

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from
Queen's University - University of Toronto Libraries

THE
CHURCH of *ENGLAND*

VINDICATED

From the CHARGE of
ABSOLUTE PREDESTINATION,

As it is Stated and Asserted by the Translator of

JEROME ZANCHIUS,

I N H I S

LETTER to the Rev. Dr NOWELL.

Together with

Some ANIMADVERSIONS

On his Translation of ZANCHIUS, his Letter to
the Rev. Mr JOHN WESLEY, and his
Sermon on 1 *Tim.* i. 10.

L O N D O N, Printed :

And Sold by E. C A B E in Ave-Mary Lane.

1771.

AC 911. 1771 S32




T H E

CHURCH OF ENGLAND

VINDICATED, &c.

REVEREND SIR!


 T is the Custom of *Florists*, when their Seedlings are blown, to take a View of them, and if they find amongst them any Flowers that are *mean* or *bad*, to pluck them up and cast them away. Had you done so by your Writings, and expunged every thing that was *ill said*, however you might not have appeared to be quite so *witty*, you would certainly have been much *wiser*. For though you may imagine that Compliment due to you, which one gives to *Shakespear*, "His Wit is in his own Power;" yet what the same Person said of him, may with much

B

more

2 *The Church of England vindicated from*

more reason be said concerning you, "I would the *Rule* of it had been so too." It cannot be said concerning you, *Felicitèr auget*; for it must be owned, you have been most *unhappily daring* and *unpardonably bold* in your *Flights*. To answer a Fool according to his Folly, is in some Cases allowable; *lest he be wise in his own Conceit*. But in your Writings you have done foolishly alone: The Men, you set yourself so *fiercely to oppose*, and so *grossly to abuse*, gave you no *just Occasion*, set you no *Example* for so doing.

It was mentioned as an Honour to *Shakespear* (as the Writer of his Life informs us) that in writing (whatsoever he penned) he never blotted out a *Line*: To which one that was his *Friend*, tho' not his *Flatterer*, replied, "I would he had blotted out a *thousand*." And I must needs say, Sir, I cannot help indulging the same friendly Wish with regard to you. Doubtless Mr *Toplady* would then have appeared a *wiser*, a *meeke*r, an *humbler*, and a *better Man*.

Sed turpem putat in Chartis metuitque Lituram.

However in my Address to you, Sir, I shall not be so partial to what I write, as to spare a Word, because I wrote it; but, if upon a revision, I meet with any thing I do not say, that might give Offence, but, that might give *just Occasion* of Offence, I shall dash it out again,

Nor think my blotted Paper a Disgrace.

Yet I shall deal plainly with you: more plainly, perhaps, than you might *desire*; yet not so plainly as you might *justly expect*. I would not say a Word *barely* to enrage you; and yet, I doubt not, but I shall *enrage* you, because there is no coping with such Writers as you, without speaking a little in your own manner; and I have always observed, those that are most prone to *give Offence*, are also most prone to *take it*.

You

You stile yourself a Presbyter of the Church of *England*; to which, in the Beginning of your Letter to the Rev Dr *Nowell*, you give the high Character of the *best* of visible Churches. I readily allow she is such; and therefore am the more sorry to see one of her Presbyters take so much pains to make her appear like some of the *worst* of Churches: I mean like those of *Rome* and *Geneva*. For how wide a Difference soever there may be between these two Churches in point of *Discipline*, and how wide a Difference soever in some Points of *Doctrine*; yet in that Point, which you stickle so mightily for, *viz.* the Doctrine of *absolute irrelative Predestination*; though all the Members of the Church of *Rome* do not fall in with it, because there they are not compelled to it, as all the Members of the Church of *Geneva* do, because there they are compelled to it, yet if the Testimony of Dr *Potter*, sometime Dean of *Windsor*, be to be depended upon, there are ten Catholics, that hold this Point of *Genevan* Doctrine, for one that is so much an *Arminian* as to deny it. And no wonder; since the Names of *Austin* and *Aquinas*, two Champions for Predestination, have as much Weight in the Church of *Rome* as they have with you. *Aquinas*, you know, was one of the most subtil Schoolmen, that ever that Church had to boast of. And *Austin's* Writings are judged to confirm the *popish* Doctrines so much, that the Effigy of that Father is set with three others to support the papal Chair. And can you then slander the Church of *England* worse than by affirming, that she holds a Doctrine trumped up by St *Austin*, maintained by the great *popish* Schoolmen, and embraced by far the greater part of the Church of *Rome*: that she holds a Doctrine, which represents the God of Mercy as dooming Millions of Millions of his helpless Creatures to *necessitated* Sin, and *unavoidable* endless Torments for the same, only to shew his *Sovereignty* and magnify his *Justice*! Justice, as you represent it, no better than the Tyranny of *Tiberius*; who because it was unlawful to strangle Virgins, caused the Hangman first to devour a Virgin, and afterwards to strangle her. Con-

trary to you then, I affirm that either the Church of England teaches no such Doctrine as you maintain; or if she does, that she is not the *best of visible Churches*.

In the same Page you give Dr Nowell the Character of a Person of *distinguished Abilities*; and p. 6. you seem at least to allow, "that his *Merits*, both as a *Scholar* and as a *Writer*, entitle him to respect." Yet but a few Lines after you tell him, "I cannot say I admire the *want of Precision*, with which you express yourself." By and by you find fault with his *Learning*; because he has not translated *Accipere* to your liking. "What Sir, you say, does *Accipio* properly signify to impute and charge a thing home?" Though I have no business to meddle in a matter, which concerns none but the Doctor and yourself, I will yet presume for once to answer for the Doctor: No Sir! *Accipio* does not properly signify to impute and charge a thing home (Phrases, by the by, not always equivalent) nor does it properly signify "to regard, consider or look upon," though it may improperly and metaphorically signify all these. Yet again, your whole Book is levelled against the Doctrine advanced by Doctor Nowell. Now Sir, all this considered, may one not justly conclude, that when you complimented Dr Nowell on account of his *distinguished Abilities* and *Merits*, as a *Scholar* and a *Writer*, you intended to pay a greater Compliment to yourself, by endeavouring to make the World believe that you are a Man of *more distinguished Abilities* than he; and that you, by your *Merits*, both as a *Scholar* and as a *Writer*, are entitled to *more Respect* than he? But whatever your *Intention* was in that Respect, let me ask, Where was your *Sincerity* when you made the Doctor the Compliments? Would not one almost be tempted to think that you parted with that, when you left Mr Wesley's Society in *Dublin*.

Page 5. You say, "If the Public have hit upon the true Cause of (a late) *remarkable Expulsion*,—we may now, with the utmost Truth adopt the old Cry of *the Church is in Danger*." And so we may, whether the Public have hit upon the true Cause of that Expulsion or not.

For

For if *Antinomianism* and *Ranterism*, the genuine Effects of the Doctrine of *Absolute Predestination*, and *Predestinarians* encouraging People to *leave* the established Church (which I know some whose Names have been frequently mentioned in certain late Publications, have done) I say, if these things endanger the established Church, (as they certainly do) we may well cry, *The Church is in Danger*. I could mention the Names of divers, who were brought up in the Communion of the established Church, were well affected to her, and made Profession of the full assurance of Faith, while within her Pale; who afterwards, through the artful Insinuations of such Persons, have been induced to forsake her,

To—*dip themselves and sound*
For Christendom in dirty Pond;
To dive like Wild-fowl for Salvation,
And fish to catch Regeneration.

But you, perhaps, can easily excuse this, so long as the good old Cause is thereby promoted.

Page 6. You say, “there is the *utmost reason* to believe, that the *main Body* of the Christian Church—were *unanimous Believers* of the Doctrines now termed *Calvinistic*, for the four first Centuries.” I should be glad to know what that *utmost Reason* is. Your telling us, page 9, that “during the four first Ages of the Christian Church, *Predestination* and its concomitant Doctrines, were *undisputed*, for ought appears to the contrary,” is no Reason at all. And till you can disprove me (which I apprehend, you never can, I say, the *main Body* of the Christian Church during that time, were *not* unanimous Believers of the Doctrines termed *Calvinistic*. That those Doctrines were all that while *undisputed* I grant you; and for a very good Reason, because it does not appear that there were any that held them.

Ibid. In Answer to that Question, which you are aware some *Arminian* Writers have had the Assurance (bold Men as they are) to ask, where *was* the Doc-

“ trine of *Predestination* before *St Austin* ?” You reply,
 “ Where *was not* the Doctrine of *Predestination* before
 “ *Pelagius* ?” I answer, the *calvinistic, synodical* Doc-
 trine of *Predestination* was not in the Scriptures, nor in
 the Christian Church before *Pelagius*. Where is it
 written in the Bible, or what Christian Writer before
Austin’s and *Pelagius’s* Time did ever affirm, as *Calvin*
 does, that “ Man doth fall, God’s Providence so or-
 “ daining it ” And “ the first Man fell, because the
 “ Lord thought it expedient ?” Or as *Piscator* does,
 “ that God doth *holily drive* or thrust Men on unto
 “ *Wickedness*. That he *ordained* Reprobates to their
 “ very *Incredulity*. That he *took care* to have his Tem-
 “ ple profaned ?” Or as your favourite Author *Zan-*
chius does, that “ a *necessity* of sinning, and of sinning
 “ unto death without Repentance, doth lie upon Re-
 “ probates from God’s immutable Reprobation. That
 “ God *works* all Things in all Men, not only in the
 “ Godly, but also in the Ungodly. That both the
 “ Reprobates and the Elect were *pre-ordained* to sin as
 “ *sin*.” Or as *Luther* does, when he happened to be
 in a *Predestinarian Fit*, in his Book, *De Servo Arbitrio*,
 which you so highly commend ; that “ it is incompre-
 “ hensible, yet believed by us, how it is just to damn
 “ such, as *do not deserve it* ?” Or as *Peter Martyr* does,
 That “ God doth *incite, seduce, draw, command, har-*
 “ *den, and inject Deceptions, and effecteth* those Things
 “ which are *heinous or grievous Sins* ?” Or as *Macco-*
nius does, that “ God ordains that Man should sin as
 “ *sin* ?” Where I say, are such horrible *Affertions* as
 those, with abundance more to the same purpose, which
 are to be found in the Writings of the most renowned
Calvinists, to be met with in the Scriptures, or in any
 Writings of the Fathers before *St Austin’s* Days ?

Page 8. “ *Spanhemius* the Son, you tell us, observes,
 “ the Arch-Heretic *Pelagius* asserted, that the Cause
 “ of *Predestination* to Grace and Glory was the Fore-
 “ sight of Good Works and of Perseverance therein,
 “ resulting from a right use of our free Will, &c.” And
 then you add, “ that these are the Doctrines of the *Ar-*

“ *minians*

“ *minians* now, as they were of *Pelagius* then, needs no
 “ Proof.” Yes verily, but it does, and more than
 you are able to bring. The Men, I presume, that you
 level your Artillery chiefly against, are those that agree
 in Sentiment with him, you call, by way of reproach,
 “ the *John Goodwin* of the present Age.” I challenge
 you to point out one such *Arminian* that asserts that the
Cause of Predestination to Grace was at all the *Fore-sight*
 of good Works and of Perseverance therein, resulting
 from a right Use of our free Will; or that the *Cause*,
 unless *sine quâ non*, of Predestination to Glory was such
 Fore-sight of good Works and Perseverance therein; or
 that good Works and Perseverance therein result from the
 right use of our Free-will; if you mean as *unassisted* by
 Grace. And if you cannot do this, how will you clear
 yourself from the Character of a Slanderer? What these
 Men hold is no more than the Calvinists great and
 giddy Apostle St *Austin* sometimes held. “ No Man,
 says he, “ is chosen, unless as *differing* from him that is
 “ rejected. Nor know I how it is said, that God hath
 “ chosen us before the Foundation of the World, unless
 “ it be meant of his *pre-science* of Faith and good Works.
 “ Jacob was not chosen, that he might be made good;
 “ but having been seen to be made good, was capable of
 “ being chosen.” Is it possible to find among all your
Arminian Heretics, a more open Asserter of this *Armi-*
nian Tenet than *Austin* was? But I suppose he is excus-
 able, because at other Times, he is as clear for the
 Doctrines that are called *Calvinism*.

Page 9. You tell us from Bishop *Burnet*, “ that in
 “ *England* the first Reformers were generally in the
 “ *sublapsarian* Way; which you say, plainly enough
 “ intimates, that all our first Reformers were *doctrinal*
 “ *Calvinists*, though with some *slight* Variation.” And
 let me tell you from the Authority of Dean *Potter*, once
 as rigid a *Predestinarian* as yourself, and who studied
 the Controversy with much more Judgment and to much
 better Purpose than you have done, “ that our first Re-
 “ formers, in the Point of Predestination, did say over
 “ again those Lessons which they had learned in the

“*Roman Schools.*” But what is that *slight Variation* that was among those first Reformers? Why the major part held, that God, in the *Decree of Predestination*, considered Mankind as *fallen*, the rest, that he considered them neither as *fallen* nor as *unfallen*; but simply as *Men*. And “this you say, affects not the main Question.” Yes very much. The main Question relates to what you call *the Doctrine of absolute Grace*, but what you might more properly call *the Doctrine of absolute Wrath, Vengeance, and Damnation*. Now if the *Calvinists* themselves agree to differ, as you phrase it, about this *metaphysical Disquisition*, whether God predestinated so many Myriads of Men to Damnation, considered as *sinners necessarily made so*, or only simply as *Men* (which *Predestination to Damnation*, you say, unavoidably follows from your *Doctrine of Election*, or *Grace*) is there not great reason to question whether God ever predestinated Men to Damnation upon *either* Consideration: especially considering that such a Predestinating Decree is most *unjust* and *cruel*; and so most unworthy the God of *Justice* and *Mercy*?

Page 10. The *Calvinistic Doctrines* you intimate “have been disputed between the *Jansenists* and *Jesuits*.” Between them and *some* of the *Jesuits* it may be. But others, even some of the most noted Writers among the *Jesuits* were *Calvinists*, as well as the *Jansenists* and you.

