. 15. 10. It is God who worketh in them, both to will and to do of his good Pleasure; 2 Phil. 13. Who maketh thee to differ from another? And what hast thou, that thou didst not receive? 1 Cor. 4. 7. And sundry other Texts prove that God, and not Man's Will, is the Cause of his Conversion, and that this is a Work far above Man's

E 2

Power

Power, and can be effected only by an Omnipotent Hand: and accordingly is compar'd to the Work of *Creation*, and to *Raising Men from the Dead*. Notwithstanding this, it is the Persuasion and Profession of all the Party, that the only Reason why *Abel* differ'd from *Cain*, and *Peter* from *Judas*, and all Regenerate Persons from the Unregenerate; is because the one did more dexterously manage their Free-Will than the other.

And now we can't but see what must necessarily follow upon all this; the Duty of *Prayer* for Grace and Conversion is quite null'd: For to what Purpose is it to lift up our Hands to God, when the whole Strefs of our Conversion lies upon our own Wills, and we have Ability to renew and change them as we please, by the Lucky Turn of them, which depends on our Self-determining Power? It is no wonder then that that Pious Father speaks thus; **We always Pray in vain, if it be in our Power to do what we will.* And as *Praying* to God, so *Praising* him is wholly Evacuated, according to that of another Father. † *Tell me, I pray, saith he, how the Apostle can say, [Giving Thanks unto the Father, who hath made us meet to be Partakers of the Inheritance of the Saints in Light] if it be not God that sets our Will at Liberty, but if our Will itself sets itself Free.* If Conversion be the Result of our own Power, then we may thank our selves, and not God for it: The Praise is due to our selves, not to him. Or, if we should pretend to ascribe Praise and Glory to him, we do but *flatter him with our Mouths, and dissemble with him in our*

* *Frustra semper oramus, si in nostro arbitrio est facere quod volumus. Hieron. l. 2. cont. Pelag.*

† *Responde obsecro quomodo dicit Apostolus, Gratias agentes Patri, &c. Si non ipse arbitrium nostrum, sed ipsum arbitrium se liberat. Augustin. ad Vital. Epist. 107.*

Tongues. These are the Strange and Monstrous Consequences of these Mens Opinions. But who can hear them without Horror? What Christian Ear can bear such Absurdities and Blasphemies? What Man, that is not a Stranger to the Sacred Volume, can brook such Impious Doctrines? And yet this is the Natural Result of the *Arminian* Scheme.

And was it not worth the Labour of the *Deist* and *Physician*, to bring over Dr. *Whitby* from his *Calvinism*, to the Embracing of such Excellent Notions as these, and to the Perverting of that plain Text, *God hath given to the Gentiles Repentance, Acts II. 18?* That is, saith he, † *God commissioned St. Peter to preach to them Peace through Jesus Christ, and Remission of Sins.* This is giving Repentance. Such another Interpretation is that of *Eph. 2. 8. Faith is the Gift of God*; that is, ∴ *the Objects of Faith are only made known to us by Divine Revelation.* Which is the very Exposition of the *Socinian* Writers. So upon those Words, *No Man can come unto me, except the Father, which hath sent me, draw him, John 6. 44.* he hath this Comment; * *To be drawn of the Father, signifies only to be persuaded, and prevailed on so to do, by the Consideration of those mighty Works which God had done.* There is no Inward Persuasion and Influx of the Holy Spirit meant here. Surely this Man, tho' he talks so much of the *Fathers*, and pretends to have conversed with their Writings, had not read the following Words of St. *Jerom*, or wilfully conceal'd them; † *Quando dicit, Nemo potest venire ad me, &c. i. e. When Christ saith, No Man can come unto me, ex-*

† *Additional. Annot. on the Place.*

∴ *Paraphrase on the Place.*

* *Annotat. on the Place.*

† *Adv. Pelag. lib. 3.*

54 *The Arminian Doctrines condemn'd*

cept the Father, who hath sent me, draw him; he breaketh the proud Freedom of Will, which if it would go to Christ, unless that be done which followeth, [Except my Heavenly Father draw him] it shall will in vain, and strive in vain. And this also is to be noted, that he who is DRAWN, runs not of his own accord, but is brought on, he being either slow, and drawing back, or else being unwilling: That is, he is so till God makes him willing. This was the Sense of the most Judicious and Pious Fathers: But we see how the Dr. and many of his Friends vary from it, and resolve the Conversion of Sinners into the Strength of their own Wills. I wish God's Hand may not be evidently seen in punishing these Bold and Arrogant Exalters of Human Power, by withdrawing his Blessing from their Endeavours in the Ministry.

Before I pass with the Dr. to the next Head, I will remark how he confutes himself about the Nature of *Grace* and *Conversion*. He rejects the Doctrine of those who assert that the Operation of Grace and the Holy Spirit is by a *Physical Influx*, and yet he explains Conversion in a Mechanical way. In his *Discourse of Sufficient and Effectual Grace*, he saith it is effected by a *Motion of the Brain*: And that Motion raises *Ideas*, and those *Ideas* make *Conversion*. He insists a great while upon this, p. 227, 228, &c. and thinks it so considerable, that he mentions it again in some other Part of his Writings. Tho' he declares against *Physical Operation*, yet he is for it, in as much as he asserts that such and such *Ideas*, rais'd in the Minds of Men by External Objects and Motives working upon the Brain, are all that we call *Grace* and *Conversion*. These Material Impressions do the whole Business. Thus saith our Mechanick Divine, but herein he contradicts himself.

The Dr. proceeds next to the Article of the *Extent of Christ's Redemption*, which I asserted to be *Limited*; and that which I said further was, that *some of the Fathers taught so*. To which the Doctor opposes the contrary Assertions of *Vossius* and *Daille*, as if they were *Fathers*; nay, as if they were infallible Authors, and ought not to be question'd in the least. The Truth is, the Dr. was apprehensive that he was like to be overwhelm'd with far better Testimonies; and therefore, like one near being drown'd, snatches at any the least and inconsiderable thing to save himself, if possible. But I believe the Dr. is not so over-run with Blindness as not to see that the Words of these Learned Men which he produces come not home to his Business. For the first of them saith, *it was the Judgment of the Ancient Church, that Christ provided an Universal Remedy for the Universal Sin of Man*: And so the Dr. knows, that it was the Judgment of the Ancient Church that Christ should come in Person, and reign here on Earth 1000 Years in the Abundance of Ease and Pleasure: It was the Judgment of the *Ancient Church*, that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper ought to be administered to Children: It was the Judgment of the *Ancient Church*, that Christ descended into the Hell of the damned: It was the Judgment of the *Ancient Church*, that *Elias* should come and appear here before the Day of Judgment. But who values the Judgment of the Church in any of these Particulars? The Dr. himself doth not, or else he dissembles in his Writings, wherein he despises some of these Opinions and Practices, as *Ancient* as they are: For he cares not for *Antiquity* when it agrees not with his Conceptions, tho' at other times he doats on it.

He brings in *Vossius* speaking thus ; *This Doctrine of Universal Redemption the Fathers proved from all those Places of Scripture which say Christ died for all.* But here the Dr. is at his old Trade again , he doth not give us the Author's Words right ; for he doth not say *the Fathers*, but the *Old Church*, and doth not say *proved* but only *gather'd*, which is much less than Proving. And besides, *Vossius* is in an Error, for I shall anon produce Texts which speak of Christ's dying for *all*, and yet some of the *Old Church* do not interpret it of *all* without Limitation. And whereas *Vossius* saith, *The Doctors of the Church taught, that Christ's Death is consider'd Two ways, either as to its Virtue and the Antecedent Will of Christ and his Father, and in this Sense Christ died for all without exception ; or as to the Effect and Fruit of Christ's Death, and the Consequent Will of Christ and his Father, and in this Respect Christ can't be said to die for All :* It is observable that *Vossius* never applies this *Double Consideration* of the Death of Christ in the reciting of any of those Quotations which he immediately after produces, to prove the Universality of Christ's Redemption : Which he would certainly have done, if he had thought that that *Distinction* was of any Value and Importance. It was only a Blind to divert and amuse the Reader ; and the Dr. was as likely a Man to be catch'd with it as any ; and accordingly we see he was. However, this very thing which *Vossius* suggests, lets us into the true Sense of many of the Fathers who speak of the Extent of Christ's Redemption ; they mean it concerning the *Virtue* and *Dignity* of Christ's Sufferings and Death, not of the *Actual Effects* and *Fruit* of them : Not but that I grant that *some* of the Fathers held Universal Redemption in the largest and fullest Sense.

Note by the by, that the Dr. very tamely and innocently (some wou'd say *ignorantly*) retains those Words,

Words, *quod ad virtutem, & quod ad effectum*, which he met with in *Vossius's* Book, and sets them down as he found them, not knowing or considering that it was a Fault of the Printer, and that it should have been *quoad virtutem, & quoad effectum*, and therefore it might have been well expected that the Dr. would not let it pass uncorrected. But it is all one to the Dr., who resolv'd to quote *Vossius's* Words right or wrong. I could likewise observe that in the subsequent Part of the Citation of *Vossius's* Words, he mangles and transposes it, and leaves out what Words he pleases, and in their Place substitutes what he thinks fit: But these being such *Common* Practises with the Dr., it would be endless to take notice of them. And the Dr. is a Man of that Assurance that he can carry it off well enough.

The Testimony of the other, namely, *Monsieur Daille*, falls short of what the Dr. brought it for; for his Words are these, *In the first Eight Centuries of Christianity I find none that absolutely in Terms saith, that Christ died for the Elect only.* And what then? Tho' this be not said *in express Terms*, yet it doth not follow but it might be said in *Terms equivalent*, and of the same Signification; and so I shall make it appear in several Quotations out of the Fathers, that I shall have Occasion to produce afterwards.

The Dr. gives out Menaces, that this *French Divine* shall confute me, and that *particularly and copiously in every Father that I have alledg'd.* I thought the Dr. himself had undertaken to confute me: I'm sure he promis'd it in the Beginning of his *Postscript.* But, it seems, he is grown suspicious of his own Weakness, and is so wise as to call for Assistance; and now I must have a great Care of my self, when they both fall upon me together. But by the by, we may observe that the Dr. doth not know his Fellow-Champion's right Name; for he calls

calls him *Dally*, instead of his well-known Name *Daillé*. The Dr. reads Authors, but doth not so much as know their Names: So, in all his Writings, *Esthivius* is constantly put for *Estius*. And how indeed should he, who writes his own Name differently, (as was above-noted) be exact in writing another Man's? Well, but this *French* Author must confute me in every Father that I have cited; and the first Instance he brings, is the *Epistle of the Church of Smyrna*, as if this Church were one of the *Fathers*.

Very nicely done, and like a Scholar, Good Dr. But to pass by that, and to come to my Quotation it self: Those Pious People of the Church of *Smyrna*, profess'd that *they would never forsake Christ, who suffer'd* for the Salvation of the whole World of those that are saved*. Which Words I produced to shew, that the Ancient Christians did not believe the Doctrine of *Universal Redemption*: For tho' 'tis granted here, that the Virtue of Christ's Redemption reach'd to the *whole World*; yet they tell us what they mean, namely, *the whole World of those that are saved*; not every individual Person. And is there not *Antiquity* enough in this Quotation? For the Letter was written by that Church about the Year of our Lord 169. The Dr. hath nothing to say against this Testimony, but that Mr. *Dally* (for so he will call him) *saieth it is impertinent; and Ruffinus translated the Words otherwise*. Which are so weak and silly Allegations, that I believe the Reader expects not that I should return any Answer to them; for surely the Church of *Smyrna* knew how

* ὑπὲρ τῆς ὅλης παντὸς κόσμου ἢ σωζομένων σωτηρίας.

to exprefs themselves *pertinently*; and what wife Man will defend a Translation that is not adjusted to the Original Words?

To say the plain Truth, the Dr. could not have chosen out a worse Second to appear in his Cause, and to back him, than this *Daille*: For tho' he was a Person of great Learning, and unquestionable Worth, and merited much of the Protestant Cause in several of his Writings, both in the *Latin* and *French* Languages; yet in the present Case he was most palpably blameable, and abandon'd his Brethren of the Reformed Religion, and gave too evident Proofs of his want of Judgment and Impartiality: For he not only quotes the *Ancient Fathers*, as Asserters of the Unlimited Extent of Christ's Redemption; but he brings in *Perkins*, *Junius*, Bishop *Abbot*, *Preston*, Bishop *Davenant*, *Ward*, and the rest of the Synod of *Dort*; yea, even *Piscator*, *Gomarus*, *Twiss*, *Peter du Moulin*, *Rivet*, as Favourers of this Cause. And truly, thro' his whole *Apology*, he hath egregiously play'd the Sophister in all his Replies to the Learned *Spanhemius*. His Reasonings are for the most part so poor and mean, that one can scarcely think that he himself was in good earnest perswaded that there was any Force in them. And as to the present Translation, which he approves of; if *Ruffinus* was a Friend to the *Pelagians*, as some have (not without ground) said, we have no Reason to attend to that Version of his.

The Dr. comes on with a *2dly*, without a *1st*; (which kind of Blunders is frequent with him) and he finds fault with what I quoted out of *Origen*, that *there is a World of the Saints, and a World of the Wicked*; which I cited to shew, that that Father (as well as some others) interprets *the World*, in some Places of Scripture, by *the Church*, or *the Elect*.

lect. The Dr. saith there is *Artifice* in this Quotation of mine : For *Origen*, by the *World of the Saints*, means the *World above the Stars* ; whereas, I apply it to the Saints in this Lower World. He appeals to the *Learned* , whether this be *fair dealing*. To the *Learned* then I am willing to refer the Matter ; who know very well that 'tis *Origen's* way , to affix *different Senses* to the same Words and Expressions in Scripture , and then to take Occasion to *allegorize*, and to present the Reader with *Mystical Interpretations*. And this he doth in this very Chapter, which treats of the *World* , as may be seen in the former Part of it ; but especially when he comes to speak of the different Significations of this Term *World* : Which , besides the common Acceptation of it, denotes (he saith) an *Invisible and Spiritual World* ; which he thinks is imply'd in what our Saviour said, *I am not of this world* ; shewing thereby that he was of another , that is , an *Invisible World*. But even that World is contain'd, he saith , *within the Circumscription of this present World*. Where now is the *Artifice* ; (for this and *artificially* are his darling Terms , that he applies to every thing as he fancies. For, 'tis observable , that when the Dr. hath got a foolish impertinent Word by the end , he unmercifully punishes the Reader with the nauseous Repetition of it ;) where , I say , is the *Artifice* of this Quotation ? For we plainly see that *Origen* mixes the *World above the Stars* with that of the *Saints below*, and distinguishes both of them from the *World of the wicked*. Is it not strange then , that a Man should produce Quotations , only to baffle himself ? For so the Dr. doth.

My Second Citation is out of *Origen's* Commentary on St. *John's* Gospel, which the Dr. saith (without any occasion given him) *contains 422 Pages* , just so many

many and no more, for there is wonderful Learning in the *exact Arithmetic* of Pages : And 'tis thought by some that the Dr. is more nice in numbring of *them* than in enquiring into the true Sense of the Words contain'd in them. The true Account of what *Origen* there saith is this (as the Reader will be convinc'd if he pleases to consult the place) that there had this Interpretation been given of that Text, *Behold the Lamb of God that takes away the Sins of the World* ; namely, that by the *World* here we are to understand * *the World of the Church*, which in another place is call'd *the light of the World*, 5. *Mat.* 14. Such Language as this he saith may cause us to consider whether Christ and his Apostles be not most properly and primarily, and the Church of Christ in a secondary way, said to be the *Light of the World*. And then *Origen* acknowleges this Interpretation as his own, and by the *World* understands *the Church of God, with all that call upon the Name of Jesus Christ our Lord*. And he positively concludes thus, † *Let the Church therefore be call'd the World, seeing it is enlightned by our Saviour*. And now, saith he, we may go on in our Enquiry, whether in that Text before named, *Behold the Lamb of God that takes away the Sins of the World*, we may not safely interpret the word *World* to be *the Church*, especially when *the taking away of Sin is confined to the Church only*. And so, saith he, we must interpret what *St. John* saith of our Saviour, that *he is the Propitiation for our Sins, and not for ours only, but for the Sins of the whole World* ; That is, the whole

* Περὶ τοῦ κόσμου καὶ ἐκκλησίας ὁ λόγος ἐστὶν ὁ γεγραμμένος, Ἰδὲ ὁ ἄμνός ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου. *Orig. Comment. in Johan. p. 5.*

† Λεγόμεθα τὸν ἢ Ἐκκλησίαν κόσμον, ὅτε ὑπὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος φωτίζεται.

Church. And he adds that those Words of St. Paul have Affinity with this, 1 *Tim.* 4. 10. *Who is the Saviour of all Men, especially of those that believe.* This is a Faithful and Exact Account of the Substance of what *Origen* delivers in that Place.

And whereas the Dr. questions whether *Origen* by the Church understands the Elect, yea, he saith, *he doth not give us the least hint of it*; he again shews that he doth not read those Authors whom he quotes, or he will not open his Eyes to see the plain Truth deliver'd by them; for *Origen* hath inserted a Passage which puts the Matter out of all doubt; for he saith the *World* must be meant of the Church, because taking away of Sins (mention'd in the forecited Place of St. *John*) hath Reference to the Church only, and that not the Church taken in general, but the Congregation of the Elect.

The Dr. thinks those Words in the same Commentary make for him, *viz.* That *Origen* saith that God endeavours to take away Sin, ἀπὸ ἐν ἑκάστῳ τῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ. But the Dr. should have look'd further, and then he would have found these Words interpreted by *Origen* himself, p. 35. who there tells us, that this deliverance from Sin is ἐν ἑκάστῳ τῶν πειθόντων, *in every one of those that believe*, and in no others; and he adds, that 'tis done ἀφ' αὐτῆς δυνάμεως, by an Ineffable Power: And afterwards in that part of his Discourse he confines this Privilege wholly to Believers. Thus the Dr. is very unhappy in his Exceptions against my Quotations, which I produced to shew that it was the Sense of some of the *Fathers* before *Augustin*, that Christ's Redemption reach'd to the Elect only. We see plainly that this was the Persuasion of this Antient Father, and we see at the same time, that the Dr. miserably perverts his true Sense and Meaning.

The Dr. gains nothing by alledging another Place in *Origen*, that *the Lamb of God was sacrificed**, that he might take away the Sin not of a few, but of that whole World for which he suffer'd: For so the Greek Words should be translated, tho' the Dr. hath been pleased to render them otherwise to servè his turn; which is no uncommon Fault with him, but it shews that he is very perfidious in his quoting of Authors, and must never be trusted. We see here plainly that the Redemption and Reconciliation wrought by Christ is confined to *that whole World for which he suffer'd*; not the whole World at large, but that *World of the Saints* which was mention'd before by him.

Is it not Pleasant to see that the Dr. in the next place endeavours to prove that *Origen* was the Patron of Universal Redemption, because he saith *Christ died for the Stars*, and the other heavenly Bodies, therefore he died for all Men? But *ὑπὲρ παντὸς λογμῆ*, for every one that hath Reason (and the Stars according to him have Reason) will not prove the Business, tho' we should grant that Father's Hypothesis, for he might mean it of every kind of Star, not of every individual one; and where is the Dr.'s Argument then? And besides, the Dr. should have certainly known whether *Origen* speaks of the fixed Stars or the Planets. Thus the Dr., notwithstanding his great Adventures, hath no Success about the Unlimited Extent of Christ's Redemption which he pretended to prove. I suppose he had a mind to give us some *Diversion*, but he could not think we should believe him to be Serious.

* "Ἰνα ἄρῃ ἀμαρτίαν ἐκ ὀλίγων, ἀλλὰ ὅλε τὸ κόσμος αὐτὸ εἰ καὶ πέ-
πνθη.

He saith my Quotation from *St. Ambrose* is *mistaken*; for the Author of the Book *De Vocatione Gentium*, is not *St. Ambrose*, but either *Prosper*, as *Dally*; or *Pope Leo*, as *Quesnel* seemeth to have proved. To which I answer, Because that Treatise hath wont to be inserted among the Works of *St. Ambrose*, and hath born the Name of that Saint in some Manuscripts, a Man might without incurring an unpardonable Fault attribute it to that Father: But at the same time I expressly added in the same place, that *some* make *Prosper* the Author of the Treatise whence these Words are taken. This might satisfy, some would think, any fair and candid Reader, but the Dr. will not suffer us to place him in that Number, for he cries out that I am *Mistaken*, and he is in the Right, when he attributes that Book not to *St. Ambrose*, but either to *Prosper* or to *Pope Leo*. But *Erasmus* will tell him, that he is the Person that is *mistaken*; for the Book *de Vocatione Gentium*, was written not by *Prosper* or *Leo*, but by *Eucherius*. * *Vossius* (who is so great a Man with the Dr. when he pleases) will by no means have *Prosper* of *Aquitain*, whom the Dr. ascribes that Book to, to be the Author; but another of that Name, who was Bishop of *Orleans* (with which agrees *Dr Cave*) or else *Hilary*, Bishop of *Arles*: But he saith, he is sure it is not *Prosper* of *Aquitain*.

Nay, I request the Reader to observe; that the Dr. clashes with himself: For in his 1st Chapter of the Extent of Christ's Redemption, p. 120. he distinctly mentions *the express Testimonies* of *Prosper*, and of the Author *de Vocatione Gentium*; and sets down those Testimonies or Quotations separately and distinctly in the Margin, adding the Name of

* *Hist. Pelag. Lib. 1. cap. 20.*

Prosper to the one, and *de Vocatione Gent.* to the other; thereby farther confirming that he took *Prosper* to be one Author, and him who writ *de Vocat. Gent.* to be another. Yet this is the Man that censures me for *mistaking* the Author of the Quotation which I produced: And thus he lets the World see, that rather than he will not contradict me, he chuses to contradict himself. I will say that for the Doctor, he hath a good knack this way: He is of the Number of those deluded People mention'd by the Apostle, who *oppose themselves*.

He next had undertaken to prove, that my Quotation was not only *mistaken*, but *impertinent*; but he very discreetly waves the Proof of this latter, as if he had not mention'd any such Charge at all: But instead of this, he saith, the Place is *cited falsely*: For *false* and *impertinent* are all one with him, who knows not how to distinguish between Things.

He complains I have left out those Words of *Prosper*, *Quamvis magna pars hominum salvantis gratiam aut repellat, aut negligat*; and I must tell him, there was Reason for it, for the Sense was entire without it, and therefore I omitted it: And the Dr. himself confesses that 'tis but a *Parenthesis*, which implies as much. But I am beholden to him for taking Notice of that Omission: For those Words being joined with the other, shew plainly the Difference between the *General* and *Special* Grace of God, and the vast Difference between the Effects that attend them: And besides, they clear the grand Point there asserted, (for which I quoted that Passage) That *the World* doth not there signify every individual Man, but is taken for *the Elect*; and that when the Scripture mentions the *Salvation of all men*, 'tis meant of *all Kinds* of Men; and

66 *The Arminian Doctrines condemn'd*

consequently, *Universal Redemption* is not included in it.

And that this is *Prosper's* plain Meaning, is most evident from what he saith in the Beginning of the next Chapter: * *When those Men who delight in Calumnious Disputations, shall read or hear these things which I have deliver'd, they will say, that by such Disputes as these we contradict the Apostle, who definitively pronounces that God would have all men to be saved.* Can any Man of tolerable Sense think that this Author would have spoken thus, if he had not in the former Chapter interpreted that Text, which seem'd to imply *Universal Salvation*, concerning a *Limited one*; and thereby had provoked the *Pelagian Party* to asperse and traduce him, as if he had opposed that known Text of the Apostle *St. Paul*? This is very clear; and yet the Dr. hath the Assurance to alledge this in Defence of *Universal Redemption*: And he pretends to recite the following Words of *Prosper*; but indeed only picks out what he pleases, and omits the rest; but none of them are to the Dr.'s Purpose. For, in Explication of that foresaid Text of the Apostle, this Author tells us, That we are obliged, by virtue of it, to put up our Petitions *pro omnibus infidelibus & inimicis crucis Christi, pro omnibus idolorum cultoribus, &c.* that is, for all sorts of Offenders in the World; because, among these, there are some that shall actually and eventually be saved.

* *Cum legerint hæc vel audierint qui amant calumniosa Certamina, dicent nos per hujusmodi Disputationes Apostolo contradicere definiendi quod Deus omnes homines velit salvos fieri.*

Where

Where now is the *Falshood* of the Quotation, which he objects? And is it not plain, that *the Salvation of all men*, spoken of before, is *limited* by *Prosper*? Any one would see this but the Doctor, whose * *Eyes fail him*, he saith; which he might truly mean concerning the Eyes of his Understanding, which must needs be weak by his Looking against the Sun, accustoming himself to confront and oppose the brightest and most shining Truths.

He will not admit of my Citation out of *Ferom's* Commentary on the 38th of *Job*; for all *Scholars* (he saith) *know it to be a spurious Piece*. And yet all *Scholars* know it hath been reckon'd to be genuine, notwithstanding what is objected against it; namely, that from what is said in the End of it, it appears, that it was made at the Request of a Bishop who lived in *Bede's* Time. But it may be answer'd, That that Addition was inserted on purpose by the Editor of it, to make it look, for some Reason known to himself, like the Work of some Writer of that Age: And that the Style is different from that of *St. Ferom*, is no concluding Argument; for some of his Pieces that pass for genuine, are of a Style different from the rest, as all *Scholars* know, and as the best Criticks have noted.

This Commentary on *Job*, hath been thought by some to have been made by *Philip*, one of *St. Ferom's* Disciples; and then the *Antiquity* of it is in a manner the same, as if it were written by that Father himself. But doubtless, the true Reason of the Dr.'s rejecting this Quotation, is, because it is so close to my Purpose, and so clear against him; and thence

* *Gen. Pref.*

he was mov'd to shew a wonderful deal of *Scholarship*, in objecting against this Book as spurious. But where was his *Scholarship* in quoting *Basil's* Commentary on *Isaiab*, which is voted to be an Adulterate Piece by Good Judges?

My Citation out of *St. Jerom's* Commentary on 20. *Mat.* 28. is allow'd of; it being so very plain, *Christ said not, he gave his Life a Redemption for all, but for many; that is, them that would believe*: But the Dr. miserably distorts the Meaning of these Words, by weakly distinguishing (without any ground for them) between *the Will of God*, and *the Effect of it*; as if what God had will'd and design'd, should not be effected. This is a Reproach both to the Sincerity and the Almighty Power of God. I do not deny that this Father speaks sometimes in another Strain; for every body knows that he (as well as some other Fathers) is not consistent with himself: But I am not to answer for that. It is sufficient for my Purpose, that those Words which I have cited out of that Writer, disallow of the Doctrine of Universal Redemption.

The Dr. is not asham'd to alledge those Words of the same Father, as if they were to his purpose: *Quia nullus absque propria voluntate servatur, liberi enim arbitrii sumus, vult nos bonum velle*. I grant this, and so do all the Adversaries of the *Arminian* Doctrines: It is no more than what we are taught by the *Psalmist*, *Thy People shall be willing in the day of thy power*, 110. *Psal.* 3. We see then how *injudiciously* the Dr. quotes the Fathers: One would think he minds not whether what they say makes for him, or not. He must produce better Quotations, before he gains Assent to his Opinions.

His other Quotation out of *Jerom*, is this: *If the prudent Reader enquire why all men are not saved, if our Saviour loved them and redeemed them by his Blood, the Cause*

Cause plainly follows in these Words, *Ipsi autem noluerunt, but they would not.* But you must not trust to the Dr.'s Translation; for 'tis common with him, either wilfully, or (as some would plainly term it) ignorantly to misrepresent the Original Words, and their Meaning.

This is evidently seen in the present Quotation, which in *Latin* is this: *Si prudens Lector tacitâ cogitatione responderit, Quare multi non servati, si ipse salvavit eos, & dilexit, & pepercit filiis suis, & redemit eos sanguine suo, suscepitq; & exaltavit assumptos? Inferitur causa perspicua, Ipsi autem non crediderunt.* In *English* thus: *If the prudent Reader with a tacit Thought replies, Why are many not saved, if he hath saved them, and loved them, and spared his Sons, and hath redeemed them with his Blood, and undertaken for them, and exalted those he hath thus taken upon him to redeem? A perspicuous Cause is infer'd; viz. They did not believe.*

Surely the Dr. consults not the Fathers themselves in their own Language; but takes out Quotations from them at second-hand, and is not solicitous whether they agree with the Original or not. And he takes no Care whether what he quotes be pertinent or no; for certainly, no Man can think this to be of that Nature: For here we read that *many are not saved, who are saved*; that is, Many are not actually saved, who have the Means of Salvation: For the latter *saving*, and the *loving* and *sparing*, which are here mentioned, are meant only of the Outward Means of Salvation, and the common Testimonies of Divine Philanthropy: And the *Redeeming* is to be understood of the Virtue and Dignity of Christ's Death, of its infinite Merit, which is said that it is able to satisfy for the Sins of all Men in the largest Acception, yea, more Men and Worlds than there are. But who can argue from

hence the Universal Benefit of Christ's Death? This is like the rest of the Dr.'s Logick.

He passes by that remarkable and shining Quotation which I offer'd out of *Jerom's* Commentary on 2. *Tit.* 11. *The Grace of God hath appeared to all men: To all Men, saith the Apostle; for there is no difference of free and bond, of Greek and Barbarian, of Circumcis'd and Uncircumcis'd, of Woman and Man.* Which Words of this Father plainly shew, that by *all Men* he understands *all Ranks and Conditions* of Persons, not every particular Man in the World.

And the Dr. overlooks that other plain Testimony of *Fulgentius* which I recited, wherein that Writer interprets *all Men by every Tongue, Age, Condition, &c.* When he is thus silent, we may conclude that the Quotation is perfectly against him, yea, that it is such that he thinks it unanswerable, for else he wou'd endeavour to attack it: As 'tis observable that when he lights on a Quotation where he is persuaded he can shew his Legerdemain, he seizes on it, and tries his Skill upon it. But he could not do so upon these last Citations out of *Jerome* and *Fulgentius*. And truly 'tis a strange thing that there should be any of our Divines that will not allow that those General Terms *all* and *the World*, are to be taken in a Restrained Sense, when applied to *Salvation* and *Redemption*, as 'tis acknowledg'd by them that they are commonly in Scripture, when applied to some other Things; yea, things that have a great Affinity with *Salvation* and *Redemption*. It is confess'd even by *Socinus* and *Crellius*, that the Apostle in these Words, 1 *Cor.* 15. 22. *As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive,* speaks only concerning *Christians*. Mr. *Dodwell* in his *Epiſtolary Discourse* mentioning the same Text, owns that here are meant *not all Men simply*, but some certain Persons. And the

the same Writer in the same Place, citing 5. Rom. 18. *As by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life; declares that this latter Universality is to be understood of those who accept of the Gospel upon their hearing it preach'd: And he adds, Such Universal Particles are to be limited according to the Exigency of the Subject in the Scripture.* Another * is forced to confess, that [every Creature] and [all the World] frequently signify not every individual Person, but only a great Number of Persons of different Nations, or all sorts of Persons, viz. both Jews and Gentiles. And he adds, *When our Saviour is said to enlighten every Man that comes into the World, 'tis meant that he teaches and instructs a great Number of Persons of different Nations, or all sorts of Persons, viz. both Jews and Gentiles: And this he repeats (as 'tis his way) over and over again. Thus these Men are self-condemned.*

Yea, the Dr. himself is of this Number, for in his *General Preface*, the *Universal Terms* in these Texts, *The Gospel shall be preach'd in all the world, 24. Mat. 14. Their sound is gone forth into all the earth, 10. Rom. 18. Your faith is spoken of through out the whole world, 1. Rom. 8.* are to be understood, he saith, of the *Roman Empire*. And in his *Annotations* on 24. *Mat. 14.* where all these Texts are repeated again (as 'tis his Fashion to abound with needless Repetitions) he owns that these Words of *Universality* are to be restrain'd, and not to be understood of the *whole World* in the strict Sense. And in his *Notes* on 4. *Rom. 13.* he interprets *the Heir of the world* thus; *Abraham, as being the Father of the faithful, so was the*

* *Mr. Bennet's Confut. of Quakerism*, p. 84.

beir of the believing world. It seems then there is a *believing World*, as well as an *unbelieving World*, which the Dr. stily disowns in another place. And observe how he expounds 1. Col. 6. 23. *The truth of the Gospel is come unto you, as it is in all the world, and was preach'd to every creature which is under heaven*: This saith he, by an usual Hyperbole is to be understood of the most noted Parts of the World. And in his Paraphrase on this place, by every Creature under Heaven, he saith are meant Gentiles as well as Jews.

And so according to this way of speaking in the N. Testament (which is own'd by the Dr.) the Calvinists justly interpret those Places of Scripture which seem to express the Universality of the Extent of Christ's Death and Redemption: They say they ought to take those General Terms in a restrain'd Sense; and 'tis certain that from other Places of Scripture we are taught to do so: For tho' 'tis said *Christ died for all*, 2 Cor. 5. 15. *He gave himself a ransom for all*, 1 Tim. 2. 6. *He tasted death for every man*, 2. Heb. 9. *He was a propitiation for the sins of the whole world*, 1 Joh. 2. 2. yet this Latitude of speaking is confin'd and limited by other Texts, and the word *all* is interpreted by *many*, 26. Mat. 28. *This is my blood which is shed for many*. 10. Mark 45. *The Son of man came to give his life a ransom for many*. 9. Heb. 28. *Christ was once offer'd, that he might take away the sins of many*. 10. John 15. *He laid down his life for his sheep*. 15. John 13. *for his Friends*. 2. Eph: 26. *for his Church*. And as to that Term the *World*, we find it restrain'd even by Mr. le Clerc, in his Notes on 4. John 22. *The Saviour of the world*: Which he interprets concerning the Jews only; for we are not to think, saith he, that the Samaritans thought of the *salvation of the Heathens*. Thus we see that the Dr. and his Brethren, the High Arminians, palpably confute themselves.

The Dr. produces another Quotation out of *Jerome's* Epistle to *Oceanus*, which he words thus, *John Baptist must lie when he said, Behold the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world, if there be any yet living for whose sins Christ did not suffer.* Which is not only falsly render'd, but the Meaning is perverted. The true rendring is this, * *When John Baptist points out Christ with his finger and voice, saying, Behold the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world, he lies if there be yet in the world those whose sins he hath not born.* And as for the Meaning, it may justly be thought to be this, that there is not *any* Sort or *Condition* of Men whatsoever in the World whose Sins Christ hath not expiated by his meritorious Suffering for them: For this is agreeable to this Father's Explication of 2. *Tit.* 11. which I mention'd before.

He is so over-run with Prejudice, that my Quotation out of *St. Chrysostom* will not go down with him, tho' 'tis most evident that in that place *the sheep for whom Christ laid down his life*, of whom *St. John* speaks, are the *People of God* † *foreknown and predestinated by him*; for those are the very Words of that Father, taken from 11. *Rom.* 2. And he further explains *St. John's* Words by 2 *Tim.* 2. 19. *The Lord knoweth them that are his*; that is, saith *Chrysostom*, ∴ *Those who he foreknew.* So then 'tis evident that Christ laid down his Life for the *Sheep* only; that

* Mentitur Joannes Baptista & digito Christum & voce demonstrans, Ecce agnus Dei, &c. si sunt adhuc in seculo quorum Christus peccata non tulerit.

† Λαός αὐτῷ ὄν προέγνω.

∴ Ἐκεῖνος λέγω ἔς προέγνω. Homil. 59. in Johan.

is, those who were *Predestinated* and *Foreknown*. And this was that Father's Judgment.

I produced two Irrefragable Testimonies out of St. *Augustin*: The one is this, [God willeth all Men to be saved; that is, all kind of Men, as the meaning of every Herb in 11. Luke 42. is every kind of Herb.] And elsewhere he interprets that Text thus, * *Not that there is no Man whom God willeth not to be sav'd, but that by all Men we should understand every kind of Men*; and then he proceeds to mention particularly all the *Ranks, Conditions, and Kinds* of Persons in the World. Now what saith the Dr. to this? He tells us, that *Vossius* hath prov'd that this Interpretation is *against the plain meaning of the Text*; for *Vossius* is of great Authority with the Dr. when he hath a mind to it; tho' sometimes, as in the Doctrine of Original Sin, and the Salvation of Heathens, he cares not a Rush for him: Wherefore we have no Reason to listen now to the Dr. when he produces that Writer's Opinion, for he doth it only to serve his present Turn. But if he had read on a little further in that *Thesis* of *Vossius* which he refers us to, he would have found that even this Writer was not on his side, for he confesses that † *the Catholics*, that is, the Orthodox Christians of old, held *that God will'd that many shou'd be damn'd*. So that we see his great Voucher hath left him to shift for himself. And besides, we can't but take notice that the Dr. reads Au-

* Non quòd nullus hominum esset quem salvum fieri nollet, sed ut omnes homines, omne genus humanum intelligimus per quascunque differentias distributum, reges, privatos, &c. Enchir. ad Laurent. Cap. 103.

† Catholici statuerunt, quanquam multos damnare Deus velit, &c. Hist. Pelag. Lib. VII. Pars 1. Thes. 2.

thors by halves, and scarcely that too, and so he is not fit to judge of what they say, yea (as we find in the Instance before us) he knows not what they have deliver'd.

My next Citation out of *Augustin* is this, that when Christ is said by St. *John*, to be a propitiation for the sins of the whole world, the Church is meant by the World. And *totus mundus est Ecclesia* are the very Words of the Father. Tho' the Dr. saith of course here (as he had done several Times before.) that *this is artificially produced*; and tho' he pretends to correct the Words cited by me, yet he hath nothing at all to object against this Father's Interpretation of St. *John's* Words. It is true he brings forth a Passage out of this Writer which he saith shews that *he held the Doctrine of Universal Redemption*; but who will believe it, that knows (and the Dr. himself confesses it) that St. *Augustin* is here disputing against the *Pelagians* who held Universal Redemption? This wou'd be disputing and arguing against himself. But I further remark, that the Dr. is very unhappy in this Quotation of St. *Augustin*, for this Learned and Pious Father argues here against those who denied *Original Sin*, and particularly asserted that Infants were not involv'd in the Guilt of it: He confutes them from that Text of the Apostle, 2 Cor. 5. 14. *If one died for all, then are all dead*, all are dead in Sin, and consequently Infants: And the Virtue of Christ's Death extends to them as well as to grown Men. This proves not Christ's unlimited Redemption; that is, the Redemption of every particular Person in the World (for *the dying for all* hath not that Signification) but it directly proves, against the Dr., that there is *Original Sin*, and that Young Children are reputed Guilty of it, because they *die*: Which is the thing that the Dr. stiffly denies. I appeal
real

peal now to the Reader whether the Dr. had not better have dropt this Quotation of *St. Augustin*.