Page 11. “*Luther* himself was an *absolute Predestinarian*.” By fits, I grant he was so, as were *Austin* and *Calvin*.—“And was as able, and as resolute a Defender of God’s *eternal, irrelative Decrees*, as *Calvin* or any other. What, did *Luther be-knave, be-dog, and be-devil* such as dissented from him in the Matter of *Predestination*, as *Calvin* used to do? Truly this makes but little for the Credit of *Luther*, if he did. And as little for the Credit of your Cause, that it has such Defenders.—But you say, Page 12. “If any Person, after having read “a single Chapter in *Luther’s Book, De Servo Arbitrio*, has the Assurance to pronounce *Luther* an Enemy to what is known now by the Name of *Doctrinal Calvinism*; he may—affirm *Calvin* himself to have “been

“ been an Arminian.” I do affirm, and prove it too; that *Calvin* was, in his *sober Intervals*, as much an *Arminian*, in the points of *Predestination* and *Perseverance*, as *Luther*, when he was somewhat *wild*, was a *Calvinist*. As to the Matter of *Justification*, whatever you falsely and invidiously assert to the contrary, those you call *Arminians*, I suppose, do as cordially assent to the Contents of the 11th Article of our Church, as ever did *Luther*, *Calvin*, or you.

Luther and *Calvin*, you intimate, p. 13. agreed mightily well about *Predestination* and *Perseverance*. True, and both agreed in *denying* at one time, what they *affirmed* at another; in *contradicting themselves* and *one another*. I need not tell you where *Luther* plays the *Calvinist*; as you inform us, it is in his Book, *De Servo Arbitrio*. But I will tell you that he hath played the *Arminian*, or rather outdone them, in such Positions as these: “ The
“ Sins of the *whole World*, which are committed from
“ the first Man thenceforth to the last Day, lie upon
“ the Back of that one Man, who was born of *Mary*.
“ Again, Christ is the Salvation of the *whole World*, from
“ the Beginning to the End of it.” He affirms also, that “ Christ is the Life and Light of *all Mankind*,” with abundantly more to the same Purpose. To offer Proof that *Calvin* sometimes strenuously maintained *absolute Predestination*, is as needless as to offer Proof that it is Day when the Sun shines. But that in Contradiction to himself, at other Times, he held *General Redemption*, appears from such Passages as these in his Writings: “ Since Christ will have the Benefit of his
“ Death common unto *all Men*, they do him wrong
“ who by any Opinion of theirs, keep back any Man
“ from the Hope of Salvation.” Speaking of Christ, he says, “ He is to be considered as an Expiatory Sa-
“ crifice, by which God is pacified towards *the World*.” Elsewhere he teaches, that “ Christ suffered for the
“ Sins of the *whole World*, and is, through the Kindness
“ of God, indifferently offered unto *all Men*, though all
“ Men do not apprehend him.” With much more to the same Purpose, especially in his Epistle before

the *French* New Testament. Such *Arminian Predestinarians* were *Luther* and *Calvin*. So did they play fast and loose with their own Doctrines.

Just as well they agreed also about *Perseverance*. If *Luther* at sometimes, as you say, maintained *absolute Predestination*, it follows that he maintained also *invincible* and *infallible Perseverance*. Yet at other Times he asserts plainly the *total* and *final Amissibility of Grace*, in such Passages as these: “He (St Paul) signifieth
 “ that now, being bewitched by the false Apostles, they
 “ (the Galatians) had *fallen away* from and *forsaken*
 “ that Truth, which formerly they had obeyed. He
 “ had said before, that seeking Justification by the
 “ Law, they *cast away* the Grace of God; and that
 “ Christ died for them in vain. Here he adds, that
 “ such Persons crucify Christ, who had formerly lived
 “ and reigned in them. As if he should say, you have
 “ not only *cast away* the Grace of God; it is not only
 “ true, that Christ died for you in vain, but that he is
 “ most shamefully crucified in or by you.—They who
 “ revolt to the Righteousness of the Law, are *consum-*
 “ *mated* by it, that is, are made an end of and *utterly*
 “ *destroyed*. He that *falleth* from Grace plainly *loseth*
 “ Expiation, Remission of Sins, Righteousness, Liberty,
 “ and that Life, which Christ by his Death and Re-
 “ surrection hath merited for us.” As for *Calvin*, who
 knows not that he sometimes stickles mightily for *absolute final Perseverance*? Yet at other Times he teaches the Possibility of falling *totally* and *finally* from Grace. Hear what he says: “We see who they are, whom
 “ the Apostle excludes from Hope of Pardon, namely
 “ *Apostates*, who have *alienated* themselves from the
 “ Gospel, which they *once* embraced, and *from the*
 “ Grace of God; which befalleth no Man, but such
 “ a one as sins against the Holy Ghost. He (St Paul)
 “ convinceth them (the Galatians) of *falling away* not
 “ from his Doctrine only, but from Christ. If you seek
 “ for any Part of Righteousness in the Works of the
 “ Law, Christ becomes nothing to you, and you are
 “ *alienated from Grace*. Scarce every tenth Man of
 “ those,

“ those who have given up their Names to Christ,
 “ retain the purity of Faith unto the end. Almost
 “ all degenerate—and grow profane.”

So do those *Weathercocks*, *Luther* and *Calvin*, oppose themselves and one another. And if those Champions for the Truth, as they are called, thus play the *Ambo-dexter*, which side of the Question would you have us take? That which pleases you? For what Reason? Because you challenge *St Austin* to be of your Party? Nay, but his Authority will stand you in no stead; for he too was a *double-minded Man* and *unstable* in his *Opinions*; as *wavering* and *inconsistent* with himself, as *Luther* and *Calvin*. I need not tell you, that he is sometimes for *absolute Predestination*. But it is needful to remind you again, that otherwhile he is clear for *General Redemption*. He says, “ It was an Article falsely
 “ fathered upon him, that he should hold, that our
 “ Lord Jesus Christ did not suffer for the Redemption of
 “ all Mankind.” And in purging himself from this Imputation, he says, “ the Blood of Christ is the Re-
 “ demption of the *whole World*.” Elsewhere he speaks in this manner, “ I know thee to be true God, and our
 “ Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, the
 “ Creator, Saviour and Redeemer of me and of *the*
 “ *whole human Race*. Mankind falls sick, not of bo-
 “ dily Diseases, but of Sins. This great sick Man
 “ lies all along throughout the whole World, from
 “ the East unto the West. For the *healing* of this great
 “ *sick Man*, the omnipotent Physician comes down.” With abundantly more of like Import. *Austin* too is quoted to confirm the Doctrine of *unconditional, final Perseverance*. Yet he says, “ It is a thing to be won-
 “ dered at, and much to be wondered at, that God
 “ should not give *Perseverance* to some of his Children,
 “ whom he hath *regenerated in Christ*, and to whom
 “ he hath given Faith, Hope and Love.” Again, he mentions some, “ who go out of the world by Death,
 “ with the goodness of their Wills *fallen from good to*
 “ *evil* — If he that is now regenerate and justified, vo-
 “ luntarily relapseth into an evil course of Life, surely
 “ he

“ he cannot say, I have not received it, because he
 “ hath *lost the Grace of God*, that he had received.”
 Again he teaches, that “ there are some that love God,
 “ who do *not persevere* in this Good unto the end.” So
 does he oppose the Doctrine which he elsewhere espouses
 and maintains.

But you will back the Opinions of your *Triumvirate*
 with the Authority of *St Paul*. Impossible; unless you
 can prove that an inspired Apostle has written *pro* and
con, as they have done. And from their Writings indeed
 you may assert that he has done so. But *bare Assertion*
 comes short of *Proof*. *St Paul* in his Writings is either
 uniformly *for* absolute and unconditional Predestination
 and Perseverance, or he is *so against* them. This must
 be allowed, or we cannot allow him the Character of
 an inspired Writer. If he is *for* such Doctrines, then
Austin, Luther and *Calvin* are mistaken, when they
 write *against* them. If he is *against* them, then these
 three *Arminian-Predestinarians* are equally mistaken
 when they write *for* them. *Austin, Luther* and *Calvin*,
 I believe were *good Men*, and I doubt not are all now
 in Heaven, and have done with all the Disputes their
 Writings have *occasioned*; but yet they were *but Men*,
encompassed about with infirmities, and liable to *mistakes*,
 as well as you and I. And since they have all been so
 positive on both sides of a *Contradiction*, which way
 would you have us follow them? That way as you do?
 And because you follow them that way? You must ex-
 cuse us, if we do not follow them nor you a Step further
 than you all follow the Doctrine of Christ and his Apost-
 les. And that is in the Way, which you call the *Armi-
 nian Heresy*; but we, *Truth and primitive Orthodoxy*.

“ What Pretence, says *Dr Nowell* to the Author of
 “ *Pietas Oxoniensis*, have you to call your own Notions
 “ the Principles of the Reformation?” You perty an-
 swer, “ because they are so.” And to prove your As-
 sertion, you say, “ Open the Liturgy where you will,
 “ *Calvinism* stares you in the Face.” I open it on the
 very first Words of the Liturgy, which are these: *When*
the wicked Man turneth away from his Wickedness that
 he

be hath committed, and doth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive, Ezek. xviii. 27. Is there any thing in this sentence, that sounds like your Predestination? Does Calvinism stare us in the face here, or in all the whole Chapter? Yea is it not as opposite to your Opinions as Noonday is to Midnight? It evidently is. In the *Absolution* used in the daily Service, it is declared, that God “desires *not* the Death of a “Sinner.” In *Te Deum*, we are taught, that Christ “took upon him to deliver *Man*.” In the Prayer for the *Clergy* and *People* there is this Petition: “Send down “upon our Bishops and Curates, and all Congregations “committed to their Charge, the healthful Spirit of “thy Grace.” In the *Litany*, “O God the Son, Redeemer of *the World*: That it may please thee to have “mercy upon *all Men*. O Lamb of God, that takest “away the Sins of the World.” In the first Prayer to be used in *Ember Week*, we are directed to pray, that “those which shall be ordained to any holy Function, “may by their Life and Doctrine, set forward the “salvation of *all Men*.” In the *General Thanksgiving*, we bless God “for his inestimable love in the Redemption of *the World* by our Lord Jesus Christ.”

In the Collects for *Sundays* and *Holidays*, we meet with such *Petitions*, *Declarations*, and *Expressions* as these. “Almighty and everlasting God, who hatest “*nothing* that thou hast made. Ashwednesday. “Almighty and everlasting God, who of thy tender love “towards *Mankind*, hast sent thy Son our Saviour Jesus “Christ to take upon him our Flesh, and to suffer Death “upon the Cross, that *all Mankind* should follow the “Example of his great Humility.” Sunday before Easter. “O merciful God, who hast made all Men, and “hatest *nothing* that thou hast made, nor *wouldest* the “death of a Sinner, but rather that he should be converted and live; have mercy upon *all Jews*, *Turks*, “*Infidels*, and *Hereticks*; and so fetch them home, “blessed Lord, to thy Flock, that they may be saved “among the Remnant of the true Israelites.” Good Friday.

In the other Offices, are these: "Almighty and ever-
 " living God, who by thy holy Apostle hast taught us to
 " make Prayers and Supplications, and to give Thanks
 " for *all Men.*" Prayer for the Church militant. "Ye
 " must give most humble and hearty Thanks to God
 " the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, for the
 " Redemption of *the World* by the Death and Passion
 " of our Saviour Christ." Exhortation at the *Communion*. "God so loved *the world*, that he gave hi only
 " begotten Son, to the end that all that believe in him
 " should not perish, but have everlasting life. This
 " is a true saying, and worthy of all Men to be re-
 " ceived, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save
 " Sinners.—If any Man sin, we have an Advocate with
 " the Father. Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the
 " Propitiation for our Sins." St *John* adds, "And
 " not for ours only, but also for the Sins of the *whole*
 " *World.*" Sentences at the *Communion*. "Jesus Christ
 " is the very paschal Lamb, which was offered for
 " us, and hath taken away the Sin of *the World.*"
 " Preface upon *Easter-day*. "Jesus Christ—upon the
 " Cross—made a full, perfect and sufficient Sacrifice,
 " Oblation and Satisfaction for the Sins of the *whole*
 " *World.*" Prayer of *Consecration*. "Thou that takest
 " away the Sins of the World, have Mercy upon us."
 Anthem at the Communion. "I learn to believe in God
 " the Son, who hath redeemed me and *all Mankind.*
 Catechism. "O most mighty God and merciful Fa-
 " ther, who hast Compassion upon *all Men*, and hatest
 " *nothing* that thou hast made, who *wouldest not* the
 " death of a Sinner." Communion Office. "O most
 " mighty and gracious, good God, thy Mercy is over
 " *all thy Works.*—The Lord is gracious and full of
 " Compassion, slow to Anger, and of great Mercy."
 Thanksgiving after a Storm at Sea.

In this Manner our Church in her Liturgy sets forth
 the *Extent* of Redemption by Jesus Christ. Let us now
 consider what she therein teaches concerning *Perseve-*
rance. And here let it be observed, that every Prayer
 for Perseverance implies a *Possibility* of *Non-perseverance*,

in

in the Opinion of our Church : For to pray for a Thing which must *necessarily* be, and no Interveniencies whatever can prevent, is such a piece of Folly, as no Man in his Senses would be guilty of. And surely you, above all Men, would never suppose this could be charged on the *best of visible Churches*. If you say, The *End* is not to be expected without the Use of *Means* ; and the Means of obtaining Perseverance is *Prayer* ; you give up the Point, and acknowledge with us, that *Per everance* is not a *necessary* and *indefectible* thing, but *contingent* and *conditional*. In our *Liturgy* then we find such Prayers as these : “ We therefore pray thee, *help* thy Servants, “ whom thou hast redeemed with thy most precious “ Blood. *Make them* to be numbered with thy Saints “ in Glory everlasting.” Te Deum. “ *Take not* thy “ Holy Spirit *from us*.” Daily Suffrages. “ Grant “ that by Patience and Comfort of thy holy Word we “ may embrace and *ever hold fast* the blessed hope of “ everlasting Life. Second Sunday in *Adv.* “ Strengthen us by thy Grace, that by the Innocency of our “ Lives, and Constancy of our Faith, even unto Death, “ we may glorify thy holy Name.” *Innocents* Day. “ Grant us thy Peace all the Days of our Life.” Second Sunday after *Epiphany*. “ Grant that we may always serve thee in pureness of Living and Truth. First Sunday after *Easter*. “ Grant us by the same Spirit to have a right Judgment in all Things, and evermore to rejoice in his holy comfort. Whitsunday. “ Keep us stedfast in this Faith.” *Trinity* Sunday. “ Make us to have a perpetual Fear and Love of thy holy Name.” Second Sunday after *Trinity*. “ Increase and multiply upon us thy Mercy, that thou “ being our Ruler and Guide, we may so pass through “ things temporal, that we finally lose not the Things “ eternal.” Fourth Sunday after *Trinity*. “ Grant that “ we may so faithfully serve thee in this Life, that we “ fail not finally to attain thy heavenly Promises.” Fourteenth Sunday after *Trinity*. “ Grant that we may “ stedfastly walk in the way that leadeth to eternal “ Life.” St *Philip* and St *James*’s Day. “ Grant us “ Grace

“ Grace so to follow thy blessed Saints in all virtuous
 “ and godly Living, that we may come to those un-
 “ speakable Joys, which thou hast prepared for them
 “ that unfeignedly love thee.” *All Saints Day.*

Much more to the same Purpose might have been produced from the Collects. But omitting that, let us see what occurs in the other Offices. “ To all thy
 “ People give thy heavenly Grace,— that with meek
 “ Heart and due Reverence, they may hear and re-
 “ ceive thy holy Word, truly serving thee in Holiness
 “ and Righteousness all the Days of their Life.” *Prayer for the Church Militant.* “ Repent you of your Sins,
 “ or else come not to that holy Table, lest after the
 “ taking of that holy Sacrament, the Devil enter into
 “ you, as he entered into *Judas*, and fill you full of
 “ all Iniquities, and bring you to Destruction both
 “ of Body and Soul.” *Warning before Communion.*
 “ Grant us therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the
 “ Flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his
 “ Blood,— that we may evermore dwell in him, and
 “ he in us.” *Prayer after the Preface.* “ Almighty
 “ and everliving God, we most heartily thank thee,
 “ that thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, who have duly
 “ received these holy Mysteries, with the spiritual
 “ Food of the most precious Body and Blood of thy
 “ Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, and dost assure us
 “ thereby of thy Favour and Goodness towards us ;
 “ and that we are very Members incorporate in the
 “ mystical Body of thy Son, which is the blessed Com-
 “ pany of all faithful People ; and are also Heirs
 “ through Hope of the everlasting Kingdom ; — We
 “ most humbly beseech thee, O heavenly Father, so
 “ to assist us with thy Grace, that we may continue
 “ in that holy Fellowship, and do all such good Works,
 “ as thou hast prepared for us to walk in.” *Second Prayer after Communicating.* “ Grant that this Child
 “ now to be baptized therein, may receive the Full-
 “ ness of thy Grace, and ever remain in the Number
 “ of thy faithful and elect Children.” *Baptismal Office.*
 “ I pray unto God to give me his Grace, that I may
 “ continue

“ continue in the same (State of Salvation) unto my
 “ Life’s end.” *Catechism.* “ Defend, O Lord, this
 “ thy Child, with thy heavenly Grace, that he may
 “ continue thine for ever.” *Confirmation.* “ Send
 “ thy Blessing upon these thy Servants, that they obey-
 “ ing thy Will, and alway being in Safety under thy
 “ Protection, may abide in thy Love unto their Lives
 “ end.” *Matrimony.* “ Continue this Sick Member
 “ in the Unity of the Church.” *Visitation of the Sick.*

Now in all this, where does *Calvinism* stare us in the Face? So far is it from *staring* therein, that it does not so much as give a *single Peep* with the Eye; but the whole of it stands in direct Opposition to that kind of *Predestination* and *Perseverance*, which you maintain.

But you go on, Page 13. “ The *Arminian Tenets* “ belong to the Church of Rome.” Do they so? I am glad to hear that the Church of Rome has something good in her. But if it be so, you have done exceeding ill to pronounce her, “ the most depraved and “ the most impudent of all Churches.” The Tenets that you call *Arminian*, and which are held contrary to you, by those that you *boot at* under the Name of *Arminians*, are the Doctrine of General Redemption, the *Amisibility of Grace*, and that the Will of Man, *assisted by Grace*, is as free to good, as the merely natural and *unassisted Will*, is free to evil: Tenets held by the best of Men in all Ages, and plainly maintained by our Church. To say these *Arminians* hold *Justification by Works*, and deny *Original Sin*, is not only to *speak wickedly for God*, and *talk deceitfully for him*, as Job says of his Friends; but to be *Forgers of Lies*, as he also speaks, to help support a *bad Cause*. But of the Doctrines avowed by these *Arminians*, you say, “ From her (the Church of Rome) they came.” What Proof of this? “ And to her they lead.” Give your Instances. Say, who that has cordially believed the 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th, 13th, 16th and 31st Articles of our Church (the Belief of which makes the *Arminian* you attack with such *Virulence*) has by such Belief been led

led to embrace the Errors of the Church of Rome? And if you cannot bring one, some perhaps will be ready to say, that by asserting this, you shew yourself to be not a whit better than that Church which you seem so much to despise.

Page 13. "How goes the Stream," of Doctrines in the Church of Rome? "Quite in the contrary Channel" to *Predestination* and *invincible Grace*. "Witness the *Tridentine* Decisions, and the more recent Constitution, *Unigenitus*. Let a Man peruse these, and then doubt, if he can, whether *Arminianism* does not cordially coincide with *Popery*." Now, Sir, let me ask in my turn, How goes the Stream of Doctrines at *Constantinople*? Is it not *absolute Predestination*? Is there a *Mussulman* in all the *Turkish* Dominions that does not hold a *necessitating Fate*, and an *ineluctabilis ordo rerum*? Let a Man consider this, and then doubt, if he can, whether *Calvinism* does not cordially coincide with *Mahometism*? Say that *Calvinists* do not look upon *Mahomet* as a Prophet sent of God. I say, on the other hand, Nor do *Arminians*, those of them that you hoot at, look upon the Pope as the *infallible Head of the Church*. Will you reply, The *Mahometans* do not believe Christ to be such a Saviour, as the Scriptures declare he is? I say, Nor do you. In this respect you are but very little before a *Mussulman*. Upon the whole, if such Members of the Church of England, as you call *Arminians*, are to be stigmatized as *Papists* for holding in common with them some Tenets, which the *wisest* of the Fathers held before *St Austin's* Days; some of the *best* of Christians have held since, and our own Church holds at this Day; is there not as much reason to stigmatize the *Calvinists* as *Mahometans*, because they hold some Tenets in common with them? It cannot be denied. Own yourself a *Mahometan* then, or call an *Arminian*, barely as such, a *Papist* no more.

Page 15. "Abbot, Grindall, Usher, Williams, Davenant, Downham, Carlton, Hall, Beveridge, Hopkins, &c. were all Bishops and Predestinarians." They were

were all Predestinarians *once* it is true. But did they continue so to their Lives end? Did they never become *wiser*? You should tell Dr *Norwell* and us that: That Piece of Intelligence, I suppose, you choose to throw *into the Shades*, as, you say, Dr *Norwell* did the Bishops. But for the honour of some of these *once predestinarian* Bishops, I cannot forbear telling Tales. Archbishop *Usher*, before he died, became what you call an *Arminian*. I know your Party deny it; but I have sufficient Proof of it now lying before me. So did Bishop *Davenant*, and several other *once antia-minian* Bishops and famous Divines that I could name. But, as you say, "After all, Truth does not depend
" on Names. The Doctrines of the Church are to be
" learned from the *Articles* and *Homilies* (and, you
" should have added, *Liturgy*.) of the Church herself;
" not from the *private Opinions* of some *Individuals*,
" who lay hold on the Skirt of her Garment, call
" themselves by her Name, and live *by her Revenue*." I know some that think, that Reflection might as well have been kept in.

However, the Doctrines of the Church, you say, are to be learned from her *established Writings* above-mentioned. Agreed. I will take the Liberty then to tell you, in the Words of a Writer in the last Century, who was once as *deeply drenched* in *Calvinism*, as you are, and, I have reason to think, studied the Points in Controversy *as much*, and I scruple not to say *to much better Purpose*, that "Universal Redemption is asserted
" in no less than four distinct Articles, *viz.* the 2d,
" 7th, 15th and 31st. So also in the *Catechism*, the
" *Nicene Creed*, and in several other Parts of the public Liturgy, as is evidently shewed by the Right
" Reverend Dr *Overal*, whilst he was Public Professor
" of Divinity, in the University of *Cambridge*. And
" to this agree the Confessions of the Protestant
" Churches beyond Sea, reckoned up by Mr *Rogers*
" upon the 31st Article; if not rightly, it is his Fault.
" Again, the *Liberty* of the Will, and the *Co-operation* of Grace, are asserted in the 10th Article,
" wherein

“ wherein there is not the least Sound of *irresistible*
 “ *Working* ; as it is excellently explained by the same
 “ Dr *Overal* (a Person, for *Temper, Piety and Modera-*
 “ *tion*, as well as for *Wideness and Depth of Learning*,
 “ as fit to tell us the very Mind of the Church of
 “ *England*, as any Man that can be named.) Again,
 “ the *Possibility* to fall from Grace after the Recep-
 “ tion of the Holy Ghost, and to fall into *damning*
 “ Sins (or into a State of Damnation) is clearly as-
 “ serted in the 16th Article, and in the Homilies of
 “ our Church concerning the *Danger of falling away from*
 “ God ; and in the Administration of Baptism ; as
 “ the same Dr *Overal* doth demonstrate, affirming,
 “ the contrary Opinion to have been *rejected by all*
 “ *Antiquity*, and too much *confuted by the Experience*
 “ *of all Times*, and only brought into the Church by
 “ the late Dissentions, which passed between *Zuin-*
 “ *glius and Martin Luther*. Lastly, *Conditional Pre-*
 “ *destination* is *sufficiently*, though *implicitly* asserted, by
 “ our Church in her 17th Article ; where it is
 “ clearly to be collected, that God’s eternal Decree
 “ of electing Men to Life eternal, was made in *In-*
 “ *tuition of their being in Christ* ; which is as clearly
 “ also to be inferred from the Nature of the Pro-
 “ mises, which are *conditionally express* in holy Scrip-
 “ ture. And the Promises of God are merely the *Tran-*
 “ *scripts of his Decrees*, revealed to us in Time, after
 “ the *Pattern and Proportion* of what he decreed from
 “ all Eternity.”

Now unless you can disprove what Bishop *Overal*
 has advanced, (which you shall never, with all your
 Art, be able to do) you shall allow that he has vin-
 dicated our Articles from the Charge of *Calvinism* ;
 however, as you say, Bishop *Bull*, Doctor *Water-*
land, and several other religious and learned Men,
 “ have laboured hard to do it, but were not able.”
 That our Church maintains *Universal Redemption*, as
 respecting Mankind ; the *Liberty of the Will*, and the
Co-operation of Grace ; the *Possibility of falling from*
Grace ; and *conditional Predestination* ; (as likewise did
Austin,

Austin, Prosper and Fulgentius) which you yet call *Arminian Tenets*, is undeniable. If therefore you have by and by in this Book culled out certain Assertions from the standard Writings of our Church, which, like many Threatnings and Promises in Scripture, are *absolute in Form*, but *conditional in Sense and Meaning*, and will yet have them to be understood in an *absolute Sense*; and to be construed *Calvinistically*, you shall be forced either to renounce your Opinion concerning such Passages; or to own that the Church of *England*, like most *Calvinistic* Writers, is so *inconsistent* in her Doctrines, that no Man can certainly tell what Doctrine she *would* maintain; and so, instead of the *best*, make her one of the *worst* of visible Churches. Whether this was not the *Design* of your Writings, you know best.

Page 16. You tell us, "The *Arminian* Doctor (Bishop Bull) insinuates, " that the Determinations of the Church in behalf of the *Calvinistic Principles*, are not sufficiently *clear*, but *dark* and *ambiguous*. As if she had not *clearly determined*, " That Predestination is the everlasting Purpose of God; " and that we are justified by Faith only." And suppose she has; as who disputes it? Under Favour, Sir, she may have *clearly determined* these Things, and yet her Determinations in behalf of the *Calvinistic Principles*, may not be *sufficiently clear*, but *dark* and *ambiguous*. For these Points are no more *peculiarly Calvinistic*, than they are *Arminian*. " After this rate " any *unbelieving Subscriber* whatever, when taxed " with *Dishonesty* and *Prevarication*, need only cry " out with Bishop Bull, " the Determinations of our " Church, are not *clear*; and he slips his Neck out " of the Collar very cleverly." And truly you have made the Collar *wide enough* for any one so to do, as much as in you lies. That our Church holds the Doctrines called *Arminian*, as maintained by Bishop Overal, is manifest to every Man of common Capacity that reads his Common Prayer Book with Attention. And you, Sir, have worthily endeavoured to
prove

prove how greatly she contradicts herself, and therefore that her Determinations are *not clear*, and that she is a Church *without any fixt Principles*. But it is well that many of her *wise and good Presbyters*, have recorded that her *fixt Principles* were *innocently and scripturally Arminian*, or to speak more properly, *Melanchtonian*; however, some have taken great Pains to make her Principles smell strong of *Geneva*.

Will you hear another Quotation from a pious, learned, and judicious Writer, whom I admire as much as you do *Zanchius*? Being charged with *Arminianism* by a bitter *Presbyterian* in *Oliver's Time*, he replies: "I was then in the Opinions I now am
 " in, when I had not read one Page of *Arminius's*
 " Works: Nor do I agree with him, any further than
 " he agrees with *Scripture, Antiquity, the Church of*
 " *England, and Melanchton* (after the Time of his Con-
 " version from the Errors of *Luther and Calvin*.) This
 " *Melanchton* had been at first as it were the Scholar
 " of *Luther*, and drew from him his first Errors. But
 " being a pious, learned and unpassionate Man, (pur-
 " suing Truth, not Faction) he saw his Error, and
 " forsook it, embracing those Opinions concerning
 " the Liberty of the Will, the Cause of Sin, the Uni-
 " versality of Grace, and the Respectiveness of God's
 " Decrees, which I asserted.—Thus *Melanchton* was,
 " and is still the Darling (more than any one Man) of
 " the reformed Part of the Christian World; so much
 " the rather, because, besides his vast Learning, un-
 " biassed Judgment, and transcendent Piety, he was
 " almost proverbial for Moderation. For this was he
 " chosen to write the *Augustan Confession*; for this he
 " was much considered by them that composed our
 " *Book of Articles*, and our other *Book of Homilies*,
 " which shews us what is the Doctrine of the true
 " Church of *England*. For this he was imitated and
 " admired by the glorious *Martyrs* of our Religion in
 " the Days of *Queen Mary*: For this he was esteemed
 " far above Mr *Calvin* by *Jacobus Arminius*, the sa-
 " mous Professor of Divinity in the University of
 " *Leyden*;

“ *Leyden* ; who, however a *Presbyterian*, as to Matter
 “ of *Discipline*, did yet so very far excel the other
 “ Divines of that Sect in exactness of *Learning*, as
 “ well as *Life*, that we may say he became *Melanchton’s*
 “ Convert.” From this Testimony of Dr *Pierce* then,
 it appears, that the Church of *England*, is neither *Ar-*
minian, nor *Calvinistic*, but treads in the Steps of *Me-*
lanchton. And that his Testimony is *true*, there is
 no room left to doubt, since, if it could have been
 proved *false*, his rigid Antagonist, Dr *Reynolds*, and
 the violent Faction that then strove for the upper Hand,
 would not have failed to have done it.