But seeing he is for quoting this Father, I will offer him one Place to consider of, which he will find in his 45th Treatise on *St. John's Gospel*, *Pro nobis omnibus tradidit illum, sed pro quibus nobis? Præscitis, prædestinatis. Christ gave himself for us all: But for what all? For those that he foreknew and predestinated.* Any Man but *Dr. Whitby* would own this to be a Decisive Quotation. Here this Father restrains the Signification of the word *all*, as it hath Reference to *Christ's* undertaking for Man: And he lets us know that *Christ's giving himself*, which is the same with his *Redemption*, extends only to the *Elect*, to the *Predestinated*, and not to every individual Person: If the Dr. hath the Confidence to make Resistance to such bright and glaring Proof as this, we may despair of ever dealing with him.

The Dr. tells us that *Dally proves*, from p. 854. to 879. (for he is wonderfully skill'd in the precise Number of Pages; he seems to delight in this sort of Pedantry) that *Prosper asserted the Doctrine of Universal Redemption*: But this Matter is falsely represented by the Dr. out of mere Partiality and Prejudice: For whereas the Dr. saith, and pretends to say it from *Mr. Daille*, that *some Gallican Divines had objected as Matter of Reproach to St. Augustin that he maintained, Quod non omnes homines vult Deus salvos fieri, sed certum numerum prædestinatorum, &c.* That is, *St. Augustin held the same Doctrine that I do*; this is no Proof that touches the Merits of the Cause. For what tho' some few *Frenchmen* made it Matter of Reproach, what is this to the thing it self? If the Dr. had consulted *Fulgenius*, he might have been informed by him, that another branch of the Doctrine which those *Frenchmen* were offended at in *St. Augustin's* Writings was this, that that Father had said,

said, * That Men were predestinated not only to Punishment, but also to Sin. And *Fulgentius* adds, That that † Holy and Learned Man *Prosper* defended this Saying with a right Faith. Now, may we not think, that he who maintain'd *this* which looks so Severe and Harsh, would not be backwards to assert the *other*? As most certain it is that he did; tho' some Dubious Expressions, that may be construed to the other side, fell from him sometimes; which is a common thing with all the Fathers.

And as for what follows, That *Prosper*, by declaring expressly that these Accusations were unjust Reproaches, sufficiently shews that neither he nor St. *Augustin* ever held any of these Doctrines; The Dr. in these Words plainly shews that he never read this Part of *Prosper's* Writings, which he refers to, or else wilfully misrepresents it: For I have proved before, That these Gallican Divines were *Pelagians* or *Semipelagians*, and therefore disrelish'd St. *Augustin's* Doctrine; and that *Prosper* took his Part, and oppos'd those Divines, as Men of Heterodox Faith.

His Reply to their Objection against St. *Augustin*, That God will not have all Men to be saved, but a small Number, is this: If the Will of God were to save all Men, why did he for so many Years leave Men in Blindness? Why suffers he Infants to die before Baptism? He asserts, that the Grace of God is not given to All; and proves it thus; because the Preaching of the Gospel is

* Quod Peccatores non ad solum Prædestinatos diceret Judicium, sed etiam ad Peccatum. Lib. 1. ad Monimum, Cap. 30.

† Cujus dicta *Prosper*, vir eruditus & sanctus, rectè defendit fide. Ibid.

78 *The Arminian Doctrines condemn'd*

not vouchsafed to some Infidels; and because, if God will'd the Salvation of all Men, they would all certainly be saved. He tells us, That the * Foreknowledge of God, which can't be deceived, hath determin'd concerning the full Number of the Members of Christ's Body: The Sum or certain Number of them, which is foreknown and pre-lected in Christ before Eternal Ages, loses nothing, and is not capable of being lessen'd by any Detriment: For which he quotes 2 Tim. 1. 9. *Who hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling; not according to works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began.*

And, in another Place, Prosper lays to the Charge of the Pelagians and their Followers, that they will not confess † *quod ex omni numero hominum per secula cuncta natorum certus apud Deum definitusq; sit numerus prædestinati in vitam æternam populi, & secundum propositum Dei electi: Quod quidem tam impium est negare, quam ipsi gratiæ contra ire: That is, That out of all the Numbers that are born in all the Ages of the World, there is with God a certain and definite Number of People predestinated to Eternal Life, and chosen according to the Purpose of God who calls them: Which Doctrine it is as impious to deny, as to contradict the Grace of God.* Judge now, whether the Dr. hath fairly and justly represented that Excellent Writer: Judge also, whether he ought not to be asham'd, for producing this Author in favour of Universal Redemption.

* De plenitudine quippe membrorum corporis Christi Præscientia Dei est, quæ falli non potest, nihil perdit, & nullo detrimento minui potest summa præcognita, atq; in Christo ante secula æterna prælecta, &c. De Vocat. Gent. Lib. 2. Cap. 10.

† Epist. ad Ruffin. de Grat. & Lib. Arbit.

I will, after all that I have said, add Two Testimonies of great Antiquity : The first is that of *Clement the Roman*, in his 1st. Epistle to the *Corinthians*, Chap. 2. * *It was your Endeavour day and night (saith he to them) in behalf of the whole Brotherhood, that the Number of his Elect might be saved by mercy on God's Part, and by keeping a good Conscience on their Part.* He lets us know, that there are Certain Numerical Persons, that are chosen to Grace and Salvation : The punctual *Arithmetick* is determin'd and defin'd, and there are no Supernumeraries. Seeing the Authority of this *Epistle* hath been vouch'd of late, as well as formerly, by some of the Learnedest Writers of our Church ; I suppose those whom I have to deal with at present, will not scruple this Testimony.

There is another of *Novatian*, a very Ancient Writer, who liv'd in the Third Century, in his Book of the *Trinity*, Chap. 24. Where he tells us of *Multus numerus hominum in gloriam destinatus* ; *A great Number of Men (not All) destined or decreed to Glory.* And afterwards, speaking of this *Predestination* or *Election*, and saying that *Adam, Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham*, were Sharers in it ; he gives this Reason ; because *apud Deum & personarum & rerum omnium Ordo digestus est* : That is, *With God, in his Eternal Decree, the Order of all Persons and Events is digested and dispos'd* : And accordingly some Persons are predestin'd to Glory and Happiness, o-

* Ἀγῶν ἦν ὑμῶν ἡμέρας τε καὶ νυκτὸς ὑπὲρ πάντων τῆς ἀδελφότη-
 τος, εἰς τὸ σωθῆναι μετ' ἐλέους καὶ συνειδήσεως τῆς ἀριθμοῦ τῶν
 ἐλεκτῶν ὑμῶν.

thers to the contrary ; which overthrowes the Doctrine of Universal Redemption.

It is as evident in the *Reason of the thing*, as from the *Testimonies* which I have produced, that the Virtue of Christ's Death and his Redemption is not extended to all Men, for if it were, none would be damn'd. This I will make very plain, so that no Man of good Sense shall boggle at it. If Christ died for all Men ; that is, every one without Exception, and thereby Redemption was made for them all, then it necessarily follows, that they are all *Reconciled* to God, for Reconciliation is the Effect of Christ dying for us, and consequently they shall be Saved ; as is evident from 5. *Rom.* 10. where we are told, that *those that are reconcil'd unto God by the death of his Son, shall be saved by his life.* Reconciliation and Salvation are the inseparable Fruits of Christ's dying for us. To this purpose another Apostle speaks, *Christ suffer'd for our sins, that he might bring us unto God,* 1. *Pet.* 3. 18. that we might have free Access unto him as a reconciled Father, that we might be admitted to his Grace and Favour, and have all our Sins pardon'd, and that we may be accepted as Righteous in the sight of God. *We are justified thro' the Redemption that is in Jesus Christ,* and being justified, we have peace with God thro' our Lord Jesus Christ, 3. *Rom.* 25, 26. Is all this true (as most true it is) concerning those Persons for whom Christ died, and who are Redeemed by him, and yet shall they not be actually saved ? This is such an unreasonable Conception as cannot enter into the Mind of any considerate and unprejudiced Person. Therefore our *English Divines* at the Synod of *Dort*, tho' they in general Terms asserted that Christ died for all Men, and redeemed all Men (as the Scripture doth) yet when they come to explain themselves,

selves, they do it thus ; † *Christ out of his and his Father's special love and intention, died for the Elect, that he might in very deed obtain for them the pardon of their sins, and eternal Salvation, and infallibly confer these upon them.* Redemption doth certainly infer Salvation ; for 'tis the Apostle's Argument, *He that spared not his own Son, but deliver'd him up for us all (all the Elect) how shall he not with him freely give us all things ?* 8. Rom. 32. By *all Things* are undoubtedly meant all things that will farther our *Salvation*, all things that will certainly procure it. If then God deliver'd his Son up for all Men, they shall all infallibly be saved. This is a very rational and well-grounded Inference, and I do not see how it can possibly be evaded.

Nay, according to the Dr's own arguing, it must be thus, every Man in the World must actually be saved ; for saith he, * *To affirm that it is for the Glory of God's Mercy to save the Elect only, and no more, seems contrary to common Sense; for the more are benefited, the greater is the Glory of the Benefactor.* Now then, if the greater the Number of the Benefited is, the greater is the Glory of the Benefactor, certainly therefore, if *All* be benefited, the Glory of the Benefactor is greatest. Whence it naturally follows, that actually to save *All Men*, without any *Exception* of Persons, wou'd be *most* for God's Glory. And yet we see this is not done : But few are actually saved : Which shews the Vanity and Shallowness of the Dr's Opinion and Arguing about *Universal Redemption*, as he would ground it on the *Extension* and *Unlimited Mercy* of God.

† Ex speciali amore & intentione tum Dei Patris tum Christi mortuus est Christus pro *Electis*, ut illis remissionem peccatorum & salutem æternam reipsa obtineret, & infallibiliter conferret. *Suffrag. Theol. Britan. Artic. 2. Prop. I.*

* *Discourse of the Decree of Election, p. 95.*

82 *The Arminian Doctrines condemn'd*

And now here I will enlarge, and shew that those who refuse to admit of this, namely, that *Universal Redemption* is an undeniable Argument of the *Actual Salvation* of all Men, do impeach God of *Imprudence, Insincerity, and Impotency.*

First, they call in Question the *Wisdom and Prudence* of God, and of our Lord Jesus Christ: For what would we say of a Person that out of Compassion to the miserable State of poor Captives should lay down a Price for the Redemption of them, and yet doth not make the Purchase *sure*, nor provide that the Enemy shall give up these Captives into his Hands, without which the laying down the Price signifies nothing? Or I appeal to you, would any Wise and Understanding Man part with his Money, a vast and immense Sum, to set those miserable Creatures free from their Bondage, if he certainly *knew* before-hand that the paying of this Price would signify nothing to them, because they would not accept of his Bounty, but would remain still in their Slavery, and defy the Favour offer'd them? Would you not reckon him a very weak and silly Man who acted thus? Now apply this: Jesus Christ, according to some Men's Scheme of Divinity, hath laid down his Precious Life to redeem All Men in the World, without Exception, from the Slavery of Sin and Satan, and yet he hath not taken care to make the Purchase Useful and Effectual, but leaves the Captives as he found them in a State of Misery, and lets the Price which he paid for their Redemption be lost for ever. Yea, and he certainly *knew* that this would be the Event; that is, that they wou'd continue Slaves notwithstanding he should Ransom them, unless he himself would please to knock off their Fetters, and bring them out of Prison, for they were not able of themselves to come out thence. So here

was a Design of Mercy and Kindness in the Redeemer, but it miscarried, and was quite frustrated, because he did not give them Ability to come out of their Slavery. Let us appeal to Reason and the Practice of sober Mankind: Doth any *Prudent* Man attempt the Release of those Distress'd People, who he certainly knows shall not be the better for it? Will his *Wisdom* direct him to undertake that which he is assured will be to no purpose, and never attain the *End* which he propos'd to himself? This shews us the Nature of the present Case. Our Adversaries say that Christ, out of pure Grace and good Will, undertook the Redress of all Men's Misery by shedding his Blood for them, and actually redeeming them, tho' he knew that his Blood and his Redemption would do them no good, and that the greatest Part of them shall never enjoy the Blessing of the New Covenant which he hath establish'd by his Death. Are not these Excellent Propositions, and worthy of the *only Wise* God? Yea, those who talk thus, do not allow God the *Wisdom, Foresight, and Prudence* of an ordinary Man.

Secondly, they do in effect charge God and Christ with *Insincerity*. For they represent the Divine *Love* to be *Unlimited*, and to extend to *All Men*; and then they own that it is *Limited* by God, and proceeds not so far as it might. Can we call that *Universal* and *Sincere Love* which refuses to contribute what is in its Power towards the Salvation of Men? Can those be said to be the Objects of God's Love, yea, of his *Unrestrained* Love, who shall be left to perish eternally? What would we say of a *Physician*, who undertakes, out of Kindness to his Patient, to cure him, and solemnly promises to do all he can towards the Recovering him from his Distempers, and yet neglects to do all that is in his Power to effect

his Recovery? Shall we say this is a Man of *Sincerity*? Now apply this; Jesus Christ comes to heal the Spiritual Diseases of *All Men* in the World, as some affirm, and to restore them to perfect Health and Soundness, and to give Everlasting Life to them by his Death and Sufferings: But who can say that he *really intends* this to be an Universal Remedy, when he sees so many debarr'd the Benefit of it, when he sees that this great Physician denies them that Medicine which alone can bring saving Health with it? Christ intended to bestow *Pardon* and *Grace* upon them, by suffering on the Cross for them, but he withholds these Blessings from them, and they shall never be the better for Christ's Death. Where now is the *Boundless, Unlimited and Universal Love* of God to Mankind, which is so talk'd of? Do we not see it stinted and stopp'd? Christ really intended, they say, to exempt all Men from Damnation; and yet most of them are eternally lost. How then was he *Sincere* in his Intention?

This is to be the more observed by the Reader, because our Adversaries most tragically cry out against us, for representing God as *False* and *Deceitful, Insincere* and *Hypocritical*; for so they say our Doctrine sets him forth. But here it may be seen how this may justly be retorted upon them, and it may truly be told them, that *they* are the Men who represent God full of Deceit and Diffimulation, when they confess, that notwithstanding God hath declared that *he wills not the Death of a Sinner, but would have all Men to be saved*, and in order to that *to come to the Knowledge of the Truth*, and to repent and believe, yet the Generality of Mankind are not brought to the Knowledge of the Truth, but continue in their Errors, and in their Sins, in their Unbelief and Impenitency, which God could free them from if he pleas'd, and he only can do it: Consequently

quently God is not *Willing* to save these Persons, and therefore we may doubt of the Truth and Sincerity of God's Declarations in the Scriptures; that is, according to the *Arminian* Plan.

Thirdly, The Asserters of Universal Redemption must accuse God of *Weakness*: They must say that if he doth not want *Will*, yet he wants *Power*: He hath very gracious Designs of Universal Charity to Mankind, but he can't execute them. He purposes the Salvation of all Men in the World, but his Ability doth not come up to his Purpose. This is a vile Conception that these Men have of the Great God, that he expresses his kind Intentions towards all Men, but he can't bring them into Act: He wishes exceeding well to every individual Person in the World: but he is not able to accomplish his Wishes. He is a kind and compassionate *Physician*, but he administers *weak Medicines*, and such as are not able to purge away the Diseases of the Soul. He doth not afford Means *Sufficient* (and yet these Men call them *Sufficient*) for the healing of the whole distemper'd World. He prescribes several Remedies, but they prove *Ineffectual*. This is very Reproachful to the Deity, because it supposes, yea, asserts that there are *Impotent* Velleities and Wishes in him; that he desires the Salvation of every individual Person in the whole World, but he *can't* succeed in his Desires: For Men not only resist, but quite frustrate them. So he is forced to alter his Eternal Intentions, to desist from his former Determinations, to act contrary to his everlasting Purpose and Counsel, and to resolve, instead of saving Men, to damn them. Thus he is disappointed of his Design, but can't help it. Are not these Excellent Apprehensions and Conceptions concerning the *Almighty* God, or rather do they not deny his *Omnipotence*?

But these Men reply, that they do not derogate from the *Power* of God ; but the Reason why the Redemption wrought by Christ for all the World is not Effectual, is because Men *wilfully reject* the Mercy offer'd to them : For we must know, they say, that every Man is left to his *Free Will*, because a Man is no Man if he hath not free Free Will ; that is, a Power to chuse either Good or Evil : And therefore God doth not interpose with his *Power*, lest he should destroy the Essential Property of the Soul, which is Free Will ; and thence it is that Man falls short of the Benefit of that Salvation which God really and sincerely intended him.

This is the desparate *Asylum* they are forc'd to fly to, namely, That Man's *Free Will* must not be destroy'd. But it is impossible they should be safe in such a poor Refuge as this : And there is not a grain of Sense in what is alledg'd by them. Here, as at other times, they most apparently contradict themselves ; for sometimes they extoll the Freedom of the Will as the *Excellency* of Man's Nature : High Encomiums they give it ; they are very Rhetorical in setting forth its Dignity and Privilege. Their Friend *Episcopius* holds that our Saviour himself had a Freedom of Will to Evil as well as Good, and that he was endued with this Faculty as he had taken upon him our Human Nature. So great and illustrious a Prerogative do they take this to be. But at other times this Power is depretiated by these Men ; and Dr. *Whitby* confesses, that † *this Liberty of the Will is not essential to Man as Man*. And he acknowledges that * *Liberty is indeed no Perfection of human Nature* ; yea, it argues Deficiency and Imperfection in Man,

† *Discourse of the Freedom of the Will of Man*, p. 308.

* *Ibid.* p. 307.

and it is own'd by him to be the Source and Fountain of all Sin and Misery. Thus we find that these Men cannot agree among themselves, whether Liberty of Will belongs to Man as Man, or whether it be a Blessing or a Curse; but yet without any Colour of Reason they agree in this, that the taking away this Liberty destroys the very Nature of Man. What Absurdity and Inconsistency can we imagine greater than this?

But they insist that this *Free Will* (as it signifies *Indifferency* to Good and Evil) is necessary in this *State of Probation*. I Answer, in some Sense this present State of Man may be said to be a *State of Probation*, that is, as he is liable to *Temptations* and *Trials*, which were design'd to exercise him, and likewise in Respect of the *Proof* which he is here to give of his Sincerity and Faithfulness; but with Respect to the *Final State of Salvation* or of the *Contrary*, it is a false Notion that he is a *Probationer*, for his State is fix'd as to the Event, and cannot admit of any Alteration. But *supposing* that Man, in the Sense of the *Arminians*, is in a *State of Probation*, I ask what Necessity was there of putting Man into such a State which they own to be so *Dangerous*, and generally proves *Fatal* and *Destructive*? Where now is that *Universal Love* and *Mercifulness* of God which is pleaded for? If he knows that this *Free Will* is so Pernicious a thing, and is the Cause of the Damnation of the greatest Part of the World, why doth he create Men with it, and why doth he suffer it to baffle and defeat his Intentions of *Unlimited Kindness* and *Love* to Mankind? Will God, the most Beneficent Being, destroy so many Thousands and Millions of Men for ever, merely because he will maintain the Faculty of *Free Will*? Doth not a Loving and Affectionate Parent think himself oblig'd to hinder his Child from doing an Evil Act, and making himself

nable thereby? or doth he refrain him from hindring him, as much as he can, because he would not take away from his Child the Liberty of Acting and shewing his Free Will? What shall we think then of God; our Gracious *Father*? will he refuse to exert his Omnipotent Power in restraining of Sin; and converting and saving all Mankind, because he will suffer them to enjoy the *Freedom of their Wills*, which is the Root of Sin and Damnation? Thus see how weakly these Men talk, tho' they perpetually boast of being strong *Reasoners*. For shame, for shame, quit these senseless Notions.

There is another Cause which they assign of the *Ineffectualness* of the Universal Redemption wrought by Christ; and that is this: Men do not perform the *Conditions of Salvation*; and thence it is that the Power of God is unsuccessful. But I ask, What is the Reason that they do not; and cannot perform those Conditions? They can't do it without God's Help; and therefore he is obliged, according to them, to enable them: But we see he doth not. They can't believe and repent, unless he gives them Strength to do it; but we see that he refuses to give it. Now, can any Man of Reason think, that Christ died with a real *Intention* to redeem all Men; and *really* did redeem them; and yet will deny that Grace and Assistance to them, whereby alone they can reap the Fruits of Christ's Redemption? Can any Intelligent Mind conceive, that our Lord laid down his Life out of Good Will to All the Men in the World, and with a sincere Purpose to save them, and yet will not enable them to perform the Conditions of Salvation? If God's Love is so Great and Unlimited as they affirm, he would not let the Stubbornness of Men's Wills frustrate his Designs; he would certainly vanquish the Perverseness and Obstinacy of that Faculty;

culty ; he would cleanse their Hearts , and purify their Lives , and make them *meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the Saints in light* ; for he alone can make them so. We can't say , that their *Sins* will hinder the Benefit of Christ's *Redemption* ; for Christ, by redeeming them , *took away their Sins* ; and therefore 'tis absurd and contradictory , to make the Sins of the Redeemed to be a final Obstacle of their Salvation.

Again : The Absurdity of these Men's Opinion about the Universal Extent of the Benefit of Christ's Death , may be gather'd hence : That as every Wise Man who propounds an *End* to be accomplish'd , provides that there be *Means* necessary to the Obtaining that End ; so without doubt the All-wise God, if he had really propounded the Salvation of All Men as his End, would have taken Care that there should be *Means* proportionable to it. But we see the contrary : God oftentimes withholds, and that justly , the Knowledge of his Reveal'd Will, from those who he foresees will reject and abuse it ; and he denies that Grace to many Persons , without which 'tis not possible they should believe and repent , and consequently be saved.

God doth not do All that for Men, which, even according to our Adversaries , is necessary on his Part to be done, to procure their Salvation. Which is a thing that they cannot solve by their own Principles ; but 'tis easily done by our's ; because we hold , that the Design of Christ's Redemption, and the Benefit of it , are confined to the Elect only ; and that Others are excluded , and for their wilful Offences justly damned.

I know these Men say , that God gives all Men *Means sufficient* to Salvation ; but how can they be said truly to be *sufficient* , if they attain not their

End

End for which they say they were vouchsafed? This is mere Sophistry and Delusion. If God intended the Conversion and Salvation of all Men as his *End*, he would provide that the *Means* in order to it should take place; he would effectually work upon them, so that his Grace should not be vain and fruitless, but compass that End for which it was made use of. In short, Can we entertain such a Notion as this, that Christ shed his Blood for every Man in the World, and yet will not bestow Saving Grace upon many Myriads of them? Would he do that which is the greater, and deny to do the lesser?

Are not these undeniable Arguments against the Doctrine of *Universal Redemption*? And yet such is the Stubbornness of these Men, that they will still maintain their Point, and in spite of all Conviction assert, That Christ died upon the Cross for *all Men without Exception*; and if so, then even for those that were then in Hell: He redeemed those that were actually damned; he sincerely intended by his Death to save those Persons. We can't so much as say here, *Credat Judæus*. Surely, with all Rational Men, the bare mentioning of this, is a sufficient Confutation, without the Formality of arguing against it, without putting it into Mood and Figure.

Well; but our *Rational Divines* (as they call themselves) tell us, That Christ by his Death and Redemption, put all Men into a *Capacity* of being saved; and they must *Actually* save themselves, by Believing and Repenting. Christ made himself a Sacrifice for them, that their Guilt and Punishment might be removed; but they must go to work, and remove the Impurity of their Sins themselves, by Virtue of their Free Wills. They are justified by
Christ's

Christ's Merits, but they must be sanctified by their own. Christ hath died for them, but they must make his Death available to them, as well as they can; and they can, if they will give their Mind to it, by the self-determining Power of their Wills. This is our Modern Divinity, and takes with the Generality of the Men of this Age.

Thus I have largely insisted on the Doctrines that respect *Free Will*, and *Divine Grace*, and the *Extent of our Saviour's Redemption*; and have laid open the Feeble Attempts of Dr. *Whitby* on these Subjects. And I doubt not but the Reader will gather from them, that the Dr. is better at mustering up Sentences out of some of the Fathers, (tho' little to his purpose) and making a Shew of some *Critical Pedantry*, than at Handling of Controversies in Divinity.

Truly we are beholden to him for what he hath done; and we wish that more of his Brethren would follow his Example, and draw their Pens against the *Calvinist* Doctrines, and maintain those of the contrary Kind; for then People would come to be truly inform'd of the plain *Inconsequences* and *Contradictions* which go along with the Latter. The more and oftner these Articles are publish'd to the World, the less Repute they would have among Thinking People. We have found, that the Cavils and Exceptions which these Men start against our Doctrines, are so contriv'd and shap'd by them, that they apparently make for us, and confirm the Truth of what we assert. We have seen, that they own those very Propositions which they quarrel with; at the same time that they deny them, they confess them; and all their Objections fly in their own Faces, where, if there were not something Extraordinary,

ordinary, Blushes would be rais'd in a plentiful manner.

To conclude this Part of my Discourse: When they have fully answer'd all the Arguments I have offer'd; and reconcil'd all the Contradictions and Absurdities which I have taken Notice of in their Writings; and when they have clear'd themselves of all that Fallacy and Sophistry which I have observ'd there, I will follow the Dr.'s Example, and renounce *Calvinism*: But in the mean time, I take the *Arminian* Opinions to be a great Scheme of Nonsense, dress'd up with an Air of seeming Reason.

We are now arriv'd at the Doctrine of the *Saints final Perseverance*; and the Dr. boasts that *I have not cited One Father for it*. But in the 6th Chapter of my Second Book of the *Evangelical Truths*, (which I find he hath perused) he might have seen Citations out of St. *Augustin* (who is one of the Fathers) very home to the purpose. Because he took no Notice of *them*, I will set *Two other* remarkable Passages before him, out of that Father: * *God, saith he, makes those whom he makes Good, to persevere in Goodness: But those who fall away and perish, were never in the Number of the Predestinated*. The other Passage is this: † *To the Saints who are predestinated*

* *Deus eos facit perseverare in bono, qui facit bonos: Qui autem cadunt & pereunt, in prædestinatorum numero non fuerunt. Augustin. de Corrept. & Grat.*

† *Sanctis in regnum Dei per gratiam Dei prædestinatis, non tantum tale adjutorium Perseverantiæ datur, sed tale ut eis Perseverantia ipsa donetur, non solum ut sine isto dono perseverantes esse non possint, verumetiam ut per hoc donum non nisi ut perseverantes sint. Ibid.*

by God's Grace to his Kingdom, there is not only given such a Help of Perseverance as Adam had, but such a one as that Perseverance it self is given to them; not only so that they cannot persevere without it, but that also by Virtue of this Gift they cannot but persevere. These cannot but be own'd to be very Shining Testimonies out of that Father's Writings: But the Dr. doth not care to open his Eyes, when there is any thing to be seen that he dislikes.

But now *Vossius* is quoted by him, as saying, that all Antiquity impugned the Indefectibility of the Saints: Which further proves, that the Dr. makes himself blind upon Occasion; for in this very place *Vossius* acknowledges; * That the Holy Fathers, Austin and Prosper, held, That God decreed from Eternity to bring some by Infallible Means to Eternal Life; whose Faith and Charity therefore should either never fail, or if they did, they should certainly be restored before the End of their Lives; because the Decree of God concerning the Salvation of those whom he chose to Life, can't possibly be made void. What can be plainer? And this Author, in his next Thesis, qualifies what he had said before, by telling us, that we ought to consider that those of the Fathers who hold Faith may be lost, do not all of them speak of any Measure of Faith indifferently; but many of them distinguish concerning Three Degrees of Faith: So that at last it comes to this; That the Faith which is capable of being lost; scarcely deserves the Name of Faith.

* Sanctos illos Patres contendisse Deum ab æterno statuisse quosdam infallibilibus mediis perducere ad vitam æternam, quorum idcirco fides & charitas vel nunquam deficiat, vel amissa certò restitatur ante finem vitæ, cum Dei propositum de iis salvandis quos semel elegit ad vitam, neutiquam irritum fieri possit. *Hist. Pel. lib. 6. c. 12.*

What doth the Dr. think of *Prosper's* Words, (speaking of those who die in their Sins,) which are to this purpose? That such Persons have no Interest in the fore-ordain'd Election in Christ, * *seeing it is certain, that Perseverance in Good to the End is the Gift of God; which that those Persons never had, is manifest from this, that they did not persevere; for if they had been elected, and once had that Gift, they could not have lost it.*

And upon the 106th Psalm he speaks thus: † *The Catholick Church is the Elect and Foreknown of God; the Sons of the Promise, the Members of the Body of Christ; is not diminish'd, nor is reduc'd to Fewness, because they truly are of the Elect: Or if they fall, they are soon repair'd, and remain what they were; and they are always many, because none that are of that Number can perish.*

But I can produce Fathers that were long before *Augustin* or *Prosper*. Such was *Tertullian* and *Cyprian*; the former of whom thus bears Testimony to the Truth: ∴ *What cometh from God, (saith he) is not ex-*

* *Cum dubium non sit donum Dei esse Perseverantiam in bono usque ad finem, quamvis istos, ex eo ipso quod non perseveraverunt, non habuisse manifestum est. Resp. ad Obj. Gall. Cap. 7.*

† *Ecclesia Catholica in Electis suis præcognitis à Deo, filiis promissionis, membris corporis Christi, non minuitur, nec ad paucitatem redigitur, quia ipsi verè sunt; aut cum lapsi fuerint, reparantur ac permanent; & semper multi sunt, quia de numero eorum nihil perit.*

∴ *Quod enim à Deo est, non tam extinguitur quam obumbratur. Potest quidem obumbrari, quia non est Deus; extingui non potest, quia à Deo est. Itaque sicut Lumen, &c. De Anima.*

tinguish'd,

inguisht, tho' it may be darken'd and obscur'd. It may be obscur'd, because it is not God; but it can't be extinguish'd, because it is from God. And then he explains and illustrates this by a fit Similitude taken from Light; which may be intercepted and obscur'd by a dark Body intervening, but the Light still remains the same that it was: So it is, saith he, with Goodness and Grace in the Soul of Man.

The other Father is St. Cyprian; whose Words are remarkable: * *Let no man think, saith he, that those that are truly Good can fall away from the Church. The Wind doth not blow away the Wheat, nor overturn the Tree that is fasten'd in the Earth with a solid Root. It is the empty Chaff that is carried away with the Wind: None but the feeble and rotten Trees are rooted up by Tempests. Such are the Persons whom the Apostle John smites, and even execrates, saying, They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us.*

The same Ancient Writer infers from 6. *John* 68, 69. (as I had observ'd before) that the Church which once believes in Christ, and holds what it is taught, doth never fall from him or it; and that those are truly said to be the Church, who continue in the House of God; and that those who are scatter'd like Chaff by the Wind, are not the Plant of God the Father's planting. And the like he saith in his Treatise on the Lord's Prayer. From which, and other Instances, we may be con-

* *Nemo existimet bonos Ecclesia posse discedere. Triticum non rapit ventus, nec arborem solidam radice fundatam procella subvertit. Inanes paleae tempestate jactantur, invalidae arbores turbinis incurfione evertuntur. Hos execratur & percutit Johannes Apostolus dicens, Ex nobis exierunt, sed non fuerunt ex nobis; si enim fuissent ex nobis, mansissent utique nobiscum. De Unitate.*

vinc'd how false and groundless the Dr.'s Vaunt was, to demonstrate that not one of the Doctrines espous'd by me, was maintain'd by any of the Fathers, before St. Austin's Time.

But let us see how the Dr. maintains his Post by Scripture: First he* allleges that Text to prove that the Saints may not persevere, 24. Mat. 12. *The love of many shall wax cold.* This is an Argument fetch'd out of the Strong Box: Some Men's Love and Charity may be diminish'd, and not be so fervent as 'twas before; Ergo it is quite vanish'd and extinguish'd. The Dr. often vaunts himself to be a *Logician*; now we see what excellent Proof he gives of it: And besides, there is not the least Hint in the Context, that this is spoken of those that were True Converts, and Sound Believers.

That is another Masterly Stroke, p. 435. where he thus argues very shrewdly; *Men put not new wine into old bottles, lest the bottles break,* 9. Mat. 17. Therefore the Saints may fall from Grace: This is the Conclusion which he draws from those Words, tho' the plain Meaning of them is no other than this; That Christ would not impose the Severity of frequent Fasting on his Disciples, whilst he was present with them, and whilst they were but yet weak and infirm, lest they should be discourag'd in those troublesome Times. Is there any Man, excepting one, of so dull a Capacity, as not to apprehend this clear and obvious Exposition of the Place, which the Learnedest Writers have generally embraced?

In his Answer to those Words, *Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?* I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, &c. shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord, 8. Rom. 35, 38. which I alledg'd in favour of the Doctrine of Perseverance; he saith, * *The Apostle doth not say that nothing can separate true Believers from the Love of God or Christ, but only declares his Perswasion that nothing would do it.* As much as to say, The Apostle doth not deliver here what is really true, and shall certainly come to pass; but he only acquaints us what is his Opinion, and private Perswasion.

It is observable here, that the Dr. joins with the Writers of the Roman Communion, and Bellarmine particularly; who say, that the Word *πέρισσως*, I am persuaded, which the Apostle here uses, imports only a Probable or Conjectural Perswasion; whereas it is agreed by the best Criticks, that this Greek Word imports Confidence and Assurance; and accordingly the Vulgar Latin renders it *certus sum*. However, in this Place, there is no doubt that it signifies the Apostle's Full and Certain Perswasion and Assurance; for when he saith, *Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?* the plain Sense is, there is no Person or Thing is able to separate us. For the Apostle speaks in the way of an Interrogation, yet it is to be understood as an Affirmation; as we learn from the Apostle's manner of speaking, in the immediately foregoing Verses, *Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? Who is he that condemneth?* Every one knows that it is meant Affirmatively;

and that it expresses the Certain and Settled Belief of the Apostle: So here, *Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?* That is, no Thing or Person can possibly do it; as he particularly tells us, *not tribulation, not distress, &c. v. 35, not death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, v. 38. I am persuaded, I am fully satisfied,* saith he, that none of these are, or shall be able to *separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.* If it were only his private Apprehension and Opinion (as the Dr. surmises) can we think that he would thus particularly and solemnly instance in all these foremention'd Things and Persons, to strengthen and confirm his Assertion? No, no. Not only the Word *πίπισμαι*, but the particular Grounds and Reasons assigned by the Apostle of this his Persuasion, acquaint us that he gave *Full Assent* to what he here saith; that is, that neither he, nor any of the truly Regenerate and Faithful, once engrafted into Christ, can be separated from him, and finally fall away. Wherefore, it is strange and unaccountable, that the Dr. should flatly contradict the Holy Apostle, and say they *may be separated*, tho' the Apostle asserts in the most solemn manner that they *cannot*. This shews the Dr.'s high Esteem of St. Paul, and of his Writings. Is not this Man an admirable Expositor of Scripture?

* He pretends to produce Instances of Falling away from Grace, as *Hymenæus* and *Philetus*, because 'tis said; *concerning the truth they have erred, or they have fallen off from the truth, 2. Tim. 2 18.* But if he had read on, he would have met with these

Words in the next Verse, *Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure*; that is, the Eternal Decree, which is the firm Basis of the Salvation of all true Believers, cannot be shaken, so that there is no Possibility of their final Apostasy. This, therefore, doth not concern those *prophane and vain babblers* whom the Apostle speaks of; and who *overtrow'd the faith of some*; that is, did what they could by their pernicious Doctrines to destroy the Orthodox Faith. But I confess, if this *Erring*, or *Falling off from the Truth*, be *Falling from Grace*, the Dr. could not have given a better Instance than in *Himself*; from whom we learn that he once believ'd and profess'd the Orthodox Truths of the Church, but afterwards deserted them, and by the Artifice of the *Deist* and *Physician*, and it is thought by a higher Instigation, turn'd Apostate.

Before I dismiss this Head of *Perseverance*, I must take notice of a precious Piece of Sound Skill and Reading in this Part of the Dr.'s Book; [** The Greek Fathers, saith he, by the heavenly Gift understand the Remission of Sins conferr'd in Baptism, &c: So Chrysostom, Theodoret, Photius, Oecumenius, Haymo, and Theophylact in locum.*] Where he most learnedly reckons *Haymo* as one of the *Greek Fathers*; tho' every one that hath the least Acquaintance with Writers, knows very well that *Haymo* was Bishop of *Halberstadt* in *Germany*, and writ in *Latin*; yet the Dr. makes him a *Greek Father*.

And here it is to be observed, that the Dr. could not have chosen a worse Man for his purpose; for this *Haymo* was a most Hearty, Vigorous, and Zea-

* P. 409.

ious Asserter of those Doctrines which at this day we call *Calvinism*; as we may see in his Excellent Expositions on the *Apostolical Epistles*. Yet the Dr. makes bold to name him, as one that favour'd the other Opinions, and he innocently takes him for a *Father* of the *Greek Church*. This was in his lucky Prosecution of what he had so often bragg'd of, that he had the *Fathers* on his Side.

The Vanity of this Bravade, shall in the last place be shew'd in the Doctrine concerning the *Salvation of Heathens*. I asserted in my *Veritas Redux*; that we have Reason to believe that Heathens and Infidels perform no Actions that are *really Good and Holy*, and consequently (according to the *Ordinary Dispensation* we are acquainted with) they shall be debarr'd of Heaven and Happiness: And this was the Doctrine of the Ancient Catholick Church, and the most Judicious Fathers. Dr. *Whitby* denies this, and declares that this Doctrine (being *one of those that I espous'd*) *was not maintain'd by any of the Fathers before St. Augustin's Time*.