Page 16. “ One of the most furious *Arminians* now
 “ living, the *John Goodwin* of the present Age—is
 “ Mr *John Wesley*.” However it may be thought a
 Matter that does not concern me, to undertake to de-
 fend Mr *Wesley* against your virulent Slanders and In-
 vectives, yet, to let the World see what Regard you
 have to *Truth*, *Justice*, and *Sincerity*, I shall make some
 Strictures upon this Passage. You tell us, though most
 untruly, Page 132. “ That an *Arminian* holds five of
 “ the Points upon which the Mystic *Babylon* is built.”
 And then you mention six Points of Doctrine main-
 tained in the Church of *Rome* ; one of which must
 be thrown aside, in order to reduce them to five ; for
 you charge the *Arminians* with holding no more in
 common with *Papists*. And pray which must that
 be ? I presume the first, viz. that no Man, so long as
 he liveth in this mortal Life, ought—positively to conclude
 that he is actually in the Number of the predestinate.
 This, though it be a Tenet of the Church of *Rome*,
 I conclude we must not deem an Error, because it is
 the undeniable Consequence of what is asserted by
Elisba Coles in his *Practical Discourse of God’s Sove-*
reignty, which is the *Calvinists’* Body of Divinity, viz.
 “ that Perseverance to Salvation must demonstrate the
 “ Truth of Faith ; and wheresoever this follows not,
 “ Faith was but pretended,” page 271. It undeniably
 follows from hence, that no Man can be sure his Faith
 is true, till he has persevered to Salvation ; and so,
 that

that no Man, so long as he lives, ought *positively* to conclude, that he is *actually* in the Number of the *predestinate*. Now whether the *Arminians* hold this *distinguishing Tenet* of *Popery* or not, it is evident the *Calvinists* do. As therefore you have been so unwary as heedlessly to lay down *six popish* Points instead of *five*; and this first, like the *Wickedness of the Wicked*, falls upon your own Pate, I doubt not but you will take it as a Favour, if we throw this out again, and retain only the five that follow.

The first of these five Points is, "That since the Fall of *Adam*, Man's Free-will is not lost and extinct." What Man in his Senses will affirm it is? He may as well affirm, that his *Soul* is *lost* and *extinct*. You yourself must allow, with Mr *Wesley*, *Elisba Coles*, and *me*, that "the Will cannot be forced." And if it cannot be forced, it must be *free*. In this you must coincide with the Church of *Rome*, as much as Mr *Wesley*, unless you would incur the Imputation of an *unreasonable* Man. Herein you must *Arminianize*, or be downright *perverse*. The Charge against Mr *Wesley* then is reduced to *four* Points, *viz.* "that he maintains Doctrines contrary to the 11th Article of the Church, (which you have split asunder to make *two* of your Points) and to the 12th and 13th Articles." Now, Sir, whoever reads Mr *Wesley's* Writings cannot but see, that his Doctrine is exactly agreeable to *all* these Articles. To charge him then with a *pretended Arminianism*, that is, "the very Essence of *Popery*," can be no other than to be guilty of *Falseness* and *Calumny*, if nothing worse. But you do not only charge him with being *such* an *Arminian*, but a *furious* one too. Now, Sir, I must tell you, I hardly believe you in this Point. I had an Opportunity twenty Years ago, of knowing as much of his *Temper*, as you do. He was then a Man remarkably *meek* and *calm* in his Temper; very far from having, like *Calvin*, a *wild Beast of Impatience* raging in him, and which he could not tame. And I have never heard, (which I should certainly have done, if it were so) that there
is

is any Change in him in this respect for the worse. Could you then justly blame Mr *Wesley* if he should apply to you, the Words of *David* concerning *Doeg the Edomite*: *Thy Tongue imagineth Wickedness, and with Lies thou cuttest like a sharp Razor. Thou hast loved Unrighteousness more than Goodness, and to talk of Lies more than Righteousness. Thou hast loved to speak all Words that may do hurt, O thou false Tongue.* And if he should tell you it is well for you (your present Quiet, I should rather say) that you can fancy yourself *elect*; or else I know not how you can read *Prov. vi. 16, 17. 18, 19.* and other such Passages of Scripture, without trembling.

But Mr *Wesley*, you say, is “ the *John Goodwin* of “ the present Age.” Is he so? And did you speak this, meaning to reproach Mr *Wesley*. Setting aside *J. Goodwin*’s political Principles, (which I shall have Occasion to shew by and by you seem to be no Enemy to) and taking him only as the *Theologist*, you could hardly have said any Thing greater in his Commendation. *J. Goodwin* is one of the chief of those Worthies, who suffered more for the genuine Doctrines of Christianity from the persecuting Calvinists of those Times, than the six expelled Students did for their Attachment to *Calvinism*; and who, by the Breath of his Mouth contributed, as much as any Man, to dispel that Smoke of the bottomless Pit, which had clouded and sullied the Face of the Church of England. His Redemption redeemed, will ever remain as a Monument of his great Reading, clear Reasoning, and sound Judgment in the Points we contend about. This Book you say, page 65. was effectually answered by Mr *George Kendall*; for which he had the Thanks of Bishop *Hall*. If it was, I’ll eat it, as tough a Morfel as it is. Has Mr *Kendall* proved, that the Scriptures do not say what they do, in favour of General Redemption, and the Possibility of falling from Grace? Or has he proved that the Writers he quotes in favour of those Doctrines, do not say what they do? Or that those Scriptures and those Writers do not mean what they say? Or

C

has

has he proved, that the *plain* Passages of Scripture are to be explained by the *figurative*; and such as are *easy* and of *undoubted Sense*, by such as are *more difficult* and *doubtful*? If he has not proved these Things, which it is impossible he should, he has not *effectually answered* *J. Goodwin's Redemption redeemed*. Surely we cannot but have a high Opinion of a Man whom *Every* itself cannot but praise. And when such an Enemy, as you deliberately avow yourself to be, commends Mr *Wesley* under the Character of the *John Goodwin* of the present Age, we certainly ought not to look upon him in any less View, than a glorious Champion for the *Truth* of the Gospel, and *genuine Doctrines* of the Church of *England*.

But did you indeed say this by Way of *Reproach* to Mr *Wesley*? How is it that your Mind is so estranged from him, since you were, as some say, a Member of his Society, or however an Attender upon his Doctrine, in *Ireland*? Was it your *Humility* (or your *Pride* was it?) led you to sit at the Back of him, or his Preachers, in the Desk at *Dublin*? One would be inclined to think you had a better Opinion of him and his Doctrines then, than you have now. What has occasioned the Change; You declare indeed, in your Sermon on *1 Tim. i. 10*. “ It is not the smallest of
“ my distinguishing Mercies, that, from the very Com-
“ mencement of my *unworthy Ministrations*, (alas!) I
“ have not had a *single Doctrine* to retract, nor a *sin-*
“ *gle Word* to unsay.” If this be true, Sir, I will venture to affirm, you are the first mere Man that could ever *boast* in this Manner, except some of the inspired Penmen: I say *some*, for it appears from *Gal. ii. 14*, and elsewhere, that *some*, even of those, had *some Words* to unsay. But if you have been so happy since the Commencement of your *most* *unworthy Ministrations* (for we are not against your *speaking humbly* in the *superlative Degree*, though we object a little to your *boasting* in a *superlative Manner*) as never to advance *one single Point* of Doctrine, which you had need to retract, and never to say a *single Word*, which you had
need

need to *unsay*, never to make *one Slip of the Tongue*; did you never do any such thing *before* that Commencement? Did you never *believe* and *maintain* the Doctrine of *General Redemption*? If you did, why did you *wheel off* from your former Principles? Will you tell me, you see *clearer* now, than you did then? This is the poor Plea of every *Weathercock* in Religion that we meet with. Several I have known, that have *shifted* about, perhaps more than you have done, whose last *Vision*, as they say, was *always* the *clearest*; and yet, like you, were as positive at first that they saw *aright*, as they were at last. This cannot but create a strong Suspicion that you do not know when you do see aright. And till you can give us better Proof of your present *Infallibility of Vision*, than you have done, you must give us leave to think for ourselves, and to think that you saw better *once*, than you see *now*.

I have known one, that was always confident that he was *right*, notwithstanding he has changed his Opinion *three* Times to my Knowledge, and his Opinions have been as widely different, as the *East* is from the *West*. And at every Turn, every one was *wrong*, that did not think as he did. Upon every Change he was still as *infallible* in his own Account, as ever was *Pope* in the Account of a *Papist*, or Mr *Toplady* in his *Judgment of himself*. And after all this, I once heard this *Shiftabout* say (as if he had always been as fixt to one Opinion, as the *Needle* to the *North*) speaking of a Gentlewoman of his Acquaintance, "I never come near that Gentlewoman, but I always find her in a new Opinion; there is a sincere Heart at the Bottom, or she would have been overfet long ago." Now what can any one think of such *Changelings*? Tho', we may in *Charity* hope, as that Man did concerning his Acquaintance, that there is a *sincere Heart* at the Bottom; we cannot but in *Reason* think, that there must be much *Pride*, and a marvellous degree of *Self-soothing* in such a one, that can all this while, upon every fresh Change, fancy himself to be right, and condemn all others that do not change as *often*

and the *same Ways* that he does. I would here give my Advice to all such, as are thus *given to change*; never change the old Opinion, unless you have sufficient Reason to think it is *wrong*; and if upon *such* Ground you do change, never condemn others for not thinking just as you do, unless you are quite sure you have changed for the *right*. If this Rule were observed, I am clearly of Opinion, that real Christians, of every Denomination, might go to Heaven quietly, as for one another, and without *falling out by the Way*.

“ Mr *Wesley*, you say, seems to have refined upon “ Bishop *Bull* in *Equivocation* and *dishonest Prevarication*; and in a *loose, shagging* Way of evading the “ Force of *Church-decisions*, and weakening the sacred “ Ties of solemn, repeated Subscriptions.” *Bull*, you say, page 14. “ is one of those Names that are not “ to be mentioned without *Honour*.” I would ask, with what Honour we can mention the Name of a Man, though a Bishop, if he was, as you represent him, an *Equivocator*, a *dishonest Prevaricator*, and a *loose, shagging Evader* of Church-decisions, and *Weaker* of the sacred Ties of solemn, repeated Subscriptions? I should suppose the Name of a Man chargeable with such Crimes could not be mentioned with much Honour. And Mr *Wesley's* Name, according to your Account, seemingly with still less. For he, you say, *seems* to have *refined* upon Bishop *Bull*; to *exceed* him in his Crimes. And with how much more Honour may we mention the Name of that reverend Presbyter of the Church of *England*, who has undertaken to *vindicate* her from the Charge of *Arminianism*, by endeavouring to prove that she is downright *Calvinistic*, by his own *Equivocation*, *Prevarication*, and *loose, shagging* Way of evading her Decision in the 2d and 31st Articles, and in many Places of the Liturgy, (as I have already shewn) and Homilies besides.

You, Sir, have subscribed to the 2d Article of our Church, which asserts, that Christ—truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile his Father to

us,

us; and to be a Sacrifice, not only for original Guilt, but also for the *actual Sins of Men*; and to the 31st, which maintains, that the Offering of Christ once made, is that perfect Redemption, Propitiation, and Satisfaction for *all the Sins of the whole World*, both *original and actual*, as well as any of those Ministers of Christ, which you call *Arminian*. And if you will needs have the Church of *England* to be *Calvinistic*, and subscribed to these Articles as such, must not you *equivocate, prevaricate*, and have a *loose, shagging Way of evading Church-decisions*, as much as ever Bishop *Bull* and Mr *Wesley* did and had? Certainly you cannot deny it. If then they, or any one else, that holds *General Redemption*, with its concomitant Doctrines, have, on that Account, been criminal in subscribing to the 17th Article; you and every *Calvinist* have been so as much as they, and more, in subscribing to the 2d and 31st. A *Generalist* may *fairly and honestly* subscribe to the 17th Article, seeing that those, who were likely to know its Meaning better than you and I, have determined, that it holds no *such* Predestination as you contend for; as every unprejudiced Person also may easily determine for himself, from the very Words of the Article; but no *Calvinist* can *fairly and honestly* subscribe to the 2d and 31st, but he must *equivocate and prevaricate*, and fly to such *Shifts and Evasions*, as are not to be admitted in any Case, much less in this, as being altogether inconsistent with *Uprightness*.