To confute this, I desire the Reader to consult the *Pelagian History*, written by *Vossius* (the same Person whom the Dr. hath so often quoted) where he will find a *whole Treatise* (*Lib. 3. Pars 3.*) wherein it is largely prov'd, That *the Works of the Gentiles have not any of the Conditions required in Good Works*: And that Learned Man shews there, that not only *St. Augustin, Fulgentius and Prosper*, but several of the *Greek and Latin Fathers* before their Time, held, That Heathens can do no Actions that are truly and properly Good and Virtuous: And he produces Passages out of *Origen, Cyprian, Basil, &c.* for this purpose. And having taken notice

nce that some Passages are cited out of *Justin Martyr* and *Clemens Alexandrinus*, to support this other Doctrine, he expressly adds these Words; *This Opinion was condemned of old by the other Fathers.* He further observes, out of *St. Augustin*, that it was the Assertion of the *Pelagian Hereticks*, That * *those who were Strangers to the Faith (i. e. Heathens) abounded with Virtue* : Which *St. Augustin* opposed with great Force of *Reason* and *Scripture*, and made it evident from both, that the Works of the *Gentile World* were not from Faith, nor design'd for God's Glory, and therefore were not truly Good and Righteous. It is from *Divine Grace* that any Man knows God aright, and loves him, and doth what is acceptable to him. It is peculiar only to the *Christians* and the *Faithful*, to do such Actions as have real Goodness in them.

I will conclude with these Notable Words of *St. Chrysostom* and *St. Jerom.* The † *Gentiles*, saith the former, *tho' they did Good Works, yet because they did not do them for God's sake, but for Esteem among Men, or because Good is Good, or for Carnal Conversation, lest they should be scatter'd and dispersed, their Works were not truly Good.* ∴ Let us, saith the latter, produce that Sentence, viz. [The just shall live by Faith] against those who not believing in *Christ*, yet think themselves to be *Valiant, Wise, Temperate and Just*; that

* Alienos à fide abundare virtutibus. *Cont. Julian. Lib. IV. Cap. 3.*

† Homil. in Matth.

∴ Sententiam proferamus adversus eos qui in Christum non credentes, fortes & sapientes, temperantes se putent esse vel justos; ut sciant nullum absque Christo vivere, sine quo omnis virtus in vitio est. *Comment. in Epist. ad Galat.*

they may know that no man liveth without Christ, without whom all Virtue is reckon'd no other than Vice. Thus we may be further satisfied what was the Sentiment of those Early Times; and we may see how miserably the Dr. acquits himself, when he attempts to prove, that all the Doctrines I asserted in my late Book, have no Countenance from any of the Ancient Church, nay (as he presumptuously adds) *not any Ecclesiastical Writer for a long time after St. Austin.* But whereas he hath let fly at me with the *Fathers*, I have turn'd his Cannon upon himself, and have (I hope) convinc'd the Reader that even these *Fathers* are of my Side. If therefore for the future, the Dr. shall think fit to write against any of my Discourses, let it be remember'd what wretched Work he hath made in his Quoting the *Fathers*, and how his Reading and Knowledge have not kept pace with his Zeal.

And here, after all, and from all that hath been said, let the *near Affinity* between the *Pelagian Heretics* and those of the *Arminian Sect* be taken notice of. They agree in their Doctrine about the Eternal Decree of God; namely, That Men were decreed or predestinated to Life and Happiness, on the Foresight of their Faith and Good Works, and the good Use of their Free Will. They agree in this, That the Number of the Elect is Uncertain and Indefinite. They agree in this, That Original Sin hath not the true Nature of Sin, and is a Punishment and Misfortune rather than a Sin. They agree in the excessive Extolling of Free Will, and in asserting, That it is the Self-determining Power of their Wills, that makes the Grace of God Effectual. They agree in this, That it is in a Man's Power to resist and frustrate the Grace of God, even when God really intends to Convert him.

him. They agree in the Doctrine of Universal Redemption, and of the Non-Perseverance of the Regenerate. And in some other Instances their Agreement is evident; as the Reader may satisfy himself, by consulting Archbishop *Usher's Continuation of the Pelagian History*, Chap. 1.

To confirm this, it may be observ'd, that the *Arminian* Writers at this day defend their Doctrines by the very same Arguments that the *Pelagians* of old used in the like Case: And moreover, most of the *Carvils* and *Objections*, which the *Arminians* now raise against the *Calvinian* Doctrines, were long since made use of by the *Pelagians* and *Semipelagians*, against St. *Augustin's* Doctrines, in his Time and the succeeding Ages. Doth not this prove, that *Arminianism*, if it be not all over *Pelagian*, yet is in great part so? I will shut up this with Bishop *Sanderfon's* Words, in his *Pax Ecclesiæ*, which was publish'd in the Year 1625. and remains a perpetual Memorial of his Judgment, with relation to the Opposers of *Calvin's* Doctrines: *When they, saith he, have done and said what they can, they must stand guilty of Symbolizing with the Pelagians, both in their Principles and Conclusions.*

And now let us hear the *Dr.'s Conclusion*, which is as rash and groundless as all the rest. *All the Members, he saith, (I suppose he would have said, All the Ministers) of the Church of England are obliged, by the express Precept of the Church of England, not to teach or propound to the People, as an Article of Faith, any of those Doctrines which I have maintain'd in my late Book: And this evidently follows, he saith, from that he hath said. But such Consequence will seem evident to none but those that have not duly examin'd it: And I must tell him that whilst he argues thus, he shews that he is a perfect Stranger to the nature of true and rational Consequences. For 'tis so far from Truth that*

the Clergy of the Church of *England* are obliged by exprefs Precept to teach none of the Doctrines which I have maintain'd, that it is an Indispensible Part of their Office and Ministry to preach these Doctrines to the People, they being such as the *Holy Scriptures* present us with, and such as several of the *Ancient Writers* of the Church (as I have shew'd) have gather'd from those infallible Records of Truth. If the Dr. had made a right use of these *Writers* and *Fathers*, he might have infer'd from the *Objections* of the *Manichees* about *Predestination* what was the declar'd Sentiment of the Orthodox in those early Days. On the contrary, we may observe how ignorantly the Dr. talks when he saith, * *The Manichees and other Hereticks were condemn'd* (he means by the *Fathers*) *on the same Accounts, and from the same Scripture and Reason, which we now use against those that hold the Decrees.*

Doth not the great and celebrated Father *St. Augustine* in his Treatise of *Perseverance* acquaint us, that those very Doctrines which I have asserted, were own'd and profess'd by some of the *Fathers* of the Church who were *before* him, as well as by those that were *Contemporary* with him: And doth he not particularly mention their Names? Do we not find him in the Ist Book against *Julian the Pelagian*, ch. 5, 6, 7. quoting Passages out of *Cyprian*, *Chrysostom*, *Hilary*, *Basil*, *Nazianzen*, *Ambrose*, *Jerom*, and thus declaring; *Quod credunt, credo; quod tenent, teneo; quod docent, doceo; quod prædicant, prædico*: That is, those *Fathers* Sentiments are the same with mine? And we are ascertain'd from *Prosper*, that *St. Augu-*

* *Preface, p. 6.*

stin's Adversaries † knew that not only the Roman and African Churches, but all the Sons of Promise throughout all the Parts of the World agree with the Doctrine of this Man (i. e. Augustin) as in all the Articles of Faith, so in the Confession of the Grace of God. And Augustin observes that Chrysostom, before the Pelagian Heresy arose, * was not careful of his Words and Expressions about Free Will and Grace; intimating to us that if he had been upon his guard, he would have utter'd his Mind more cautiously, and have plainly spoken in behalf of those Doctrines which some think he was an Enemy to.

Not that we are much concern'd whether there be any of these First Fathers on our side, for I have † elsewhere assign'd Reasons why we could not expect it: But seeing some of them plainly declare for us, I think we ought not to refuse and slight their Testimony; that it may evidently appear that the Objection of Novelty which some weak Writers have started against our Tenets, is a mere Pretence and Groundless Cavil; and that what is call'd Calvinism was the True Primitive Doctrine of the Christian Church. It is certain there never was such a Stream of Antiquity on the other side as the Dr. Dreams of, telling us very wittily (as he fancies) * that only one St. Austin and his Two Boat-Swains Prosper and Fulgentius tugg'd hard against it. But the Dr. had approach'd nearer to Truth and Solidity, if he had confess'd that himself was carried with

† Noverunt non solum Romanam Africanamq; ecclesiam, sed per omnes mundi partes universos promissionis filios cum doctrina hujus viri, sicut in tota fide, ita in Gratia confessione, congruere. *Epist. ad Rufin.*

* Cont. Julian. lib. I.

† *Discourse of Truth*, chap. 6. Verit. Red. p. 500, &c.

* *Preface*, p. 6.

the *Stream* of the present Age, and that in the next (if his days would hold out) he may be found *tugging* in another Chanel, if he lights on another sort of *Deist* or *Physician*. Besides, we must attribute it to the Dr.'s *Troubled* and *Disturb'd* Mind, that the *Current* of Antiquity seems to him to have been so *Violent*; for I have prov'd that several of the Ancientest Fathers thought and spoke as *Prosper* and *Fulgentius* did afterwards. And a late † *Ingenuous* Writer, whom I take to be no great Friend to *Calvinism*, freely grants that the Doctrine of *Absolute Predestination* was known and taught in the *Western Churches* at the end of the Fourth Century: Which was a considerable time before *Prosper* and *Fulgentius*. Thus the Dr. every where discovers his Weakness and Want of Knowledge. And who could expect any other from a Man who took a *Church* for a *Father*, and a *German Bishop* for a *Greek Father*?

But we may see the Dr. is fully set against these Excellent Men *Prosper* and *Fulgentius* right or wrong, or else he would not have objected against them that * *they wanted skill both in the Hebrew and Greek Tongue, and so it was not to be expected that we should learn the True Sense of the Scripture from them.* As if a good *Latin Scholar* could not understand *Predestination* and the like Doctrines without *Hebrew* and *Greek*. How then came those Fathers whom he fancies to be on his side; namely, *Irenæus*, *Clement of Alexandria*, *Justin Martyr*, *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Theodoret*, how come these to understand those Points, when 'tis well known they had no Skill in *Hebrew*, but have discover'd their Ignorance of the true meaning of Words and Expressions in Scripture in that Language, as I have shewn in ' another place?

* *Remarks on some Books lately publish'd.*

* *Preface, p. 14.*

† *Discourse of Truth, p. 191. 192.*

Thus we see what poor Stuff the Dr. entertains his Readers with, and to reproach and vilify those great Men before named, disparages his own Judgment and Reading. Can he think to carry his Cause by such silly Arts as these? Surely such poor and weak arguing as this must needs make that Man Blush that is capable of it. The truth is, he every where shews that he is govern'd by Caprice and Prejudice, and more particularly that he hath a great and unchristian Antipathy to St. *Augustin*: He often undervalues his *Learning* and *Judgment*; he charges him with *Self-Contradiction*; he saith he utters things *vain* and *empty*, *absurd* and *false*. He tells us, that * *he writ much and fast*; and so doth the Dr. which one would think should reconcile him to that Father. He saith in the same place, that St. *Augustin* writ against his former and his better Self: So doth Dr. *Whitby*; he writ his last Book against his former Self; that is, against what he was in the first Seven Years of his Education in the University; against his better Self, before he met with the *Deist* and the *Physician*. It is to be wish'd that he would return to Himself, and follow the Example of that great Man in his *Retractions*, who thereby added to his Greatness.

If the Dr. had had any Esteem and Regard for the happy *Reformation* from *Poper*y, he could not but have embraced these Doctrines which he now so fiercely opposes.

For the Letters that pass'd between *Calvin* and *Cranmer*, and between *Calvin* and the Duke of *Somerset*, are plain Demonstrations to the World that our *Reformers* consulted *Calvin*. And those who composed the *Articles* and *Hömilies* of our Church, inserted

* Preface, p. 12.

his Doctrines into them. This is freely granted by the Right Reverend Bishop of Sarum: * *It is not to be denied*, saith he, *that the Articles were writ according to Augustin's Mind*: Which is as much as to say, they were writ according to Calvin's Mind. And again, *It is very likely*, saith he, *that the Authors of the Articles meant the Absolute Decree*. And in another place, † *The Doctrine of Predestination was generally taught by the Reformers*. Which Testimony of this Learned Person is the more considerable, because he professes himself not to have a Kindness for the *Augustinian* or *Calvinian* Scheme: Yet we see he is so fair and ingenuous as to own that our Reformers, and particularly the Compilers of the Articles, were of Calvin's Perswasion, and drew them up according to his Mind. Which shews that both Truth and Ingenuity are wanting in the Performance of a late Writer, who with great Earnestness and Concern asserts the contrary: But this may be said of that Author and that whole Undertaking, that he is ever *most Peremptory* when he hath the least ground for it. But let any Man strip himself of his Prejudices, and I will venture him to give his decisive Judgment on the Matter: He cannot but close with the Verdict of that foresaid Learned Prelate, yea, and of all that high Order in the Church of *England* who had occasion publickly to declare their Judgment; as Archbishop *Cranmer*, Bishop *Latimer*, Bishop *Jewel*, Archbishop *Whitgift*, Bishop *Morton*, Bishop *Carleton*, Archbishop *Abbot*, Bishop *Abbot*, Bishop *Prideaux*, Bishop *Babington*, Bishop *Hall*, Bishop *Davenant*, Archbishop *Usher*, Bishop *Hacket*, Bishop

* *Exposition of the 39 Articles*, p. 168.

† *History of the Reformation*, Part 2. Book I.

∴ *Nicholsii Defens. Eccl. Angl.*

Fern, Bishop Brownrig, Bishop Sanderfon, and several others, who, together with a grand Body of the next Order of Ecclesiasticks, profess'd and maintain'd the *Calvinian* Assertions.

And it is well known that our Divines did not change their Judgment by their crossing the Water, but at the Synod of *Dort* actually concurr'd with the rest of that Body in condemning the Opinions of the *Remonstrants* and *Arminians*. Dr. *Heylin* grants * that but one of the *British* Divines at that Synod, and but one of those that came from *Breme*, asserted the Doctrine of Universal Redemption. How inconsiderable was their Judgment in respect of the whole Synod? But though there had been some Debate about that Point, and the Ministers sent from *Breme* had demurr'd to it, yet at last they and our *British* Divines (as may be seen in the *Acts of the Synod*) by their Subscriptions to the Determinations of the rest of the Synod, condemn'd the Opinions of the *Remonstrants* about the Redemption of Mankind, and all the rest of their Doctrines. And it is well known that the Articles of that Synod were confirm'd by the National Synod of all the Reformed Churches in *France*, and by that of *Ireland*: As they had long before been comprehended in some of the *Thirty Nine Articles* of the Church of *England* agreed upon by the Archbishops and Bishops of both Provinces and the whole Clergy in Convocation.

That is a most remarkable Passage of Bishop *White*, in his Reply to *Fisher*, p. 275. *Our Tenet*, saith he, concerning *Predestination* is no other than *St. Augustin* and his Scholars maintained against the *Pelagians*: And what *St. Augustin* and his Scholars maintain'd is that

* *Quinquartic. Hist.* p. 55.

which we now call *Calvinism*; and 'tis that which our *English* Protestant Writers have universally asserted and defended. For Proof of this, let any Man go into a Publick Library, and consult those *Classes* which contain the Writings of the *Divines* of the Church of England from the beginning of the Reformation to the latter end of King *James* the First; and he will find what I say to be true; that is, he will find these Doctrines unanimously avouched by them, and the contrary condemn'd.

That these were the Sense of the Church of England, is manifest from King *James* the Ist's Declaration against *Vorstius*, and his Letter to the States of the United Provinces. I will only mention that memorable Passage in the former; One *Bertius*, saith he, Scholar of the late Arminians, was so impudent as to send a Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, with a Book concerning the falling away of the Saints: And not thinking it enough to vouch the sending of such a Book (the Title whereof was sufficient to render it worthy of the Fire), he was so void of shame, as to assert in his Letter to the Archbishop, that the Doctrine contain'd in his Book was agreeable with that of the Church of England. It seems it was Impudence and Shamelessness in that Arminian Writer to charge the Church of England with the Doctrine of the Falling away of the Saints: And is it not the same in those who at this day maintain that this and the other Arminian Opinions, are the Doctrine of our Church?

To demonstrate further that they are not, I will ask this Question, Were not the Puritans reckon'd Calvinists? No body will deny this: Then I ask, Did not our Churchmen agree with the Puritans in

* In the Collection of R. James's Works.

these Points? This likewise cannot be denied, for 'tis confess'd by our own Writers, and particularly by that Learned Prelate * Bishop Carleton; *Albeit*, saith he, *the Puritans disquiet our Church about their conceived Discipline, yet they never mov'd any quarrel against the Doctrine of our Church: Which is well to be observed, for if they had embraced what the Church of England denied, they would assuredly have quarrel'd about that as well as they did about Discipline.* This is an undeniable Proof of what I have advanced, and I challenge any Man to refute it. Our Churchmen were Doctrinal Calvinists, and so far were of the same Judgment with the Puritans: And accordingly these, as well as the others, willingly subscribed to the Doctrinal Articles of the Church of England: Which is another plain Evidence that those Articles were penned according to the Sense of Calvin's Writings. Thus we may satisfy our selves that the Calvinian Doctrines are the Doctrines of the Church of England: And accordingly they were constantly profess'd and maintain'd by our Archbishops and Bishops, our Convocations, our Universities, and by the general Body of our Clergy till the end of the Reign of K. James the First, and the beginning of the next Reign. And then the Stream ran another way, and these Doctrines which before were held as Orthodox, and adjust'd to the Sacred Scriptures, and the Sense of the Primitive Christians, were laid aside, and voted Unscriptural, New and Upstart. This surely cannot but give a great Shock to Religion, and the Truth and Reality of it, that that should be True in Religion in one Age, that is False in another; that that should be Orthodox in one King's Reign, which was Heterodox in another. They that

* Examination of the Appeal, &c. p. 8.

made this Change, do as good as say that the Generality of our Divines at the Reformation, and a great while after that, were strangers to the true meaning of the Articles of Religion which they subscribed to, and that they themselves were the first who had a true and right Apprehension of these Points. These are the Men who are so bold and senseless as to endeavour to persuade us that these Opinions which were oppos'd and confuted by the Learnedest Men of our Church, are the very Doctrine of our Church.

This is to be imputed in part to what Bishop *Sanderson* charges the *Arminians* with in his *Pax Ecclesiæ*: They are, saith he, *Cunning in advancing their Party, they brag that their Tenents are the received establish'd Doctrine of the Church of England, by forcing the Words of the Articles to a Sense which appears not to have been intended therein.* This is their Artifice, they give the Words another turn than they had at first: They refuse to interpret them according to their natural and genuine Import, according to their literal and Grammatical Sense. This is *Jesuitical* enough. This is a horrid Abuse and Banter upon the Articles, and consequently upon the Church of *England* it self. Hence, hence it is that some Preachers at this day defend those *Arminian* Doctrines which their Predecessors disdain'd, exploded, discarded, yea abhorred.

And this they are not able to do without *corrupting* and *perverting* the *Scriptures*, for which some of them are very Notorious and Scandalous. It is true they heap up several Texts to defend their Opinions; and so did the *Pelagians* of old, and so do the *Arians* before them, and so did the *Socinians* at this day: But as no wise Man thinks the better of these Men's Notions because they quote Scripture for them, so neither are the *Arminians* to be attended to and regarded
because

because they (as one before them) cry out, *It is written*: For they put a false Gloss and Interpretation on what is written, and so impose on Men's Minds. For my part, I can't see, but that as the *Romanists* deprive the People of their *Bibles*, so some other Men would deprive them of the *true Sense* and *plain Meaning* of what is contain'd in them; so that it is all one whether they have their *Bibles* or not.

These Persons have arrived to this strange Disorder, by giving way to the Suggestions of *mere Human Reason*, and preferring these to the infallible Oracles of the Scriptures. For tho' I have above defended these Doctrines by *Reason*, that is, so far as they were capable of being defended in that way, and when *Reason* was guided by *Scripture*; yet we are not to think that the former of these alone, without the Conduct of the latter, is to be our Rule; yea, sometimes it is to be wholly neglected, otherwise we shall reason away our Religion.

Tho' we should admit of some of the *Arminian* Notions to be *Rational*, yet it doth not follow thence, that they are *True* and *Real*. This is a Distinction that is used by a Great and Judicious * Philosopher; which if duly consider'd by our Adversaries, would be sufficient to baffle all their bold Suggestions, to stifle their Prejudices; and to put an End to their Disputes. It is not enough that some Propositions are adjusted to the Principles of Common and Natural Reason. We, as we are *Christians*, are to be guided by Higher Maxims; because sundry Doctrines in Christianity are of that sublime Nature, that they can't be made Level with our Natural Corruptions, and Ordinary Apprehensions.

It is a most admirable Passage of the Renowned *Father Paul*, who writ the *History of the Council of*

* Dr. Henry More's *Apology*, B. I. C. 1.

Trent, in his Letter to *Daniel Heinsius*, thus giving his Judgment of the Synod of *Dort*, and the Doctrines there maintained: *They are, saith he, agreeable to the Doctrine of the Apostles: The Belgicks are happy, in having the Mysteries of Divine Grace discover'd to them from above: These Things are displeasing to the Wise Men of the World, and to Human Reason; for they are not able to perceive them by the Light of their Understanding: As Owls are blind in the day-time, so these Men see nothing of Divine Light.*

This was the Sense of that Excellent Person concerning the Articles determined by the Divines in that foresaid Synod, and concerning those who refus'd to admit of them. And this shews what is the true Reason why the *Calvinian Verities* are disregarded, yea strongly opposed by such great Numbers of Men among us; namely, because they shut out the Divine Light, and affect to be wiser than our Saviour and his Apostles, who recommended these Doctrines to us. But that of the Apostle is truly applicable here; *Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools.*

It was at the *Restoration* that the contrary Principles came most into Fashion, and were taken up by the General Consent of the Conforming Clergy; and they have ever since grown more and more into Credit with us. Which is a great Reproach to us, in my Judgment, and shews that we are forgetful of *what Church* we lay Claim to. It might have been expected, that the Judgment of our own Wise and Pious Reformers should have been of some Weight and Prevalency with our Divines. It would become them to maintain the Honour of the *Church of England*, by strenuously asserting her Doctrines. But the contrary is now to be lamented by all sincere Lovers of our Church.

We have lately repair'd, or rather erected anew, the *Temple* dedicated to *St. Paul's Name*, but some

of us have pull'd down and demolish'd his *Doctrines*. Our Church celebrates that *Apostle's Conversion*, but many of us seem to renounce what he hath deliver'd concerning *Grace and Conversion, and Regeneration*.

I heartily wish and pray, that my Brethren of the Church of *England* would at last open their Eyes, and having so clear a Light shining about them, not continue any longer in their *Darkness*. More especially, my sincere Wishes are, that the *Dr.* may be convinc'd of his Errors, and abandon them. Of which we ought not to despair, seeing we know he hath been no *Stranger to Recanting*. As this *Proteus* turn'd from *Calvinism* to *Arminianism*, so he may turn from this to that again; and there I hope he will fix, where there is *Sound Faith, and Orthodox Doctrine* to rest on.

To conclude: I could not forbear saying these Things; for I reckon it as a *Duty and Service* owing to my *Religion*, to my *Profession*, to my *Conscience*, and to the *Church* of which I am a *Member*, to assert and vindicate these *Divine Truths*, which carry plain and convincing Evidence along with them. And I hope I shall have *Courage* enough to defend this *Post* to the last, seeing I contend not for *Victory*, but *Truth*, which is the best *Conquest*. And I think I do it in a *seasonable Time*; that is, in an *Age* that is so strongly inclin'd to despise the *Christian and Evangelical Doctrines*, and to comply with the *Deists* (as the *Dr.* did) in an *Age* wherein so many fall under *St. Paul's Anathema* for *Preaching another Gospel*; in an *Age*, wherein *Calvin* is scarcely in *Credit at Geneva*. The *Pastors and University* there seem to stand ready, not only to part with their *Discipline and Church-Government* which they have defended, as of *Divine Institution*, for above *150 Years*; but young *Turretine* declares in the *publick Schools*, that he is sick of the *Calvinian Doctrines*; and is willing to rid himself of

them. Is it not very entertaining, to see this hopeful Professor face about, and to see *Calvinism* damn'd at *Geneva*? Therefore now I hold my self obliged in a more signal Manner to bear Testimony to those Doctrines of the Christian Religion, and to shew that I am concern'd for the Welfare of the Church of Christ. I am well satisfied that I have appear'd in a Just and Honourable Cause; the very Cause which our own Church it self, and its choicest Worthies have espous'd, and therefore I have no Reason to be asham'd of it. On which comfortable Consideration I hope I shall be able to digest all those *hard Speeches* and *Reproaches* which some have loaded me with; yea, it is a great Satisfaction to me that I have escaped the Scandal of their Good Word and Approbation.

F I N I S.

A N
A N S W E R
T O
Dr. W H I T B Y's
Second Pretended D E F E N C E
O F T H E
Arminian Doctrines,
I N H I S
Four Discourses, as he calls Them.

Shewing more Particularly, That these Two
P R O P O S I T I O N S,

God's Foreknowledge depends on his Decrees.
God from Eternity decreed the Commission of Sin ;
Are neither *False* nor *Blasphemous*, but are grounded
on *Holy Writ* and *Right Reason*, and are approved of by
several *Ancient Writers* of the Christian Church, by
Schoolmen, Philosophers, and Modern Divines, both *Foreign*
and *Domestick*.

By J O H N E D W A R D S, D. D.

[*God from all Eternity did by his unchangeable Council ordain
whatsoever in time should come to pass.*] Artic. of Reli-
gion agreed upon by the C O N V O C A T I O N at
Dublin. 1615.

L O N D O N :
Printed in the Year M D C C X I.

ANSWER

TO
THE
SECOND EDITION OF
THE
ARTICLE DOCTRINES
AND DISCIPLINES
AS THEY CALL THEM.

Shewing more particularly, That these
PROPOSITIONS
God's Providence doth not on his
From the very heart of the Commission
and the right nature, and the approval of
the Christian Church, by
the Council of Trent, and the Council of
the Roman Empire.

By JOHN B. WARD, D.D.

Printed in the Year 1704.
By J. B. WARD, D.D.

Printed in the Year MDCCLXII.

T H E

I N T R O D U C T I O N .

After I had prepared the foregoing Papers for the Press, Dr. Whitby's Four Discourses (for so he entitles them) came to my Hands, wherein he apologizes for himself, and his former Performances in his Annotations on the N. Testament; and he pretends to confute what I had asserted in my Veritas Redux, concerning God's Foreknowledge and Predestination, especially with reference to the Commission of Sin: And thro' the whole, he gives farther Proofs of his being a very angry and waspish, as well as a weak Writer. However, he was pleas'd to make a fresh Effort for the Retrieving his Credit, which he was sensible was in great jeopardy, if not entirely lost. Now therefore, in a late Pamphlet he sends me a new Challenge; and, with Banners display'd, he appears openly, to combat me. I accept of the bold Aggressor's Challenge, and come forth to meet him; for I am fully satisfied that the Cause which I maintain, cannot possibly be shock'd by the Attempts of this feeble Adversary, who hath not struck one true Stroke, nor taken one true Step towards the Establishing of what he offers. I never met with a Man that made a greater Noise of Learning and Reading, and yet hath a lesser Share of them, and abuses and perverts them more, than the Doctor. He loves dearly to banter and amuse a Sort of Readers that delight to be so used; but he is of the Number of those, that dare not try their Strength against the Arguments and

Reasons which are urged against them: Yea, when they feel the Strength of them, they dissemble it. We may observe that the Dr.'s Pretensions and Assurance run always highest, when he hath the least Ground for either. When he is vanquish'd, he talks like a Conqueror; not unlike a Neighbour of ours, who sings Te Deum when he loses the Victory. Such sort of Writers call for Pity, but no Answer.

*But it will be expected that something should be said, because of his loud Clamours of Blasphemy, Horrid Blasphemy, which he so fiercely and so frequently bellows out against me, as if I were that Beast with seven heads and ten horns, that had the name of Blasphemy written on his forehead. And he invidiously and maliciously manages this hideous Outcry; tho' I had expressly said in my * Veritas Redux, that if this Language [the Decreeing of the Commission of Sin] were offensive, I would forbear it; and instead of [willing and decreeing] I was content to make use of the common and received Terms of [Permission and Suffering, or decreeing to permit or suffer]: And tho' I had expressly asserted in that very Discourse, where I used the foresaid Language; That there are no Decrees that necessitate Men to Sin, or consign them to Damnation, without their own voluntary Impiety and Wickedness; That God hath no Agency in the Actions of Men, as they are sinful; That there is no Positive Operation of his towards the Evil of their Doings; but the whole Vitiosity and Depravity of them is from themselves, that is, their depraved Wills and Nature; That God determines no Man's Will to Sin; and that it is impossible that he should be the Cause and Author of it. Notwithstanding all this, he fastens the Opprobrious Character of Blasphemer upon me.*

* Book I. Chap. 3. p. 129.

I declared farther ; That God doth not by his Decree permit any man to sin, to the end that he may damn him ; as if one were the Means in order to the other. Nor did God decree to create Men to damn them ; but he decreed to damn them because they are Sinners. The Contrary to these might indeed be justly censur'd and condemned, as Blasphemous Positions ; but I abhor them.

But this we say, That all Human Actions and Events, even those that are sinful and vicious, are the Object of the Divine Decrees ; and there could be no Sin, nor Sinners in the World, if God did not decree the Being of them both. And we say moreover, That it is not unworthy of God to decree the Being of Sin ; because there were great Ends and Purposes which induced him to it ; namely, that Good and Benefit which redounds to Mankind out of it, that is, the Incarnation of Christ, Redemption by him, and all the Happy Consequences that attend it. It cannot be unworthy of God, to determine that that shall be which will give him Occasion to manifest his Wisdom, Justice and Goodness, in the most illustrious manner. It can't be unworthy of God to decree that, which would be an Occasion of putting Man into a far better State than he was in at first.

We do not say that Sin is good ; for that would confound the Notions of Good and Evil, and destroy all Religion ; but we say, and have proved it, and shall further prove it in the following Papers, That Sin is made conducive to Good by the Divine Management and Conduct. And surely then, God may so far determine and ordain the Commission of Sin, as it can be made by him serviceable to that Great End, and consequently conducive to his own Glory, and the Happiness of his Creatures. I doubt not but I shall fully satisfy all unprejudiced Readers, that this is a true Proposition : I will shew that it agrees with the Analogy of Faith, and the Rules of Piety and a Holy Life ; and that there is nothing in it that nourishes Error in Judgment, or Depravity in Manners.

And

And further, I will let the Reader see that this was the Sense of several of our Clergy of the Church of England, yea, and of a whole CONVOCATION of Bishops (and those most of them English Divines) and others of the Church of Ireland: Whence it will appear, how ignorantly Dr. Whitby talks, when he tells us, That we can scarce shew any of our Divines, besides Dr. Twiss, who embrac'd these Sentiments. And by the way, I may add here, that ALL the DOCTRINES relating to the Decrees, Free Will, Grace and Conversion, Redemption, Perseverance, which I have defended and vindicated in my late Writings, are the very same that the foresaid Learned Convocation expressly asserted and determin'd, and publish'd to the World, as their Real Belief and Perswasion. Certainly it is Considerable, to have such an Entire Synod of the Prelates of the Subordinate Clergy of our Sister-Church on my Side. And this explains and confirms the Meaning of the Articles of our own Church relating to those Points above-mention'd: For no Man of Sense and Reason can think, that the Archbishops and Bishops, and the rest of the Conformable Clergy of the Church of Ireland, would publish Articles of Religion contradictory to those of the Church of England. Nay, 'tis observable, they have faithfully transcribed the Articles of our Church about those foresaid Points word for word, to let us see that they differ not at all from us, no not so much as in Terms and Expressions.

I do not deny that these, and all the other Doctrines held by the Calvinists, are capable of being misrepresented, abused, and perverted, and really are so by some Men: And so is Religion it self; but it is not to be dislike'd surely on that Consideration. We know that Christianity was the way every where spoken against; and we know, that the most Sublime Doctrines of the Gospel are liable to Cavils and Objections; and these Objections can't possibly be answer'd and satisfied by the mere Principles of
Natural

Natural Reason ; but we are not to have an ill Opinion of those Doctrines on this Account. The same may with truth be pronounced concerning the Propositions which we contend for : No Man will abate of his Esteem for them, because they are obnoxious to Cavils, and are generally in this Age evil-spoken of.

On the other hand, it can't be denied that the Opposite Opinions are very plausible and popular, especially as they are dress'd up by the same Men's Hands. Arminianism is the Favourite Doctrine of these Times. This is the Diana, which so many at this day contend for with such loud Clamours, and some of them I fear with the same Views that Demetrius the Silversmith had. This is the Great Idol that our Priests and People fall down to, and so devoutly worship. But the contrary Sentiments are not Taking and Charming, and have but few Profelytes ; for which there is this good Reason to be given : These (as all other Evangelical Truths) are a Contradiction to the Notions which Men of the World have, and run Counter to all the Maxims of Carnal Minds. The Sacred Verities of the Gospel differ as much from these, as Faith from Sense, Divinity from Philosophy, Grace from Nature, Inspired Authors from the Prophane.

I have in the following Undertaking, and in several Discourses heretofore publish'd, endeavour'd to assert and vindicate these Truths, and to clear them from the invidious and false Representations they lie under ; I have taken care to establish them on the best and surest Grounds : Nor do I know that there is any one Objection or Argument used by our Adversaries, which I have not particularly and fully answered. I hope, as to the main, I may say with St. Paul, I have fought a good fight ; I have appear'd in a Good Cause, the very same (whatever private or publick Censure it may undergo) that that Holy Apostle and Elect Servant of God was engaged in : I have kept the faith ; I have according to my Ability maintained the Doctrines of the Gospel, and vigorously attack'd the Opposers
of

of the Evangelic Faith: Yet so, as this Contest hath not stirred up in me any undue Fermentations of Mind; but I have been careful to preserve a Temper worthy of a Christian, and a Minister of Christ. Whilst I have been engaged in this War, I have always had Regard to the Interest of Christianity, and the Concern of its Truths, and not to any Party or Faction: And I bear a Love and Respect to the Pious and Learned of that Perswasion which I appear against. And now I may likewise in some Sense say with the forementioned Apostle, I have finished my course; I am arrived at the Period of my Labour on that Subject. I bid adieu to these Polemics, after this one Skirmish with the Chanter of Sarum; wherein, tho' I shall avoid rendring evil for evil, and railing for railing, yet I shall return Truth for Error, Arguments for mere Harangue, Seasonable Rebukes for downright Calumnies and Slanders. But afterwards I will let the Controversy sleep and rest, and leave the Event of it to the Conduct of Divine Providence in After-times. For though what I have written doth not agree with the general Taste of our Divines in this Age, yet I despair not of a future Generation, that will shew they have another Spirit and Character.

But at present, it is in vain to set one's self against a Torrent; and therefore I will give my self Repose: And having discharged my Conscience and Duty, and delivered my Soul, in bearing Testimony to the Truths which are rejected in this Age, I will cause all Acts of Hostility to cease on my part, and I will sacrifice the further Urging of my Sentiments to the Love of Peace. In a word; I will answer all the future Objections, Insults and Obloquies of my Adversaries, with Silence and Contempt, unless there shall be an Absolute Necessity of Justifying my self.

A N
A N S W E R
T O

Dr. *Whitby's* Four Discourses.

THE Dr. begins the *Preface* to his Book with Exclamations against me for my *Praising my self*; as if that were always, and in all Cases, to be absolutely censur'd and condemn'd. It seems he had not read (tho' he mightily pretends to be acquainted with Authors) that Excellent Treatise of *Plutarch*, *ὡς ἂν ἑαυτὸν ἐπαινεῖν ἀνεπιδήμιος*, *how a Man may praise himself without Envy*. He may speak Truth of *himself* surely, as well as of *others*, when, not out of Vanity and Ostentation, but to purge himself, he is forc'd to speak in favour of himself. That wise Moralist proves, by many Examples of the most Prudent and Modest Persons, that *Self-Commendation* is not unlawful, when there is Just Occasion for it. We might support this by far greater Instances than those which that Writer hath produced. Those
Divine

Divine Heroes, *Job, Moses, David*, and the Great Apostle *St. Paul*, have authoris'd this Practice; but especially the last of them; who in * Three Chapters together, not only vindicates himself from the Aspersions of False Teachers, and defends his Ministry against the Obloquies and Cavils of Detractors, (such as *Dr. Whitby*) but from several Topicks, commends and magnifies his Endeavours in the Gospel, and sets forth and displays the ample Matter of his *Boasting and Glorring*.

But what is this *Praising my self*, which is so displeasing to the Dr.? It is this: I had said, that *I can't but acknowledge the Divine Goodness, in making my poor and weak Endeavours in some degree instrumental to the Good of the World: I own it, to the Honour of the Eternal Majesty, that my Labours have found Acceptance among the hearty Lovers of Learning, Truth and Religion.* May not a Man be allow'd to say this, without being censur'd for *Praising himself*? What? Is *poor and weak Endeavours* the Stile of those that applaud themselves? Is it Self-flattery, thankfully to acknowledge the *Divine Goodness*, in making my Labours any ways successful, and in owning this to the Honour of the *Eternal Majesty*? I believe none but this unthinking Dr. would say so. This smells rank of the true *Pelagian* Spirit and Principles which he is tinctur'd with, not to ascribe the Success of our Performances to the Divine Assistance and Blessing, but to our own self-determining Wills. Especially this Censure of *Self-praising* comes very ill from one, who is observ'd by all his Readers wonderfully to applaud his own Notions, even when they contradict the Sacred Writings, and the

* 10th, 11th and 12th, of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians.

Doctrine of the Church of *England*. But this is his way ; and it is the way of his Party, to impute a Fault to others, which they are conscious they are guilty of themselves : But nothing is more * *intolerable*, as well as more *ridiculous* than this, in the Opinion of all wise and sober Men. Whence we may gather, in what Esteem the Dr. is among those of that Character. Even whilst he magisterially remonstrates against a Man's Praising himself, his own Practice flies in his Face. And truly, we need not have *Moriae Encomium*, or *Laus Asini*, from any other Hands, when it comes so properly from the Dr. himself.

In this *Preface* he is so kind to me, as to tell his Reader how *one hath represented me in Print* ; and he gives Credit to what he saith ; tho' every one knows, that he is the most illiterate and ridiculous Rhapsodist that any Age hath seen. The Dr. cannot take it ill then if I return his Kindness, and mention what a † Learned and Known Writer of our Church saith of *him* and his Writings. ∴ *He is impertinent*, saith he, *in his Citations* : * *I have seldom met with more Trifling and Sophistry* : † *He uses Tricks and Fallacies* : ∴ *He very rarely quotes any Author, without wresting his Words to another Sense than what was intended* ; * *He makes a great Flourish with a multitude of Arguments ; as those Men usually do, who*

* *Omnia quæ vindicâris in altero, tibi ipsi vehementer fugienda sunt. Etenim non modò Accusator, sed nè Objurgator quidem ferendus est, qui quod in alio vitium reprehendit, in eo ipso deprehenditur. Cic. Act. 5. in Verrem.*

† *Dr. W. Sherlock ; in his Vindication of the Rights of Ecclesiastical Authority.*

∴ P. 145.