Page 17. “ Mr *Wesley*, you say, very gravely tells “ us, that the Article, which treats of Predestination, “ only *defines the Term*, but does not *affirm the Doc-* “ *trine*.” The Doctrine taught by *such Calvinists* as you, I suppose he means. And can you prove that it does? If you can, I should heartily repent that ever I subscribed it. If I had had the least Notion of such Doctrine being *affirmed* in that Article, I would as soon have subscribed to the *Mahometan Koran*, as to it. You may *gravely tell* us, and you may as *gravely attempt to prove*, that all Events are *absolutely necessary*; and that such Necessity is *fixt* by the Author of Nature;

but I must have as bad an Opinion, as you have, of God, the *sovereign Good*, and believe him to be the *Author* of all the *moral Evil* there is in the World, before I can believe you. However, you maintain that the 17th Article does affirm *your* Doctrine of Predestination; and I maintain that the 2d and 31st do affirm (in Words, that it is impossible, without doing Violence even to common Sense, to draw aside to any other, than their *plain, obvious* Meaning) the Doctrine of *General Redemption*. To these you have subscribed; and if you have subscribed *as a Calvinist*, you did it *insincerely*, and with *secret Proviso*es and *Exceptions* of *your own*. I cannot help therefore retorting upon you St Paul's Words, accommodated to the Case in hand, varying a little from your *slight Variation*: *Thou art inexcusable* (O subscribing Calvinist!) *whoever thou art, that judgest* (the subscribing Arminian) *for, wherein thou judgest* (him) *thou condemnest thyself*: *For thou that judgest dost the same Thing* (in another Way.) And your own Words, a little varied, concerning Dr Nowell and his Subscriptions, page 24. "You, Sir, have subscribed to our Articles and Homilies.—These Articles and Homilies are, not in *your* Sense, *Calvinistic*, but what you call *Arminian*. And you are a *professed rigid Calvinist*. Either therefore you was *not* a Calvinist when you subscribed, or you subscribed to what you *disbelieved*." By your own Estimate then I judge of you; and leave you, as well qualified for the Business, to judge of the rest of your Sect.

Well Sir, you have, with that Measure of *Courtesy* and *Candor* that you are possesst of, painted out Mr Wesley in very *black Colours*, not only as a Man unfit to be a *Minister of the Gospel*, but unfit even to be a *Member of human Society*. You have set him forth as an *Equivocator*, a *Prevaricator*, an *Enemy* to the Church of England, a *Factor* for the Church of Rome; that such Men, (as you would make the World believe, he, and such as hold *General Redemption* are) were in Queen Elizabeth's Days ranked among *Pelagians*, *Papists*, *Epicires*, and *Anabaptists*. Now, Sir, after you have
said

said all this, let me ask you, who do you think will believe you when you say, page 26. “ I *abhor* every “ thing that even looks like *Persecution* for Principles “ *merely religious.*” But you do not perhaps, look upon the *Generalists* Principles to be *merely religious.* You look upon them as *corrupt, impious* and *wicked* Principles, and so by means of this *Starting-hole*, you can well *approve* of *Persecution* against the *Generalists*, and Mr *Wesley* especially, as being an *Arch-heretic*, one of the most *furious Arminians* now living. the *John Goodwin* of the present Age, and the *Abridger* of your Translation of *Zanchius*. You well know, Sir, that Mr *Wesley* has had a pretty good Share of *Persecution*, and that chiefly for having been represented to the World; in much the same manner as you represent him; so much of it, that if you had been in his stead with your Principles, and it must have cost you *as much* to maintain them, as it hath cost him, I am inclined to think you would not have come up to the Price. As dear as you hold *Calvinism*, I could almost venture to affirm, you do not hold it *dear enough* to give up every thing for it, that the Men of the World hold most dear.

But as near as Mr *Wesley* has oftentimes been to the Gates of Death, through the *Outrage* and *Violence* of an *incensed Rabble* (which I do not find but he always bore with the utmost *Patience* and *Meekness*, as *furious* an *Arminian* as you say he is) he has hitherto escaped with Life, and he can now go on his way pretty quietly, a favour which you seem to repine at. And therefore, out of your *pious Zeal* for the *Church* and *Orthodoxy*, you will give one more loud *Halloo*, after the former Manner, to try if you cannot rouse again the *dull inactive Populace*, that they may do effectually that Business, which before they left undone. But be advised, Sir, take heed what you do. For notwithstanding you would shift the Character of *Methodist* from the *Calvinistic Party*, and throw it wholly upon the *Generalists*, a thoughtless Mob, when once raised, will shew them no favour on that account. The Leaders among you may take to themselves the plausible Character of *THE Gospel Ministers*,

ters, as if none preached the Gospel but they ; and call their followers *Sweet Christians*, and *Dear Children of God*, as if none but *Calvinists* were worthy of such Names, but take my word for it, this will never *save your Bacon*. When Persecution raged before, the *Calvinists* fared but little better than the *Generalists*: And if your *good Offices* can prevail so far as to raise the Storm again, call yourselves what you will, the World calls you *Methodists*, and as such you must not think to go scotfree.

Will you pretend to say, you do not desire to *raise* Persecution against the *Generalists*, the *Arminians*, as you call them? Why then did you set forth Mr *Wesley*, and *all* that agree with him in point of Doctrine, in such a Light? Is not that in itself a *kind* of Persecution? And would you not have every one else *think* of them as you do? And do by them as you have done, if not *worse*? You shall never persuade me that you would not. If you had thought Mr *Wesley*, Dr *Norwell*, or any one else in an Error, would it not have been sufficient to have said what you could by way of Proof, without shewing what you call your *becoming Indignation*? Without *reviling, slandering* and *calling reproachful Names*? I think it would. And if you had omitted that, there had been some Room to hope that you do indeed *abhor* Persecution. But first to *persecute*, and then to tell us very gravely that you *abhor* Persecution, can but make every thinking Man conclude, that if you *do* abhor it, it is only when it lights upon yourself and your own Party. You would fain be thought a *wise* and a *good* Man: And if you really are that wise and good Man, which you desire to be thought, I must say concerning you, as you say concerning Dr *Norwell*, " All is not wise that wise Men say ; nor all good that good Men do." I not do say as one of old did, Μισῶ σοφιστὴν ὃς ἐκ αὐτοῦ σοφός, I hate that Sophist, who is not wise for himself ; but this I say, I pity such a Sophist who is neither wise for himself, nor others.

I have dwelt long upon the Matter between Mr *Wesley* and you, for several Reasons. 1. In my Opinion there is a kind of *common Justice* due to every Man ;
which

which is, that we should *do unto them as we would that they should do unto us*. It is a Lesson taught us by Christ himself, and admired even by a *Heathen Emperor*; the more is the Pity it should not be practised by you, who set yourself up as the *Church of England's Vindicator*. You, Sir, would not be willing to be persecuted yourself, why then should you endeavour to raise Persecution against Mr *Wesley*, or *any Man else*, that differs from you in Sentiment? If you would convince them that they are in an Error, do it if you can by Reason, where they err against Reason, and by Scripture, where they err against Scripture; but use no other Weapons, nor encourage others to do it. Do not, by charging them with high Crimes they are innocent of, endeavour to set the licentious Vulgar on to *beat their Brains out*. As much as I hate *Calvinism*, I do not hate *Calvinists*. And though I would, if I could, rid the World of their horrid Opinions, I would not wish such as hold them to be *shut up* in a Castle in *North Wales*, or *Wallingford*, where none should be suffered to resort to them but their Keepers; as the *Calvinian Bishops* advised concerning those termed *Pelagians* or *Free-Willers* in *Q. Elizabeth's Days*; much less would I wish an End to their Lives, because they differed in Opinion from me. 2. I need not now tell you, that I am one of those *Arminian Heretics*, condemned by your Pen, that hold *General Redemption*, *Free Will*, and the *Amissibility of Grace*, in such Manner as they are maintained by our Church; and therefore whatever you have said to spirit up the World and the *Calvinists* against Mr *Wesley* or others, as *Generalists*, equally affects me. And when it is come to this, that,

Proximus Ucalegon ardet.

When any *ill-minded Incendiary* hath set fire to our next Neighbour's House, it behoves every one to lend a helping Hand to extinguish the Flame, lest he be mischieved by it.

Page 18. "If *Arian* Subscription to *Trinitarian* Articles is palpably dishonest, then, by all the Rules of Argument in the World, *Arminian* Subscription to Articles that are *Calvinistic*, must be no less criminal. This was the Gordian Knot, which Dr *Waterland*, with all his straining, never could untie." But the Doctor, you say, "to free himself from this Embarrassment, resolved to cut the Knot at once, by roundly denying, that our Articles are *Calvinistic*:" and a very good Expedient too. For if Words have any *fix'd* and *settled* Meaning, those Passages, which I have collected from our Liturgy, must be acknowledged to be as opposite to *Calvinism*, as Light to Darkness. And unless you can prove that our Articles contradict the Liturgy, you must own, that these, no more than the Liturgy, are *Calvinistic*. the Doctor therefore has given the *Arian* Adversaries no Advantage at all against him, nor our Church, by this Method: You and your Party have, by insisting upon her being *Calvinistic*: Yea, and the *Deists* too, against the Scriptures, as well as her. And 'tis next to a Miracle, while the Scriptures are so *wrested* to support *Calvinism*, that all the World do not turn *Deists*.

Page 20. You pray, "That the *Delilahs*, who make it their Business to *shear the Church of its Locks*, by robbing it gradually of its *Doctrines*, may not, at the long run, deliver her quite up into the hands of the *Philistines*," Why, indeed, there is great Danger of it; but it comes from a quarter, that either you do not *suspect*, or are willing to *conceal*. Her *genuine* Doctrines, I hope, we shall always maintain against the Church of *Rome* and *Geneva*, and any *Innovators* whatever.

Having dispatched Bishop *Bull*, Mr *Wesley*, and Dr *Waterland*, you will have a Bout with Bishop *Burnet*. Page 21. The Bishop supposes an Article may be "conceived in such *general* Words, that it may admit of *different* *Literal* and *Grammatical* Senses." You reply, "As if there could be more *Literal* Sen-

"ses

“ ses of a Proposition than one !” As if there could not
 It is evident there may. For Instance, take this Pro-
 position, *the Word was God*. A *Trinitarian* will take
 this in the *literal* Sense, and say, *the Word was God*;
 even the *eternal, unoriginated* God. An *Arian* will
 take it likewise in the *literal* Sense, and say, *the Word*
was God; but it was only an *inferior, originated* God. It is
 plain then that different Persons may subscribe the same
 Article in the *literal* and *grammatical* Sense, and yet
 subscribe in a Sense plainly *contrary* one to another. The
 chief Matter in Subscription then, is not to consider only
 what is the *literal*, but what is the *true* and *genuine* Sense
 of the Words subscribed to ; as intended by those that
 framed those Words ; which can be, supposing them all of
 one Opinion, but one and the same ; whereas the *literal*
 Sense may be taken *different* Ways. And he alone is
 the *honest* Subscriber that subscribes in the *true* and *ge-*
nuine Sense of the Articles, where that Sense is *certainly*
known, or however in a Sense that appears to him as such,
 where the Matter is not sufficiently clear. But this cannot
 be said with regard to those Articles that oppose *Arianism*,
Popery and *Deism* ; for these are framed in such a Man-
 ner, as admits of no *Evasion*, nor *Mistake* ; no *literal*
 Sense, but what is the *true* and *genuine* Sense also.
 When therefore you say, that supposing there could be
 more literal Senses of a Proposition than one, “ An
 “ *Arian*, a *Papist* or a *Deist*, may *with a good Conscience*,
 “ and *without Equivocation*, subscribe those very Articles,
 “ which *literally* and *grammatically* conclude point-
 “ blank against *Arianism*, *Popery*, and *Deism*,” You
 only bear *false Witness*, and vilely *slander* that Church
 you pretend to vindicate. A *precious Vindicator* truly !

Page 23. You tell Dr. Nowell, “ You and I and
 “ every Subscriber, are by express Declaration of *Au-*
 “ *thority*, pinned down to the plain, *literal* and *gram-*
 “ *matical* Meaning of each Article.” By the Decla-
 ration of what *Authority* are we thus pinned down ?
 Supposing it to be that of King *James* the first ? What
 is that to you and me ? Unless it were the Declaration
 of present Authority, and so expressed. A Declaration
 without any Name affix to it, I can hardly call, a De-
 claration

claration of Authority. Its being called, *His Majesty's Declaration*, I presume, makes it no more Matter of Authority, than if it were called, *His Holiness's Declaration*. But let me repeat it again, we are not only to consider the *literal*, but the *genuine* Sense and Meaning of each Article. And this I learn from the Liturgy to be such, that *Calvinism*, however it may appear to be the Sense of one Article (which yet, when attentively considered, is no more than *Appearance*) is not taught in our Articles. And this every one must allow, that will not make our Church as inconsistent with herself, as *Austin, Luther, Calvin* and *You*.

Well, you urge us further, *King James* declares, “ That no Man shall put his *own Sense* or *Comment* to “ be the Meaning of the Article, but shall take it in the “ *literal* and *grammatical* Sense.” What, without putting his *own Sense* upon it? Did you subscribe the Articles *without* putting your *own Sense* upon them, even when you subscribed them in the *literal* Sense? Your Question is not, whether you took the Letter in a Sense of your own devising; but whether the Sense you took it in was not your own, from whencesoever you gathered it up; or whether you subscribed them in the Sense of others, which you knew nothing of, and did not believe? If the former, then you subscribed it contrary to *King James's Declaration*, you put your own Sense upon it: If the latter, you were either very *thoughtless* or very *dishonest*.

You, Sir, have, among the rest, subscribed the 35th Article, which declares, *the second Book of Homilies,— doth contain a Godly and wholesome Doctrine*. In the Homily of *Alms-doing* there is this *Apocryphal* Text, *Alms makes an Atonement for Sins*. Now as much a *Calvinist*, as you are, did you not subscribe to this, which is one Principal Tenet of *Popery*? Or did you, like every *honest Arminian* Subscriber, come in here with a Sense of your own, and make a little Exception. This I allow, that this Homily contains a *godly* and *wholesome* Doctrine (in *general*, but not in *every particular*.) You subscribed likewise the 21st against *Rebellion*. And yet, *Page 49.* you set your best Hand to promote it, as the
loyal

loyal and *godly* Mr *Prynne* did. For you say, "When-
 " ever a Prince *oversteps Law*, Loyalty itself obliges a
 " loyal People to say to such a Prince, as the Almighty
 " to the Sea, *Hitherto shall you come, and no farther.*"
 Now, Sir, it is possible, that a very good and well-
 meaning Prince may chance to *overstep Law*, through
Inadvertence and the *wrong Advice* of those about him,
 yet I can hardly think a Prince's taking such a step, will
 justify his Subjects in rebelling against him immediately,
 or whenever he takes such a step. If you can prove
 Rebellion to be ever necessary, I should think it, how-
 ever, as it is a dreadful Expedient, to be the last Recourse
 that should be had to. Did you think this, as the Article
 says of the Homilies, to be "*godly and wholesom*
 " Doctrine, and necessary for these times?" If you do, I
 shall only say, However "the famous Mr *Wilkes* is in
 " the Opinion of very many a *passable Politician*," (as
 you say) you are not; much less an *honest Subscriber* to a
 Homily against Rebellion, while you say one Word to
 encourage another.

Page 26. "The *reverend* and *dignified* Author of *The*
 " *Confessional*, is a *Saint*, when set in Competition with
 " such Divines, as would put out our Eyes, by daring
 " to tell us, that the 10th Article does *not overturn*
 " *Free-will.*" And he is a *Sinner*, that dares to tell us
 that it *does*, and a *very foolish* one too. There is no need
 to put out the Eyes of those that are *wilfully blind*. Such
 Divines would only have you see, what you will not see,
 when you might; that to suppose a Man *without Free-*
will, is to suppose him *without a Soul*; that though
 Mens will by Nature is free to *nothing but Evil*, yet the
preventing Grace of God gives again such an *Equipoise* to
 it, that, it is as free to *Good* through Grace, as it is free
 to Evil by Nature; and that the Will, thus enabled by
 Grace, is *co-operant* with God, in working out our Salva-
 tion. Is this denied in the 10th Article? No, but evi-
 dently taught there. To claim the 11th Article to
 yourselves, as *Calvinistic*, in Opposition to those you call
Arminians, is as great a Piece of *Arrogance*, as if you
 were to claim to yourselves the 1st Article, as *such*, in
 Opposition to them. We do not want to put out your
 Eyes,

Eyes, lest you should see, that that Article “ asserts Justification by Faith only; but we would have you see and own that we allow it does, and believe what it asserts to be true as much as you do; and no more *bear false witness against your Neighbours*. If there are some that are called *Arminians*, that believe it not, censure them, but do not throw out your *venemous Slander* upon all without Distinction. Excuse me, Sir, if I tell you, I could mention many, that you are pleased to *boot* at under the Character of *Arminians*, that are (if one may judge of you by your Writings) much better Men than yourself. And I must tell you farther, we must have clearer Sight than you have, before we can see that the 17th Article “ teaches *everlasting, absolute, gratuitous Predestination*.” That God from Everlasting appointed, *persevering obedient Believers* in his Son Jesus Christ to eternal Life, we see in his Word, and believe it; that he so appointed them *freely* without any *Claim* or *Merit* in Man, we allow also; but that he so appointed them *absolutely* and *without any Respect at all* to their *Faith* or *Obedience*, and that his Wisdom did not freely chuse to *regulate* his *Appointment* according to these *Qualifications*, which are the *Effect* of his Grace received, we see not, nor can we believe, till we substitute the *Decrees* of the *Synod of Dort* in the room of the Bible. If you see any thing like this, you must give us leave to suppose, till you can more clearly prove to the contrary, that it is occasioned by some *Imperfection* in the *Visive Faculty*.

In your Remarks upon the Advice given by some Bishops to the Government in Queen *Elizabeth's* Days, “ that incorrigible *Arians*, *Pelagians*, or *Free-will-men*, be sent into some one Castle in *North Wales*, “ or *Wallingford*, and there to live of their own Labour and Exercise, and none other be suffered to resort unto them, but their Keepers:” You observe, “ 1st, That FREE-WILL-MEN (printed always in Capitals, for fear they should be not enough taken notice of) were considered by the Church of *England*, “ when in her Purity, as some of the most dangerous “ *Recusants*”

“ *Recusants* she had to grapple with.” It may be, not, Sir ; I rather think they were only considered as such, by some of her *bigotted, Calvinistical* Bishops. “ I do not quote this mortifying Paragraph, you say, from any Approbation I entertain of the Expedient recommended.” No, good, moderate Man, you abhor every thing that even looks like Persecution, for Principles merely religious.” Had you omitted your Remarks upon this *mortifying Paragraph*, and had not shewn your becoming Indignation, in the virulent Manner you have, against *Arminians*, your Protestation might have gained credit ; but as the Matter is, it hardly will with those that know you best, unless it be herein, that you do not approve of the Expedient recommended, but a worse.

A certain *Calvinistical Trumpeter of Persecution*, had the Insolence, not long since, to publish a Letter to the Queen, in which he wishes the Civil Magistrate to inflict *corporal Punishment* on all Preachers, that do not preach Predestination. And after reading what you have written, who can doubt, whether you second him with the same good Wish ?

But you observe, 2dly, “ the FREE-WILL-MEN (*capital Offenders* again) at that Time were *very few* in number ; otherwise *one* Castle, however spacious, would not have been thought large enough to contain them.” One Castle, I suppose, would have held all the *avowed Protestants* in *England* in *Queen Mary’s* Days. And no wonder, when Prison, if not Death, was the Consequence of owning their Principles openly. What then shall we learn from this wise Remark of yours ? Why, that the Government in those Times was more tyrannical than it is now ; and that we have reason to be thankful, that we live in an *Age of Liberty*, free from *Popish* and *Calvinistical Tyranny* ; or else, that the People in *general*, in those Times, were led away with *Popish* or *Calvinistical Errors*.

I, Sir, as much as you, condemn Mens “ subscribing to Forms which they believe not, according to
“ the

“ the true and proper Sense of the Words, and the “ *known Intent* of the Imposers and Compilers.” But I must remind you again, that the Intent of the Imposers and Compilers of our Articles, was not to establish the Doctrine of *Calvin* in the Church, but that taught by *Melanckton*, as being thought most agreeable to Scripture and Reason. So that it is not so very evident, as you would have us believe, “ that *Calvinists* are the “ only fair Subscribers ; and that *Arminians*, as such, are “ *virtually excluded* from Subscription.” Page 23. If by *Arminians*, you mean *Melanckthonians*, I say, such are the only fair Subscribers ; so far are they from being excluded from Subscription. *Whitaker*, indeed, and his Party, would fain have made the Church *Calvinistic*, in *Q. Elizabeth’s* Days ; and in complaisance, as some think, to his Wife, who was a rigid *Predestinarian*, endeavoured to get the *Geneva Doctrine* imposed upon her. But the Smell was too strong for that Queen and her Privy-Council ; wherefore the *Lambeth Articles*, which *Whitaker* had devised, and would fain have gotten added to the 39, were rejected, and commanded to be speedily suppressed. Nor would King *James* be intreated by Dr *Reynolds* and his Party, to let them pass among the Articles of the Church, any more than Queen *Elizabeth*. And as those *Calvinistic Articles* were rejected by these Princes, by the Advice of the Governors of the Church, it is plain such Doctrines were not then considered as the established Doctrine of the Church, nor indeed fit to be made such.

Page 29. You bear us in Hand with the Testimony of Bishop *Burnet*, that “ the meaning of every Subscription is to be taken from the Design of the Imposer, “ and from the Words of the Subscription itself.” But must we not know then what was the Design of the Imposer, and what the Words of the Subscription itself (whereby, it seems, is meant the Words that are subscribed to) mean, before we can tell what is meant by the Subscription, or know what it is that we subscribe to ? I should think we must. You tell us from Dr *Heylin*, just before, “ that the first Reformers did not so “ compose

“ compose the Articles, as to leave any *Liberty to dissenting Judgments* ; but did bind Men to the *literal and grammatical Sense* ; they had not otherwise attained the End they aimed at, which was, *to take away Diversity of Opinions, and to establish an Agreement in the true Religion.*” I suppose this to be the End the Reformers aimed at, but if there are any *ambiguous Words, any equivocal Terms* in the Articles, notwithstanding the Subscribers are bound to the *literal and grammatical Sense* ; and do subscribe in *such Sense* ; yet *Diversity of Opinions* may not be taken away, nor the *Reformers End* in composing the Articles answered. If every Word is not *sufficiently clear* ; every Term *fixed and univocal*, there must be *some Liberty* left for *dissenting Judgments* ; Men must have some Leave to put their *own Sense* upon *such Words*, unless you would have them subscribe something they *do not know*, and *need not care what*.

Will you berate me, as you have done Bishop Bull, for insinuating, that there are *any Words* in our Articles, which are *not clear* ; that there is any Thing in them *dark and ambiguous* ? I shall venture to stand the Brunt. We are told in our 3d Article, that *it is to be believed, that Christ went down into HELL.* Will you tell me, what is the precise Meaning of the Word *Hell* there ? (not to mention some other fond Opinions about it) Whether it means *the State of separate Souls*, which is called *Paradise*, or *Abraham's Bosom*, as some of our Reformers supposed ? Or whether, as was the Opinion of others, it means, *the Place of eternal Torments* ? Certain it is, the Meaning of this Word is not quite clear. Will you tell me then farther, when you subscribed, Did you take this Word in *both* these Senses ? or in *one of them* only, and *which* ? And are you sure, the Sense you subscribed in, was agreeable to the *Intention* of the Reformers ; who, though they agreed, that Christ, in *some Sense*, did descend into Hell, did not agree in *what Sense* ? Or did you subscribe it in some Sense, the Sense of *other Men* and not *your own* ; and in Obedience to the *Royal Declaration*, never attempted to put *any Sense at all* upon the Word *Hell* ? If you subscribed it in any Sense conceived in your own Mind, you put
your

your own Sense upon it; however, it might be a *literal* Sense; and so offended against the Royal Declaration, in so subscribing the 3d Article, as much as an *Arminian* does in so subscribing the seventeenth. If you subscribed it, without *regarding* what was the Sense, without pretending to *fix any Sense* at all to it, then an *Arian*, a *Papist*, a *Deist*, a *Jew*, or a *Turk*, may subscribe in *such a Manner*, and be as *honest* a Subscriber as you.

I could, if I thought proper, point out several other Passages in the Articles, the Meaning of which is as *unfixed*, and *ambiguous*, as that above-mentioned; which shews the Necessity there is, that Subscribers should *sometimes*, in *such Cases*, put their *own Sense* upon the Articles. Yet at the same Time I maintain, that no Man in subscribing, ought to depart from the *literal* Sense, nor from the *true* and *genuine* Sense of the Words subscribed, when it is *certainly known* what that Sense is. And where that Sense cannot be *certainly known*, he must needs, if he be a *wise* and an *honest* Subscriber, in such Case, put a *Sense of his own* upon the Article, agreeable to the *literal* Sense; and which, according to his best Judgment, appears to be the *true* and *genuine* Sense; in doing which he must be especially careful not to depart from the *Analogy of Faith*, and the *general Tenor* of the *Liturgy* and *Homilies* of the Church. This I suppose you will hardly deny. And this granted, I scruple not to affirm that an *Arminian* may be an *honest* Subscriber.

Let it be observed here, that when I say, there are some Passages in our Articles, the Meaning of which is *unfixed* and *ambiguous*, I do not mean, any more than Bishop Bull, that the Church in her Articles “has absolutely determined *Nothing*, and is a Church without *any fixed Principles*.” Your Wisdom must certainly know, as injuriously as you have treated Bishop Bull, that the Church may have determined *some Things*, though she may not be clear in all Things, as you cannot but allow she is *not*. She may have *some fixed Principles*, though there *may be* and *are*, some Matters in her Standard Writings, as well as in the Scriptures, of
doubtful

doubtful Meaning. In all things *essential* and *necessary* to Salvation, the Scriptures are *clear*; so is the Church of *England*. Such Things she *has determined*. In such her Principles are *fixed*, and may be *known*; and known to be *for*, and not *against Arminians*, how positive soever you are to the contrary.

Page 31. "Only admit the three preceding Citations (from Dr Heylin, Bishop Burnet, and Dr Waterland) to be *just, reasonable* and *true*; and the Consequence is undeniable: Namely, that *Arminian Subscription* is absolutely *unjustifiable*, *Arminians* themselves being Judges." But I cannot admit all these three Citations to be true (I mean in their Contents,) For though it be true, as Dr Waterland intimates, that "Men ought not to subscribe to Forms, which they believe not, according to the *true* and *proper* Sense of the Words, (add, if he certainly knows what that Sense is) and the *known* Intent of the Imposers and Compilers;" yet this affects not the present Case, as we plead for *no such* Subscriptions: Yet the Citations from Dr Heylin and Bishop Burnet cannot be *both* true, because they are *contradictory*. The Doctor would have no Man put his *own Sense* upon the Articles, whether it agree with the Compilers Sense, or not; as if he were to subscribe them in *no Sense at all*. The Bishop tells us, "The Subscriptions of the Clergy must be considered, as a *Declaration of their own Opinion* (i. e. a *putting their own Sense* upon the Articles; however it be agreeable to the Compilers Sense) and not as a *bare Obligation to Silence*." You see your Premises are bad, and therefore your *undeniable Consequence* does not follow from them. But whether these Citations are *just, true*, and *reasonable* or not, there is not a Syllable in one of them *against Arminian Subscription*, either directly or indirectly. And to offer these Citations by way of Proof, that *Arminian Subscription* is *unjustifiable*, is just as wise and as reasonable, as if you had endeavoured to prove it, by saying, *Arminians* honestly subscribe what they believe to be true; therefore *Arminian Subscription* is *unjustifiable*. I say therefore it is not.

Page 32. " I would not be understood, as if I meant
 " to put *all Arminians* on a Par with *Arians*. I only
 " draw the *Parallel*, or rather Point out the *Similitude*,
 " so far as *prevaricating Subscriptions*, and *false Decla-*
 " *rations of Assent* are concerned ?" That is, you do not
 compare them to *Arians* in *Principle*, but in *Practice*;
 not in their *Opinions*, but in their *Hypocrisy* and *Pre-*
varication; their *Falseness* and *Knavery*, in subscribing
 our Church Articles. How greatly obliged are the
Arminians to such a *worthy Presbyter of the Church of*
England for his *Candour* and *Moderation* ! You might
 when your Pen was dipt in *Gall*, have called them
Rebels, *Thieves*, and *Murderers* ; or even have given them
 the Appellation used by old Father *Barlee*, as *high a*
mettled Calvinist as yourself, viz. *Noon-day Devils* :
 but you spared them, and have called them no worse
 than *Hypocrites* and *Prevaricators* ; i. e. *false-hearted*
Knaves. I know a Clergyman, Sir, (and I suppose you
 know him too, by Name at least) that *could not in Con-*
science subscribe the Articles of the Church of *Geneva* ;
 but *could* and *did* subscribe those of the Church of *Eng-*
land, and that as an *Arminian*. And I make no
 doubt, but that the Searcher of Hearts knew, that he
 was as *honest* a Subscriber as you was. Nor have I so
 little Charity, though you have, as to think that he
 was, *Rara avis in terris, nigroque simillima Cygno*. I
 make no doubt, there are many *honest Arminian Sub-*
scribers, as well as he. However it were best for you
 to leave that Matter to be decided by him, whose *Judg-*
ment is according to Truth.