* P. 163.

† P. 162.

∴ P. 149.

* P. 225.

cannot find a good one. † He is either a very ignorant and careless Reader of Books, or a shameless Impostor. This is the Character which is given Dr. *Whitby*, by one that was well acquainted with him, and was one of his own *Arminian* Brethren: And I doubt not but the Reader hath already found it exactly verified in the Dr.'s Writings, which I have lately had Occasion to animadvert upon: And he will further find it confirm'd in these his Papers, on which I am now going to make some Remarks.

From his *Preface* I proceed to his *First Discourse*, as he calls it; but he never call'd any thing by its *Right Name*, (no not himself, as I have heretofore observ'd) and therefore we can't expect it here. This which he entitles a *Discourse*, is no other than a *Paraphrase* on the Ninth Chapter of the Epistle to the *Romans*; and it is no more than a Bald and Idle Repetition of what he had said in his former *Paraphrase* and *Annotations* on that Chapter, and in his *Discourse of the Decree of Election*. So vain and self-conceited is the Dr., that he imagines his Reader is delighted with hearing the same Things over and over again.

I will not be guilty of the like Fault, by repeating here my own large *Paraphrase* on that Ninth Chapter to the *Romans*, which I have inserted into my *Veritas Redux*, from pag. 135, to p. 149. where that Chapter is fully explain'd, and every Syllable of the Dr.'s *Paraphrase* is beforehand particularly answer'd and confuted, and the Doctrine of *Eternal Predestination* is vindicated and establish'd. This is that Divine Truth, to which the Dr. hath so great and implacable an Antipathy, and which every where he takes Occasion to ex-

plode; tho' even *Bellarmino* himself acknowledges, that St. *Augustin* did justly conclude from the Writings of the *Fathers*, mention'd by him in his Treatise of the *Good of Perseverance*, Chap. 20. That * *the Perswasion and Belief of this Free and Gratuitous Predestination, did always prevail in the Catholick Church.*

Yet the Reader may observe, that the grand Design of our *Protestant Dr.*'s Paraphrase on the 9th to the *Romans*, was to disparage and vilify this Catholic Doctrine, and that other of *Limited Redemption*; both which are contain'd in our Church's Article of *Predestination*; for there it is expressly asserted, that *before the Foundations of the World were laid, God decreed to deliver from Curse and Damnation those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of Mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting Salvation, as vessels made to honour.* This is spoken exclusively, and can't be understood otherwise: For when it is said, that those who are *chosen out of Mankind* shall be happy, it necessarily follows, that the rest of *Mankind*, who are *not chosen*, have no Share in this Happiness. Those *chosen ones* have the sole Advantage of Christ's Redemption; and, as the inseparable Consequent of that, Sanctification by the Holy Spirit, and all other Spiritual Privileges; as it follows in the next Words in this Article; *They which are endued with so excellent a benefit of God, (that is, Predestination, or Election) are called according to God's purpose by his Spirit working in due season; they (and they only) thro' grace obey the Calling; they (and they only) are justified by Faith: They (and they only) are made Sons of God by*

* *Gratuitæ Prædestinationis sententiam & fidem in Ecclesia Catholica semper fuisse. De Grat. & Lib. Arbit. Lib. 2. Cap. 14.*

Adoption; they are made like the image of his only begotten Son Jesus Christ: They walk religiously in good works, and at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity. Thus we see it is the declared Judgment of our Church, that not all Men, but a certain Number of Mankind are predestinated to Salvation, and, in order to that, to Redemption by Jesus Christ. Indeed, the bare Notion of *Election* argues thus.

And we must needs lay aside all Prejudice against this Doctrine, if we entertain right Thoughts concerning the *Sovereignty* and *Good Pleasure* of God, which are the sole Ground of that Difference which is made by the Eternal Decree between one Man and another. Which an incomparable *Writer illustrates by this Example: [“There are two
“ Persons that are guilty of the same Crime: The
“ Prince is pleas'd that one shall be condemned,
“ and the other quitted. The Crime of the con-
“ demned Person is the Cause of his Punishment;
“ but it is not the Cause why the Prince is other-
“ wise affected towards the Person whom he ab-
“ solves, seeing the Crime of them both was alike.
“ The Cause of the Difference between them is,
“ that something interposed which averted the Pu-
“ nishment from one of them. This, (saith he)
“ in the Business of *Predestination*, is no other than
“ the mere Divine *evdrix*, by which God did
“ out of his sole Good Pleasure, give certain
“ Persons unto Christ, to be saved by him, and
“ left the rest to perish in their Sins. We must not
“ accuse God for making this Difference; for he
“ is Unaccountable for his Actions, and is not in-
“ debted to any Creature, and punishes no Man

* Molinæi Anat. Arminianismi.

“ unjustly. In the former Case, he bestows that
 “ Grace and Favour which he was not obliged to
 “ shew; in the latter, he inflicts that Punishment
 “ which was due.] So that we see, the Eternal
 Election is to be resolved into the *Will* and *Plea-*
sure of God: And if an Earthly Prince may admit
 what Offenders he pleases to his Favour, surely the
 King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, may claim
 that Privilege.

This is a Doctrine of great Use and Advantage,
 if we may believe the Church in her foresaid Arti-
 cle of *Predestination*; where she tells us, that it is
full of sweet, pleasant and unspeakable comfort to godly
persons; that it doth greatly establish and confirm their
faith of eternal salvation, to be enjoyed through Christ;
and that it doth fervently kindle their Love to God. It
 is an effectual Antidote against Pride, and an un-
 due Opinion of our own Worth and Ability: And
 it is a powerful Motive to Obedience and Good
 Works; for *God hath chosen us in Christ before the*
foundations of the world, that we should be holy and with-
out blame, 1 Eph. 4. Which last thing is sufficient
 to acquaint us with the Perverse Spirit of our Ad-
 versaries: They all agree to assert, that the Do-
 ctrine of *Absolute Predestination* tends to the promo-
 ting of an *Unholy and Vicious Life*. For if Persons
 (say they) be predestinated to Eternal Glory and
 Happiness, they have free Leave to live as they
 list, and they may do it without any Danger: For
 if they be preordained to Happiness, they cannot
 possibly miss of it, whatever their Behaviour is.
 This is proclaim'd aloud by all *Arminian* Writers
 and Preachers; and they have taught every one of
 their Disciples and Followers to object this against
 the Decree of Election. But this shews, that they
 wilfully reject and contradict the foresaid Text of
 the Apostle; which acquaints us, that the *Election*

of certain Persons from Eternity, was in order to their *Sanctification*; they were chosen, that they should be holy. And the same Apostle informs us, that whom God did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, 8. Rom. 29.

God hath predestinated no man to Eternal Life, whom he hath not also predestinated to be conform'd to Christ in Righteousness and Holiness. This is the *Election* which we assert; and we see that it is so far from promoting a Vicious and Unholy Life, (as the *Arminian* Sect have the Confidence and Hardiness to aver) that there cannot possibly be any Holiness in Men's Lives without this Election, and the Effectual Grace of God which follows it; both which are the great Source of all personal Righteousness and Sanctity. From this, the intelligent Reader will, I doubt not, gather how seasonable it is at this day to assert and vindicate the Doctrine of *Predestination*, and to clear it from the unjust Cavils of our Adversaries.

Before I dismiss the Dr.'s *Paraphrase* on the 9th of the *Romans*, I cannot omit to remark what he saith on the 16th Verse of that Chapter; *It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth*: That is, saith he, Abraham willed that God should shew his mercy to Ishmael: And Esau ran to fetch venison, that he might have the Blessing. Certainly, here is such a Maggot as was never bred in any place before; and that wherein it is now bred, blushes, I doubt not, to have it said it had its Rise there. Surely, *willing* and *running*, in that Text, were never so madly interpreted by any *Expositor*.

Tricæ sunt apinæq; , aut siquid vilius istis.

The Dr. tells us in one place of his Book, that he is pass'd the Age of Man; and now we find that he

is pass'd the Reason and Sense of Man ; or else such paltry Whimsies, and even approaching to Impiety, had not fallen from his Pen.

What the Dr. saith here is remarkable. *Observe*, saith he, *that God is never in Scripture said to harden the hearts of any Persons, but with respect to their destruction ; that is, their outward and temporal Destruction, as he explains it afterwards. But his Observation is false and groundless ; as appears from these following Texts, 7. Exod. 13. He hardened Pharaoh's heart ; where there is no mention of any Judgment or Destruction. In 63. Isa. 17. 'tis said concerning the Israelites, that God hardened their hearts from his fear ; but there is no relation to any Judgment. So in 12. Jobn 40. He hath hardened their hearts ; but no Destruction is referr'd to. Thus, tho' the Dr. pretends to great Skill in Scripture, 'tis evident that he is a Stranger to it, and makes Observations on it without any Foundation.*

I will take notice of another gross Mistake. *Of Pharaoh it is very observable, he saith, that it is never said that the Lord hardened his heart, till after the Plague of Boils. But here is nothing observable for his Purpose ; for tho' this is the first time when 'tis expressly said, The Lord hardened the heart of Pharaoh, yet this was sufficiently implied before ; which no one can reasonably deny ; if he considers what is said in 4. Exod. 21. I will harden his (Pharaoh's) heart ; and again, 7. Exod. 3. I will harden Pharaoh's heart. Here God foretels and threatens that he himself will harden Pharaoh's Heart : And is it not then rational to infer, that in the following places, where 'tis said Pharaoh's heart was hardened, as in 7. Ex. 13, 14, 22. Chap. 8. ver. 19. Chap. 9. v. 7. the fulfilling of that Threatning is mention'd ? This is so natural an Inference, that I don't see how any one can demur to it : And consequently,*

the Observation which the Dr. makes, is of no Use to him; for *before* the Plague of Boils, as well as *after*, Pharaoh's Heart was hardned by God; for this was the *Accomplishment* of what God had *threatned* and *foretold*.

I have but one thing more to note; That *Episcopius* and *Curcellæus's* Commentaries on the 9th to the *Romans*; are commended to the Reader by the Dr.; and those Well-wishers to *Socinus's* Doctrines, are vouch'd by him to be very *able Men*; for this Reason, without doubt, because the Dr. and his Friends have made great Use of the *Socinian* Writers; and many of their Expositions of the Texts of Scripture, yea, even all of them that are concerning the *Decrees*, *the Grace of God*, &c. are borrowed from them.

His *Second Discourse* is of *the true Sense of the Word [Election.]* He runs to his *Concordance*; (which is the Book he thumbs most on such an Occasion) and musters up a great Number of Texts where that Word is used; and then he cries till he is hoarse, that *no Personal Election to Salvation*, but only that of *whole Nations to some External Privilege*, is meant by this Word in Scripture. But here again he is at his unsufferable Trade of *Repetition*: He puts the Reader off with the same that he had said long before in his *Annotations* on those Texts, and in his late Discourse of the *Decree of Election*. But if the Reader pleases to consult the following Texts, he will be thro'ly convinc'd that the Dr. hath advanced a False Proposition, and that the *Contrary* is very true; namely, That the *Particular and Personal Election to Salvation*, is frequently asserted in the Sacred Writings.

We read in 20. Mat. 16. that many are call'd; but few are chosen: That is, few Persons are by the Eternal Decree of God chosen to Salvation; tho' Multitudes are call'd by the General Promulgation of the Gospel. 13. Mark 20. For the Elects sake whom he hath chosen, those days shall be shortned; that is, for the sake of those few Elect Jews who embraced the Christian Faith, the Troubles of those Times shall soon have an End. * 8. Rom. 33. Who shall lay any thing to the charge of Gods Elect? Where, by the Elect are meant the Saints, v. 27. them that love God, v. 28. those that were foreknown and predestinated to be conformed to the image of Christ, v. 29. the called, and justified, and glorified, v. 30. What considerate Man would say that these are Whole Entire Nations? So in 1. Eph. 4. when the Apostle saith, He hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world; he speaks only of the Saints, and the faithful in Christ Jesus, v. 1. those that are predestinated unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ, v. 5. accepted and beloved, v. 6. If any one can think that this is spoken of whole Promiscuous Societies of Men, and not of Peculiar Persons; he hath a strange Turn of his Head.

Again; in that Text, 3. Col. 12. Put on therefore, as the Elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies; the Elect are those Persons only who are Holy, that is, renew'd and sanctified by the Grace of God, and those who are beloved of God with a peculiar and distinguishing Love. Which lets us know that this is spoken of particular Persons, not of Communities in general.

* Observe, that it was not enough to call them Elect; but it is added, whom he hath chosen, to signify the Peculiar Election of those Persons.

So in those places; 2 *Tim.* 2. 10. for the *Elects* sake; 1. *Tit.* 1. according to the faith of God's *Elect*; the Word is meant of individual Persons, for there is no reference at all to any Body of Men. And because this Election is the particular Favour of God to some, with the Rejection of others, therefore in this last Text, and in two others before-cited; these Favorites are emphatically called *ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ*, the *Elect* of God; and one Person is called the *Elect* in the Lord, 16. *Rom.* 13. Which Election of God, or the Lord, plainly relates to the *Eternal Decree of God*; and not to the good *Disposition* and *Qualities* of the Persons; as Dr. *Hammond*, and our Author (who is his humble Imitator) constantly assert. Then, as to the *Elect Lady*, and the *Elect Sister*, 2 *Ep. John*, v. 1, 3. these surely were Persons, and not Nations and Societies.

Nay, those Words in 9. *Rom.* 11. the Purpose of God according to Election, are spoken concerning *Jacob* and *Esau* as personally consider'd; and even our Dr. himself grants this: For tho' he doth more than once in his *Annotations*; and in his *Discourse concerning the Decrees*, interpret these Words, *Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated*; not concerning the Persons of *Jacob* and *Esau*, but their whole Nation and Posterity; yet in his *Annotations* on 2. *Eph.* 3. he understands by *Jacob* and *Esau* the very Persons of these Men; and in his *Discourse concerning the Decrees*, p. 98, 99. he cites several Fathers, as *Origen*, *Chryostom*, *Hilary* the Deacon, *St. Jerom*, *Theodoret*, who interpret those Words concerning the very Persons of *Jacob* and *Esau*. So forgetful and self-contradictory, and consequently so self-condemned is our Dr.; rather than he will not be confuted, he will do it himself. This is like *Balaam's* being chid by his own Animal.

I could

I could take notice that the Dr. often inculcates this, that *Election* is meant only of a *chusing men out of the World*: And that you may not mistake him, he saith it is *chusing them out of the Jewish or the Heathen World*, which is most apparently disprov'd by the Apostles telling the *Ephesian Christians* (and in them all other true Christians) that God had chosen them in Christ before the foundation of the world, 1. Eph. 4. the same with those whose Names were written in the book of life before the foundation of the world, 17. Rev. 8. The Apostle saith of himself and all true Converts to the Faith, that they were saved and called by God according to his own Purpose and Grace (viz. in Election) which was given them in Christ Jesus *πρὸ χρόνων αἰώνων*, before or from Eternal Times, 2. Tim. 1. 9. So the *Thessalonians* were from the beginning chosen to Salvation, 2. Theff. 2. 13. not from the beginning of the Gospel (which is the Sense that the *Socinian Writers* give of this Expression here) but from Eternity, as the same manner of speaking is used in 119. Psal. 160. 8. Prov. 23. the same with *in the beginning*, 1. John 1. the same with *ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων*, which our Translators render (but not exactly) from the beginning of the world, 3. Eph. 9. And accordingly *Election* is call'd *πρόθεσις τῶν αἰώνων*, the purpose of Ages, or the Eternal Purpose, 3. Eph. 11. It is plain then that these places can't possibly be meant of a Temporal Election, a chusing Men out of the *Jewish or Heathen World* in time, which the Dr. vainly dreams of, and wholly excludes the Election from Eternity. Doth he not merit the Title of a *Profound Divine*, and is not his Skill in the Bible very extraordinary? Or rather, after all his vain and fruitless Attempts, doth he not prove this, and nothing but this, that he chuses rather to keep Company with *Pelagians, Romanists, and Socinians*, than with the *Orthodox Divines* of the Church of England, who

always

always understand those Places of Scripture concerning *Personal Election*?

His *Third Discourse* is spent in opposing these two Assertions, That *God's Foreknowledge depends on his Decrees*; And that *God did from all Eternity decree the Commission of all the Sins in the World*. And he saith these Positions are sufficient to make a Man boast the whole Book; and he proclaims them to be not only False, but *Blasphemous*. As to the First Assertion, I have prov'd and establish'd it in my *Veritas Redux*, p. 21, 22, 23, but he takes no notice of the *Particular Reasons* I there urge; for no other Cause certainly than this, that he knew he was not able to withstand the Evidence and Force of what I alledged, for otherwise we must expect that he would have attack'd those Arguments which I offer'd; and he had promis'd and engag'd that he would do it. Indeed there can't be a more sober and Rational Proposition than this, That *therefore God foresees all Things, because he hath foreordain'd them*, were it only for this one Consideration, that God can't foreknow a thing as *Future*, unless he hath will'd it to be so. For it must be own'd that every finite thing is in its own Nature merely *Possible*, not *Future*, because if Things and their Events and Issues be *Future* of their own Nature, then it would follow that they are by Necessity, and that their Existence is necessary, which is the Property only of the Deity. And moreover, there could be no *Free Actions* of Men, for if they come to pass by the Necessity of their Nature, the Liberty of them is lost. So then the Argument is good and valid, *God knows all the Events that shall happen*; that is, he knows them as *Future*; and the knowing them as *such* implies that he hath decreed them; for there is no other way whereby they can become

become *Future*, but by the Divine Predestination. It can't be the *Preſcience* of God that makes things to be Future, for they muſt firſt be made Future before they can be known: And what can do this but God's *Will*? What elſe can determinè the future *Exiſtence* of Things? See this enlarged upon by Dr. *Twiss* in his *Vindiciae*. It is demonſtrable hence that God foreknew all Things, and particularly the *Commission* of all the Sins in the World from Eternity, becauſe they were Pre-ordain'd by him. He could not know them otherwiſe: And his Knowledge could not be Certain and Infallible without this. I ſay *Certain* and *Infallible*, which ought to be duly conſidered here; for if God's Knowledge be Certain and Infallible (as I ſuppoſe our Adverſaries will not deny) it muſt penetrate into and have a perfect ſight of ſome Certain Reason, why the thing ſhall be Future (and this I ſuppoſe will be granted likewiſe by the Perſons we now contend with); now, it is impoſſible to imagine any other thing to be the Certain Reason of this Futurity, but the Will and Decree of God from Eternity: And conſequently the *Foreknowledge* of God neceſſarily ſuppoſes his *Will* and *Decree*.

I will make this further evident from another Conſideration, or Instance; and that is this, God can't *foreſee* that a Man will believe and repent, unleſs he hath *determin'd* to beſtow theſe Graces on him. As for Example, God foreſaw from everlaſting St. *Paul* ſhould be converted, and believe and repent: Why? becauſe he had determin'd from everlaſting to vouchſafe him that Grace whereby alone he could be converted, and believe and repent. For thus I argue, *Paul*, or any other Man, muſt have this Power to believe and repent either from himſelf or from God. He could not have it from himſelf, for if his *Being*

was

was not from himself, then certainly his *Acting* in Divine Things can't be from himself. Now, if he had not this Power from himself, he had it from God, who had decreed to give him this Power: And from this Decree flows his Foresight of it. So then either you must deny that Belief and Repentance are the Gift of God, or you must hold that it was fore-ordain'd by God that these Graces should be given to the Person. Yea, tho' you resolve this into the *Free Will* of Man, yet still the Necessity of God's *Prædetermination* in order to his *Prescience* is apparent: For we can't possibly conceive that God can foresee that a Man will rightly use his *Free Will*, unless he had determin'd he should so, because the Man's right using of his Will is from God. If therefore we should say that God may *foreknow* that such and such a Person will be Converted, and consequently sav'd, without his *Decree* concerning this, it is as absurd as to say that a Physician foreknows that such a Patient shall be cured by him, and yet he hath not purpos'd and design'd to cure him. I hope it is manifest from what I have thus suggested (without any farther expatiating) that God's Foresight of Man's Conversion (which is the Spiritual Curing and Healing of him) depends absolutely on his Eternal Purpose to effect his Conversion. I challenge any Man to make void this Reasoning.

There are Three Things which Dr. *Whitby* offers in opposition to this,

I. He saith, *From this Doctrine it clearly follows that God hath decreed that no Man shall do either more good, or less evil than he doth; because 'tis impossible he should do either more good or less evil than God knows he will do.* And where is there any Absurdity in this, I pray? Would he have Men do less good and more evil than they do? This is a precious Sketch of Divinity.

One

One would wonder how such wild Conceits should come into his Head. It might have been expected from him, that, in order to confute what I had said, he should have proved that God could not Foreknow things by Reason of his Decree, or that Foreknowledge is not grounded on the Decrees: This had been like a Workman; but instead of such an Attempt as this, he bubbles us with that wretched Jargon before-mention'd. The Idleness and Folly of which manner of talking appears from this, that this very thing which he accounts to be an Absurdity will necessarily follow from that Proposition which he maintains, that is, That Predestination depends upon Foreknowledge: For then no Man can do more good or evil than he doth, because 'tis impossible he should do more Good or less Evil than God determin'd he should do. This plainly convinces him of the Shallowness of his Arguing.

He runs it to this at last, that *then all Mens Sins, and the Aggravations of them must be necessary*: Which is as silly and precarious as the other, for neither the Divine Foreknowledge, nor Predestination do make any Man's Actions Good or Evil, nor do they lay any Necessity upon his Actions. It is Notorious that under this Head he all along forgets what he was to prove, and accordingly he is pleas'd to prove the quite contrary, and so to baffle himself. For according to what he had undertaken; namely, To shew the Falsity of my Assertion, that God foreknows things because he decrees them, the proper Answer to God's Enquiry, *Why will ye die?* must not have been this which he gives, *Because thou, Lord, knowest, and therefore hast decreed it shall be so*; but this, *Because thou, Lord, hast decreed it shall be so, therefore thou knowest it will be so*. His design being to expose my Opinion, he should have framed his Reply thus. But he mistakes the thing he speaks of,

of, and flatly contradicts himself, and speaks contrary to what he intended to say. Thus he is drain'd to the very bottom, and affords nothing but Dregs and *Caput mortuum*. May we not think that his *Fifteen Years Study about his Annotations* hath quite dozed him?

2. He objects that if the Divine Decree precedes Foreknowledge, then *the Freedom of Men's Actions is destroy'd*. This is the last Resort and Refuge of the Party in all their Disputes of this Nature. This is the great Column and Support of their Cause. But hath it not been pull'd down, and thrown to the Ground? And nothing but Wilfulness and Obstinacy could attempt to set it up again. Have not these Men been often told, and hath it not been as often prov'd, that the Decree is no Impediment to the Liberty of Man's Will, and that this is part of the Decree, that Men shall act Freely, and consequently there is no Violation of their Wills? And therefore whether *Precognition* be the result of the *Divine Will*, or this of that, it is all one in the present Case: And if the Dr. had not a Mind to whiffle, he would frankly own this.

3. It is another foolish and ludicrous Objection, and like the Dr. that *God knows not only what is Future, but what is Possible, though it will never be: Therefore he knows what he hath not decreed*: And he instances in what is said of *Keilah*, and *Zedekiah*, and the People of *Tyre* and *Sidon*. The first Instance he brings out of *1 Sam. 23. 12.* of *David's* staying in *Keilah*, and the Inhabitants delivering him up to *Saul* if he staid there. God foreknew this, saith he, tho' he decreed it not, for it never came to pass. He borrowed this Notion from those known Jesuits *Vasquez* and *Molina*, *Suarez* and *Lessius*, who urge this Text for their *Scientia Media*. But let us hear how he argues, *It is repugnant, saith he, to Divine Wisdom*

to decree that on Condition shall be future, which he knows never will be future, and so, according to this Assertion, must have decreed before it never should be future; this being a Decree to this Effect, I will this shall be done upon a Condition, which I will shall never come to pass. And a great deal more of this sort he hath, which it would make a Man sick to read, it being so shallow and weak, and yet dress'd up with an Air of Argument. But this is always to be observ'd, that when the Dr. seems to set himself to argue and reason, and make use of his Logick, he is the most trifling and empty Man alive, and hath nothing but Falacy and Sophistry. Thus what he here amplifies about the Men of Keilah is briefly and fully answered in one word, namely, that God foreknew that these Men would deliver up David to Saul, if he staid in Keilah, because he had decreed that if David staid there, they would do this: But he had also decreed that they should not deliver David up, and therefore he was admonish'd to fly. This is very plain and intelligible; but what the Dr. fills up two or three Pages with on the occasion of the Keilites, is all of it mere Gibberish, and design'd only to amuse us. Especially that a Man, who holds there are no Absolute Decrees, but that all are Conditional, should talk against Decrees which imply Conditions, is such a Piece of barefac'd Absurdity and staring Nonsense, that none but the Dr. could be the Author of it. Yea, I have prov'd in my *Veritas Redux*, that tho' the Divine Decree be Absolute, yet Conditions are comprisd in it, because those Conditions are Part of it; and 'tis absolutely determin'd that such and such Things shall come to pass by such and such Means, and on such and such Conditions.

This Answer, which I have given to the First Instance produc'd by the Dr., will fully satisfy what he objects from that other in 38. Jer. 17.
and

and therefore I need not stand to apply it in a formal manner.

So as to the next Instance, namely, That God foreknew that if those Miracles had been done among the *Tyrians* and *Sidonians*, which were done by Christ in *Chorazin* and *Bethsaida*, they would have repented in sackcloth and ashes, 11. Mat. 21. Whereupon the Dr. infers, that there was no Decree of God concerning the doing these Miracles, for these Miracles were not done in *Tyre* and *Sidon*; therefore the Foreknowledge of what should come to pass with relation to these Miracles, was not founded on a Decree: The Answer is very obvious and intelligible; namely, That God had decreed what should Actually be, and likewise what might be Conditionally; that is, what might be in case of such and such Circumstances: And his Foreknowledge was suitable to this Decree; that is, he foreknew not only what should really be, but what should happen upon Supposition of such Circumstances: He decreed the Possibility of such Events, and no more. It was determin'd that the thing might be, not that it should not be. This latter is a mere Hypothetick or Conditional Futurity; but shall never be made Actual. Now Christ, by virtue of his Infinite Knowledge, knew this possible Futurity in the Case which is before us; he knew that the Inhabitants of *Tyre* and *Sidon* would have been brought to Repentance, if the same Means had been allow'd to them which were vouchsafed to the People of *Chorazin* and *Bethsaida*. This he could not but have the Foreknowledge of, because it was from Eternity determin'd, that if Christ should exert his Miracles, and preach the Gospel in *Tyre* and *Sidon*, these People should be effectually wrought upon by those Miracles, and should be converted to the Christian Faith

Faith by the Preaching of the Gospel. Where is there any Difficulty in all this? Is it not clear and bright, and obvious to every Man's Sense? Is it not evident that God's Foreknowledge is founded on his Decree and Predetermination, seeing those Miracles would not have been sufficient to work the Conversion of those *Tyrians* and *Sidonians*, without the Divine Grace and Help; which they could never have any Experience of, unless he had *determin'd* to bestow it upon them?

And doth not this, by the way, inform us, that the Gift of Saving Grace is not bestow'd on all Persons nor Countries, but only where it seems good to the Sovereign Being to confer it; which is a Doctrine that is not allow'd of by the Writer I am now dealing with, nor by any of his Party?

I conclude then, that the Omniscient God foreknew all Futurities, even the most contingent, because they were determin'd from Eternity by his Decree. And particularly as to the Salvation or Perdition of certain Persons, nothing can be more evident than that God foresaw these, because he had foreordain'd what their State and Condition should be: For which I give this undeniable Reason, because (as I had said before) God could not foresee that such and such Persons would believe and repent, unless they were those unto whom he had *decreed* to give Faith and Repentance: And on the other hand, he could not foresee the Unbelief and Impenitency of other Persons, unless he had predetermined to withhold that Grace from them, whereby they might be freed from their Unbelief and Impenitency. Thus it is manifest that the *Divine Prescience* depends on the *Eternal Decree*; and God did not decree things because he foresaw them, but he foresaw them because he decreed them: which yet our Dr. is pleas'd

to call a *Blasphemous Assertion*. I hope the thinking Reader is convinc'd by this time of the Dr.'s rash and groundless Censure.

But if I have *blasphem'd*, I have therein followed the Example of some of the wisest, learnedest and most Religious Christian Writers among the Ancients and Moderns. Origen hath these Words, * *Any thing shall not therefore come to pass, because God knows it shall be; but because it shall be, therefore 'tis known of him before it come to pass.* And he instances in Judas's betraying our Lord, which happen'd, not because it was foreseen and foretold, but it was foreseen and foretold because it was to be done. To the same purpose, and almost in the same words, this Excellent Father, in his Commentary upon Genesis, quoted by Eusebius, declares, That † *God's foreknowledge is not the Cause why Things are Future, but their being Future is the Cause why God foreknows that they will be: For they come to pass, not because they are known to be Future, but they are known because they are Future.* And Eusebius himself may well be reckon'd among the Ancients that approve of this Doctrine, because he alledges these Words of Origen to confirm and establish what he had been discoursing of. The Pious Hilary tells us, ∴ *That whatever God decreed to do, he first saw it and knew it in his Will.* Which is applicable to the present Case, for if God foresaw

* Non propterea erit aliquid quia id scit Deus futurum; sed quia futurum est, scitur à Deo antequam fiat. *Comment. in Epist. ad Roman. Cap. 8. v. 30.*

* Οὐ γὰρ ἀεὶ γινώσκον ἀπὸ τῆς ἀποδείξεως, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐσομένον ἀπὸ τῆς προνοίας. Οὐ γὰρ ἐπειὶ ἔγνωσται, γινέσθαι ἀλλ' ἐπειὶ γινέσθαι ἔμελλεν, ἔγνωσται. *Euseb. Præp. Evang. l. 6. c. 11.*

∴ Quæ Deus facere decrevit, ea in Voluntate sua cognoscit *De Trinitate.*

in his Will or Decree what he intended to do, it is certain that he saw in the same Mirror what he had decreed shall be. St. Jerom is on our side, and speaks after the same manner that Origen did, †† *A thing* (saith he) *is Future, not because God knew it to be so; but because it is Future, therefore God knew it.* Several Passages out of St. Augustin might be quoted here, but the Dr. is pleas'd to bar this Father, and therefore I will pass him by, to humour him once.

Only I will take notice of one Allegation which is produced out of this Father against what I have asserted: * *Predestination, saith he, can't be without Foreknowledge, but there may be Foreknowledge without Predestination.* Which at the first reading seems to beat down what I have been building up: But we shall think otherwise when we have read what immediately follows: † *By Predestination, saith he, God foreknew those things which he was himself to do: But he can also foreknow those things which he doth not do himself; as all Sins.* In which Words this good Father gives the Reason why some things can't be said to be the Object of *Predestination*; namely, because *Predestination* is meant here by him concerning those things only which God himself doth. He restrains the Signification of this Word, and applies it wholly to God's Efficiency, and therefore he rationally infers that God doth not predestinate Sin, because he is

†† Non enim ex eo quod Deus scit futurum aliquid, idcirco futurum est; sed quia futurum est, Deus novit. *Comment. in 26 Cap. Hieremiae.*

* Prædestinatio sine Præscientiâ non potest esse; potest autem esse sine Prædestinatione Præscientia. *De Prædest. Sanct. Cap. 10.*

† Prædestinatione quippe ea Deus præcivât quæ fuerat ipse factururus: Præscire autem potens est etiam quæ ipse non facit, sicut quæcunque peccata.

not the Efficient Cause of it. And so *Prosper* and *Fulgentius* explain this Word *Predestination*, and tell us that they understand it here concerning those Things and Actions *which God is the Author of*. And so there may be in this Sense *Foreknowledge* in God without *Predestination*: But we can't gather thence, if we take *Predestination* in the larger and common Sense (as *St. Augustin* himself at other times takes it) that *Foreknowledge* is not founded on *Predestination*. Thus, notwithstanding what is alledg'd out of this Father, we are confirmed in the Truth which is now before us, by the judicious Determination of this and the other forementioned Ancient and most Learned Fathers of the Christian Church, if we rightly understand them.

I might let the Reader see that † many eminent Writers, even of the Church of *Rome*, who cast away Prejudice, confess this to be true, That God's Prescience is founded on his *Predestination*, and have openly vouch'd it. And 'tis observable that *Aquinas* and *Scotus* agree in this, though they differ in many other Points. I will only set down the admired *Alvarez*, * *God*, (saith he) by his *Eternal Decree*, and *Absolute and Efficacious Will*, hath predetermined all our Actions in particular, before the foreknowing of them, and independently on all the *Middle Knowledge* (so call'd) of any free, future, and conditional Co-operation. And he adds, *This is the Opinion of Thomas and all*

† *Ferrariensis, Rispolis, Capreolus, Bonaventure, Durandus, Bannes, Marsilius, Ariminensis, Cajetan, Janſenius.*

* *Deus æterno suo Decreto atque absolutâ & efficaci voluntate prædeterminavit omnes actus nostros in particulari, anteorum Prævisionem, & independenter ab omni scientiâ mediâ liberæ Co-operationis futuræ ex hypothesi. De Auxiliis Divinæ Gratiæ, Disput. 22.*

the Thomists, and Scotus, Vega, and the holy Fathers. Now I ask whether all these were *Blasphemers*.

To come down lower: This is so self-evident a Truth, that the late famous Philosopher lays it down as a certain Maxim, That * *God's infinite Understanding and Wisdom depend on his infinite Will, and his Eternal Determination of all Things*: He knows all Things by his Will and Decree. There is another modern Author, of great Esteem for his Sagacity and Penetration in some sublime Matters, who hath given his Suffrage to this Truth. † *I confess, saith he, I cannot conceive how God can discover the Consequences of Actions, which derive not their Infallibility from his Absolute Decree.* This and the foregoing Testimonies are the more considerable, because they come from Persons who were no Friends to *Calvinism*; and therefore we must think, that it was the Reasonableness of the Thing it self that produced this Acknowledgment. Will the Dr. then say, that *Des Cartes* and *Malebranch* were *Blasphemers*?

One of our own Church, who is often quoted, and highly valued by the Dr., and was never suspected for a *Calvinist*, expressly owns that ∴ *God foresees Sin in his own Decree of Permission.* And afterwards he saith, * *God sees what shall come to pass by the Decree of his Will.* And again; † *God's Determination of Contingencies which qualifieth them future, is all the Ground why they are present to his View.* Hath

* *Cartes Epist. & alia Scripta.*

† *Mr. Malebranch, of Nature and Grace.*

∴ *Mr. Thorndike's Pref. to his Epilogue.*

* *Book II. Chap. 21.*

† *Chap. 24.*

the Dr. the Confidence to say that Mr. Thorndike blasphemes?

I will add the Testimonies of Two Learned Writers of our Neighbouring Countries: The one is the Physician whom the Dr. mentions and applauds. His Words are these. ∴ *The Certainty and Infallibility of the Divine Foreknowledge are not inconsistent with the Liberty of Man's Will; for the Divine Foreknowledge, in respect of the Acts of the Will, is as if it were not; for God's Knowledge doth not make, but suppose the Object. The Acts are done, not because God knows them; but God knows them, because they really are either past, present, or future; namely, by the Order of the Divine Will.* It may be, this was the very Physician, who made the Dr. a Convert to *Arminianism*; for he is a zealous Asserter of those Opinions, and a sworn Enemy to the *Decrees*; but here he falls in with this Truth whether he will or no.

The other is as considerable on the same Account; for he forsakes his own Hypothesis to bear witness to this Verity. * *This is good Arguing, faith*

∴ *Certitudo & infallibilitas præscientiæ diviniæ Libertati non adversantur; nam præscientia divina est respectu actuum voluntatis ac si non esset; scientia enim non facit, sed supponit Objectum. Non ideo sunt actus quia Deus cognoscit, sed ideo Deus cognoscit actus esse præteritos, præsentés, vel futuros, quia reipsa sunt præteriti, præsentés, vel futuri.* Jo. Stearn *Animi Medela*, l. 2. c. 10.

* *Validum est illud Argumentum, Deus non potest scire quod non est scibile, & præscientia Dei supponit ejus Objectum. Quicquid autem futurum est, proculdubio est scibile à Deo, præscientia enim ejus necessario fertur in omnia quæ futura sunt. Atqui nihil est futurum sine Decreto Dei. Ergo nihil potest præsciri sine Decreto Dei. Hæc omnia libenter concedimus.*
 ——— *Et quidem fatemur Deum præscire non potuisse quæ in tempore permittit, nisi decrevisset ea permittere; quia re vera non erant futura, nisi Deus ea permittere decrevisset.*
Strang. de Volunt. Dei circa peccatum. Lib. 3. c. 3.

he ; God can't know what is not to be known , and the Foreknowledge of God supposes its Object. Now , whatsoever is future , can without doubt be known by God , for his Foreknowledge necessarily reaches to all Things that are future. But nothing is future without the Decree of God ; therefore nothing can be foreknown without that Decree. All this we freely grant. — We confess that God could not foreknow the Things which he permits in time , unless he had decreed to permit them ; because they can't be really future , if God had not decreed the Permission of them. Thus this Learned Scot destroys all that he had said against the Decrees in his Elaborate Treatise , and he (as well as the others before-mention'd) asserts the very same thing that I do ; that is , That God's Foresight and Precognition are founded in his Pre-determination and Fore-ordaining : And I have establish'd this Proposition on those Grounds and Reasons which are unshaken : Talk then no more of the Falseness and Blasphemy of it.

I proceed to the Second Proposition ; namely , That God did from all Eternity decree the Commission of all the Sins in the World.