Page 32. You proceed to give an Account of *Henry*
VIII's Book, intitled, *A necessary Doctrine and Eru-*
dition for any Christian Man. I shall not pretend to de-
 fend *all* that is in that Book : I shall only observe, that
 whatever " *Papist Trumpery*" there is in it, it does not
 prove that *Cranmer* and *Ridley* had *no* hand in composing
 it. Nor that *Poynt Bishop of Winchester*, had none ;
 the Author of your admired *Calvinistical Catechism*,
 set forth in the Time of *Edward VI*. He is supposed to
 have had a principal Hand in composing that Book, in
 1534, which, three Years after, was *reviewed, subscribed*

to, and published by all the Bishops of England; amongst whom was *Cranmer*, and consequently *Ridley* too, unless you can prove that he was not then a Bishop. However therefore, this Book shews, that the Reformation had proceeded no farther, than to leave "*Papery*" much as it found it; and that the *Reformers themselves* wanted reforming;" it shews likewise that *Cranmer* and the rest of these Reformers, were *Arminians*, in the Points we contend for; unless you can prove, that they too were all *prevaricating Subscribers*, and *false Declarers of Assent*.

Page 34. You say to Dr *Norwell*, "He who lives on the Banks of the *Iffs*, is not ashamed to dip his Pen in the *Tiber*!" And may not Dr *Norwell* say to you, He who has preached, and was well paid for it too, near the Banks of the *Thames*, is not ashamed to fetch his Doctrine from the *Leman Lake*; and he might as well have fetched it from the *Hellespont*? — "But at all Events, *Delanda est Carthago*, Down with *Geneva*; though *Rome* itself flourish on its Ruins." You rather mean, I suppose, up with *Geneva*; though *Constantinople* or *Mecca* flourish by its Rise.— "Think not, Sir, that I am too warm." I will answer for the Doctor as well as for myself, that he will not; if he only considers what it is that kindles your Ardour. No wonder that a Man should be somewhat inflamed, that professes to believe in a Deity, that he represents, as little better than *Moloch*. Were it not for this, the Doctor, as well as I, might wonder, that after you had promised, Page 5. to "endeavour to preserve, not only the *Decency*, but the *Respect*, to which his Merits, both as a *Scholar* and a *Writer*, justly intitled him;" you should fall upon him open mouthed, crying: "A Protestant, a Protestant Divine, a Protestant Divine of the Church of England, dares, in the Face of the Sun, to rake into the Sink of an antiquated Popish Book, in order to throw up Mud, with which to spatter the Doctrines of that reformed Church, whose Bread he eats and whose Raiment he wears!" Gently! Warm Sir! If you and others had raked no more Mud out of that

that *Papish* Book, than Dr *Nowell* has done, our Church had been left as clean as a Penny, and the *Weaknesses* of our *pious* Reformers, just emerging out of *Papish* *Darkness*, had not been so exposed to public View. But go on, dear, *zealous* Man, expose every one, *Tros Tyriusva*, that will not swallow down *Geneva*, as glibly as yourself.

Page 36. The first Passage, quoted by Dr *Nowell* from the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, you say, “visibly implies, that there are in fact, *Decrees of Predestination*.” What then? Does it imply that these *Decrees* are *absolute* and *irrespective* of any Thing that Men do? No, nor any thing like it. Your Distinction of God’s *hidden* and *declared* Will, I shall pass over here, as you will give me Occasion to animadvert upon it elsewhere.

In your Remarks on the next Quotation, (in which you find fault with the Doctor’s Learning, with *no more* of your own) you say, “To talk of God’s *actually* imputing Sin to justified Persons, would be a Contradiction in Terms.” I would ask you, If Sin be imputed at all, is it not *actually* imputed? Or is there any such Thing as Sin’s being imputed, otherwise than by being imputed? And again, If *imputing Sin to justified Persons*, be a Contradiction in Terms, is not *justifying the Ungodly* a Contradiction in Terms also? Certainly it is. So then in order to establish the *Calvinistic* Doctrine of the *Inamissibility of Grace*, you will have it, by your Argument, that St *Paul* hath written a Contradiction; and that *no Man* (seeing *all* by Nature are *ungodly*) can ever be justified. A sure Way indeed of establishing your Doctrine, if your Ways holds good: For he, that never has Grace, can never lose it. But may not Righteousness be imputed to an *ungodly* Man, that is *ungodly until that Instant* that Righteousness is imputed to him, and he thereby ceases to be an *ungodly Man*, and becomes *righteous*? This I hope you will not deny. By parity of Reason then it is plain, that Sin may be imputed to a justified Man, that is justified *until that Instant* that Sin is imputed to him, and thereby he ceases to be a *justified Man*, and becomes *guilty*.

You

You proceed, Page 37. to shew what may be inferred from the Passage quoted; as, “ first, That “ *justified Men are not impeccable*; the Doctrine of “ *Sinless Perfection* in this Life, even after Grace received, being *false, fanatical and presumptuous.*” Yet that justified Men are not *impeccable* we deny no more than you. But is this an Argument that the Doctrine of *Sinless Perfection* in this Life is false? What has such a Conclusion to do with the Premisses? You may just as well reason thus: *Innocent Men* are not *impeccable*; therefore the Doctrine of *Sinless Perfection* in this Life is *false*. Never the more for that; *Adam and Eve* were *innocent*, and in a State of *Sinless Perfection* once, yet at the same time they were *peccable*, capable of sinning, as we know by sad Experience. Hence it is plain, that Man’s being in a *peccable* State, is no Proof of the *Falsity* of the Doctrine of *Sinless Perfection*; whether that Doctrine be false or not. One would have thought, that a Man of your *deep Sagacity* might have discerned, that to be *sinlessly perfect*, and to be *impeccable*, are Things widely different.

Again I must observe, that you make use of such Petitions as these in our Liturgy; and have *declared*, and *subscribed* your Assent to them: “ Keep us this Day “ without Sin. Mortify and kill all Vices in us. “ Grant us the true Circumcision of the Spirit, that our “ Hearts and all our Members being mortified from all “ worldly and carnal Lusts, we may in all things obey “ thy blessed Will. That our Flesh being subdued to “ the Spirit, we may ever obey thy godly Motions in “ Righteousness and true Holiness. Cleanse the “ Thoughts of our Hearts by the Inspiration of thy “ Holy Spirit, that we may perfectly love thee, and “ worthily magnify thy holy Name;” with much more to the same Purpose, implying *Sinless Perfection*, and that in this Life, if it can be implied in Words. And do you, Sir, pray for what is *not attainable*; what you never expect in this Life? *Subscribe* and declare your Assent to a Doctrine, that you pronounce to be *false, fanatical, and presumptuous*? And will you quarrel

rel with *Arminians* for subscribing to Articles that they do not believe, supposing that to be true? *Physician heal thyself!* Or else find fault no more with *prevaricating Subscribers*. All candid Men allow, that there is great Room to suppose that an *Arminian Subscriber* to the 17th Article may be *honest*: But *Charity itself* cannot acquit any Man, as an Opposer of sinless Perfection either of *egregious Folly* or *vile Hypocrisy*, that *subscribes* to, and uses such Prayers.

But farther, *Sinless Perfection*, you maintain, is not attainable *in this Life*. Therefore, if attainable *at all*, it must be *in the Life to come*. And pray, where is it to be attained. “In *Heaven*? No: for *without* Sinless Perfection we shall never come *there*. In *Hell*? No: He that goes thither *without it*, will never come out again *with it*. So that you must, with the *Papists*, maintain the Doctrine of *Purgatory*, or recant your Assertion; which smells as much of *Rome*, as your Doctrine of *Predestination* does of *Geneva*. Will you tell me, “No; Sinless Perfection is to be attained *in the Article of Death*, and not before? We shall put “off the Body of Sin and the Body of Flesh together.” I want Proof. Your Prayers intimate no such Thing; the Scriptures do not assert it; and I can bring from the Writings of some of your own Party (unless they have published the Accounts of *dying Hypocrites*, instead of *dying Saints*) *Experience* to contradict it.

What you, or others mean by *sinless Perfection*, I can hardly tell; but the Perfection that I cannot help contending for, and am aiming at, and expect, according to the faithful Promises of God, through his Grace, to receive before I go hence, far as I am at present from it, is *to love the Lord my God with all my Heart, with all my Mind, with all my Soul, and with all my Strength, and my Neighbour as myself*. Now if such Perfection as this (call it sinless Perfection, if you will) is not to be obtained here, it must be for want of *Will*, for want of *Skill*, for want of *Means*, or for want of *Power* in God to effect it in us. Either God has *determined*, that his People shall not love him so; which is not the Case;

Case; for he hath said, *I will circumcise thine Heart— and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy Heart, &c.* Or it is for want of *Wisdom*, so that he knows not how to accomplish his Promise. But both *Reason* and *Scripture* enter a *Caveat* against such a Supposition, and pronounce, that his *Wisdom is infinite*. Or, he has not sufficiency of *Means*, to effect what his *Wisdom* could contrive, and his *Will* would have accomplished: But *St Paul* suffers us not to entertain such a Thought, when he styles him *the God of all Grace*. Nor will he suffer us to distrust his *Power*, any more, than question his having the *Means* of making us *perfect in Love* here, when he says, *God is able to make all Grace abound towards you*; and when he prays, (not a *senseless* Prayer, I presume) *the very God of Peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole Spirit, and Soul and Body be preserved blameless, unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ*. Such Considerations incline me to believe, that we *must* and *shall* recover *here* through the *Second Adam*, that *Image of Holiness* which we lost through the *first*. You will still say, I suppose, Tell me one that was ever perfect in this Life? I reply, Tell me one that is happy in the other, and that is the Man.

To convince you still farther that my Opinion is right, I refer you to a *Sermon preached in the Parish-Church of St ANN, BLACKFRIARS, on Sunday, April 29, 1770, by AUGUSTUS TOPLADY, A. B. Vicar of BROAD HEMBURY, Devon*. This *irrefragable* Author therein tells us, “ *Heaven* must be brought down into
“ the human Soul, ere the human Soul can be fitted
“ for Heaven. There must, as the Schoolmen speak,
“ be a *Congruity* and *Similitude* between the *Faculty*
“ and the *Object*,” *i. e.* there must be an *inward Meet-ness* for the Vision and Glory of God, wrought in you by his Holy Spirit, in order to render you susceptible of those exalted Pleasures, and that Fulness of Joy, which are in his Presence, and at his Right Hand for ever. Was thy Soul, O unconverted Sinner, to be, this Moment, separated from thy Body, and even admitted in-

to Heaven, (supposing it was possible for an unregenerate Spirit to enter there) Heaven would not be Heaven to you. You cannot relish the Blessedness of the *New Jerusalem*, unless God, in the meanwhile, make you Partaker of a *new Nature*. The Father *chose* his People to Salvation; the Son *purchased* for them the Salvation to which they were chosen; and the Blessed Spirit *fits* and *qualifies* them for that Salvation, by his *renewing Influences*. And soon after; “ God’s *gratuitous Donation*, and Christ’s *meritorious Righteousness*, “ constitute our *Right* to future Glory, while the Holy “ Ghost, by *inspiring* us with *spiritual Life*, (of which “ spiritual Life, good Works are the *Evidences* and “ the *Actings*) puts us into a real *Capability* of, and “ *Fitness* for that Inheritance of endless Happiness, “ which otherwise we could never, in the very Nature “ of Things, either *possess* or *enjoy*.” I ask no more. All is here granted, that, I suppose, any sober *Perfectionist* ever contended for.

“ The *Reformatio Legum*, you say, only declares, “ that the Justified *may* fall into Sin, and that Sin *is* “ Sin, let who will commit it; and that *Cranmer* and “ his Brother Commissioners, by going no farther, “ but letting the Matter rest here, tacitly set their Seal “ to the *Perpetuity of a Regenerate Man’s Estate*.” Suppose they went no farther in that Tract, did they go no farther elsewhere? Prove this, otherwise this *tacit sealing* will not help your Cause at all, whatever such Proof may do. For their *tacit* sealing of an *Untruth*, can never make it *Truth*. To your Question therefore, “ What has all this to do with your *Novel* “ *Arminian Doctrine*, of *totaly* and *finally falling from* “ *Grace*? I answer, 1st, It is not proved that this is “ a *Novel Doctrine*; on the contrary, it is certain, the “ Doctrine of the *Inamissibility of Grace* is, as Bishop “ *Overall* affirms, and *J. Goodwin*, and many others “ have undeniably proved. 2d, It has *much* to do “ with it: For if it be granted, that the Justified *may* “ fall into Sin; and that Sin *is* Sin, let who will com- “ mit it; and, as you affirm besides, that “ Sin is, if “ possible,

“ possible, more exceeding sinful in a regenerate Man, than if he was *not so* ;” then it must be allowed that if a *regenerate Man* falls so into Sin, so as to become *exceeding sinful*, it is *possible* he may never rise again. You have God’s own Word for it, *Ezekiel* xviii. 24, 26. The Force of which, all the *wrigling* and *twisting* of all the *Calvinists* in the World could never evade.

It is pity but you had published what you had prepared in the *rough Draught* of your Papers, to vindicate those venerable Prelates, *Latimer*, *Hooper* and *Ridley*, from the Slander, as you call it, of *Arminianism*. But you was afraid of swelling your Book, and I presume, you would have swelled it to no Purpose, if you can vindicate them no better than you have done the Church of *England*; seeing your Vindication of her, is only *slandering* the *Mother* and *her Sons*. Is this *Calvinism*; “ *Christ* shed as much Blood for *Judas*, as he did for *Peter*. *Peter* believed it, and therefore he was saved; *Judas* would not believe, and therefore he was condemned; the Fault being in him only and nobody else?” If it be, it is such *Calvinism* as I shall never quarrel with. Yet these are Bishop *Latimer*’s Words. But to what Purpose is it to quote the Words of *Latimer*, *Hooper*, or *Ridley*, or any one else on our side, since you say, *Page* 41. “ Not the *Sermons* and *private Writings*, even of our Reformers themselves, are to be taken for *authentic Tests* of our established *Doctrines*, as a Church: But those *stubborn Things*, called *Articles* and *Homilies*, which have received the Sanction of Law, and the Stamp of public Authority.” And let me ask you, Sir, has not the *Liturgy* recieved the *Sanction of Law*, and the *Stamp of public Authority*, as well as the *Articles* and *Homilies*? I suppose it has. Now it is evident, no *Writings* in the World can more oppugn your *Doctrine*, than the *Liturgy*. Do the *Articles* and *Homilies* then *contradict* the *Liturgy*? Beyond all doubt, if they speak your Mind. *Stubborn*, as the *Articles* and *Homilies* are, the *Liturgy* is *stubborner*. The Words of that Composition can, by no Art whatever, be brought to bend to *your Calvinism*;

though the Words of the Articles and Homilies may easily be bent to our *Arminianism*; and must be so, unless we would render the established Doctrines of our Church, as great a *Hotch-potch* of *Contradictions*, as the Writings of *Austin, Luther, Calvin* and *yourself*.