To make a Noise , and to represent this Doctrine as odious as he can , the Dr. tells his Readers that I make God the *Author of Sin* ; that I make him the *Cause* of all the Enormities and Villanies in the World ; that I hold that Sin proceeds from God , as the *First Cause* ; and that *God wills Evil to be done , more effectually than the Devils in Hell can do it* ; (tho' in another place , as I shew'd , he holds there is no *Hell* , therefore no *Devils* there) that I give free Liberty to Men to be as wicked as they please : And lastly , He condemns me as a *Blasphemer*. What a Roaring doth he make with such Suggestions as these ? Indeed , this is the *Gorgon's Head*,

that he and his Companions terrify silly People with. They represent this Doctrine of the Decrees in such a horrid Shape, that 'tis no wonder the Imaginations of People have been disturb'd about it, and that they have entertain'd an Antipathy against it. But these Men wretchedly deceive others and themselves, by these mistaken Ideas which they frame: For the Innocency and Truth of this Assertion, *That God from Eternity did will or decree the Commission of Sin*, will plainly appear to any unprejudiced Person, if, 1. he considers the *Nature* of that *Divine Will* and *Decree* which we speak of. 2. If he takes notice that the *Divine Permission* (which is granted by all *Arminians*) is the same with *God's Will* or *Decree*. 3. If he acknowledges the *Eternal Reasons of Good and Evil*. 4. If he considers the *Nature of Divine Providence*.

First, I say, let the *Nature of the Divine Will* or *Decree*, which we now speak of, be rightly weigh'd, and then it will appear rational to assert that *God's Will* or *Decree* is concern'd in the *Evil Actions* of Men in the World. We do not ascribe to *God* Two *Contrary Wills*, nay, not Two *Wills*, but One and the same *Will* differently consider'd. He *wills*, and *not wills* the same thing in a *different respect*. Our Adversaries themselves acknowledge that it is the *Will* of *God*, that every individual *Man* shall be saved: And they hold likewise, that it is *not his Will* that every individual *Man* shall be saved; but they do not think *God's Will* to be contrary to it self; for it is *God's Will* that all *Men* shall be saved, if they believe and repent: But it is not his *Will* that they shall be saved without *Faith* and *Repentance*.

So we read in Scripture, that God *hath no pleasure in the death of the wicked*, 18. Ezek. 23. 33. 11. yet we learn from the same infallible Writings, that God takes Pleasure and Delight in their Death and Destruction. 1. Prov. 26. *I will laugh at your calamity, I will mock when your fear cometh.* 9. Jer. 24. *I am the Lord which exercise loving-kindness, judgment and righteousness in the earth; for in these things I delight, saith the Lord. He delights in Judgment and Righteousness, as well as in Loving-kindness. He delights not in them, and in the Death of Sinners, as they are abstractedly and barely consider'd; that is, as they are merely afflictive, and destructive to his Creatures; but he delights in them, as they are a Punishment for disobeying the Divine Law, as they are the Execution of Justice.*

So in the present Case, God *wills Sin*, and he doth *not will Sin*. Both these Propositions are true in a different Sense: He *wills Sin*; that is, it was his Will and Pleasure from Eternity, that Men in the World should not be sinless, but that there should be Sin in the World. He *wills not Sin*; that is, when Men by their own depraved Wills commit it, he approves not of it; he hates and abhors it. We may then, nay, we must distinguish between the *Decretal*, and the *Approbatory* or *Perceptive Will* of God: And accordingly, every Man, when he sins, sins *against* this latter Will of God; but he sins *with* the former Will; that is, as it barely predetermines the Futurity of the sinful Action. Thus we are told that Christ was *deliver'd*, that is, betray'd, *by the determinate counsel*, that is, the determinate Will, of God, 2. Acts 23. And so as to all the other Evil Actions of the Sons of Men, they were the Object of the Eternal Counsel and Will of God.

But when we assert the Universal Extent of God's Will, we hold that God doth not will the being of Moral Evil, *as* he wills Good; that is, directly, and for it self. In it self consider'd, that is, as to its intrinsick Nature, it can't be will'd or decreed; for in it self and its formal Nature, it hath nothing that can make it fit to be the Object of the Divine Will. Wherefore God doth not *simply* and *absolutely* decree the being of Sin; he wills it not primarily, but secondarily, occasionally, respectively; that is, with relation to something else: He wills it only so far as he is able to order and dispose it to great and good Purposes; yea, even to his own Glory. Thus, if there were any Ingenuity and Fairness in our Adversaries, they would let *us distinguish*, as well as *do it themselves*, and as the Holy Scripture (as we have heard) hath taught us to *distinguish*. In short, I bring the Bntiness to this Issue with our Adversaries; God *did will* that Sin should be committed, or he *will'd* it should *not* be committed. If he will'd this latter, then there would be no Sin committed in the World: But we see this confuted by the perpetual Practice of Men. If he will'd the former, that is, that Sin should be committed, then there is an End of the Controversy, and the Dr. is silenc'd for ever.

Secondly, if we consider the *Nature of the Divine Permission*, which the Dr. and his Friends freely acknowledge, we must needs own that the Divine Decree extends to the Commission of Sin, for *Permission* includes in it the *Divine Will and Decree*. It must needs be so; for else Permission is a bare negative thing, it is idle, drowsy, and careless, and represents God either an ignorant or an idle Spectator. This approaches to *Epicurus's* Doctrine concerning the Divine Being, that he gives himself no trouble to take notice of things in this World. This makes
him

him a Gallio, caring for none of these things, but wholly indifferent whether there be Sin in the World or not. Wherefore we must be forc'd to acknowledge that *Permission of Sin* is some actual Exertment, and implies God's Will and Pleasure; that is, his Will not to hinder the being of Sin, though he could hinder it if he pleas'd. And here let me observe, that such is the inconsistent Humour and self-contradicting Spirit of this Gentleman whom I deal with at present, that though he denies my Assertion; namely, That permitting of Sin contains in it the willing and decreeing it, yet he expressly grants that *this Permission is an Act of God's Will terminated upon himself or his Power, or a Will not to exert his Power to restrain the doing it by others.* Mark it, he will not allow me to say that God *wills Sin*; and all along in this *Third Discourse* he contends that God *doth not will Sin*, but only *permits* it, for, saith he, *Permission is no Act of the Will*; yet now he flatly tells us that *Permission is an Act of God's Will.* They are his very words, and what then can the Reader think of this Man? Is he not one of the *vain Funglers* the Apostle speaks of, who *understand neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm?* Yea, (whatever he suggests to the contrary) the *Act of God's Will is terminated upon Sin*, for it is his positive Will that his Power shall not be exerted in restraining Persons from sinning. It is his Will that the Commission of Sin in the World shall not be hindred, but that some Men shall be left to their own disorder'd Wills and Lusts.

Yea, I will prove that *Permission* (whatever Thoughts some may form of it) is not a *bare not hindring* Men from sinning, but it is a *Positive Thing*, because it is God's determining to withhold his Actual Assistance and Grace from some Persons, whereby they fall into Sin. This voluntary Suspension of Grace was exerted towards *Adam*; otherwise he could not have

have transgress'd: And the Case is the same with all his Posterity who transgress the Divine Laws. So that even from God's determining to *permit Sin* (which our Adversaries grant) it follows that he determin'd the *Commission of it*: For we can't imagine the Permission of it unless we grant that God determin'd to *withhold his Grace* from some Men, *that Grace* being necessary in order to the avoiding of Sin. Wherefore 'tis absolutely requisite to God's permitting of Sin that he should first have determined to deny that Efficacious Help which prevents the Commission of Sin. If you deny this, you must own that Sin is without and against God's Permission; or else you embarrass and confound common Sense.

I will under this Head further shew the Nature of *Permission* from the Consideration of the very *Words and Terms* by which Permission is express'd in the Old and New Testament, whether with Relation to *God or Man*. The *Hebrew* Word that is used to signify *to permit or suffer* is *janach*, or rather *hinniach*, (for 'tis not found in *Kal* but in *Hiphil*) which generally imports something *positive* and *wilfully done* by the Person or Persons to whom 'tis applied, as in *1 Chron. 16. 21. He suffered no man to do them wrong*; which expresses the Actual Care and Providence of God towards the holy Patriarchs: He did *not barely hinder* the People among whom they sojourn'd from doing them wrong, but he took them under his Protection, and had a special Regard to them. When the *Psalmist* saith, *Leave me not (or permit me not) to my Oppressors*, *119. Psal. 121.* there is included in it, that the Merciful God would exert his Power and Goodness in rescuing him from his implacable Enemies. And in all the following Texts, the *assent or consent* of the Mind is implied in the *Hebrew* word that is used to signify *Permission*, *32. Ex. 10. 3. Judg.*

1, 16, 26. 2 Sam. 16. 11, 21. 2 Kings 23. 18.
3. Esth. 8. 43. Jer. 6.

Sometimes *Nathan*, to give, or grant, is the Original word that is translated to suffer or permit, as in 16. *Psal.* 10. *thou will not suffer thy holy one to see corruption*; but 'tis plain that this *suffering* or *giving* imports more than a bare Indifferency; it includes in it the express Will and Pleasure of God, that Christ's Body (concerning which these Words are prophetically spoken) should not continue in the Grave, but be rais'd up the third Day. So those Words in 121. *Psal.* 3. *He will not give or suffer thy Foot to be mov'd*, express God's special Care and Concern for his Righteous Servants.

In the New Testament there are three Words in the Original that signify *Permission* or *Suffering*; The first is *ἀπιέν*, as in 3. *Mat.* 15. *Suffer it to be so now*, — then he suffer'd him. *ἀπει* — *ἀπινον*. Which are Christ's Words to *John* the Baptist, who seem'd to be backward to baptize our Saviour: But no Man can think that this only is meant here, that *John* should be merely Passive, and not hinder Christ's being baptiz'd by him. No, 'tis evident that Christ by this *suffering* and *permitting* here, means that *John* should comply with his Injunction, and fulfil all righteousness as it became him: And accordingly the Baptist suffer'd him; that is, he discharged that Office which he was before averse to. Again, see this in 19. *Mat.* 14. *Suffer little Children, and forbid them not to come unto me*, *ἀπετε*. By which Expression we are to understand some Act of the Will, and accordingly the *Vulgar Latin* renders the latter Clause thus, *Nolite eos prohibere*: And even real Performance is meant by this *suffering* or *permitting*; for so Expositors represent the Sense of the Words to be; as if our Saviour had said, Bring the little Children to me that I may lay my Hands upon them and bless them, as

we

we read in the foregoing Verse. In 18. *John* 8. these words are spoken by our Lord to the Soldiers and Officers that came to seize him, *Suffer these to go away, ἀπέτε*: By which he meant that he would have his Apostles not only not to be hurt by them, but that they should be safe and secure.

The second Greek Word is ἐάν, which we find in 22. *Luke* 51. *Jesus answered and said, Suffer ye thus far, ἕστε*, which are our Saviour's Words to his Disciples when *Peter* had wounded the High Priest's Servant; and they signify such a *suffering* or *permitting* as denotes something Positive, as we are assured from the parallel place, 26. *Mat.* 52. *Then said Jesus unto him, Put up again thy Sword into its place.* Whence it appears that this *Suffering* was a Willingness to submit to the present Dispensation, and a shewing it by real Action, sheathing the bloody Sword. So in 5. *Acts* 28. where *Gamaliel's* Advice to the Council, is, *Let them alone*, or (as 'tis in the Greek) *suffer them, ἐὰν οὐτε αὐτοὺς*, a positive Act is meant; namely, the dismissing of the Apostles; and accordingly 'tis said, *To him they agreed*; that is, as *Dr. Hammond* paraphrases it, *They took his Advice, and they let them go*, v. 40. In two other Places which I will mention the Greek word is applied to God himself, as in 14. *Acts* 16. *In times past he suffer'd all Nations to walk in their own ways*, in their sinful Ways. But was this an idle and careless Permission? This cannot be the Sense of the place, for it was by God's over-ruling Will and Disposal that it was thus with the Nations, and therefore this is reckon'd amongst the other Instances of Divine Providence and Superintendency, as *giving rain from Heaven, and fruitful Seasons, &c.* v. 17. The other Place I will mention is 1 *Cor.* 10. 13. *God will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able.* Doth any one think that nothing else is meant
by

by this, than that God will not leave them to the Temptations which they are subject to? No surely, there is this likewise meant, that he will give them Strength to bear those Crosses and Trials which he will exercise them with, and (as it follows by way of Explication) *with the Temptation will make a way to escape.*

The third Greek Word is *ἐπιτρέπειν*, as in 8. *Mat.* 22. *Lord, suffer me first to go and bury my Father:* And in 9. *Luke* 61. *Suffer me to bid them farewell who are at home at my house.* Who doubts but that by this Suffering they meant a Positive Grant from Christ? For they could not think that our Saviour would dismiss them, but rather that he expected they should attend him and the Work he had to set them about. And conformably to this, Christ said to the former of these Persons, *Go thou and preach the kingdom of God, and to the latter, No man having put his hand to the plow, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God.* Therefore by Suffering or Permitting, we must understand Christ's Assent or Leave; and accordingly Dr. Hammond Paraphrases on the former Text thus, *I beseech thy leave that I may, &c.* When we read in 8. *Mat.* 31. that the Devils besought Christ that he would suffer them to go away into the herd of Swine, we can't but conceive that they had an Actual Grant or License from our Saviour: Which is confirm'd by Verse 32. *He said unto them, Go;* and by 5. *Mark* 13. *Jesus gave them leave.* In 19. *Mat.* 8. 'tis said, *Moses suffer'd them to put away their Wives, ἐπιτρέπειν:* Now, doth not every one know that this Suffering or Permission was not a negative Thing, but was a voluntary Act? For it was part of the Judicial or Political Law of *Moses*, 24. *Deut.* 1. Accordingly Dr. Hammond thus paraphrases on the Place. [God in the *Mosaic* Oeconomy, for the preventing of some greater Sin, allow'd a Dispensation in this Point,

and

and tolerated Divorces.] Where, by the way, observe that this Learned and Pious Divine, the great Ornament of the Church of *England*, asserts that God for the preventing of a greater Sin, *suffer'd* a less, and he gives it the Name of *Allowance*, which is more than ever I have done. If by *Allowance* he means *Approving*, I cannot go those Lengths with him. But this I hold, and I request the Reader to take notice of it, (for it determines the whole Controversy) that God *wills* that which he doth *not approve of*, as in this present Case, namely of *Divorces*. He *will'd* them, as plainly appears from the *Law* he gave about them, for the *Law* shews the Will and Pleasure of the Lawgiver: But he did not approve of them, as manifestly appears from our Saviour's condemning them in his Sermon on the Mount.

We read in 19. *John* 38. that *Joseph* of *Arimathea* besought *Pilate* that he might take away the Body of *Jesus*; and 'tis said *Pilate* gave him leave, ἐπέτρεψεν, he *suffer'd* or *permitted* him. But is there any one that imagines that this was a negative Permission? Was there not some Express Declaration of his Will and Pleasure? Without doubt: For *Joseph* dared not venture to dispose of Christ's Body without a particular Order. Therefore in 27. *Mat.* 58. 'tis said, *Pilate* commanded the Body to be delivered to him. When *St. Paul* was brought a Prisoner to *Rome*, he was *suffer'd* to dwell by himself, 28. *Acts* 16. and in his own hired house, and to receive all that came in unto him, 30. v. But doth not this *suffering* or *permitting* imply the Pleasure and Will of the Emperor, or some of his Officers? No body questions it.

I will conclude with those Texts where this Greek word ἐπιτρέπειν is used concerning God, as in 6. *Heb.* 3. If God permit; where 'tis certain that this Permission is no Negative Thing, for the Apostle tells the

Hebrew's

that he will not in that Epistle treat on the first Principles of the Doctrine of Christ, but will go on unto Perfection, he will treat of the great Mysteries of the Gospel, which 'tis impossible for him to do, unless he be particularly assisted and directed by God: *This will we do if God permit.* This Permission then signifies the Divine Help and Direction. However; 'tis more than bare Sufferance, according to Dr. Hammonds Paraphrase, *If God see fit.* And that by God's permitting is meant his willing, I will farther demonstrate, by comparing 1 Cor. 16. 7. with 1 Cor. 4. 19. In the former of which 'tis said by St. Paul, *if God permit*, which relates to his Journey to Corinth: In the latter he mentions it thus, *I will come unto you shortly, if the Lord will.* Whence observe that Permission in the first Text is expressed by willing in the second: Which informs us, what is the meaning of God's Permission; namely, That 'tis the same with his Will. And the Reader is desired to take notice that this Divine Permission, which the Apostle thinks to be necessary whenever he takes a Journey, is call'd *the Will of God* in two other places; as in 1. Rom. 10. where he begs of the Roman Converts to pray that *he may have a prosperous Journey to them, by the Will of God*; and again, in 15. Rom. 32. he desires their earnest Prayers for him that *he may come unto them with joy, by the will of God.* And it is observable that he speaks after this very manner with Reference to his Journey which he was to take from Jerusalem, *I will return again unto you, if God will*, 18. Acts 21. And it is further worth our observing, that these Words in 4. Jam. 15. *if the Lord will*, have relation to Travelling, *going into such or such a city, and continuing there*, v. 12. So that from taking notice how in these several Texts the Apostle refers to the same particular thing, and by observing the manner of his expressing himself, we may conclude that one

Expression explains the other ; that is, That God's *permitting* and *willing* are Terms convertible.

This we have gain'd by examining the *Words* by which *Permission* is express'd in the *Hebrew* and *Greek* of the *Old* and *New Testament*. And I might add that the *Latin* *permittere* and *permissio* are Words of *Activity* : *Mittere* itself is so, and much more when join'd with the *Preposition* *per*, which augments the *Sense*. And the *English* agrees with the *Latin* in several *Instances* which I have not time to mention : I will propound one only. We know that it is inserted into the *Title* of the *Reverend Bishops* of our *Church* that they are *permissione divina*, by *divine Permission*, but do we think that the meaning is only that *God* doth not hinder them ? No surely, 'tis as much as *Voluntate divina*, by the *Will of God*, or else we very much depreiate their *Character*. But I will not insist any longer on *Grammatical* and *Critical* *Proofs*, seeing I have already produced those that are more *Material*, and have still others to produce.

Thirdly then, I argue from the *Reasons of Good and Evil*, which are acknowledged to be from *Eternity*, and they are seated in the *Mind of God*, and therefore appertain to his *Will*, as well as his *Understanding*. Not but that things are *Good* or *Evil* in their own *Nature*, and therefore they are said to be *Intrinsically* such. But why are they so ? Namely, because this is founded in the *Nature of God*, from whom we had our *Nature*. Right *Principles* concerning *Good* and *Evil* are in us, and inseparable from us ; as our *Souls* by their *Make* resemble the *Divine Nature*. Because the *Mind of Man* is the *Image of God*, therefore the *Notions of Good and Evil* are essential to the *Mind*, they being imprinted on it as it is his *Image* and *Portraiture*. Thus we see that *Good* and *Evil* depend on the *Nature* and *Will*

Will of God. And we cannot have a Notion and Apprehension of the most *perfect Being*, unless we conceive that in his Mind are the Ideas of all things, as of what is *true* and *false*, so of what is *Good* and *Evil*, because Truth is the Rule and Measure of Falshood, and Good is the Rule and Measure of Evil, as a strait Line is the Measure of a crooked one. Whence it necessarily follows, that if God hath from Eternity determin'd the Nature of Truth and Goodness, he must likewise determine that of Falshood and Evil. Now, if these Ideas and Platforms of Good and Evil were in God's most perfect Nature and Mind from all Eternity, and were fix'd and determin'd by him, it is rational to think that he did *will* and *decree* that there should in time be actual Examples of both these, Good and Evil, in the World. If God from everlasting constituted and settled the Nature of Evil, as well as Good (as most certainly he did, and he could not do one without the other) we can't help inferring thence that it might seem good to him to ordain and determine that there should be Real Instances of this in the Lives and Manners of Men. This is an Idea which will thrust itself into our Minds whether we will or no.

Fourthly, if we seriously mind what is the *Nature* of the *Divine Concourse* and *Providence*, we can't refuse to give Assent to this Truth. It is own'd by Papists and Protestants, and Men of all Religions, that God concurs to *every* Act of his Creatures; that is, as it is a Physical Act. None but those who are tinctur'd with Atheism deny the immediate Dependence which every Being hath on God, not only as to its Existence, but as to the Exercise of its Faculties and Powers. And particularly this is true of *Man*, and all his Actions: The mere natural Power and Faculty of doing them is from God. Accordingly, when *Pilate* said *he had power* (that is, of him-

self) to crucify Christ, which was a Power to do a sinful Action, our Lord told him, that *he could have no power at all against him, except it were given him from above*, 19. *John* 10, 11. Yet it is most certain that whatever there is of Evil and Depravity in this or the like sinful Action, it is to be attributed wholly to the depraved Will of the Man that doth it: And consequently he is the Author of the Evil, and not God. It is true, God concurs and assists in the Action as it is Natural, but Man abusing this Assistance turns the Action into a Moral Evil. I say, he concurs to it as it is natural, and as it is merely an Act, for as it is such, it is not vitious and culpable. There is a plain Demonstration of this; for a sinful Act, barely consider'd as an Act, can't be sinful, because then every human Act would be sinful, and consequently all Good Acts: Which destroys the Nature of Good and Evil, and therefore is too absurd to be admitted. But the more absurd any thing is, the more easily it is entertain'd by the Dr.; and accordingly he saith, * [*He that concurs to the Commission of a forbidden Act, as it is Physical, concurs to the Commission of the Sin.*] He had forgot what the great Apostle saith, *In him we live and move*: God is the General Cause and Author of all our Actions, and so far as they are from him they are good. It is granted by those who are not of Calvinistical Principles, that God by his Providence † doth not only support both Agent and Patient in that Being which he gave them, but doth perpetually co-operate with them in their Motions, doth apply and direct their Motions unto those Ends and Uses whereto his Wisdom hath ordained them. God makes the worst of Men his Instruments in these his Works of

* Disc. 3. p. 55.

† Dr. Jackson. Vol. 2. p. 139.

Providence; he accomplishes his Designs which are Good and Holy, by the help of those Men whose Work is altogether Evil and Unholy. This Providential Disposing of the Evil Actions of Men to Good Ends, was expressly asserted by the learnedest Schoolmen, as we may see in * *Estius's Commentaries* on the *Sentences*: And I do not find that any sober Writer ever since hath questioned the Truth of it.

Now then, if the over-ruling *Providence* of God extends to evil Agents and their sinful Actions, there is as good Reason why we should assert that his *Eternal Decree* reaches to these. Seeing God in his infinite Wisdom can and doth produce the greatest Good out of the sinfulness of Men's Works; we can't but think that those Works were the Objects of God's Decree. Certainly it is not unworthy of God to determine from Eternity to permit those Actions which he concurs to in time. The *Decree* is as reasonable as the *Concourse*. And they both tend to the same end, the setting forth of God's Glory, and the Benefit of his Chosen in some Respect or other. So that the Divine Intention and Operation are always Good even about those things which are Evil. To this purpose it was rightly said by St. *Augustin*; † *It is possible that a Man may will that with an evil Will which God wills with a Good one. — God accomplishes some of his Wills, which unquestionably are Good, by the evil Wills of evil Men.* Though *Joseph's* Brethren sold him to the *Midianites*, and they sold him into *Egypt*,

* Lib. 1. Dist. 39.

† Fieri potest ut hoc velit homo voluntate mala quod Deus vult bona. — Deus quasdam voluntates suas utiq; bonas implet per malorum hominum voluntates malas. *Enchirid. ad Laur. cap. 101.*

yet he acknowledges that *God sent him thither*, 45. *Gen. 7.* It was by the Divine Administration that that wicked Act was ordered for Good. God may therefore be truly said to decree that Action, and all the other evil Actions of Men, so far as he can, and will bring Good out of them. He doth not will any Evil for itself, but for the Consequences of it. It is said in *17. Rev. 17.* of those Ten Kings who shall give their kingdom unto the Beast; i. e. who shall submit to the Authority and Sway of *Antichrist*, and execute his Pleasure by promoting Superstition and Idolatry, and persecuting the Saints of God, it is expressly said of them, that they *fulfill God's Will*: And moreover, he *puts it into their heads to do it*. It was his Will and Pleasure that these Persons should be employ'd in persecuting the Faithful, for the trying and purging them, for the exercising their Faith and Patience, for their Correction and Chastisement. Yea, as they were mere natural Agents, God did co-operate with them: And therefore if you take *permission of Sin* for a bare non-hindrance of sinning, you can never apprehend how Man is able to sin, and consequently how Sin can be in the World: For he depends every Moment on God as to his Being, and as to the exerting of his Faculties.

Sometimes the Divine Will and Decree may be said to reach to the Commission of Sin, in as much as it makes it a *Punishment* for former Sins, and as it intends it to be a fore-runner of future Judgments. In this Sense those words may be taken, *He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he that is filthy, let him be filthy still*, 22. *Rev. 11.* Seeing they will not abandon their Injustice and Lewdness, it is God's Will and Pleasure that they continue in them, till they are ripe for Judgment. We may observe that it is the same manner of speaking that is used in the

next

next Clause of this Verse, *He that is righteous let him be righteous still; and he that is holy, let him be holy still.* Doth God properly will that those who are righteous should be righteous still, &c. then it follows, that he properly wills that those who are unjust should be unjust still, &c. with this Difference, that the former should persevere in Goodness, to the saving of their Souls, and that the latter should continue obstinately in their Unrighteousness, as a just Recompense for their former Sins: And by both, the great Ends and Designs of the wise Disposer of all Things are accomplish'd. Yea; and by both the Will or Decree of God is accomplish'd, according to that of the great *Aquinas*, * *The Sinner, who as much as in himself lies, falls off from the Will of God by his sinning against him, yet falls in with the Order of God's Will whilst he is punished by God's Justice for his Sin.*

And thus I have shew'd that he who owns the Divine Providence cannot reject the Doctrine of the Decrees. If not only good but evil Actions fall under the Conduct of the one, they may as well come under the Determination of the other. By this latter, no less than by the former, they are disposed and ordered to good Ends and Purposes. It must therefore be look'd upon as the Effect of great Prejudice and Inadvertency in that known Writer of the *Roman* Communion, that he so fiercely stick'd against that Assertion which I am maintaining; namely, that the Decree of Heaven extends even to the Commission of Sin, though he in express

* Peccator, qui quantum in se est, recedit à divina voluntate peccando; incidit in ordinem divine voluntatis dum per ejus iustitiam punitur. *Sum. p. I. qu. 19. art. 6.*

Words owns; that † God presides even over the evil Wills of Men, and rules and governs them, bows and bends them, by invisibly operating in them, so that though they are by their own Fault evil, yet by Divine Providence they are disposed to one Sin rather than to another. Indeed he adds, that this is not done positively, but permissively; but who doth not see that this is said too late? For he had expressly acknowledged before, that God governs and rules, bows and bends the evil Wills of Men, and that this is one effect of it that they are inclin'd to one sort of Evil rather than to another. This is more than Permission. Certainly if sinful Actions are thus managed and governed by Providence, this Writer might very well have granted (if he had a mind to be consistent with himself) that they come within the Compass of the Decrees.

Yea, an Ancient Christian Philosopher gave this Description of Providence; that it is : God's Will and Counsel whereby all things whatsoever are fitly managed, And that judicious Writer whose Name is celebrated in all the Reformed Churches, was sensible of this, and accordingly he joyns both these, Providence and the Decree together. * [“ Tho' wicked Men, saith

† Deus præsidet ipsis voluntatibus malis, easq; regit & gubernat, torquet & flectit; in eis invisibiliter operando; ut licet vitio proprio malæ sint, tamen Divinâ Providentiâ ad unum potius malum quàm ad aliud non positivè sed permissivè ordinentur. Bellarm. de amiss. Grat. & statu peccati, lib. 2. cap. 13.

∴ Π ρόνοια ὄχι βέλῃσις Θεοῦ, δὲ ἢν πάντα τὰ ὄντα τὴν προεσφορὴν διεξαγωγὴν λαμβάνει. Nemes. de Nat. Hom.

¶ Quamvis improbi prout sunt suopte ingenio ad peccandum, Dei tamen Providentiâ arcanoque consilio inclinantur ad hoc potius patrandum quàm illud, &c. Pet. Molin. Anatomie Arminianismi. cap. 3.

“ he,

“ he, are by their own Nature prone to Sin in ge-
 “ neral; yet by the *Providence of God* and his *secret*
 “ *Counsel* they are inclin'd to this rather than to
 “ another; that hereby they may be serviceable to
 “ the executing God's Judgments, when he thinks
 “ good to make use of them, either for the punish-
 “ ing of the Wicked, or for the trying the Faith
 “ of those that are Holy, or for the rousing of those
 “ that are sluggish and negligent.] Thus the Sins
 and Vices of Men fall under the *Decrees of God* as
 well as under his *Providential Management*.

And truly, any Man's Common Reason would
 dictate to him, that tho' there should perhaps be
some Exceptions as to the *Decrees*, (which yet I can't
 say, but only propounded it in my *Veritas Redux*, as
 a mere Conjecture, and so I leave it; for I will
 not endanger a Certain Truth, by contending for
 an Uncertain *Supposition*;) yet that *most* of the
 Actions and Events in the World (such are those
 that relate to *Vicious Men*, and their Behaviour,)
 should be excepted out of the *Decrees*, is wholly
 incredible.

I conclude then; that it was God's Will that
 there should be Sin and Sinful Men in the World.
 Those that deny this, can't possibly defend the Do-
 ctrine of *Providence*; for the *Providence of God*
 (if we will speak properly) is the actual Execution
 of that in Time, which was *decreed* from Eternity.
 Thus I have made good the *Second Proposition*, which
 the Dr. so furiously objected against: And the Ju-
 dicious Reader will find, that all that I said before
 to establish the *First Proposition*, is a Proof of this
 Second. Wherefore I may justly conclude with
 Tully's Exclamation; * O the great Force of Truth;

† O magna vis Veritatis, quæ contra hominum ingenia, cal-
 liditatem, solertiam, contraque fictas omnium insidias facile se
 defendat! *Orat. pro Calio*

which

“which easily guards and defends it self against the
 “Wit, Guile and Craftiness of Men, and against all
 “the framed Wiles and Snares that are laid to de-
 “ceive us: that is, of your own, and of others.”

The Dr. alledges Two Places of Scripture in fa-
 vour of what he hath advanced against my latter
 Proposition:

First, He thinks he doth great Feats, by quo-
 ting *22. Jer. 25.* where it is said that the *Israelites*
did those things which God commanded them not, neither
came into his mind that they should do it; Whence he
 infers, that those Evil Deeds were not decreed by
 God; for if they had, they would have come into
 his Mind. Mere Tinsel! There is nothing to be
 expected from the Dr. but idle Freaks. After this
 rate he might argue against the Eternal *Foreknow-*
ledge of God; for it is certain, that God *foreknow*
 those Evil Doings which are spoken of in the Text:
 But could he *foreknow* them, and yet was it possi-
 ble they should not come into his mind? This shews
 the extreme Vanity of the Dr.'s Arguing. And it
 shews something worse; namely, his wilful Cor-
 rupting that foremention'd Text. He hath con-
 fess'd that a *Deist* was instrumental in making him
 a Profelyte: Behold now! he renders this service,
 able to the making of *Deists*; for what can do it
 more effectually, than the Perverting of the Re-
 veal'd Word of God, and thereby exposing it to
 Contempt? The Original Words are these;
 וְלֹא בָּרַחַתְיָם לִי אֲשֶׁר עָשׂוּ; which are thus to be eng-
 lish'd, *neither did it ascend upon my heart*: Which
 Phrase sometimes signifies to remember, or call to
 mind; and in this Sense 'tis used in *44. Jer. 21.*
Did not the Lord remember them; and came it not into his
mind? That is, *came it not into his mind to pu-*
nish them, and take Vengeance of that People?
 Which

But

But in other places, it generally denotes something more than Remembrance; to wit, calling Things to mind with *Desire* and *Affection*, as in 65. *Isa.* 17. *The former shall not be remember'd, nor come into mind; Heb. come upon the heart.* And so in 3. *Jer.* 16. *Neither shall it come to mind; Heb. not come upon the heart;* that is, there shall be no Love or Affection towards it, as the Matter there spoken of plainly shews. So in those other places where this Expression is used, the *Affection* and *Good Will* of the Person spoken of are meant; as in 2 *Kings* 12. 4. 2 *Chron.* 7. 11. 65. *Isa.* 17. 51. *Jer.* 50. I doubt not but 'tis the same with that Phrase in 22. *Jer.* 27. *to lift up the soul*, which our Translators render *to desire*. I conceive that *לָרַחֵם אֶת הַנֶּפֶשׁ*, *to lift up the soul upon a thing*, is of the like Import with that manner of Speech, wherein a thing is said *לָרַחֵם אֶת הַנֶּפֶשׁ* *to ascend*, or *come upon the heart*. Which way of speaking answers to what is now in use with us; *to have it at heart*, that is, to affect and delight in this or that thing. The genuine Sense then of the Prophet's Words is, That those Practices which the *Israelites* indulg'd themselves in, were highly *displeasing* to God; that is the plain Meaning of their *not coming upon his heart*, or *mind*. But what is this to the Matter in hand? Could not the Sovereign Lord of the World will and ordain, that there should be such Practices amongst the Sons of Men? Could not he *voluntarily* permit such Things to be (else 'tis impossible they should be) unless he wills them in the way of *Approbation*?

He quotes 5. *Psal.* 4. in favour of his Opinion, which he translates thus, *Thou art a God not willing iniquity*; and thence would infer, that God cannot in any sense, be said to *will* or *decree* the Evil Actions of Men. But here again he perverts the plain Meaning of the Text; For the Psalmist doth not speak

speak of the bare willing of Sin, but of approving
 of it, and taking pleasure in it; and accordingly our
 English Translators have render'd the Place thus,
Thou art not a God that hath pleasure in wickedness. So
 the Latin Version of the Arabick is, *Cui non placet*
iniquitas. Castalio's Rendering of the whole is,
Neq; enim is Deus es cui placeat improbitas. Junius and
 Tremellius thus; *qui delectetur improbitate.* The French,
qui prenes plaisir à mechanceté. Cocceius in his Com-
 mentary on this place explains it thus: *The Psalmist,*
saith he, removes from God Chephetz, that is,
all pleasure taken in wickedness. And as for the Ob-
 servation that the Dr. borrows from a Professor of
 the Hebrew Tongue, namely, that *Chaphatz* signifies
 chiefly to will, it is groundless and false in the Dr.'s
 Sense; that is, it signifies barely to will. If he had
 consulted the LXX Greek Interpreters, he would have
 found that *Chaphatz* is sometimes render'd *αἰστέζεν*,
 and very often *ἠδουκέν* by them: And when 'tis
 render'd *βέλεσται*, and *δέλεν*, and *ἔδλεν*, in most of
 those places it is the same with *ἀγαπᾶν*: And more
 signally in 109. *Psal. 17.* *ἀγαπᾶν* and *δέλεν* are syno-
 nymous. And if the Dr. had conferr'd with those
 that are the best Judges of the Meaning of the O-
 riginal Word, he might have satisfied himself, that
 not willing a thing in the general; but taking plea-
 sure in it; is the chief and primary Denotation of
 it. Thus *Avenarius*, in the Word *Chaphatz*, gives
 this as the first Signification of it, *voluptatem ha-*
bit, volupe fuit. So *Marinus*, in his *Thesaurus Lin-*
guæ Sanctæ; *Chaphatz voluntate, complacentiâ maximâ*
affectedus est. Kircher, in his *Hebrew Concordance*,
 assigns this as the first Sense. We are told by *Foster*
 in his *Hebrew Dictionary*, *Hoc verbum proprie signi-*
ficat placuit, bene placuit, complacitum est. If
 Dr. *Whitby* can construe that, he will be ashamed
 to stand to what he said before. And that Author
 ἀσπ

afterwards adds, that when the *Hebrew* Word *Chaphatz* is render'd by the Verb *velle*, it even then imports *Affection* and *Acceptation*. So that *Chaphatz* is the same with *Abab*, to love or affect; which *Hebrew* Word the Dr. mistakes, and writes it *Abal*, instead of *Abab*.

And lastly, The Dr. might have observed that the Word *Chaphatz* is generally render'd by our own Learned Translators, to like, to please, to be pleas'd, to delight in, to have delight in, to desire, to have pleasure. And yet, to patronize his own Opinion, he takes the Word in another Sense, therein contradicting the Sentiment of all the Learned who have given their Judgment on this Word, and on this Text. And so it hath been his continual Work in his *Annotations* on the New Testament, to wrest those Places which he had a mind should favour his Perswasions.

I pass now from his *Texts* to his *Arguments* (tho' he is so silly as to call his *Texts* *Arguments*, as the Reader can't but observe) and I will make it evident, that this Writer discovers his Weakness in *Reasoning*, as well as his Unskilfulness in *alledging* of *Scripture*.

His Chief Arguments are these Two. First, saith he, *If God decrees Sin, we must by our Lord be taught to pray that we may sin; for Christ hath taught us to pray that his Father's will may be done by us.* This Conceit is as empty as the Place where it was hatch'd, and yet he mightily triumphs in it. But who doth not see that this is mere Playing with Words, and proceeds from want of Ability to discern what is meant by the *Will* of our Heavenly Father in the Lord's-Prayer; namely both his *Purposing* and *Preceptive Will*? But neither of these *Wills* approve of the Commission of Sin; Not the first,

first, for it only predetermines the future Being of Sin in the World, not the Second, for it commands us to avoid Sin; and therefore it is as ignorantly as ridiculously said, that *Christ hath taught us to pray that we may sin*, upon the Supposal of the Decree. We know now to whom that Part of the Description of False Teachers and Seducers belongs, 2 Pet. 2. 12. *They speak evil of the things that they understand not.*

I might here observe, that this foolish Perverting of that Petition of the Lord's-Prayer, *Thy Will be done*, is wholly and entirely borrowed from Dr. Stearne's *Medela Animi*, l. 2. c. 21. p. 306. It was that Writer's *Conceit*; and our fanciful Dr. took it up presently, and thought it to be an *Argument*, and set it down as he found it, but doth not tell us whence he had it. In the like manner he dealt with another of that Writer's whimsical Reasonings, which he met with in the foresaid Book, p. 308. and he lik'd it so well, that he transcrib'd it Word for Word almost, but conceals his Author, and makes the Reader believe that it is his *own* Invention. It will not be amiss to represent this Piece of Plagiarism in these Two Columns, for the Reader's Diversion, as well as Satisfaction.

Dr. STEARNE.

Quicquid Deus de futuro statuit, id ipsum homini revelare potest; proinde & suam de futuro hominis (Adami) peccato decretum eadem patefacere potis est. Hac revelatione admissa, si Adamus peccare voluisset, non peccasset,

Dr. WHITBY.

What God may decree de futuro, he may reveal to any of his Creatures that he hath decreed; and so he might have reveal'd to *Adam* that he should sin by eating the forbidden Fruit. And then,

peccasset, eo quod Deum ipsum velle decrevisse scivit, voluit: Si peccare nolisset, peccasset, quia probe novit quod Deus, ut ipse peccaret, voluit. Adamas vel volendo peccare, non peccasset; vel nolendo peccare peccasset. Præterea, hoc patens factum Decretum de primo Adami peccato futuro vel ei placuisset, vel non: Si placuisset, primam peccatum aliud præcessisset, nam decretum de peccato, nisi & ipsum peccatum placeat, placere nequit: Si non placuisset, primo in idem peccato prius fuisset, nam Iniquus est cui Voluntas Dei Opt. Max. sibi revelata non placet.

then, if Adam will'd thus to sin, he had not sinn'd, because he will'd that only which he knew the Counsel of God's Will had decreed he should will: If he would not have sinn'd, he had sinn'd, for he then must know that it was God's Will he should sin. Now, sure it is absurd to say, that Adam had sinn'd by being unwilling to sin; and that by being willing to sin, he had not sinn'd; (for I suppose it should be so, tho' he hath left out not.) Again, either this Decree made known to Adam might have pleas'd him, or not: If it had pleas'd him, he must have sinn'd before the Eating of the forbidden Fruit; for the Decree that he should sin, could not have pleas'd him, without his being pleas'd with the Sin decreed: If it had not pleas'd him, he had sinn'd also; for he is wicked that is displeas'd with the Good Will of God made known to him.

This

This is one of the poorest and weakest Arguments that Dr. Stearn hath in his whole Book; for the former Part of it is a mere Captious and Sophistical Dilemma, which any one may easily answer, by telling the Author of it that he proceeds upon a vain and groundless Supposition, of God's Revealing his Will to *Adam* in that manner which he mentions; and by distinguishing between the Will of God, as it denotes his *Appointing*, and as it signifies his *Approving*. And the latter Part of his Arguing cannot but appear to be weak, because we see it is founded on that which he reckons an Absurdity; namely, that there was any Sin precedent to the *Actual Eating of the forbidden Fruit*; whereas all Divines hold, that this was usher'd in by Infidelity or Pride, or some other depraved Disposition. But this is like some others of this Writer's Freaks; as about *Concourse*, about *Happiness*, about the *Passions*, and particularly *Sorrow for Sin*, which he condemns as utterly unlawful; and other Things he hath which are Unscriptural, and against Common Sense and Experience. Yet our Judicious *Sarum*-Dr. thought this to be worth the Transcribing, without mentioning the Author's Name, no not so much as in the Margin; herein shewing himself a clever *Plagiary*, who takes out whole Sentences and Periods together, as they lie in an Author, and never lets the Reader know that he is beholden to him. And what is he the better for this Robbery? He hath play'd the Thief, but he hath got no Booty, or Prize of any Value; for what he hath stolen from that Writer, is only a Sport of Wit and Fancy. But a Good Cause hath no need of the Subtilty of Sophisters: Truth wants not the Artifices of Counterfeit Reason.

Another Argument, as he calls it, is this. According to this Doctrine, we must both obey and transgress the Will of God, by the same sinful Action: Transgress it, because Sin, in the formal Nature of it, is a Transgression of his Holy Will: Obey it, because it is the doing of his Will.

This, like the other, is poor and sorry Arguing, and therefore any one may know it to be the Dr. s. Who doth not know the Difference between the Purposing and the Preceptive Will of God, which I before mention'd? The former respects only the Being of Sin, that as to the Event there shall be such a thing; the latter necessarily implies Approbation. When a Man sins, he transgresses this latter Will of God; but 'tis most irrationably said that he obeys it at the same time. It is true, the Purposing, or Decretal Will is fulfill'd; which is as much as to say, the sinful Event happens; there is such a thing as the Commission of such or such a Moral Evil; but this doth no ways imply Obedience to the Will of God as it disapproves of Sin, yea, 'tis a perfect Disobedience. Wherefore 'tis plain, that the Dr. doth nothing but juggle and equivocate, when he talks of both Transgressing and Obeying the Will of God by the same sinful Action. He strives to amuse his Readers with such Language as this, which seems contradictory: But it is easily reconciled by that clear Distinction above-mention'd, which is as old as St. Augustin; as we may gather from those Remarkable Words of that Learned and Godly Father *. [“ As to Evil Men, saith he, they do that

* Quantum ad ipsos malos attinet, quod Deus noluit, fecerunt: Quantum vero ad Omnipotentiam Dei, nullo modo id efficere valuerunt. Hoc quippe ipso, quod contra voluntatem Dei fecerunt, de ipsis facta est voluntas ejus. — Ut miro & ineffabili modo non fiat præter ejus voluntatem, quod etiam fit contra ejus voluntatem, quia non fieret, si non sineret; nec utiq; Nolens finit, sed Volens. Nec sineret bonus fieri malè, nisi omnipotens etiam de malo facere posset bene. *Enchirid. ad Laurent. Cap. 100.* N “ which

“ which God *wills not*: Tho’ if we speak of God’s
 “ Omnipotency, they can by no means do what
 “ he would not have them to do. But so it is, that
 “ in this very thing wherein they act *against the Will*
 “ of God, they even *do his Will*. — Thus, in
 “ a wonderful and unspeakable manner, their Evil
 “ Actions are not done *besides his Will*, tho’ they are
 “ done *against his Will*: For they could not be done
 “ if he did not permit them; and certainly he doth
 “ not permit them without his Will, but *with his*
 “ *Will*. Nor would he, as being Good, suffer Evil
 “ to be done, unless he could, as being Omnipotent,
 “ make Good out of Evil.] Thus this
 Great and Famous Light of the Christian Church
 clears up the whole Matter that is now in Debate:
 He shews, that those different Exertments of the
 Divine Will, as it is *Decretive* and *Permissive*, and
 as it is *Declarative* and *Preceptive*, do not clash with
 each other; and consequently, the Contradiction
 and Absurdity which the Dr. dreams of are van-
 nish’d.

And as to the Nature of *Divine Permission*, the
 foresaid Father tells us what is his Judgment con-
 cerning it; namely, That it contains in it the
Will or *Decree* of God; which is the Assertion that
 I advanced. Having this Ancient, Learned, and
 Pious Writer on my side, I think I may justly defy
 the Novel and Upstart Doctrine of our *Salisbury*
Divine. Only here let us take notice, how he and
 his Friend the Physician have set their Brains on
 work to evade the plain Truth. They have studied
 to perplex and confound, when they had not Ability
 to reason; and they would seem to do it with a Lo-
 gical Twang. But away with such apish Subtilty,
 such Foolery, and such mere Chicanry as this.

In the next place, he pretends to answer the Arguments which I had produced, to confirm my Assertion; and he offers some of his own. But upon the whole, I can only say this, that the older the Dr. grows, the more of the Fox he hath in him. He shifts and winds, and uses little Quirks and Subterfuges, and is full of impertinent Dilemmas and Fallacies: and I will not so far humour him, as to enter into the particular Consideration of them.

But whete he makes but even some Shew of Reasoning, I am willing to attend to what he saith. And first, he suggests that my Assertion is repugnant to the Justice of God; because if the Decree is past concerning Men's Evil Actions, he cannot justly punish them for doing them. By the Decree, he saith, God obliges a Man to do evil, and he makes his Sin Necessary; and is it not Unjust then to punish him for that Sin? Here the Dr. thinks he is entrenched to his very Chin, and imagines himself safe and secure. But this is the Effect of that Presumption which he is wont to be guilty of: And I will now let him see, that it is easy to come at him, and to demolish such weak Ramparts as he hath erected. He builds without a Bottom, and therefore his Structure must needs fall. He saith, a Man is oblig'd to sin, and is necessitated to it by the Decree; for which Assertions there is no Ground at all; for the Decree only fixes the Futurity of the Action or Event, but doth not force and compel any Man: He that acts immorally, doth it voluntarily and freely, without any Necessitating Influence from the Decree, and therefore it is his own Will that makes him liable to Punishment, and consequently renders that Punishment Just. For what is it that makes the Punishment Just? Is it not this, that the Offender deserves it? And every Sinner deserves Punish-

ment, because his Sin was his own Act. Whence it follows, that the Righteous Judge of all Men may inflict Punishment on them for their Offences; and yet this is not inconsistent with his Ordaining before the Foundation of the World, that there should be Sinful Men in the World.

To prove that God's *Willing* or *Decreeing* the Permission of Sin, argues the *Injustice* of God, he propounds such Questions as these: *Did ever any just Judge will that any man should offend, that he might have an Occasion to condemn him to death? Or doth he ever punish any man for doing that which he will'd he should do, and made inevitably necessary for him to do? And shall we ascribe such an Act of Justice to the Righteous Judge of all Men, which no Earthly Judge thought fit ever to do?* To which the Answer is easy. I never asserted that God will'd that any Men should offend, to give God an Occasion to condemn them to death: Nor do the Calvinists use that Language; nor was it ever said by them, that God made it *inevitably necessary* for a Man to sin, in the Sense that the Dr. means, as I have shew'd before, and therefore the Dr. fights with his own Shadow.

Besides, this is most truly to be said, that God's *Justice* and Man's are not the same; and we must not judge of one by the other. To instance in the very thing I have been discoursing of, *Permission of Sin*: If we should suffer the Commission of Sin in others, when it is in our Power to hinder it, it would be an Unjust and Vicious Act in us: But 'tis not so with the Divine Being; for he is not oblig'd to hinder the Acting of Sin, as we are; he is above this Law. And in other Instances I have shew'd in my *Veritas Redux*, p. 195, 196. that we cannot argue from *Human Justice* to that which is *Divine*, as the Dr. fallsly doth. I defy him to dis-

prove

prove this, tho' he calls in the Assistance of his *Deist and Physitian*.

As to the Nice and Particular *Circumstances* which attend *Punishment*, which the Dr. insists upon, no Man ever pretended to apply them to the Nature of *Sin*, (as if *Sin* should be said to be *Punishment of Sin*, with respect to all those *Circumstances*) and therefore the Dr. shew'd himself very childish and trifling, in labouring to prove that *Sin*, in *some respects*, can't be the *Punishment of Sin*. But this all Men must grant, that one *Sin* may very properly be said to be the *Punishment of another*: For what is the main thing considerable in the Nature of *Punishment* but this, that it is an *Infliction of some painful Thing*, for some *Crime committed*? And surely, 'tis no difficult thing to apply this to many of the *Sins and Enormities* committed by wicked Men?

Again; he thinks he turns some Face of an Argument towards me, when he saith it is *against the Purity and Holiness of God* to decree that *Sin* shall be in the World; for surely he would not decree that which he *hates*. To which I answer, If this be an *Argument*, it is as valid against the *Divine Permission of Sin* (which yet the Dr. and all Men frankly acknowledge) as against the *Decreeing of it*. They say, God can't decree the *Futurity of Sin*; because if he should do so, this would shew that he loves and approves of *Sin*: Now, for this very Reason he should not permit *Sin*; for from permitting, and not hindring it, (tho' he could hinder it if he pleas'd) as well as from *decreeing it*, it might as reasonably be gather'd that he loves and approves of it. For the *Divine Permission* (as that great Instructor of the Christian Church, *St. Augustin*, and as our own Reason will tell us, as I have already prov'd) is an Act of the *Divine Will*, and is the

same with the Decree, or is a Part of it. I conclude then, that it is not inconsistent with the Purity and Holiness of God, to will and decree the Commission of Sin in the World.

Besides, it can't be repugnant to the Purity and Holiness of God to decree to suffer Sin, and sinful Men to have a Being in the World; because he orders and disposes this to *Good and Holy Ends*, which I have particularly and distinctly mention'd in my *Discourse* on this Head. But the Dr. will not allow of these Wise Reasons and Ends of God's Decretal Permission of Sin, tho' they are taken notice of and allow'd even by the Heathen Moralists; and they make use of them as Motives to perswade Men to Patience and Meekness. To this Purpose I will mention a Passage of the famous Royal Philosopher *Antoninus*; and the Reader will presently, on the Reciting of it, perceive how pertinent it is, and to whom I may justly apply it. * *When ye are offended, saith he, with the Impudence of any one, ask your selves this Question; Is it possible there should not be an Impudent Man in the World (or in the Church)? It cannot be; therefore desire not what is impossible; but say thus to your selves, This is one of those Shameless and Troublesome Men, whom it was necessary the World (or the Church) should have, for the Trial of Men's Virtues.*

Thus, from the Dr. himself we are taught the Truth of what he denies, That the Permission of Sin is good, because it may be beneficial to Mankind. Some of the most Shining Virtues are occasion'd, and all of them may be improv'd by the Worst of Vices. Even that Author, whom the Dr.

so much admires, and borrows so plentifully from, acknowledges this: † [Many Good Things, saith he, would be missing, if no Evil were permitted: Where there is not Iniquity, there can't be any Vindicative Justice. If there were not Iniquity, there would be no Patience.] And therefore, it is not unworthy of God to appoint that there should be such Obliquities in the World. For certainly, it can't be unworthy of him to determine the Being of such Events or Actions, as do some ways contribute to his Glory, and to the Welfare of his Servants. In a Word, to will Sin so as to approve of it, and to delight in it, is not reconcilable with the Holiness and Purity of God; but to will it so, as to consent that Sin shall be by his Permission, is very reconcilable. Thus the Dr.'s Argument (as he would have it call'd) comes to nothing: And he must be forc'd to accept of our Scheme, and to acknowledge his own Preterensions to be vain and idle.

Further, he argues thus: *The Decreeing of Sin vilifies and depreiates the Mercy and Goodness of God; because it can't be Mercy in God, not to punish a Man for doing that which he himself decreed to be done, and thereby makes it necessary for him to do.* This is but what he had said before under the Topick of *Justice*; and therefore the like Answer which was given before, will serve now; namely, That a Sinner is justly punish'd, tho' he doth those Actions which were predetermin'd by the Decree; for it is the

† *Multa bona tollerentur si nullum malum permitteretur: Ubi non est Iniquitas, Justitia Vindicativa esse nequit. Si non foret Iniquitas, Patientia non foret. Animi Medela, lib. 2. c. 14.*

Man's own depraved Will that is the Cause of the Actions so far as they are Evil; and the Decree hath no Causal Influx upon them, or upon him; therefore it is *Mercy* (properly so call'd) to pardon the Sinner.

Thus it is evident that the Cause I maintain is not in the least hurt, and is never like to be by what the Dr. is able to suggest. We see that all his Artificial Movements are only to disguise the Truth, and at the same time we see that they become serviceable to represent it in its genuine Shape, and to commend it to us. He came with a full Design to baffle the Doctrine of the Decrees, but by the Weakness of his Objections he confirms and strengthens it; herein not unlike him who was call'd to curse *Israel*, but blessed them.

Before I proceed, if you would know out of what Magazine the Dr. fetch'd his Ammunition which he hath made use of (tho' without doing any Execution) you may be satisfied by consulting Cardinal *Bellarmino's* second Book of the *State of Sin*: There you will find set down the very *Texts* and the very *fallacious Reasonings* which Dr. *Whitby* hath produced (as his own) to prove that the Decrees did not predetermine the Futurity of the Actions of wicked Men: So that he hath the Honour not only of fighting under that great Champion of the Church of *Rome*, but of using his Weapons, though he doth not tell us that they are *his*. From this and from what I had observed before, we may rightly place Dr. *Whitby* among the *privateering* Authors: It is common with him to load himself with those Spoils, and to neglect to make Acknowledgement where it is due.

The next thing he undertakes is, to answer the Places of Scripture which I brought in my *Veritas Redux*

Redux to establish the Doctrine I propounded. But the Reader will find that I had so guarded and fortified those Texts, and obviated the Dr.'s Interpretations, that I believe it will not be expected that I should say any thing more. All that the Dr. hath raked up out of his *Annotations*, and his *Discourse* of the *Decree of Election*, to invalidate those Texts which I made use of, are before-hand answer'd in that Treatise.

One thing here by the by I cannot but note, that the Dr. in one place of this Discourse ventures to quote one or two Texts as they are in the Original, but makes miserable work of it. Instead of *gadol avoni* he reads *gedel oni*, and for *avono them* he reads it *onothem*, and *shenith* for *shenoth*, as if he did not know his *Hebrew* Letters. And he cannot spell a common *Greek* word so often used in the New Testament, as *εὐδωκία*, which he reads *εὐδουεία*. He should have learnt his Orthography at School, before he came to set up for a Critick or an Annotator.

It now remains that I let the Reader see that my *Second Assertion* about the Divine Decrees, which the Dr. hath been labouring to refute, and which he saith is not only *False* but *Blasphemous*, is not so much mine as it may be said to be the Sentiment and Persuasion of the Learnedest and most Judicious Writers both heretofore and of late. We have already heard what St. *Augustine* said, and for which he is quoted by the *Master of the Sentences*, * *Multa non fieri præter voluntatem Dei quæ sunt contra voluntatem*: Many things are against the Will of God, but yet they are not beside it. This knowing and religious

* Lib. I. Dist. 47.

Father thus further declares, *† There is not any thing done but what the Almighty wills to be done; either by permitting it to be done, or by doing it himself.* He holds, you see, that the Divine Permission is Volition, and that there is no Action but comes under this Volition. Again he saith, *† Unless it were good that there should be Evil, it would by no means be permitted by him who is the Almighty Good, and was able to hinder the Commission of that Evil, if he would.* At another time he saith, *† there are innumerable Wickednesses which God suffers to be done before his Eyes; which if God willed not that they should be done, he would not by any means have suffered them.* This the foul-mouth'd Doctor calls Blasphemy, though it comes from the Mouth of that Pious Father.

Prosper and Fulgentius were two Eminent Disciples of *St. Augustinus*, and the latter of them tells us, that it was that Father's Doctrine, *† that Men were predestinated not only to Punishment, but even to Sin; that is, is deemed good from Eternity to the Divine Being that Man should not be in a sinless State in this Life.* And we are told by this *Fulgentius*, that *∴ that Holy and Learned Man, Prosper, defended this Saying with a Second Dissertation about the Divine Decrees, which the*

† Nihil aliud sit nisi Omnipotentis fieri vellet, vel sinendo ut fiat, vel ipse faciendo. *Augustin. Enchirid. Cap. 95.*

Nisi esset hoc bonum ut essent & mala, nullo modo sineretur ab Omnipotente Bono. *Ibid. Cap. 98.*

∴ Quam innumerabilia (scelera) ille permittit fieri ante oculos suos? Quae usiq; si nolisset, nulla ratione permitteret. *Cont. Julian. 5. c. 4.*

† Quod Peccatores non ad solum predestinatos diceret Judicium, sed etiam ad peccatum. *Lib. II. ad Mon. cap. 38.*

∴ Cujus dicta Prosper, vir eruditus & sanctus, recta defendit fide. *Ibid.*

right Faith. And shall we then say that these Ancient Fathers of the Church, these Religious and Learned Writers were Blasphemers? *De A.*

In the Writings of the famous *Anselm*, who liv'd in the Eleventh Century, we are told by him that God's *permissive Will* is that which permits something to be done; though it is displeasing sometimes; and so God is said to will the Evils which he permits to be done. Another Eminent Divine in the next Century tells us that though some *pious Minds* may startle at this Assertion, [God willeth Evil] yet the Reason of it is not because this is not well and rightly said, but because it is not well and rightly understood. The renowned *Bradwardine* who was Archbishop of *Canterbury* (as was *Anselm*) and flourish'd in the Fourteenth Century, determin'd thus, *About whatsoever the Permissiō of God is conversant, about the same is his Actual Will conversant.* Now, must we give Credit to the Dr. when he pronounces these excellent Persons, *Anselm*, *Hugo de S. Victore*, and *Bradwardine*, to be Blasphemers?

We are told by the Prince of the Schoolmen, That * *as Predestination includes in it God's Will to con-*

Permittens Voluntas est quæ permittit aliquid fieri et si displiceat quandoq; & hoc modo dicitur Deus velle mala quæ permittit fieri. De Volunt. Dei.

† *Deus vult malum: Refugit hoc pia mens, non quia quod dicitur non bene dicitur, sed quia quod bene dicitur, non bene intelligitur. Hugo de S. Victore de Sacram. L. 1. Pars 4. c. 12.*

∴ *Cujuscunq; est Dei Permissio, est & ejus Volitio actualis. De Causa Dei, Lib. I. cap. 37.*

∴ *Sicut Prædestinatio includit voluntatem conferendi Gratiā & Gloriam, ita Reprobatio includit voluntatem permittendi aliquem cadere in culpam, & inferendi damnationis pœnam pro culpa. Aquin. Sum. I. Qu. 23. Art.*

fer Grace and Glory, so Reprobation includes his Will to permit some to sin, and to inflict the Penalty of Damnation for it. And this Proposition, That the Fall of Adam, and all Men's Sins, are by a Permissive Will or Decree, is expressly asserted by several other Schoolmen.

A famous Divine who hath commented on some of their Writings, expressly tells us, That † the Permission of Adam's Sin was will'd and intended by God for some Good: Therefore God's Permission of Sin is not a Negative Act only, but it is even a Positive one. Again he saith, ∴ It is not only true, that God permits Sin, but he also wills that Permission: For if it be ask'd, whether God permits it voluntarily or unvoluntarily; the Answer certainly must be this; That he permits it voluntarily: And this is truly said concerning every Sin that is committed. Thus this Doctrine is so Clear and Convincing, that even some of the Learnedest and Soberest Persons of the Roman Communion come over to us, and embrace it. And must we, with Dr. Whitby's Charity, stigmatize them as Blasphemers?

To descend to later Times: Were Archbishop Usher (so dignified afterwards) and all the Upper and Lower House of Convocation in Ireland (in the Year 1615.) Blasphemers, who unanimously agreed upon this Article, (which I mention'd in the Title-

† Permissio peccati Adæ volita fuit & intenta à Deo propter aliquod bonum: Ergo non tantum negativè Deus se habuit permittendo illud peccatum, sed etiam positivè. *Æstus in Commentar. in Lib. 1. Sentent. Distinct. 40. p. 151.*

∴ Non tantum verum est dicere, Deus permittit peccatum, sed etiam Deus vult permittere peccatum. Si enim quærat utrum permittit Volens an Nolens, respondetur utiq; Volens, idq; verè dicitur de quocunq; peccato. *Ibid.*

Page) That God from all Eternity did by his unchangeable Counsel ordain whatsoever (whether good or evil) in time should come to pass? Must the Whole Body of the Clergy be voted guilty of *Blasphemy*?

Even *Arminius* himself, whose Scheme of Divinity is so much admired by the Dr. and his Brethren, speaking of the Actions of Men, saith thus: * *None of them are done without the Will of God; yea, not those that are done contrary to his Will.* Which is the very same that *St. Austin* had long before said. But the greatest Admirers of *Arminius's* other Doctrines refuse to close with him here, and therein shew themselves Singular and Partial. And as to the Divine *Permission*, that Author subscribes entirely to what I have deliver'd on this Head; for his Words are these: † *Whatsoever God permits, he deliberately and willingly permits; his Will being immediately concern'd in the Permission.* And in another place he saith, ∴ *God willed that Ahab should fill up the measure of his Sins.* According to him, * *Permission belongs to the Decree: And he declares, that it is † an Act of the Divine Will.* And in his Comment on those Words, *Him being deliver'd by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, &c. 2. Acts 23.* he

* — Sic ut nihil fiat sine voluntate illius, etiam eorum quæ contra voluntatem illius fiunt. *Disp. 3. de Efficacia Provid. Dei in mala.*

† Quicquid permittit Deus, id consulto & volens permittit, voluntate immediatè versante circa permissionem.

∴ Deus voluit Achabum mensuram scelerum suorum implere. *Exam. p. 162.*

* Decretum Dei duplex est, efficacis Actionis & Permissionis. *Exam. Prædest. Perkins. p. 4.*

† Permissio Dei est actus voluntatis divinæ. *Ibid. p. 146.*

faith,

faith, That God preordained that the Jews should put Christ to death; that is, in plain Terms, commit the Sin of Murder. And now, will Dr. *Whitby*, and his Companions, brand their good Friend *Arminius* with the Title of *Blasphemer*.

Another Foreigner, A of great Note among the Learned, speaking of *Joseph's* being sold by his Brethren, and *Christ's* being crucified by the Jews, saith thus: From these Texts it follows, that God did decree and will not only the good Sufferings of *Joseph* and *Christ*, but likewise the evil Actions of the Brethren and the Jews. He adds indeed, that these Actions were decreed, not as they were evil, but as Actions that might be deduced to a Good End, and in themselves were not evil, setting aside the Deficiency and Enormity of the Second Cause, which is the thing that I have often asserted. The same Learned Author speaks thus: We hold that God not only infallibly foresaw the Sin of the First Adam, and preordained his Temptation to that Fall, but likewise decreed the Permission of it, and order'd it to a Good End.

∴ Præordinavit quidem Deus ut Christo ab ipsis mors inferretur. *Ibid.* p. 114.

Ex istis locis sequitur Deus non tantum passiones bonas *Josephi* & *Christi*, sed etiam actiones malas fratrum ac *Judæorum* voluisse ac decrevisse, non quæ malæ erant, sed quæ actiones ad bonum finem deducendæ, & in se non malæ; seposito defectu causæ secundæ. *River. Exercit. 167. in Genes.*

† Deus non solum infallibiliter peccatum primi *Adami* prævidisse, & tentationem ejus ad lapsum præordinasse, sed etiam ejusdem permissionem decrevisse, & eam ad bonum finem ordinasse statuimus. *Idem Coll. Controv. Disp. 37. Thef. 4.*

Another

Another Eminent Writer among the Protestants abroad, determines thus : *God wills not Evil as it is Evil, but he wills his Permission of it, and approves of it, because it is a Work of the Divine Will.*

With him I will join another Foreign Divine, well known in the Learned World, who tells us, That *God permitted the Fall of Adam (and consequently the Sins of all other Men in the World) because he willed to permit it, and because it was good that he should permit it.* And more largely and fully he thus expresses himself : *This Permission is a*

Vult Deus non malum quia malum, sed permissionem suam vult, & approbat, quia est divinae Voluntatis Opus. *Walaeus in Loc. Commun. P. 164.*

Permitit quia voluit permittere, & quia bonum erat ut permitteret. *Molinae Anatomie Arminianismi, cap. 6.*

Hæc Permissio est actus quidam voluntatis divinæ, est enim voluntaria : Deus enim nihil facit invito, nec insciens : Ergo permisit peccatum, quia voluit permittere. Nec permisisset nisi bonum fuisset ut permitteretur. Nam si Malum non esset, ne quidem cognosceretur quid sit Bonum ; non secus, ac ignoraretur quid sit Lux, nisi esset Nox. Nec Justitia Dei quæ punit, nec Misericordia quæ ignoscit, fuisset cognita. Nec Sapientia per quam ex malo elicit bonum. Nec infinitus Amor per quem misit in mundum Filium suum ut pro nobis moreretur. Non quidem quod Deus scelere hominis egeat ad illustrandam suam gloriam, sed quia alioqui non potuisset homo pervenire ad plenam illam felicitatem, ad quam creatus erat. Non enim potest perfecte Deus cognosci, ac proinde nec perfecte amari dum ignoratur ejus Justitia & Misericordia. Ipso igitur lapsu hominis Deus gradum struxit homini ad perfectiorem conditionem. Ac quanquam respectu multorum singularium pereuntium, optabile fuisset ut homo non peccasset ; respectu tamen universalis boni, cujus potius fuit habenda ratio, non debuit Deus potentiam suam adhibere ad impediendum nè peccatum committeretur. *Ibid. cap. 3.*

“ certain

“ certain Act of the Divine *Will* ; for it is Volun-
 “ tary, because God doth nothing unwillingly and
 “ ignorantly. Therefore he permitted Sin, be-
 “ cause he *will’d* to do so : Nor would he have per-
 “ mitted it, unless it had been good to permit it.
 “ For if there be no *Sin* or *Evil*, it *can’t be known*
 “ *what is Good* ; as we must be ignorant of the Na-
 “ ture of Light, were there no Darkness and
 “ Night. Nor would the *Punitive Justice* of God,
 “ nor his *Pardoning Mercy* have been known, if
 “ there had been no Sin. Nor God’s *Wisdom*, by
 “ which he brings Good out of Evil. Nor his *In-*
 “ *finite Love*, whereby he sent his Son into the
 “ World to die for us. Not that God stands in
 “ need of the Sin of Man to manifest his Glory ;
 “ but because otherwise Man could not possibly at-
 “ tain to that *Compleat Happiness* for which he was
 “ created. For we cannot arrive to a Perfect and
 “ Consummate Knowledge of God, and conse-
 “ quently we cannot perfectly love him whilst we
 “ are ignorant of his Justice and his Mercy. Where-
 “ fore, by the very Fall and Transgression of Man,
 “ God made way for the Exalting him to a more
 “ Perfect Condition. And tho’ indeed, in regard
 “ of many particular Persons that perish, it might
 “ be wish’d that Man had not sinn’d ; yet in respect
 “ of the Universal Good, which rather was to be
 “ regarded, God ought not to exercise his Power in
 “ hindring the Commission of Sin.”] Thus he.
 And was this Person, who was one of the greatest
 Pillars of the Protestant Cause in *France*, and was
 celebrated among all the Reformed Churches for
 his Learned Defence of it, was he a *Bla-*
spbemer ?

Next, let us come home, and there I will present the Reader with the Testimony of Two very eminent Writers; and I chuse these out from the rest, because what they say in the present Matter cannot but be of great Weight with the Divines of the Church of *England*, of which they were so Zealous Asserters, and with those of them particularly who embrace the *Arminian* Doctrines, for their Biss was set that way; and yet one of them in express Terms asserts that the *Divine* * *Permission*, to speak properly, is a *virtual Part of the Decree it self*. And in another Place he saith, † *We must conceive of the Eternal Decree, that it is the immediate Axis or Center upon which every successive or contingent Act revolves*. If every contingent Act, then all Acts of Sin without doubt. Was this great Man a *Blasphemer* for saying, ∴ *God's Will is always done, albeit many Particulars which God willeth be not done, and many done which he willeth should not be done?* Which he repeats in other Words, * *Such things as God no ways willeth, oftentimes come to pass; when as their Contradictories, which he wills most ardently, come not to pass*. Here is God's *willing*, and his *not willing*, and yet no real Contradiction, tho' about the same thing: Which Dr. *Whitby* will not allow of.

The other Writer of our Church, whose Testimony I promis'd to produce, plainly tells us, that † *God hath determined from everlasting the Events of all future Contingencies, by determining the Objects, whether inward or outward, which all Men on all Occasions that*

* Dr. Jackson, Vol. 2. p. 161.

† Vol. 2. p. 57.

∴ Ibid. p. 169.

* P. 170

† Mr. Thorndike's *Epilogue*, Book 2. Chap. 24.

shall come to pass, shall meet with. According to this Learned Man the Eternal Decree hath fixed the Events of all future Contingencies, and therefore of Sinful ones, as well as of those that are not such: And in order to this, he holds, that all *Objects* whatsoever that shall at any time occur to us, were from Eternity fixed and predetermined. This is the very Thing that I have asserted, and for which the Dr. and his Party find fault with me, and even reckon me among the *Blasphemous*. But the Reader cannot but see that these Men's most Rational Defenders of their Cause are forc'd to confess what is asserted by the *Calvinists*: They themselves grant what they condemn in us.

I will make this Evident from one Testimony more, and that is of Dr. *Sherlock*, the late Dean of St. Paul's, who in his *Discourse of Divine Providence*, p. 31, 32. asserts, That God co-operates in all the wickedness that is committed. Men do wickedly by the Power and Co-operation of God. Sinful Actions are done by God's immediate Power. But this can't entitle God to Men's Sins. Again, Men act, even when they sin, by a Power derived from God in their first Creation. And could this Writer say so much (and more, which I omit) and not hold that God by his Eternal Will decreed all this? Was it not rational for him to infer from his own Concessions, that the Commission of all the Sins in the World falls under the Divine Determination? For *Co-operation* is more than *Decreeing*, this latter having no proper Influx, but the former hath.

A neighbouring Divine, who sometimes is stiff, now seems to be pliant, and to shew his Willingness to come o'er to us; for speaking of those who crucified

cified our Saviour, he saith, * *They did that with an Evil Mind, Counsel and Design, which God himself willed. Whilst, with no Intention to obey God; but out of inbred Wickedness or pernicious Error, they opposed the revealed Will of God, they at the same time fulfill'd his secret Will.* But when he ventures to deny the Divine Decree about Sinful Acts, he is inconsistent with himself, and baulks that Good Sense which he is Master of; and he lies at last to this; † *There are some Actions that God partly permits, and partly will'd and decreed; namely, such as are partly Good and partly Evil.* To such indigested Thoughts is this Learned Man reduced; so wretchedly doth he falter, because he would not plainly speak the Truth. And that Learned Irish Gentleman, whom I have before mention'd, is as hard put to it as this Scottish Divine; for rather than he will submit to the Doctrine of the Decrees, he hath the Confidence to averr; † *That God hath not will'd or decreed any human Actions that are free.* One would chuse rather to be among the Dr.'s Blasphemers than of the Number of those who vent such wild Notions as these.

I will conclude with the Testimony of a well-studied Writer, * *There is nothing in the World, saith he, that did not pass under the Censure of the Will of God; of some sort or kind soever, before it was, as it pass'd under the View of his Knowledge.* He makes the Will of

Illi malo animo, consilio & intentione id fecerunt quod Deus voluit; non animo parendi Deo, sed ex insita malitia aut pernicioso errore repugnando voluntati Dei revelatae, voluntatem ejus arcanam impleverunt. *Strang. de Vol. Dei, l. 4. c. 2.*

† Nonnullæ sunt actiones quas Deus partim permittit, partim vult ac decrevit, quæ nempe partim bonæ sunt, partim malæ. *Lib. 2. Cap. 24.*

Medela Animi. *Lib. 2. Cap. 20.*

* Playfere's Appello Evangelium, p. 70, 71.

God as extensive as his Knowledge, and consequently Sin must be the Object of God's Will and Decree. These are the Thoughts and Confession even of a stanch Arminian.

But seeing the Dr. fancies he hath found *false Assertions*, yea, *Blasphemous* ones in my late Book, I might trouble the Reader with a List of those *really absurd and false Propositions* which occur in this *Third Discourse* of his which I have been examining. They are such as these, *The Manifestation of God's Justice is the only Good he designs to bring out of the Sins of Reprobates*, p. 44. *That which necessitates the Action (tho' but as to the Certainty of the Event) must also necessitate the Will to do it*, p. 50. *If God permissively wills the Commission of Sin, he must do it with a Will of Approbation*, p. 54. *God doth not punish one Sin with another*, p. 65. *If God concurs to the Commission of an Act as 'tis physical, he concurs to it as it is Moral*, p. 55. *God doth not will the Being of Sin in the World, as it is order'd by his over-ruling Providence and Wisdom to good Ends*, p. 55. *God doth not manifest the Glory of any of his Attributes by his permissive willing that there shall be Sin in the World*, p. 57. And several other unsafe Propositions might be muster'd up out of the Dr.'s Pamphlet; and, if I were of the Dr.'s uncharitable Temper, I might brand some of them as *Blasphemous*.

Lastly, I will take notice of something in the Dr.'s *Title Page*; and I mention it *here* because it more peculiarly belongs to the Matter I have been speaking of. He brings in *St. Augustin*, relating how some Men excuse and defend their most heinous Enormities, thus, *Si deus nolisset, non id fecissem*: If God did not will these, I should not have done them: And then he makes me interpret it thus; *Sin is not absolutely against God's Will, for if it were, he would hinder the being of it*. This he thinks is a brave

Flourish

Flourish in the Front of his Papers, and will invite People to peruse them; but the considerate Reader, if he consults that Father, will find that my Assertion is impertinently brought in by the Dr. because it is nothing to the Business that that Ancient Writer was then treating of, and hath no Relation to that foremention'd Excuse which some Men frame for their Commission of Sin. For *this* was the thing that was alledg'd by those that held an *Astrological Fate*, as appears from the very next Words, *Quid vis faciam fato meo?* The Stars have forc'd me to do what I do: I owe my Wickedness to the powerful Influences of the heavenly Bodies. Now, what is this to the Business? This cannot affect any thing that I have said in my *Discourse on the Decrees*, because I have disown'd there that *Fatal Necessity* which the foresaid Father refers to, and which some vitious Men in those times fled to as a Patronage for the worst of their Crimes. I have more than once declar'd that there is no *Compulsion* from above to do any sinful Acts, tho' I assert the Decrees extend to such Acts as they are Future Events, and as they may be serviceable to some Good, tho' they themselves are Evil. If this gives real Offence, let it be call'd *permitting* or *suffering* of Sin: But then the Man that hath any Sense in him can't but perceive that this *permission* or *suffering* is by *God's Will*. If he did not *will* that Sin should be suffer'd in the World, it could not be at all in the World. This is plain, and clear as the Sun: But it is every Man's own free Willing and Acting that makes the *Sin*, and makes him guilty and obnoxious to the Divine Displeasure both here and hereafter. Why then are *Calvin*, and those of his Persuasion, said by Dr. *Whitby* to make God the *Author of Sin*? If the Dr. had look'd into the Writings of those Judicious and Learned Divines of our own Church,

* Bishop *Abbot*, † Bishop *Morton*, ∴ Dr. *Field*, || Dr. *Hackwell* (not to name others) he would have found that after a deliberate Examination of *Calvin's* Doctrine, they declare that there is nothing contain'd in it that looks that way: And *Calvin* himself professes that it is an *Execrable Blasphemy* to say that God is the Author of Sin: Where then is the *Blasphemy* that Dr. *Whitby* talks of, and which he charges me with so desperately?

I must acquaint the Reader that this is only of Course, he treads in the Steps of his old Friends the *Pelagians*, who represented the *Catholic* and *Orthodox Christians*, who were Zealous for the same Doctrine that I have asserted, as *Blasphemers*: And the *Popish* Writers have done the same to the *Calvinists*, as every one knows that hath look'd into their Books: Nothing less than *Blasphemy* is objected to those that maintain the *Decrees*. More particularly this is done by *Bellarmin* in the *Treatise* above mention'd, wherein Dr. *Whitby* is so well vers'd, and from which he hath taken all that he saith. It seems he hath the Skill to chuse out the best Examples in their kind to follow.

And so much for his *Third Discourse*, wherein he hath fill'd our Ears with such precarious and groundless Notions as one would blush to offer to the Publick: And truly I'm almost asham'd my self of what I have done; that is, that I have spent any time in a *formal Reply* to what deserves so little Consideration. But for the Reader's sake I was willing to submit to this Task, that I might not be wanting even in satisfying his least Scruples, and discovering the Fallacies of the Adversary.

* Antilog.

† Cath. Apol.

∴ Of the Church.

|| Against Carrier.

That which he calls his *Fourth Discourse*, is a pretended Defence of his Annotations on several Texts. It is nothing but a Repetition of some of his former senseless and corrupt Expositions of those Places. I will instance only in one or two. He persists in translating these Words, Acts 38. 48. ὅσοι ἕσονται εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, thus, *As many as were disposed to everlasting life*: And to authorize this Translation, he instances in Acts 20. 13. ἕτοιμος ἦν διατεταραμένος, which he renders thus, *For so he was disposed*; and he is Angry that I take no notice of these words. But why should I? for they are nothing to his purpose, for he undertook to prove that τὰ ἕτοιμος and τὰ ἕτοιμος, signify to *dispose* or *make ready*, or to be *disposed* or *made ready and fit*, as it means an Inward disposition or quality of the Mind: but instead of the Verb τὰ ἕτοιμος, he produces a place where διατεταραμένος is used, which alters the Case, unless he hath the Art to prove that τὰ ἕτοιμος and διατεταραμένος, and consequently τεταραμένος and διατεταραμένος are the same. Every one that is but a Smatterer in the Greek Tongue, knows that δια, being prefix'd to Simple Verbs, doth oftentimes change the Import and Propriety of them, as in διατίθεσθαι, διαφέρειν, διαβάνειν, and many others. We read that διατάσσειν is to *declare*, or *enjoin*, Matt. 11. 1. 1 Cor. 16. 1. and thence διάταγμα, a *Command*, Heb. 11. 23. But if we should grant that τὰ ἕτοιμος and διατεταραμένος are sometimes Synonymous, yet I appeal to any Judicious Man whether we are not directed to the true meaning of the Word in the Text before us, when we read that this inspired Writer uses it no less than four times in the Signification of *appointing* or *determining*. Thus in Luke 7. 8. ταῦτα εἶπε, *set* or *appointed*: Acts 15. 2. ἐταξάν, they *determin'd*: 22. 20. ῥέτακται, are *appointed*: 28. 23.

ταξάμενοι, when they had appointed. One would think this is enough to settle the Sense of this Word in this Sacred Writer, when he constantly uses it in that one Signification. Our greatest Criticks and Divines have thought this to be a good Rule to go by. Besides, the other rendring of the Word in this Text is confuted by the Text it self; for how can it be said that those who were *disposed*, or *made fit and ready* for Eternal Life, *believed*, seeing this implies that they were disposed and fit for Eternal Life *before* they believed? But the Dr. is of so admirable a Constitution that he can digest the hardest Absurdities and Contradictions.

There is another Text, or rather a Chapter, the 5th of the Epistle to the Romans, which the Dr. hath wretchedly perverted in his *Annotations* on it; for there he denies the Imputation of Original Sin and the propagating of it by Generation, and at the same time denies the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, and saith *one might reasonably have expected that something might have been offered by me against the Suffrage of Antiquity produced by him to support his denial.* To which I answer, If he had been pleas'd to look farther, he might have seen, p. 503. that I referred him to *Vossius's Pelagian History*, where that Learned Author produces a great Number of Greek and Latin Fathers who writ before St. Augustin's time, and concludes that the Imputation of Original Sin was the received Doctrine of the Ancient Catholic Church: Which shews that the Doctor is hugely mistaken, and that the Suffrage of Antiquity is on my side. And I have more particularly made this good in my Papers which were chiefly in answer to the Dr.'s *Postscript.* And especially as to the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, which the Dr. ridicules, I have in my *Discourse of Faith and Justification*, Part. II. Chap. 2. shew'd that it is a Doctrine as old as Holy David,

David, and the Evangelical Prophet *Isaiab*; and was amply attested by the great Apostle *St. Paul*. This is *Antiquity* enough. But if the Ancient Testimony of some of the Fathers be required, that also I have added in the fore said Discourse, *Part II. chap. 8.*

If this Imputation of Christ's Righteousness to Believers, and also of their Sins to him, had not been the Sentiment of the *Primitive Church*, that great Admirer of Antiquity, the most Learned Bishop *Andrews*, would not have embraced it, and thus positively express'd himself in his Sermon of Justification: *Mark it, saith he, God made him (that is, Christ) not only a Sinner, but Sin it self; as in another Place, not accursed, but a Curse it self; Sin, in respect of the Guilt; a Curse, in respect of the Punishment.* And accordingly in his second Sermon on the *Passion*, he saith, *Christ made that to appertain to himself which of right pertain'd to us: And he made that pertain to us which pertain'd to him only.* Another of our Learned Prelates, Bishop *Sanderson*, owns that the *Meritorious Sufferings of Christ* may be said to have been for his own Sins, his own by Imputation. *Not that he had sinn'd, and so deserved Punishment, but that he had taken upon him our Sins, which deserved that Punishment. As he that undertakes for another Man's Debt, makes it his own, and stands chargeable with it, as if it were his own personal Debt; so Christ, becoming Surety for our Sins, made them his own, and so was punishable for them, as if they had been his own personal Sins; who his own self bore our Sins in his own Body upon the Tree, 1 Pet. 2. That he was punish'd for us, who himself deserved no Punishment, it was because he was made Sin for us, who himself knew no Sin.* Thus he in his Fourth Sermon *ad Clerum*, on *Rom. 14. 23.* and he quotes the Scriptures and *St. Augustin* for it.

Hear

Hear what another late Father of our Church, who was well acquainted with the Writings and Doctrines of the *Ancients*, saith on this Head, and concerning Original Sin, and the Imputation of it, on those Words of the Psalmist, 51. *Psalm*. 5. *I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me.* By way of Paraphrase he speaks thus: * *I was formed in Sin; I was a Sinner so soon as a Creature; So soon as my Soul was united to my Body, Sin was imputed to my Soul.* — From the first Moment of my Conception, even all the while that I was in my Mother's womb, even then did Sin cleave unto me, and I was conceived in it.

In the next Page but one he saith, Adam sinning against God, we all sinn'd with him; so that the Sin that he did is as really imputed to us, as if it had been committed by us.

In another place he hath these Words: † *I believe my Person is as really accepted as perfectly righteous, by the Righteousness of his (i. e. Christ's) Life imputed to me, as my Sins are pardon'd by God for the Bitterness of the Death he suffer'd for them; his Righteousness being as really, by Faith, imputed to me, as my Sins were laid upon him.*

And again; ∴ *I believe that my Person is only justified by the Merits of Christ imputed to me.*

And in Explication of that Article which he is upon, he saith, *As we by Faith lay hold upon it (i. e. Christ's Obedience) so God, thro' Grace, imputes it to*

* *Bishop Beveridge's Brief Notes, Vol. I. p. 361.*

† *Private Thoughts on Religion, Artic. 6.*

∴ *Article 8.*

us, as if it had been performed by us in our own Persons. And hence it is, that as in one place Christ is said to be made sin for us, 2 Cor. 5. 21. so in another place he is said to be made our righteousness, 1 Cor. 1. 30. And in the forecited place as he is said to be made sin for us, so we are said to be made righteousness in him. But what Righteousness? Our own? No, the righteousness of God, radically his, but imputatively ours.

I will add but one Passage more (tho' there are several others that are worth the inserting here): Upon that Text, *By the obedience of one shall many be made righteous*, he hath this following Commentary: * *We are righteous by one in the same Sense, as we are said to be made sinners by one. This is done by having Christ's Righteousness, as we had Adam's Sin, imputed to us.* — *It is impossible we should be accepted as righteous before God, unless we have some other Righteousness than our own imputed to us.* 4. Rom. 6. 11. Hence Christ was pleas'd to be obedient even unto death for us, that so by his Obedience imputed to us, we might be accepted of as righteous. This is the Reverend Prelate that Dr. Whitby laughs at, in his Annotations, for Espousing such Primitive and Ancient Doctrines as these. Had he not great Reason then to defend his Annotations in this late Undertaking of his? Hath he not by this acquainted the World, that as he had taken up False Apprehensions, so he hath the Obstinacy to persevere in them?

He concludes with an Appendix, in Answer to my Discourse concerning the Fixed Term of Man's Life;

* Bishop Beveridge's Brief Notes, p. 127.

but what a Reverend Person, a Dignified Clergyman of our Church, said of one of the Dr.'s Books, may be said of this Concluding Part which the Dr. calls an *Appendix*: † *He hath said no more than what hath been said before*; viz. That my Opinion takes away the *Freedom* of Men's Actions; That it destroys the *Usefulness and Efficacy of Prayer*; That all *Endearours* are cramped by it. And such ordinary Haranguing as this he stuffs his Paper with; all which is particularly and distinctly answered by me in my Discourse on that Subject. I have there proved, that the Liberty of Human Actions is consistent with God's Determining the precise Number of Men's Days. But because he now insists upon this again as his Chief and Principal Argument, I will shew, that partly thro' Ignorance, and partly thro' Obstinacy, he mistakes and falsely represents the State of the Question, and the Consequences of it. For he tediously insists upon this, That the Fixing of a Certain Time, and other Circumstances, makes all Actions *Necessary*, and therefore void of *Choice* and all *Willingness*; when as every one of Ordinary Capacity knows how to make a Difference between *Necessity*, as it signifies the Certainty of the Event, and *Necessity*, as it imports Coaction and Force. The Divine Decree renders Men's Actions *Necessary* in the former respect, because the Actions will certainly and infallibly be done; but not in the latter, for there is no Force and Compulsion on the Will, so as to violate the Freedom of it. And yet the modest Dr. stares me in the Face, and tells me that *I destroy the Li-*

† Dr. Sherlock's *Vindication of the Rights of Ecclesiastical Authority*.

erty of the Will. But let him disprove this if he can, that a Man's Actions may be *Unavoidable*, and in that Sense *Necessary*, and at the same time *Free* and *Voluntary* in respect of the Actions themselves, which proceed from the Free Principle in him: And it is this that makes the Actions *Good* or *Bad*.

But the Dr. here urges, that *if the Action be sinful, then the Decree makes it Necessary to be done. A Necessary Effect must have a Necessary Cause; and when it is sinful, a Cause that shall necessarily produce that Sin: Now, if that be the depraved Will of Man, there must be first a Necessary Cause of that Depravation, and secondly, a Cause that necessitates that depraved Will thus to act.*

The Dr. would say something, but nothing can be more impertinent and senseless than what he here suggests. This Careless and Thoughtless Man deludes himself by misunderstanding and misapplying the Word *Necessary*; and so his little Efforts of Arguing come to nothing.

To understand how Sin is a *Necessary Effect*, and how it may be said to have a *Necessary Cause*, we must recur to what was said before. All Actions and Events are *Necessary* with regard to the *Certainty* of their coming to pass, and consequently all Evil Actions are so; but they are not *Necessary* as to their immediate *Principle*, the Mind of Man from whence they issue. Which clears up the whole Controversy; and informs us, that the depraved Mind of Man, which is free as to its Operation, is the Cause of all Sinful Actions; and that it is very ignorantly said of the Dr. that there must be a *Necessary Cause*, in this Sense, *of that Depravation*; and that there must be a *Cause that necessitates*, that is, *compels the depraved Will to act*. According to his own *Arminian* Principles, the Will of Man can't possibly be forc'd; and yet he talks of *Necessitating*,

tating, that is, of Forcing the Will. Surely no Man hath a better Talent of blundering than the Dr. It is plain, that he hath more Skill at Quoting some easy Sayings out of the Fathers, which have no hard *Latin* or *Greek* in them, than in framing an Argument, and pursuing the Design of it.

But he urges, that a Man's Actions are *necessary*, because *he can't do otherwise* by reason of the Decree that hath fix'd him, and therefore he acts not *Freely*.

I answer; Tho' the Man with respect to the Decree cannot do otherwise, yet it can't be denied that he *wills* and *chooses* the Action, and that makes it free. The Dr. thinks to impose upon some ignorant Souls, by saying in a Canting way, *Why should a Good God condemn, and even damn Men, for being willing to do what his Decree hath made it necessary for them both to will and to do?* Observe the Inconsistency of this silly Jargon. The Dr. was to prove what he confidently asserted, that the Action was a *Necessary* Action, and therefore the *Freedom of the Will* was destroy'd; but now he owns, that the Man is *willing to do what the Decree hath made it necessary for him both to will and do*. Here is Nonsense piled upon Nonsense, and Contradiction upon Contradiction. The *Will* is taken away, he saith, by the Decree, and yet the Man is *willing*. And again, tho' he holds that *Necessity* destroys a Man's Will, yet here he saith the *Decree makes it necessary for him to will*. There is *Will* then where there is *Necessity*.

And so at length he baffles himself. But indeed the whole is mere Fiction and Dream; for no Calvinist ever held, that *God damned Men for being willing to do what his Decree made it necessary for them*; in the Dr.'s perverse Sense, *to will and do*. For, by *Necessity*, the Dr. means a Force upon the Will of Man. And as for what the Dr. adds about

Neces-

Necessary Causes and Effects, and a *Double Necessity*, it is clear from what hath been said, that it is mere Playing and Fooling with Words, and deluding his Reader with Equivocations. In short, the whole is a Medley of disagreeing Thoughts: He neither knows what himself saith, nor what the *Calvinists* say, tho' he served an Apprenticeship under *Calvin*, as he confesses; yet he will be dabbling in the Controversy.

Again, I have shew'd that the *Prefixing of the Event* doth not render our *Prayers useless*; as in the Case of *Jehosaphat*, who tho' he was ascertain'd of the Success of the Battel, yet put up his Addresses to God. Yet the Dr. is so unreasonable and perverse, as to contend against plain Matter of Fact.

Next, I have proved that the Doctrine of the Fixed Term of Human Life hinders not our *Endeavours* about Preserving our Lives. And I have shew'd, that Industry and Diligence are so far from being superseded by the Divine Counsel, that they are subservient to it. And I have back'd this with Instances in Scripture. I do not know any thing more that I can do.

In the Dr.'s *Appendix* one Passage is very sharp: He saith it is *wickedly said by me*, in my *Veritas Redux*, that God sometimes preserves the Lives of Evil Men to *increase their Guilt*.

If this be *wickedly said*, then what shall we think of what is said in 15. Gen. 16. *For the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full*; is not yet perfect or complete, the Word in the Original being כִּלְיָם : Which is given as the Reason why the *Israelites* shall not return to *Canaan* till the Fourth Generation is past,
and

and not before ; namely, because the Sins of that People of *Canaan* would not be at the Full till that Time ; which Time God had decreed, or else he could not have foretold it here. He foreseeing that they would in their several Generations persevere in the Ways of Wickedness, he resolved to make their Sin their Punishment, and to lengthen out their Years for their greater Condemnation. But when the precise Period shall arrive, when that Heathen People shall proceed to that Height of Wickedness which the Divine Wisdom had determin'd to suffer them to climb up to, and thereby to *increase their Guilt*, then their Lives shall be preserved no longer, but the Fulness and Perfection of Punishment shall be inflicted on them, according to the Fulness and Perfection of their Sins.

Answerably to this way of speaking in *Genesis*, it is said in *51. Jer. 13. Thy end is come, and the measure of thy covetousness.* Which is spoken of the *Babylonians*, concerning whom we are told that the *Measure* (the *Cubit* in the *Hebrew*, because that was the usual Measure of the Ancients) of their Rapine and Oppression, which was the Effect of their Covetousness, was now made up to the full. God had before suffer'd them to live and prosper, and enrich themselves by unjust Violence, but now *the End is come*, the Term of Life is expired, and the Judgments inflicted on them bear proportion to the Increase of their Guilt.

A parallel Place is in *8. Dan. 23. When the transgressions are come to the full, Heb. According to the consummating of the transgressors, or, when the transgressors are consummated*; that is, when the *Jews* are at the Height of their Impiety and Apostasy, the Cruel *Antiochus* shall arise and plague them. The Consummation of all their Sins prepares them for the most Consummate Punishment; and they were
preserved

preserved on purpose to have this inflicted on them, because they had obstinately continued in their Sins?

In the New Testament we have the like way of speaking; as in 23. *Mat.* 32. *Fill ye up the measure of your fathers;* that is, of your Fathers Wickedness, before-mention'd. Christ speaks here to the *Jews*, and tells them what is determined concerning them, namely, that they shall be suffer'd to live, and to proceed in their Persecutions and Outrages, which their Fathers had been guilty of, till they shall arrive to the *μέτρον*, the utmost Measure and highest Pitch of their Predecessors Impiety; till they come up to the full Increase of their Enormities, and consequently of their Guilt. And was this wickedly said by our Blessed Saviour?

I will add one Text more, (to give the Dr. his full Measure) *1 Thess.* 2. 16. where we read that the Unbelieving and Persecuting *Jews* were permitted to continue in the World, and to go on in their Wickedness, *εις το ἀναρτιῶσαι αὐτῶν τὰς ἀμαρτίας*, to fill up their Sins; that is, to increase their Sins and Guilt, as it follows in that Verse. And will the Dr. now persist in saying that this was wickedly said by me? If I have for ever lost his good Graces for this, I shall not much lament the Loss.

Before I part with him, let me take notice of one Thing. Whereas I had cited, and paraphras'd upon those Words of that Holy and Wise Man *Job*, *Is there not an appointed time to man upon earth? Are not his days also like the days of an hireling? His days are determin'd, the number of his months are with thee: Thou hast appointed his bounds that he cannot pass.* *Job* 1. 14. 5. and thence inferr'd that the Life

of Man is determin'd and fixt; the Dr. is pleas'd to tell us, that *we have no Reason to believe that every thing which Job there utter'd was spoken by Divine Assistance, or the immediate Inspiration of the Holy Ghost.*

Afterwards he saith, *What Assurance can we have that the Words cited from these Two Chapters were Divine Truths, and not rather Opinions that prevail'd among the Edomites?* This is more like Spinoza, or Hobbs, than a Divine of the Church of England. After this rate, no man is able to know what Part of the Bible is Canonical Scripture, or whether any of it be so. The Dr. might with as good Reason tell us, that when Solomon saith, *To every thing there is a season, and particularly a time to be born, and a time to die,* that is, a Certain and Determined Time for both, 3. Eccl. 1, 2. he delivers it only as an Opinion that prevail'd among the Jews at that time, but it was no Divine Truth. So when the Apostle saith, *God hath determined the times before appointed,* Acts 26. he speaks not his own Sense, or what is really true, but talks after the foolish way of Speaking which he had pick'd up somewhere. Yea, our Blessed Saviour himself, when he saith that *his hour was not yet come,* 7. John 30. and afterwards when he saith *his hour is come,* 13. John 1. 17. 1. he spake only after the vulgar way of the Galileans, whom he had conversed with. This hath as good Foundation as what the Dr. saith of the foresaid Passages in the Book of Job; spoken by that Holy Man. And then, in vain have the Ancient Fathers of the Church, in their Homilies and Sermons, quoted any Passages out of this Book; In vain do the Divines and Preachers at this day do the same, to confirm the Doctrines they deliver; for 'tis likely that what is alledged by them thence, is only the

the private Opinion and Fancy of some of the *Idol-mans*; with whom this Writer convers'd. It is a sign that the Dr. is hard put to it, when he dares make an Inspired Penman of Holy Scripture a Liar; that his own Doctrine may seem true.

To This, without doubt, he had from the *Deists*, who was one of his *Reformers*, he saith, and taught him to have Right Notions concerning some Points of Divinity: And it is most acceptable and grateful to the whole Herd of *Deists*, to see this their new Convert blast the Credit and Authority of the Bible. And this is that which the Church of *Rome* would have; that is, the Scriptures disparaged and vilified, and their Authority despised: And none was fitter to do this than Dr. *Whitby*, who hath sported with those Writings, and perverted so many Places of Holy Writ.

Thus we see who it is that pretends to defend God and Religion, but betrays this Cause by maintaining false and pernicious Propositions, and fathering them on the Bible. This confirms all that I have said of him before: This approaches to that which *Job* mentions with Abhorrence, *speaking wickedly for God, and talking deceitfully for him*, Chap. 13. v. 17.

To shut up all: I am afraid that this is one Account that may be given of this Part of the Dr.'s Undertaking; namely, his Quarrelling with the *Fixed Term of Life*; that he, being an *Unsettled* and *Changeable* Man, (as I have heretofore given his Character,) hath no good Opinion of the *Immutable Decrees*, and the *Predetermination* of all Things, especially of the Life

of Man. One would be inclined to think that he doth not love to hear of the *Limited Terms* of it, because he would have his *Declining Years* yet *lengthned out*, to serve the Cause he hath lately espous'd, to join with the *Arminian* Factors in *Dissettling* the Received Notions of the Christian Religion, in *Distorting* the Genuine Sense of Scripture, and, in plain *English*, (which I am very loth to pronounce) to do more *Mischief* in the Church.

And I have not been able to find any one who is so bold as to say that the Church of England is not a Church of Christ, or that it is not a Church of the same Christ as the Church of Rome is. I have not seen any one who is so bold as to say that the Church of England is not a Church of the same Christ as the Church of Rome is. I have not seen any one who is so bold as to say that the Church of England is not a Church of the same Christ as the Church of Rome is.

And I have not been able to find any one who is so bold as to say that the Church of England is not a Church of Christ, or that it is not a Church of the same Christ as the Church of Rome is. I have not seen any one who is so bold as to say that the Church of England is not a Church of the same Christ as the Church of Rome is. I have not seen any one who is so bold as to say that the Church of England is not a Church of the same Christ as the Church of Rome is.

And I have not been able to find any one who is so bold as to say that the Church of England is not a Church of Christ, or that it is not a Church of the same Christ as the Church of Rome is. I have not seen any one who is so bold as to say that the Church of England is not a Church of the same Christ as the Church of Rome is. I have not seen any one who is so bold as to say that the Church of England is not a Church of the same Christ as the Church of Rome is.

THE

The Design of them is to expose the Mistakes, and
to illustrate the Wishes of the former Undertaking,
which I had said was: But such is his Unhappy
Folly that he rather adds to them, and runs into new
Errors and even greater than before. I will spare
only on a few of them, and from thence the Intri-

THE
APPENDIX.

And though the Intri-
guing may give some Trouble to the Reader,
it will be repaid by the Pleasure of the
Adventur'd, and with the Advantage of per-

NOW, when my hand is in, the Reader
will not be offended, I hope, if I trou-
ble him with some Reflexions on a few
Passages in a late Pamphlet of Mr. Robert Lightfoot,
which is no otherwise considerable, than for the Ig-
norance and Insolence which may be discern'd in
it, and the gross Mistakes, Forgeries and Calum-
nies it is stuff'd with; and, in a Word, for that
Writer's Inability to handle a Pen himself, and to
judge of other Men's Performances. All which
might have been conceal'd from the World, and he
might have pass'd for a good honest Country Priest,
if he had not rashly adventur'd to employ the Press,
and thereby to proclaim his Folly. Tho' what he
saith is far from deserving a Formal Reply, yet I
will take this Opportunity of saying something to
it by the bye. The things which I alledg'd against
him were so Perspicuous and Obvious that there had
been no need of adding any thing to clear them,
and set them in a plainer Light, if his Boasting
and confident Pretensions had not made it Requi-
site, with Respect to some Credulous Persons into
whose Hands his late Papers might have come.

The Design of them is to excuse the Mistakes and palliate the Follies of his former Undertaking, which I had laid open: But such is his Unhappiness that he rather adds to them, and runs into new Errors, and even grosser than before. I will glance only on a few of them, and from thence the Intelligent Reader will soon perceive how easily the others may be accounted for. And though this Undertaking may give some Trouble to the Reader, who may be thought not to concern himself in our Particular Controversies, yet it will be attended with his Satisfaction, and with the Adversary's perpetual Shame and Confusion.

I shall wholly pass by the Merry Part of his Pamphlet; namely, about *Drinking and Smoaking*, where he affronts the civil Reader with his Ribaldry, and acts the Part of Poor ROBIN: But I shall only take notice of and reply to what may seem to some prejudic'd Persons to carry with it some shew of Plausibility. Thus in his 9th Page, &c. he defends the common Opinion of his Brethren, that all Dissenters and Nonconformists are Schismaticks, and though they are tolerated by our Christian Governors, and more particularly by the Consent and Act of the most Reverend the Archbishops, and the Right Reverend the Bishops, yet they are Guilty of downright Schism. To which I answer, I am not so clear-sighted as to see that they are Guilty of the Sin of Schism; but this I plainly see that they had a License given them even by our Spiritual Fathers and Representatives of the Church, to exercise their Religion according to the Dictate of their Consciences, and that with Impunity. Now, it would be a very scurvvy Compliment to these our Reverend Fathers and Prelates, to tell them that they voted for the Tolerating of Schismaticks. No; it was from a Paternal Compassion to the Souls of their Brethren,

thren, and from an earnest Desire to cultivate Peace and good Will among Protestants, and especially those at Home, that the Guides and Overseers of our Church condescended to this Indulgence: And this, and only this is the Motive that hath prevail'd with me to speak in their behalf. And surely I ought not to be blamed for being Ambitious to imitate so Laudable Examples. I have so great a Respect and Esteem for those our Spiritual Governors, as to think that they are good Judges as to the Point of *Schism*, and that they are of such Integrity and Conscience that they would not wilfully tolerate it. But those of Mr. *Lightfoot's* Kidney are not guilty of too much Civility and Reverence to their Superiors and Rulers, though sometimes they boast of their transcendent Loyalty and Obedience to them. We see in the present Case that they give little Proof of these Qualities, and they think to cover their Disobedience and Refractoriness by their talking against *Schism*.

And 'tis worth our observing who are the *Chief Men* that do this, and cry out against the Dissenters as *Damn'd Schismatics*. They are those very Men that separate from our Church, and publickly defend their Separation. Mr. *Dodwell* in his Book entitul'd, *The Separation of Churches, &c.* hath in above Six hundred Pages in 4to most flagrantly writ against *Separation* and *Disunion from the Bishop*, and in his *Preface* he positively asserts, that *those who separate from our Church are guilty of sinning against the Holy Ghost, and unto Death*; and yet this very Man hath in the Face of the World separated himself from our Church, and disunited himself from his Bishop, and from all the Bishops: And this he hath done for a long time, though indeed of late he is graciously pleas'd to give his Brethren leave to come to Church. So Dr. *Hickes* in several Places of his Writings hath inveigh'd with uncommon Zeal and

Fierceness against the *Dissenters* for their disuniting themselves from our Church as to external Communion, and yet he openly and publickly refuses to join with it. And it would raise a Man's bilious Humour to see how that Notorious *Dissenter* from our Church (as well as from our State) Mr. *Lesley*, mauls the *Dissenters* and *Nonconformists*, and roars against them as *Schismatics*, and yet lives in a profess'd Separation from the Church of *England*. Is it not entertaining, to hear a Man cry *the Church, the Church*, and yet to see him abandon the Church of which he was a Member? He remonstrates against Separation, and yet is the Head of the *Nonjurors*. Thus we see all is Cheat and Disguise and Contradiction among these Men; and at the bottom of all, is a *Popish Prince* and a *French Government*. I will not make any Reflexions here on those who heartned and encourag'd this Writer, and were Benefactors to him, shewing thereby that they had a Kindness for one sort of *Schismatics*, though not for another, as they are reputed by them.

But Mr. *Lightfoot* thinks he knocks all these latter *Schismatics* on the head, by saying, *The true way to know whether a Separation from a Church be sinful or no, is not to enquire whether our Governors* (no, tho' they are our *Spiritual Governors* to whom we have sworn *Canonical Obedience*) *give us leave to separate; but what Grounds and Reasons there are for separating*: As if our *Bishops*, the lawful *Governors* of our Church, who consented to the tolerating of the Separation which we are speaking of, did not know what *Grounds and Reasons* there are for it; or as if they had done what they did in this *Affair* without good *Grounds and Reasons*. Still we see that this our *Clergyman*, who pretends great *Deference* to our *Prelates*, shews he hath a very mean *Opinion* of them, and will not allow them to act upon sufficient *Grounds and Reasons*. The *Dissenters* from our
Church

Church have a thousand times told us what are the Grounds and Reasons why they can't maintain Communion with it; and it is most certain that they are good Grounds and warrantable Reasons *as to them*, (whether they be so *in themselves* or not) and this justifies their Separation as to their *own Consciences*. And we of the Church of *England* profess that we act by the *same* Principle and Guide, in our separating from the Church of *Rome*. Wherefore should not our Charity, as well as our Prudence, prompt us to be cautious in stigmatizing the Orthodox and Conscientious Dissenters with the infamous Brand of *Schism*? Must we pronounce them all *Damn'd*, and doom them to the Infernal Pit, as many Hot Churchmen do? What is this the Language of those Men who at the *Burial* of the most profligate Wretch, say, *In sure and certain hope of the Resurrection to eternal Life*?

To be short, I will freely give my Opinion concerning the Sober and Moderate Dissenters among us, (for of such only I speak); I consider that they are our Fellow-Christians, and Fellow-Protestants, that they believe and acknowledge the same Articles of Christian Faith with the Church of *England*, they serve and worship the *same* Blessed Jesus without any Mixtures of Superstition and Idolatry; they profess to live according to the *same* Holy Rule, the Sacred Scriptures. They have the *same* Principle of Conscience in their Breasts that we have; and we can't be so uncharitable as not to think that when they leave this World they go to the *same* Place of Happiness that we look for. And shall we meet them there, and yet persecute them here? No, by no means. It is true, they differ from us as to some Modes of Worship and some Points of Discipline, but we all know that these are not of the Essence and Substance of our Holy Religion. Wherefore let us endeavour to win them to us by Argument
and

and Reasoning, not by Violence and Rigor. Let us treat them as Brethren, with Meekness, Moderation and Forbearance; and the rather, because for this Practice we have so Authentick an Example as that of our Superiors and Higher Powers, who (as appears by the *Act of Indulgence*) were of Opinion, that the Freeing of some of our Brethren from that Constraint they were under, was most conducing to the Quiet of the Church, as well as it is a sensible Relief to Tender Consciences. So much for the First Point; wherein I declare I differ from Mr. *Lightfoot*.

In the next place, he undertakes to vindicate Archbishop Tillotson, p. 15, 16, &c. And from this time I shall give him the Title of *Vindicator*, tho' it is certain that no Man ever deserv'd it less. He labours to bring off the Archbishop from the Imputation of Asserting *Justification by Works*, and produces Quotations out of his Writings for that purpose: But alas! the Archbishop is too Wary and Cunning for such a shallow Scribe: He knew how to smooth it, and to make such a one as he believe from a Passage or two sprinkled in his Writings, that he was for *Justification by Faith only*. But no Man of Consideration ever thought so; after he had read the Archbishop's Sermons on the Subject of *Justification*; for 'tis the profess'd and avow'd Doctrine not only of the Church of Rome, and of the Disciples of *Socinus*, and of Dr. *Hammond*, Bishop *Fowler*, Dr. *More*, Dr. *Cave*, Dr. *Sherlock*, Mr. *Norris*, Dr. *Blackall*, but of the foresaid Archbishop, that we are justified by Works as well as by Faith. He that denies this, hath not read any thing of these Authors on that Head, or he grossly dissembles; which latter is the detestable Crime of

of our present *Vindicator*, in this Matter now before us, as well as at other times.

He soundly sweats and toils, to confute what I had said of the Archbishop; namely, That he *disallows of Justification by Faith only*; and that he *maintains Justification by Works*. It is well worth our Remarking how he goes to work here, that it may be seen what a special Knack he hath of Confutation. He quotes out of one of the Homilies these Words: [“ The very sure and lively Christian
 “ Faith is, not only to believe all Things of God
 “ which are contained in Holy Scripture, but also
 “ is an earnest Trust and Confidence in God that
 “ he doth regard us, and that he is careful over
 “ us, as the Father is over the Child that he loves;
 “ and that he will be merciful to his for his only
 “ Son’s sake; and that we have our Saviour Christ
 “ our perpetual Advocate and Priest; in whose
 “ only Merits, Oblation and Suffering, we do
 “ trust that our Offences be continually wash’d and
 “ purg’d, whensoever we (repenting truly) do
 “ return to him with our whole Heart, stedfastly
 “ determining with our selves, thro’ his Grace, to
 “ obey and serve him, in keeping his Command-
 “ ments, and never to turn back again to Sin.
 “ Such is the True Faith that the Scripture doth
 “ so much commend.

The Substance of which Words is this; That *True Justifying Faith* consists in *Assent* and *Trust*: The first is Believing all that is contain’d in the Holy Scripture; The Second is Confiding in the Fatherly Love of God to us, thro’ Jesus Christ our Priest and Advocate; and trusting that our Sins shall be done away; when we return unto God by Repentance, and resolve, thro’ his Grace, to obey and serve him.

These,

These, and no more, are the Two Grand Parts of Justifying Faith, which this Homily here mentions: But the *Vindicator* finds Two more, namely, *Repentance* and *Obedience to God*: And he tells us, that the Archbishop exactly agrees with the Homily; for he makes Justifying Faith consist of these Four Parts, *Assent, Trust, Repentance, Obedience*, Vol. XII. Sermon 9. Now 'tis plain that the Homily assigns but these Two Ingredients of Faith, namely, *Assent* and *Trust*; which latter we find explain'd by Trusting in the Love and Mercy of God, that for Christ's Sake our Sins shall be forgiven if we repent of them, and heartily turn unto God; and obey him. But can one gather hence, that Repentance, and Obedience, and Good Works, are Parts of Justifying Faith? Or can we truly say, that Dr. *Tillotson* agrees with the Homily? Yet this is vouch'd by the *Vindicator*. Certainly there cannot be a greater Affront done to a Reader, than to offer such wretched Stuff as this to him. Every Child hath Understanding enough to comprehend this, that the *Vindicator* wilfully mistakes *Four* for *Two*.

I take no pleasure in Exposing any Man's Weakness, but here I'm necessarily engaged to do it, and to request the Reader to observe it; because it is not only Wilful, but Notorious; and because so much Confidence is tack'd to it. He hath the Front to aver, that the Archbishop teaches the Doctrine of Justification by Faith only, notwithstanding he hath himself produced a Sermon of the Archbishop, where he makes Justifying Faith consist not only in Assent and Trust, but *Repentance* and *Obedience*, or *Good Works*. Such wretched Absurdities and Contradictions doth this poor Man fill his Paper with. This is the Fate of those Writers, who will be maintaining a Cause that can't be maintain'd.

And

And as it plainly appears that the Passage in the forecited *Homily* is nothing to his purpose, so now I will lay before the Reader the express Words which we meet with in the first Part of the *Homily of Good Works*; which will convince any Rational Man that the *Vindicator* was stupidly overseen in his former Quotation; and that the Doctrine of *Justification by Faith only*, which I asserted, is the very same which the Composers of the *Homilies* in plain Terms have deliver'd.

The Words are these, (and they are taken out of the Writings of an *Ancient Father* of the Christian Church, which makes them the more Authentick) *I can shew a man, that by Faith without Works lived, and came to Heaven; but without Faith never man had Life. The Thief that was hanged when Christ suffer'd, Believed only, and the most merciful God justified him. And because no man shall say again that he lacked Time to do Good Works, for else he would have done them, Truth it is, and I will not contend therein; but this I will surely affirm, that Faith only saved him. And immediately after it is added, Faith by it self saved him; but Works by themselves never justified any Man.*

What can be more positive than this? And who is there that reads it, can believe that the forecited Passage in the other *Homily*, makes *Repentance* and *Good Works* a Part of *Justifying Faith*; which yet the *Vindicator* obstinately asserts?

I will adjoin another Remarkable Determination of our Church, in another of her *Homilies*, about this Matter. * *Faith* (saith she) *doth not shut out Repentance, Hope, Love, Dread, and Fear of God, to be join'd with Faith in every man that is justified; but it*

* *The first Part of the Homily of Salvation.*

shutteth them out from the Office of *Justifying*. It is the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, we see, that tho' Faith is accompanied with those foremention'd Qualities, yet they are all excluded from the Office of *Justifying*; and it is *Faith alone* that hath that Honour given to it.

Well; but the *Vindicator* would persuade us still, that the Archbishop holds Justification by Faith only, and not by Works, p. 17. and he produces some Passages out of his Writings to prove this. Let us then examine them: And this we may be sure of, that the Particular Words which he lays the greatest Stress on, are those which are printed in a great Character, as thus: [We cannot hope FOR OUR OWN RIGHTEOUSNESS, to be justify'd and accepted with God, and upon the Merits of it to have our Sins pardoned, much less to be rewarded with Eternal Life. — It is not for the Merit of our Repentance and Righteousness that these Blessings are conferr'd upon us, but for the MERITORIOUS OBEDIENCE AND SUFFERINGS of our Blessed Saviour. — NOT FOR ANY WORKS OF RIGHTEOUSNESS that we have done, but of his Mercy he saves. — FOR THE ALONE MERIT of this Sacrifice, God is graciously pleas'd to forgive us all our Sins upon our true Repentance.]

It may suffice to mention these Passages only, because he hath marked these out, and I don't see any other marked. But who sees not how blindly and impertinently these Quotations are made? For he undertook to prove from these Passages, that Dr. *Tillotson* did not hold Justification by Works; but here is no such thing so much as hinted by the Dr.: For he only saith, we are not justified for our own Righteousness which we have done; that is, as he explains it, not for any Me-

rit in our Works. This is all he saith, (and many a Roman Catholick will say as much); but he no where saith, that we are not justified by our own Righteousness, or by our Works, which is a quite different thing from the former. Yea, he maintains that we are justified by Works, even when he is said to assert that we are justified by Faith only; for he holds that Obedience, or Works, are Part of Justifying Faith. Therefore, when he saith in another Passage quoted by his *Vindicator*, that *through Faith in the Blood of Christ, not by Confidence in our selves and our own Righteousness, we obtain Remission of Sins and Eternal Life*; every one knows what he means: For tho' he excludes *Confidence in our Righteousness*, yet he holds that we are justified by our *Righteousness*; and even when he saith this is done thro' *Faith in the blood of Christ*, he doth as good as say that it is also done by *Works*; for (as hath been said) he maintains that Good Works are a Part of Justifying Faith: For he, and the Generality of his Brethren, confound *Faith* and *Works*. This is the known Divinity of our Modern Clergymen, but disclaimed by our own Reformers, and by the Reformed Churches abroad.

See then how vainly and ignorantly the *Vindicator* cries out, *How utterly doth the Archbishop, in these words, disclaim Righteousness or Justification by our own Works?* There is no such thing disclaimed; he only renounces *Justification for our Works*; that is, as he explains himself, he doth not declare them to be Meritorious. Who then can trust to this *Vindicator*, who either doth not understand the plain Words of the Person he quotes, or else designedly perverts them? And who will attend to a Man that enters upon a Controversy, (as this of *Justification*), whether by Faith, or by Works, or both) and yet knows nothing of it, and is not so
 much

much as acquainted with the very Terms of the Question? Surely the Reader will not forget this, when the next Controversy is started.

In the next Pages, 21, 22, 23. which have Reference to what I had said of Dr. Lucas, about *Natural Gifts*, and *Sins of Infirmity*, he very submissively confesses most of the Things which I charged him with, tho' he is not so fair and ingenuous as formally to own it. But we may perceive, that being sensible of the Weakness of what he had said, he withdraws his Plea, and prudently declines what he is not able to answer.

P. 26, 27. according to his known way of being perverse in every thing, he will not allow that my Quotation out of Bishop Pearson is a Proof of that Prelate's Asserting the *Irresistibility of Divine Grace*; tho' nothing can be more evident to every Man of Sense. For when the Bishop saith, *A Translation from the State of Death into Eternal Life, is not to be effected without Absolute Authority and Irresistible Power*, he assigns this as a necessary Part of the *Kingly Office of Christ*, which is exercis'd in Ruling his Chosen People, and Subduing their Enemies. Wherefore the Bishop, without doubt, means by *the Translation from the State of Death into Eternal Life*, the very same with *being deliver'd from the power of darkness, and being translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son*, I. Col. 12. that is, being freed from the Dominion of Sin and the Bondage of Satan; and advanced to the Privilege of being the Faithful Subjects of Christ's Kingdom: The same with *passing from death unto life*, 5. John 24. 1 John 3. 14. that is, from a State of Sin, which makes us obnoxious to Everlasting Death, unto a State of Grace, which fits us for an Endless Life of Glory. Yet the *Vindicator*

ator stands to it obstinately, that *the Bishop only speaks of our Translation from the Grave to Eternal Life*, p. 28. Which too plainly evidences, that the *Vindicator* is a Stranger to the Common and Receiv'd Principles of Divinity: he talks as if he had never look'd into a Commentator or a Catechism. He hath not so much as consulted the *Whole Duty of Man*, (which is thumb'd by every one of his Parish) where he is told, that this is one thing that * *Christ is to do for us*, namely, *to send his Holy Spirit into our Hearts, to govern and rule us, to give us Strength to overcome Temptations to Sin, and to do all that he now under the Gospel requires of us. In this he is our KING, it being the Office of a King to govern and rule us, and subdue our Enemies.*

The Parishioners of *Odel* now must instruct their Rector, the Sheep must feed the Shepherd, and tell him that he hath put a Book into their Hands which acquaints them with the Nature of the *Kingly Office* of Christ, by Virtue of which Christ is to Rule in the Hearts and Lives of all true Christians; and yet he himself is ignorant of this, and asserts, that Christ's *Kingly Office* obliges him not to any thing of this nature; that is, not to free Sinners from the Dominion of their Lusts, and from the Power of the Devil, but requires of him to raise the Dead at the last Day, *to translate them from the Grave*: These are his Words.

Who cannot but wonder, that a Man that undertakes to be a Writer, and to treat of the Great Points of Theology, yet hath not learnt the most Common Notions belonging to it? He stands up

* *Pref. concerning the Necessity of Caring for the Soul.*

for *Catechising*, and thinks *Afternoon-Sermons* to be but *Creeping Things*; and yet a poor *Catechumen* hath more *Divinity*; than this mighty *Vindicator* of *Archbishops* and *Bishops*.

Whereas I had said that *Bishop Andrews* agreed with *Archbishop Whitgift*; as to the main; about the *Lambeth Articles*; he doth not take notice of those plain Passages in the Manuscript in *Trinity-College Library*; which I refer'd to; and which expressly set forth *Bishop Andrews's* Agreement with the *Calvinistical Points*; as to the main. Wherefore now I will place them before his Eyes. But first, for the Reader's Satisfaction, I will set down the *Lambeth Articles*; that is, those Articles which were unanimously agreed upon by the *Archbishops* of both *Provinces*, and some *Bishops*; and several other *Learned Men* of the Church; and were sent from *Lambeth* to the *University of Cambridge* by the famous *Archbishop Whitgift*; in the Year 1595; for the *Stating* and *Settling* those *Doctrines* which related to the *Five Points* (as they have been since called) and some others belonging to them. I will, I say, set these down here; (tho' I have formerly recited them in another place) because from thence we shall learn what was the Sense of our *Learnedest Divines* about the Matters we are now speaking of, and from thence the groundless Opinions of the *Vindicator* and his Brethren, will be laid open and confuted.

The Articles were these:

—1. *Deus ab æterno prædestinavit quosdam ad vitam; quosdam reprobovit ad mortem.* 2. *Causa Mœrens aut Efficiens prædestinationis ad vitam non est prævisio fidei aut perseverantiæ, aut bonorum operum, aut ullius rei*
quæ

quæ insit in personis prædestinatis, sed voluntas beneplaciti Dei. 3. Prædestinatorum præfinitus & certus est numerus; quæ nec augeri nec minui potest. 4. Qui non sunt prædestinati ad salutem, necesse est propter peccata sua damnabuntur. 5. Vera, vivax & justificans fides & Spiritus Dei justificans non extinguitur, non excidit, non evanescit in Electis, aut finaliter aut totaliter. 6. Homo verè fidelis, i. e. fide justificante præditus, certus est plebrosiâ fidei de remissione peccatorum suorum; & salute sempiternâ per Christum. 7. Gratia salutaris non tribuitur, non communicatur, non conceditur universis hominibus, quæ servari possint, si voluerint. 8. Nemo potest venire ad Christum, nisi datum ei fuerit, & nisi Pater revelaverit. Et omnes homines non trahuntur à Patre, ut veniant ad Filium. 9. Non est possumus in arbitrio aut potestate alicujusque hominis servari.

In English thus:

1. God from Eternity predestinated certain Men unto Life: Certain Men he reprobated unto Death.
2. The Moving or Efficient Cause of Predestination unto Life, is not the Foresight of Faith, or Perseverance, or Good Works, or of any thing that is in the Person predestinated, but only the Good Will and Pleasure of God.
3. The Number of the Predestinated is predetermined and certain, and can't be increas'd or diminish'd.
4. Those who are not predestinated to Salvation, shall necessarily be damned for their Sins.
5. True, Living, and Justifying Faith, and the Sanctifying Spirit of God, is not extinguish'd, fails not, vanishes not in the Elect, either totally or finally.
6. A truly Faithful Man, that is, one endued with Justifying Faith, is certain, with a full Assurance of Faith, that his Sins are pardon'd, and that he shall eternally be saved by Christ.
7. Saving Grace

is not given, communicated, granted to All Men, by which they may be saved if they will. 8. No Man can come unto Christ, unless it be given him, and unless the Father draws him: And all Men are not drawn by the Father, that they may come unto the Son. 9. It is not in the Will or Power of every one to be saved.

These were the Articles; and they plainly show what was the Judgment of our Churchmen in those Days. And among other Celebrated Divines, Dr. *Andrews*, one of great Study and Penetration, was desired by the Archbishop of *Canterbury*; to let him have his Opinion concerning these Articles; which he distinctly did, and in that very Manuscript in *Trinity-College Library*, which I appeal'd to, this following express Account is given by him: Whence the Reader will see whether I had not Reason to assert, that Bishop *Andrews* was a Calvinist as to the main.

Upon the First Article about *Predestination and Reprobation*, he hath these Words; *Esse apud Deum in æternâ illâ suâ, sive Præscientiâ dicere libeat, sive Scientiâ, quâ videt quæ non sunt tanquam ea quæ sunt, prædestinatos, quosdam, quosdam reprobos, rectè assertitur. Scripturæ verba sunt, ωὲ ἁλαβόλῆς νόου, i. e. ab æterno elegisse Deum nos, 1. Eph. 4. & versu proximo, prædestinasse. Elegisse autem ἐν τῷ νόου, de mundo, 15. Jo. 19. Quare, non omnes in mundo, sed quosdam de mundo, nec enim alioqui foret Electio. Quos verò non elegit, & eligendo approbavit (ut Electionis natura fert) reprobasse. Nec ignotæ Sacris Literis voces τὸ ἀποθῆναι, rejiciendi, 11. Rom. 2. τὸ ἀποδοκιμάζειν, reprobandi, 12. Heb. 17. It is, saith he, rightly asserted (in the *Lambeth Articles*) that in God's Eternal Prescience, or Knowledge, (call it
which*

which ye will) whereby he sees those Things that are not, as if they were, some are predestinated, and some are reprobated. The Words of Scripture are, that [from the foundation of the world, that is, from Eternity, God hath chosen us,] 1. Eph. 4. and in the next Verse [hath predestinated us]; that [he hath chosen them out of the world] 15. John 19. Wherefore, not All in the World, but Some out of the World, are chosen, for otherwise it would not be a Choice. And as for those who were not chosen, and approved of by that Choice, (as the very Nature of Chusing imports) they were reprobated by God. Nor are unknown to us in the Holy Scriptures those Terms of [casting away], 11. Rom. 2. and [rejecting or reprobating], 12. Heb. 17. Thus Dr. Andrews asserts the Articles of Election and Reprobation; and that he means Absolute Election and Reprobation, is clear from the following Words. For,

Upon the Second Article, concerning the Cause of Predestination, he gives his Judgment thus; *Referenda ad Deum solum Prædestinatio nostra*: Our Predestination is to be referred to God alone; therefore not to the Foresight of Faith or Good Works.

As to the Third Article, concerning the Certain Number of the Predestinated, he confirms it by St. Augustin's Words; *Eorum qui prædestinati sunt ita certus est numerus, ut nec addatur eis quispiam, nec minuat ex eis*: So certain is the Number of those that are predestinated, that none can be added to them, nor can any be taken from them. And he further backs the Truth of this Article by a known Passage out of Prosper, and by those Words of the Apostle, *The Lord knoweth them that are his*, 2 Tim. 2. 19.

The Fourth Article, of the *Necessary Damnation of some for their Sins*, is agreed to by him, and confirm'd by 20. Rev. last Ven. and by a Sentence out of St. Ambrose. But by *Necessary Damnation* he understands *Certain Damnation*. It is true, he professes, under this Head, his Backwardness to engage in any unnecessary Disputes about Predestination and Reprobation, but at last he declares, that he is willing to submit his Sentiments in this and the whole Matter, and about the Articles themselves, to the most grave and prudent Judgment of the Archbishop. Do not these Words evidence the Truth of what I had said, that Bishop Andrews agrees with Archbishop Whitgift, as to the main?

Upon the Fifth Article, concerning the *Losing of Faith and the Spirit*, he saith, *Eidem in electis finaliter excidere, vel spiritum in illis finaliter extinguere, nemo, credo, dixerit*. I believe no man will say, that Faith in the Elect doth finally fail, or that the Spirit is finally extinguish'd in them.

The Sixth Article, of the *Certainty of Salvation*, is perfectly agreed to by him.

The Seventh Article, of the *Collation of Grace*, as 'tis understood in one Sense, is doubted of by him; and he mentions on this Occasion the Opinion of Three or Four Fathers, but he doth not deny the Proposition.

The Eighth Article, of *being drawn by the Father*, is fully consented to, and confirm'd by Scripture and Ancient Fathers.

The Ninth Article, of the Power, or rather Impotence of Man's Will, as to Salvation, is entirely own'd by him.

From the whole then let the Reader judge, with what Reason and Truth the *Vindicator* could say, that he would prove from the foresaid Manuscript, that Bishop Andrews was no Calvinist, p. 28. Surely he thinks his Readers are very blockish and stupid; that can be imposed upon after this vile rate. But as sure it is, that he that forges such gross Falsities as these, and endeavours to thrust them on the Reader's Belief, can't expect to have any Faith to be given to him.

And as for what the *Vindicator* hath alledged out of the MS. as deliver'd by Bishop Andrews, we know that he is very unhappy in all his Quotations; they never come up to his purpose, tho' he hales and pulls them without Mercy: And so 'tis here. It is not possible for any Man in his Wits, to make what he here quotes speak on his Side, that is, to assert the *Arminian* Cause. Now then I claim the Performance of the *Vindicator's* Promise, namely, That if the Dr. (meaning me) can reconcile this with Calvinism, then I will (saith he) freely retract what I asserted, and own my self to have been in an Error, p. 30. You must then retract; there is no Remedy against it; for every Unprejudic'd Reader will grant, that what the Learned Bishop saith, may well be reconciled with Calvinism, nay, 'tis Calvinism it self. You must then own your self to have been in an Error; tho' I know it is the most hateful thing that can be put upon you, and it will half kill you. But this you must be forc'd to submit to, for the plain and express Words of Bishop Andrews,

in the foresaid MS. undeniably shew him to have been a Friend to the *Calvinian Doctrines*.

And here I desire the Reader to take notice that all these *Lambeth Articles* were word for word inserted into the Articles of Religion unanimously agreed upon by the Archbishops and Bishops (most of them *English Divines*) and the whole Representative Body of the Clergy in *Ireland* in the *Convocation* 1615, before the Synod of *Dort* was held; and therefore they could not be byassed by that. No, it was purely from the Uprightness of their own Judgments, that they agreed in these Points of Divinity. And consequently if another Convocation of Protestant Archbishops and Bishops, and the rest of the Clergy, made up wholly of *English Divines*, should destroy these Theological Doctrines, and assert the quite contrary to them, in what a miserable Condition would the *Articles of our Religion* be, and how Arbitrary would our Belief look?

P. 23. He saith he undertook to defend this Assertion of *Dr. Tillotson*, *That all the Duties of the Christian Religion which respect God, are no other than what Natural Light prompts Men to, excepting the Sacraments, and praying to God in the Name and by the Mediation of Jesus Christ.* To confute which, I shewed that Natural Light could never prompt Men to these following Duties, which we are obliged to as Christians; Namely, To believe the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity; to acknowledge our Corruption and Depravity by the Fall of *Adam*; to be acquainted with the Way of our Recovery by the Incarnation of the Son of God; and by his making Satisfaction for our Sins; to know the Terms of the Covenant of Grace made by God in and through *Jesus Christ*; to inform our selves of the Certainty of a Future State, and of the endless Duration of it; to beg the Grace and Assistance of the Holy Spirit; and sever-

ral other Duties of the Christian Religion. I named: And consequently Dr. *Tillotson* is deceived in his Notion of the Christian Religion. Here now I expected that the *Vindicator* would attempt to clear his Idol of this Imputation, but he hath not one Syllable to say; he doth not so much as offer to disprove what I had asserted. Here he stands as mute as somebody did when he kept his Act for his Batchelor of Divinity's Degree, when the Noble Train from the College which came with him, expected he would say something for himself, but he had it not in him. Whether this Dumbness was the Effect of that *Drinking* and *Smoking* which he said I recommended, I will not now dispute. Yet this is the Archbishop's *Vindicator*; and though he hath said nothing to let the Reader see that he deserves that Title, yet he begs pardon for his being willing to vindicate a Person who by his Preaching and Writings hath done such great Service to the Christian Religion: Such indeed as we should be glad to see; but 'tis easy to prove, and hath been already proved, that he hath done real Disservice to Revealed Religion, and to the Christian in particular. If he had confin'd himself to his *Moral* Subjects, he had done well, and gain'd universal Repute; but when he comes to treat of *Christianity*, and the Nature of it, he generally debauches it, so far as I'm able to judge.

P. 38. He saith it is an horrible Falshood that I charged Dr. *Tillotson* with; namely, That he finds fault with Parents for forbidding their Children to play at Cards, and such like Games: And yet he grants in express Words, That Dr. *Tillotson* finds Fault with Parents for forbidding things, as absolutely unlawful in themselves, which are not so. And the Instance given by the Dr. is in Cards. Here is a plain Confession of the thing, namely, that the Dr. blames Parents for forbidding their Children to Game; for

as for that Distinction [*forbidding as absolutely unlawful in themselves,*] it is foisted in by the Vindicator to help the Dr. out, for he expressly saith, *he owns that the Archbishop doth not make use of that Distinction,* p. 29. He had forgot * one of the Canons of our Church, which pronounces *Card-playing* to be an *unlawful Game*; and therefore forbids all *Clergymen* to use it either by Day or Night: And certainly if Ministers may not play at Cards, it becomes them not in the Pulpit to favour that sort of Gaming in others, and even in Children. I know not how you can be so ignorant of this, P. 29. He accuses me of *Falsification*, for saying that Dr. Hammond is of the Opinion, that *St. Paul writ the Second Epistle to Timothy at or before the time when he writ to the Corinthians and Galatians.* And would any Man, but the Vindicator, deny this, when he finds that Learned Annotator industriously proving, from the Testimony of Ancient Fathers and from Texts of Scripture, that *the 2d Epistle to Timothy was writ by St. Paul at his first being at Rome, after which time he preach'd the Gospel to the Gentiles in other Regions,* among which Regions that of *Galatia* was one, to the Inhabitants of which he wrote an Epistle? See this expressly own'd by Dr. Hammond in his Preface to his Annotations on the 2d Epistle to *Timothy*: And yet the Vindicator, impatient of Contradiction, affirms the contrary.

P. 40. He blames me for saying Dr. Overal was perfectly a Calvinist in the Point of the Perseverance of the Saints: And he questions the Truth of what I said, that he declar'd as much at the Conference at Hampton-Court: Yea, he is peremptory, and must needs say, *he believes it not.* Wherefore to cure him of his In-

175th.

fide-

fidelity, I remit him to the plain Testimony of a Reverend and Learned Prelate, who hath these very words, † [Dr. Rainolds desired that Article, *After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from Grace,* might be explained by these Words added to the end of it, *yet neither totally nor finally.* Against this no Man speaks, but for it: That Worthy and Learned Dean of Paul's then, after Bishop of Norwich, Dr. Overall, did speak so much as directly confirmed that which Dr. Rainolds had moved] that is, That the Article was to be understood thus, that tho' the truly Regenerate may depart from Grace for a time, and in some Degree, yet not finally and totally. I hope by this time the Vindicator hath thrown off his Unbelief. As to the Papers he talks of, I have not seen them, nor do know whether there be any such; and therefore I can say nothing to them.

P. 44. and to the very end of his Papers, he endeavours to confirm what he had said, that Bishop Sanderfon forsook Calvinism in the Year 1625; and to enervate what I had produced to the contrary; he first charges me with not quoting Dr. Sanderfon aright, and yet he sets down the Quotation which I made use of, which agrees exactly, to a Syllable, with what he presently after sets down himself as the very Words of Dr. Sanderfon. This shews the strange Spirit and Genius of this Man. It is true; I did not quote all that is said in the Letter, of God's Grace and Decree, nor was I obliged to it, and I have his own Example for it: That I hope will please him. He saith, p. 12. *he freely confesses* that he hath left out something, and wholly omitted something in a Quotation of mine, though he pretended to give it

† Bishop Carleton's Examination of the late Appeal, &c. p. 191.
entirely

entirely to the Reader. Here is *Confession*, but whether it was free, I question: I rather think it was extorted from him, because the thing it self was so plain and glaring. But he falsely adds that my Quotation of Bishop *Sanderson* is mangled and broken, for the Reader may see it was whole and entire, so far as I had occasion to cite it.

P. 48. He further insists, that I impose upon the Reader, by leaving out all the Bishop said that might seem to lessen Calvin's Reputation. It is he that imposes upon himself, and upon the Reader; for the true Reason why I left out some following Passages, was, that I might not lessen the Bishop's Reputation. It was out of Reverence to that good Prelate that I stopt there, and added no more, that he might not be exposed, as Inconsistent with himself. I turn'd his *Calvinistical* side to the Readers view, and it was very plain and obvious. If the Vindicator hath a Mind to turn the other, or rather to fancy such a thing, he may; yea, he hath done it; but I must tell him that thereby he hath represented the Bishop in no commendable Posture; which I was careful to avoid, because of that Veneration which I paid to so excellent a Person. As to the main thing, the Bishop's changing his Judgment and forsaking Calvinism in 1625, which is so much insisted upon by the Vindicator, I took the best and fairest Course that could possibly be prescribed to confute this, and by that means to preserve the Bishop's Credit unstain'd. I produced several Passages out of his Sermons which assert the *Calvinian* Doctrines, and condemn the *Arminian* one as *Popish*. These Sermons were preach'd before the Year 1625, but he publicly own'd them by printing them in the Year 1632. and after long Deliberation, by reprinting them in the Year 1657. Any rational Man would think that

that this is sufficient to prove that Dr. *Sanderson* had not chang'd his Mind in 1625. otherwise he would not have twice publish'd those very Passages several Years afterwards.

But because I would give full Satisfaction in this Matter, I produced several Passages out of the Dr.'s Sermons, which are unanimously acknowledged to have been preach'd after 1625, and were Revised by him with great Care and Diligence (as he saith himself) in order to their being publish'd. And in these Sermons he positively asserts the Doctrines of *Eternal Election*, the *Immutability of the Decrees*, *Special Grace in Conversion*, *Irresistibility of Divine Grace*; and he brands some of the *Arminian Doctrines* with the Title of *Pelagianism*. This I thought was a plain and demonstrative way of convincing the Reader, and even (if such a thing were possible) the Vindicator: For generally there is so much Ingenuity in the Nature of Men that they scorn to rebel against shining Truth. There is something of Natural Modesty in most of Mankind to restrain them from such Reluctances. But the harden'd Vindicator is a scandalous Exception to this; and he differs from his Kind: I can make no Impression upon him, though I have with all Freedom and Sincerity set the whole Matter right before him. It is a strange and prodigious thing, that a Man professing to be a Divine, and a public Teacher, should thus fly in the Face of Truth, and discover to the World that there is neither good Faith nor Meaning in his Breast.

I proceeded further, and out of several Passages in the *Last Letter of Bishop Sanderson to Dr. Hammond*, I made it evident, that the Bishop had not chang'd his Mind, as to the main Scheme of *Calvinism*. I shew'd, that the *Decrees of Election* and
Repro-

Reprobation, *Special Grace*, the *Irresistible Efficacy* of it, the *Final Perseverance of God's Elect*, are asserted by him: And the Good Bishop censures the *Arminians*, for their *Extolling of Free Will*. I produced the very Words which are used by the Bishop in that Letter: But the *Vindicator* doth not pretend to make any Return at all to the Particulars. *I shall not*, saith he, *produce the Particulars*; p. 51. No indeed, no body expected that you would, they being such Bright and Incontestable Instances of the Bishop's adhering still to *Calvinism*, and of your Immodesty and Falshood in denying it.

But something must be said for the Cause; and now see the Pregnancy of the *Vindicator's* Invention, in a very scandalous and shameful Instance, such as must render him very obnoxious to all Men of Sincerity and Honesty. Having nothing else to suggest, he saith, *I cunningly conceal'd from the Reader where this Letter* (before-mention'd) *was to be met with*, p. 52. He means, where the Passage which I quoted is to be met with; and he represents this as a *Dishonest Act*. Every one that I have communicated this to, is amazed at the Insolence of this Man, who durst so grossly write Untruths in so plain a Case: For I particularly and expressly told the Reader in the Margin (as all my Authors and References are put in the Margin,) where this Passage is to be found; namely, in the *Letter about God's Grace and Decrees*, as may be seen in my *Veritas Redux*, p. 542. And in my *Reflections on the Vindicator's Remarks*, to which he now refers, I acquainted the Reader that those Words which I quoted, were to be found in the Last Letter of *Dr. Sanderson to Dr. Hammond*, p. 292.

This was so plain, that I thought Impudence it self durst not oppose it. But behold! the *Vindicator* tells the World, that *I cunningly conceal'd from the*

Reader

Reader where those Words which I cited were to be met with. What can this be resolv'd into, but his being wholly led by a Spirit of Falshood and Mischief? And, by the way, this shows his Cause to be very bad; seeing he hath no way to defend it, but by such Methods as are a Scandal to Christianity, and especially to the Character of a Minister of the Gospel.

By this Instance he hath told the World, that he will not stick to vent any Fables and Forgeries, to support his Cause. So then, for the future, he can never think to gain Belief; He is now a Bankrupt Writer; he hath lost his Credit, and no Man will trust him. No Protestations and Affe-rations, from the Mouth of such a Penman, will signify any thing. No Jury would find a Man Guilty, tho' of Murder, if there were no better Witness and Evidence than the *Vindicator*.

But he asks, Is it possible to conceive, that either Bishop Sanderfon could so formally renounce Calvin's Opinion, and yet afterwards assert, and maintain it? Or could Dr. Hammond be so stupid, as to contradict his own Design; viz. of shewing Bishop Sanderfon's Change of Judgment; and yet produce such Passages out of his Letter, which plainly prove that he had not chang'd his Judgment? All which is absurd to suppose. P. 52, 53.

To which I answer; I have sufficiently prov'd that the Bp. did not renounce Calvin's Opinion: And as for Dr. Hammond, tho' he was a very good Man, and Eminent for his Piety, yet he had his weak side (as all have) and was extremely byass'd in his Judgment (witness his Interpretations of the Scripture of the New Testament, concerning the *Gnostics*, and the *Destruction of Jerusalem*; and witness his evading the Texts about *Eternal Election*, to menti-

on no more), and in the present Case, the plain Truth of the Matter is this: He was greedy of gaining so Great and Considerable a Profelyte, as he knew the Bishop would be if he changed his Judgment; and this Greediness so far prevail'd upon the Dr., that it made him verily think that the Bishop had chang'd his Judgment, when he had not.

So that tho' Dr. *Hammond* saith, he published Part of the Bishop's Letter, to make known to the World the *present Sentiments of the Judicious Sander-son*, yet he fail'd in this Design of his; for those several Passages in the Letter which I produced, are not reconcileable with the Bishop's Changing of his Judgment: But yet the Dr. labouring under great Prejudice, perswaded himself that the Bishop had alter'd his Sentiments, and was come over to his Party.

It is well known that not only Dr. *Hammond* but Dr. *Pierce*, and others, had been teasing and worrying the Bishop a considerable time, and in a manner forcing him to quit *Calvinism*, and to declare on the *Arminian* side. Even † Mr. *Isaac Walton*, the Bishop's profess'd Friend and Acquaintance, acknowledges in express Words, that the Bishop *was with much Unwillingness drawn into the Debate; for he declar'd it would prove uneasy to him, who in his Judgment of God's Decrees differ'd with Dr. Hammond.* This was in the Year 1648, and in the Years succeeding, as Mr. *Walton* expressly testifies. Which most evidently shews these Two Things; first, That the Bishop and Dr. *Hammond* differ'd about the Doctrine of the Decrees, and consequently about the Other Points which necessarily go along with it:

† *In the Life of Bp. Sanderson.*

And Secondly, that the Dr. and his Friends drew the Bishop against his Will into that Debate; which therefore could not but be very Uneasy to him, because it agreed not with his known Principles of *Calvinism*.

We may gather from hence, how rashly and falsely it is said by the *Vindicator*, p. 45. that I *certainly knew* (notwithstanding what I writ) that Bishop Sanderson had made a Declaration of the Change of his Judgment in 1625. This may confirm the Reader in the Perswasion which I doubt not he hath taken up already, That the *Vindicator's* Talent consists altogether in Traducing and Calumniating. Tho' he stickles for *Catechising* instead of *Sermons*, yet he hath forgot the Duty which our *Church-Catechism* taught him, to keep his Tongue from Lying and Slandering.

This must be said; whatever Conceptions we may have of some Things deliver'd by the Bishop (if they were deliver'd by him) in his *Pax Ecclesiae*, it is certain, and beyond all Dispute, from the foresaid Evidence given by Mr. *Walton*, that the Bishop dissented from Dr. *Hammond* in the main Points they debated about, which were those of the *Calvinists* and *Arminians*. But it is also manifest from that foremention'd Evidence, that Dr. *Hammond* and his Partners hook'd the Bishop into the Controversy a-new, and out of the Transcendent Kindness they bore to the *Arminian Cause*, strongly fancied that the Good Bishop favour'd it: And this was the true Rise of that foresaid Letter of Dr. *Hammond* to the Bishop, wherein we may observe how *strangely* and *abruptly* he fetches in a great Part of the Bishop's Words. He had no Occasion at all to recite them to the Bishop *himself* in that Letter; and therefore I must needs say I suspect some *foul Play*, according to the *Vindicator's* ele-

gant Way of Speaking. The Cause was to be carried on, that Cause which had been laid asleep for some Years ; but now it was to be awaken'd, and to appear brisk, in Hopes of the *Restoration* which was approaching at that time, and would certainly encourage it.

The Learned Dr. *Hammond*, who was a great Bigot in those Points, was made use of in this Affair just before he left the World, (for he died in that very Year, when he is said to have wrote this Letter;) and a little before the Aged Bishop's Death: For the Managers had a mind to let the World see, that both these *Great Men* were the Patrons of their Opinion; before they went off the Stage. But from what I have premised, it is undeniably evident, that their Design prov'd successless; for the Contents of that foremention'd Letter must needs convince us, that Bishop *Sander-son* retain'd his *Calvinistical* Sentiments to the Day of his Death.

And now, to let the Reader at last into the True Secret of the Business, he must know, that Dr. *Sander-son's Pax Ecclesiæ*, which is so much talk'd of and quoted by the *Arminians*, was not a *Scheme* drawn up by him to tell the World what he verily thought concerning those *Calvinian* and *Arminian* Points which he discourses of; but it was only at that time a *Proposal* that was to be offer'd (as he tells us himself) to the *Convocation*, if there should be Occasion to debate about these Points. This, he tells us, was the Rise of those Papers.

But because *some* Things were then said, that favour'd the *Arminians*, (as it was his Business at that time to represent both Sides) thence those that had list'd themselves into that Party, thought the Bishop to be of the same; And among others, the
Reve-

Reverend Dr. *Hammond* (who is known to have addicted himself to Peculiar Notions and Opinions, and to have imagin'd that some Texts of the New Testament patronized them;) perswaded himself from some Passages in the Bishop's foremention'd Proposal, that he was an *Arminian* as well as himself.

This is the True and Impartial Account of the Matter, as the Reader will own, I question not, when he hath weigh'd what I have suggested. He will find that that Piece was a *Draught* of the several Opinions about those Points, rather than a *Declaration* of his own Particular Sentiments, unless in one or two Places, which I have heretofore quoted.

But what saith the *Vindicator*? *We must take notice*, saith he, *of this one thing, that after he forsook Calvinism, he did not turn Arminian*, p. 51. Which is so Ridiculous and Silly a Fetch, that every one, I find, hath laugh'd at it that hath read it, for it outfaces all Common Sense and Reason: And 'tis agreed on all Hands, that the *Vindicator* hath betray'd the Cause. For every one knows, that *Calvinism* and *Arminianism* are the Two Opposites in the Debate before us; and are so represented all along by the Bishop and Dr. *Hammond*, in their Disputes; the one is always brought in by them as *Contrary* to the other. Wherefore it is a vain and idle Conceit, to imagine that the Bishop was no *Calvinist*, and yet he was no *Arminian*. A Man hath a hard Province to deal with this Tribe of Men, who have such Chimera's and Whimsies as these in their Heads.

What he talks of Dr. *Overall's* Scheme, is nothing to the Purpose; tho' he would fain get off by

this means, as one of his Brethren some Years ago endeavour'd to come off from his former Pretension, by Virtue of *Dr. Overal's Convocation Book*. I do not say that *Dr. Overal* was a rigid *Calvinist*, neither was *Bishop Sanderson* such; but it is evident, that they were both of them *Calvinists* as to the main, which is enough for my Purpose.

But because I assert this, especially that the latter had not abandon'd the *Calvinian Doctrines*, and because the *Vindicator* attempted to confute it, but found he was not able to do it, he grows Rampant, and transgresses the Bounds of Civility and good Manners, charging me in his Pamphlet with *foul and dishonest Doings, Rancor, and Malice, &c.* And yet this is the Man who tells us, that *it is very ill becoming a Christian to give ill Language, p. 8. And Mens Reputations are valuable Things, and ought to be used tenderly, p. 15.* This is but an ill Character of our Preaching *Vindicator*, to teach others those Lessons which he never learnt himself, and never intends to practise.

Lastly, *P. 53, 54.* He would again be reproaching me with *Dishonesty*, and would charge it on my *Calvinistical Principles*: But I advise him not to be too bold here, lest somebody should be tempted to make Reprisals, and in way of Retaliation, to ascribe all the Laziness, Intemperance, Pride, Neglect of Pastoral Duties, Prophaneness and universal Dissoluteness of Manners in some Men to their being *Arminians*. I hope he will, in his *Lucid Intervals* at least, think of this. I heartily forgive him all the Rudeness of his Pamphlet; for I consider he hath a Distemper that he can't help: And he is to be pitied and prayed for, rather than Rebuked and Confuted.

And now to shut up all, I own that I have been a Free Speaker, but I have not traduced or defamed either

either of those Persons whom I have had to do with in this or the foregoing Undertaking, unless the representing them in their true Colours, and the plain and impartial uttering of Truth be to traduce and defame. I must acknowledge that there are some Passages which I had very little Inclination to publish; but I may say with the Apostle, *They have compell'd me.* I was sometimes forc'd to follow these *Ignes fatui* whither they led me, or else I could not have let the Reader see how wild and extravagant they are in their Rambles. But even here I am able to justify my manner of treating them by the Example of the Best and most Approved Writers both Sacred and Secular, who are wont to write with a Satyrick Air when there is Occasion. Sharp Reflections (even Personal ones) were never thought to be a Sin by the Prophets, Apostles, and Fathers of the Church. Yea, the most Religious and Learned Men in all Ages have been Poinant and Smart upon their Adversaries, and have given the Enemies of the Truth a warm Reception, tho' they knew as well as our Moderns what 'tis to *keep a Temper*, as they call it. And 'tis observable, that those who of late pretend to be Nice and Squeamish, and approve of none but Mild and Soft Writers, even these Men applaud the most Fierce and Rough Pen-Men when they write on *their Side*; of which sundry Instances might be produced. This is that sort of Men which I could never please, and I never design'd it, and I shall not now begin to endeavour it; especially since some very good Judges have been pleased to say that it is as good a Sign as can be of a Man's being a Laudable Author, that he is dislik'd and censur'd by this Race of Mortals. I do with all my Heart abhor all Strife and Contention in Religion, but a just and necessary War can't be condemn'd; And
such

such is that which I have been engag'd in: And I do not know that any Bias of Prejudice or Interest, or any selfish Humour hath influenced me in this Quarrel; for I have all along been combating for *Truth* and *Religion*, and nothing else.

However, at present I lay down my Arms, I cease from all Hostilities and Disputes; for why should I fight the Battel over again, if I have already been Victor? But that I must leave to the Judicious Reader to determine. And if he should give it on my side, I ought to wave all *Triumph*. Besides, he that *discerns the Signs of the Times*, can't but be invited to quit the Field of Battel, lest he should seem to give Encouragement to the quarrelling Spirit, which now rages in *Europe*, when we see a new and bloody War set on Foot, and *Christians* taking the Part of *Infidels*, and a *Protestant* Prince supporting and supported by the Friends of the *Alcoran*. Whilst this Tragical Stage (besides that in which we are more nearly concern'd) is treading Abroad, it is time for *Ecclesiastics* to lay aside their warlike Instruments, though but of Pen, and Paper, and not to begin the War again, as my *Salisbury-Adversary* doth, who is at this very day publishing a Discourse against the Doctrine of *Original Sin*, which he confesses he had composed above Twenty Years ago; thereby letting the World know that he grows gray and decrepit in Error, and that he intends to breathe out his last (one would think, with little Comfort.) in defiance of that Article of Faith which is expressly asserted by the Inspired and Holy Men in Scripture, by the Orthodox Fathers after them, by the Church of *England*, of which is a Minister, and by all other Protestant and Reformed Churches. It is time, I say, to shew our dislike of such an Example as this, to throw off the *Military Cassecks* which we had put on, and to join *Peace* with

Truth,

Truth, as we tender the Glory of the Divine Majesty, the Edification of the Church of Christ, and the Salvation of our Souls.

F I N I S.

In a short Time will be publish'd, Proposals for Printing THEOLOGIA REFORMATATA: Or, The Body or Substance of the Christian Religion; Comprised in Distinct Discourses, or Treatises upon,

I. **T**HE APOSTLES CREED, commonly so call'd: Where all the *Principles* and *Articles* of the Christian Faith therein contain'd, are particularly explain'd, asserted and vindicated: Especially under the First Article, the BEING, ATTRIBUTES and PROVIDENCE of God, are copiously handled, and the Truth of them demonstrated from several New and Uncommon Topics. To the Article of the *Holy Catholick Church*, are reduced the *Officers* of the Christian Church, with their Peculiar Employments, the *Sacraments*, and all the other *Sacred Institutions* belonging to the *Worship* of GOD, and to the *Discipline* and *Government* of the Church.

[*All the Doctrines of the Church of Rome, which are Contrary to these, are to be treated of afterwards in another Volume.*]

II. The LORD'S PRAYER: Where the Full Sense of every Petition is assign'd, and the Matter of our Prayers discours'd of. With a General Treatise of the *Nature*, *Kinds*, *Qualifications*, *Necessity* and *Excellency* of Prayer. Where the Meaning of *Praying by the Spirit* is examin'd and decided. The Nature of *Temptation* (under the last Petition) is
amply

amply set forth: The whole State of a *Wounded Conscience* is consider'd: All the *Scruples and Complaints of Tempted Souls* are fully answer'd, and *Proper Remedies* are applied.

III. The **TEN COMMANDMENTS**; where the *Rules and Measures of our Religious Practice* are largely discours'd of: With a more *Particular Account of the Love of God, and of our Neighbours; of Idolatry, or Polytheism; of Obedience to the Higher Powers; of the Observation of the Lord's Day; of Marriage and Divorce; of Usury; of the Abuses of the Tongue; of Covetousness; of Contentment.*

[*The Various Duties and Graces, which are reducible to the Decalogue, are to be treated of in another Volume.*]

In this *Undertaking*, several *Theological Problems and Controversies* are discuss'd; *sundry Cases of Conscience* stated and resolv'd; *Obscure Passages in Scripture* clear'd; the *Author's Particular Judgment concerning some of them* propounded: *Practical Inferences* from the *Respective Doctrines* every where interspers'd.

The *Whole design'd as an Antidote in this Corrupted Age*, against the *Dangerous Notions and Opinions of Papists, Arians and Socinians, Pelagians and Remonstrants, Deists, Atheists, Scepticks, Enthusiasts, Libertines..*

All is endeavour'd to be so framed, as not to be below the *Genius of the Learned*, nor above the *Capacity of Others*.

By *John Edwards, D. D.*

The Proposals will be deliver'd out by Jonathan Robinson, John Lawrence, and John Wyat, Booksellers.