But you say, "the Sermons and private Writings, even of our Reformers themselves, are not to be taken for authentic Tests of our established Doctrines, as a Church." What then, are we to suppose that their *private Writings* were intended to contradict their *public ones*? That they *preached* Doctrines from the Pulpit, to *oppose* those that they *offered to the Sanction of the Law*? I cannot suppose this. If some of the Reformers spoke as you do, others did *not*. So that it is evident they were not *all* of one Mind, any more than you and I. And we have as much Liberty to take the Articles and Homilies in the Sense of those that *differ from you*, as you have to take them in the Sense of those that *differ from us*; especially as we can do it without *wresting* of Words; whereas you *cannot*.

Page 42. In your Animadversions on Bishop Poynt's Catechism, you give *Stephen Gardiner* the Title of an "*Ecclesiastical Butcher*;" and not without Reason. But have you considered, Sir, that the *same butcherly Spirit* is in yourself, that there was in *Gardiner*? You only want the *same Power* over *Arminians*, that he had over the *Protestants* in *Queen Mary's Days*; which, if you had, I have no doubt, but where he butchered *one* of the latter, you would butcher *ten* of the former. Do you start, like *Hazaël*, saying, *But what is thy Servant a Dog, that he should do this great Thing*? If I could, in the Spirit of Prophecy, answer, *The Lord hath shewed me, that thou shalt be Bishop of Winchester*, with *Stephen Gardiner's* Authority, I should not at all scruple to say, you would be *much worse*, than either the *Brute*, or the *butcherly Bishop*. That very Spirit which hath led you to *revile, reproach, and abuse* the *Arminians* as you have done, would as easily lead you to *torture them to death*. There is none but those of your own Party, that reads your Letters to *Dr Nowell* and *Mr Wesley*,

ley, but can easily discern, that your *Disposition is fiery*, though your *Arm be feeble*.

Bishop Poynt's Catechism, you say, "clearly exhibits the Sense both of the *Church and Legislature*." Allowing that it exhibits the Sense of both, as it was in the Days of King *Edward VI.* what is that to us, any more than *Pia et Catholica Institutio*, set forth in his Father's Days? The Doctrines of the Church, you grant, are to be learned from the *Articles and Homilies* (I add, and *Liturgy*) of the Church herself; and not from Bishop Poynt's Catechism; which is as contrary to the Standard Writings of our Church, as *Darkness to Light*. Nor does that Catechism, though set forth by the Command of King *Edward VI.* and bound up with the Bible, sufficiently prove, that *Calvinism* was even then the *established Doctrine* of the Church. All that can be inferred from it is, that some *rigid Calvinists in Power*, had imposed upon that good young King, and made use of his Authority to impose their Notions upon the Church. Nothing, I presume, was done in a *legal* Way, to establish the Doctrines of our Church as they stand now, till Queen *Elizabeth's* Time; when, not *Calvinism*, but *Melanchtonianism*, or *Arminianism*, as you call it, was made the established Doctrine. Whatever therefore is *asserted, explained and enforced* in Poynt's Catechism, concerning *eternal, personal, gratuitous and irreversible Election*, and the *Inamissibility of Grace*, we are no more concerned with, than with Queen *Mary's* Commands for the Establishment of Popery. Nor does that Catechism, which you call *A valuable Monument of good old Church-Doctrine*, contain much more sound Divinity than the old *Koran of Mahomet*.

Page 44. "This *Excellent Catechism*" (excellent only for its *Absurdity*) "was published the very next Year after the framing and setting forth of our Church Articles; and therefore may be considered as a *professed Explication and Enlargement* of them." I can, in part, readily allow this; and a *pretty Trick* it was. When Articles were framed in such a Manner, that *Melanchton* himself would hardly have refused to sub-

scribe to them, up starts *rigid Poynet*, and gives us (I do not say as you do, an *Explication* of them; for his Catechism is *not such*, but) an *Enlargement*: Laying down such Matters, to be believed concerning *Election* and *Predestination*, as are not so much as *hinted at* in the Articles; and then gets poor young King *Edward*, whom he had brought to his Lure, to command *all Schoolmasters within his Dominions* to teach the Youth *this Catechism*. It is well for us, that *wiser Men* have drawn up a *Form of sounder Words*, and have composed a *more scriptural Catechism* than *Poynet's*, and have inserted it in the *Book of Common Prayer*, for the Instruction of Youth; this, Sir, you have declared your assent to. But now affirm, that *Poynet's Catechism*, which is the very *Reverse* of our *Church Catechism*, is a *valuable Monument of good old Church Doctrine*! How comes this to pass? Did you *play the Arminian* in your Subscription to the Church Catechism, to *gain Preferment*; and the *Calvinist*, in your Letter to Dr *Nowell*, for *some other End*?

Page 45. You honour Queen *Elizabeth* with the Character of a "great Princess," because she did not oppose the Tyranny of the *persecuting, bigotted Calvinists* for a while; but Page 54. when she exerted her Authority to suppress the *Lambeth Articles*, then you degrade her as a "*haughty Monarch, who was too much her Father's own Daughter.*" Here, as well as every where else, we see what Sort of Persons shall be intitled to your Commendations. And I see so much of it, that I must needs tell you, I cannot but esteem your *Reproaches Elogies*, and your *Encomiums downright Slander*, wherever I find them.

You tell us, from *Strype's Annals*, "that the Parson of *Milk-street, London*, in behalf of himself and others, requested an *Act of Toleration* for himself and his Brethren, and petitioned, that they might enjoy their Opinion, viz. that God doth not predestinate any Evil, Wickedness, or Sin in any Behalf." Good God! to what a Pitch of Tyranny and *Wickedness* was the *Calvinistic Faction* gotten in *Elizabeth's* Days!

Days? That a Man could not enjoy an *innocent* and *scriptural* Opinion, without fear “ of those *Corrections*, “ *Punishments* and *Executions*, which the Clergy had “ already in their Authority.” It is plain then from your own Confession, that Dr *Heylin*, as much a *Liar* as you represent him, at least says true, when he tells us, “ it was safer for any Man in those Times, to “ have been looked upon as an *Heathen* or *Publican*, “ than an *Anticalvinist*.” Hence it is easy to foresee “ what the poor *Arminians* have to expect, if ever *Calvinism* should get the upper Hand among us.

In your Remarks upon the Extract from *Styke's* *Annals*, you observe, “ that our Protestant Bishops and “ Clergy were then *more highly Calvinistic*, than, perhaps, the Scriptures will warrant; as holding that “ God was the Author both of Man's Sin and Damnation.” *Perhaps!* Then it is not certain to you, that the Scriptures do not warrant such a *blasphemous Tenet!* I presume, you think they do, because you hold it yourself. For which Reason, though “ Mr “ *Wilkes* (as you say) is far enough from being a *Calvinist*,” I scrup'e not to pronounce him almost as *consummate a Theologist* as yourself. For if he is mistaken in one Point, you are as much in another:— “ That those Persons, who did not hold this, were “ looked upon as differing from the rest of our Protestant Churchmen.” And whatever such *Protestant Churchmen*, as you call them, thought of the Matter then, every *wiser* Man now will allow, that they did not differ from them *without Reason*.—“ That Parson “ *Talbot*, and his Followers, are expressly said to have “ imbibed their *qualified Notions* of Predestination from “ *foreign Divines*.” And pray, (excuse my plainness, as I only tread in your Steps) did Parson *Toplady* and his Teachers imbibe their *high Calvinistic Notions* from any other? And if Parson *Talbot's* *qualified Calvinism* is therefore to be exploded, because it is not of pure “ *English Growth*,” must not Parson *Toplady's* *rigid Calvinism*, for the same Reason be exploded along with it? What could your Wisdom intend by this—

deep Remark?—"Those who held this Opinion, of
 "God's not being any *Cause* of *Sin* and *Damnation*,
 "were at that Time mightily cried out against by
 "the main Body of our reformed Church, as *Fautors*
 "of *false Religion*." This shews what a *deplorable*
State the Church was at that Time in, and you would
 wish it to be in now; that unless a Man would be an
impious Blasphemer, he was mightily cried out against
 as a *Fauctor of false Religion*; and that by the main
 Body of the Church: and such a Church you call a
reformed one. Reformed indeed; but from *bad* to
worse; from *Papish Superstition* to *Calvinistic Blasphemy*.
 —"That to be called a *Free-will man*, was looked upon
 "as a *shameful Reproach* and *opprobrious Infamy*; yea, and
 "that a Person so termed, was deemed *heretical*." The
 same may be said now of those that are called *Methodists*,
 (a People how greatly honoured, while you were reckon-
 ed one among them!)—But, I suppose, to be *deemed* he-
 retical, and *proved* so, are *two* Things.—"That the Par-
 "son of *Milk-street*, his requesting an *Act of Toleration* for
 "himself and his Brethren (to enjoy their Opinion)
 "demonstrated a *Consciousness* of their *differing from the*
 "*Church established*." Not at all. It only demonstrates
 that they *differed* from the *leading Faction* of the Times;
 and that such was the *Tyranny* and *Oppression* of that
bigotted Faction, that it was dangerous even for a Man
 to *enjoy his innocent Opinion*, without an *Act of Tole-*
ration; notwithstanding he should worship God ac-
 cording to the prescribed Order of the Church. In all
 this have you been unwisely pleading the Cause of
Calvinism; or *artfully* and *designedly* exposing it to Con-
 tempt? For, as you have set it forth, it cannot fail of
 being the *utter Aversion* and *Abhorrence* of every sober
 thinking Man.

But you remark further. "As these sort of People
 "were then more *modest*, so they were much more *ortho-*
 "*dox*, than the *Modern Arminians*." I presume, their
 petitioning for leave to *enjoy their Opinion*, was not
 so much a Token of their *Modesty*, as of their *Fear* of
 that *Herd of Persecutors*, who sat at the *Helm*. And
 whether

whether they were more *Orthodox* than the *Modern Arminians* or no, it is certain they were *more so* than either the *Calvinists of that*, or the *present Age*. But, by the by, let me tell you, a Man of your *Metal* is no more fit to be a Judge of *Orthodoxy*, than a *Papist Inquirer* is to be a Judge of *Heresy*. For as he judges of *Heresy* by the Decrees of the Council of *Trent*; so you judge of *Orthodoxy* by the Decrees of the Council of *Dort*; and which Convention was the *worst*, it is hard to say.

You add, “The *Semipelagians*” (why not *Semicalvinists*? Seeing they were only such as held “*qualified Notions of Predestination*”; and were no other than what are now called *Moderate Calvinists*.) These *Semipelagians*, alias *Semicalvinists*, “of *Queen Elizabeth’s* Reign, were very ready to consent that any ecclesiastical or civil Penalty should be levied on those who should, by their express Words or Writings, affirm and maintain, that Man, of his own *Natural Power*, is able to *think, will, or work* of himself, any Thing that should in any Case help or serve towards his own Salvation, or any part thereof. Where is the *Arminian* now, who would make such a Concession as this?” The *John Goodwin* of the present Age, as you call him, will readily allow, that Man, of his own *natural Ability*, can do none of these Things. I will do the same for another, and so will many *pious, worthy Men* that I could name. But whatever the *Semicalvinists* might do, much more those of your Stamp, I suppose no *godly Arminian* would consent to persecute Men for their *religious Opinions*, and *force them to be orthodox* — by *apostolic Blows and Knocks*; such a Method of Conviction they would leave to *Calvinists and Papists*.

Page 48. “Nothing can be more evident, than that the *Bishops and Clergy* to whom that Petition was addressed, believed the *Predestination of all Actions and Events* whatever, *Evil* as well as *Good*.” Then I say, nothing can be more evident, than that these *Bishops and Clergy* were a Company of *silly Men*, to say no

worse. Whatever Pains you have taken to make them appear such, one would scarce think they could be such *Dolts*, as you represent them. But it is very proper you should represent them as such, to keep yourself in Countenance. That too many of the inferior Clergy at that Time were Men of *little Learning* is plain, and were but *mean Proficients in Divinity*, as appears from the *Preface to the Book of Homilies*. But that the *Fathers* of the Church were as ignorant as such their *Sons*, and as deep in the *Calvinian Error*, I cannot believe, if I look into my *Common Prayer Book*.

That Mr *William Barret* was constrained to recant some *scriptural Truths*, that he had advanced in his Sermon, preached before the University of *Cambridge*, must be allowed, to the *eternal Shame* of the Persons that obliged him to it; seeing he was forced to retract, if I may so speak, what he *never asserted*. Mr *Barret* had only asserted, “ that no Man was so *firmly establisht*, that he ought to be *secure* of his Salvation;” whereas he was *enjoined* to make this Retraction; “ those that are justified by Faith, &c. ought to be *certain and secure* of their Salvation.” Where, observe, *certain* should not have been added; for that he never denied; and to make him acknowledge that Men ought to be *secure*, was to make him speak against the *Tenor* of many *Passages of Scripture*, and the *Mind* of some of the *most renowned Fathers*, and even of *Austin* himself. But what of that? The *good old Cause*, as it was afterwards called, required, that an *Arminian Heretic* should be suppressed, and it mattered not how, whether *justly* or *unjustly*, so it was but done. And here let me observe, that Dr *Goad*, afterwards one of the Members of the Synod of *Dort*, was one of *Barret*’s Judges. This *truly learned Man*, who had once sickled so mightily for the Doctrine of *absolute Predestination*, when he came to himself, stood forth an Advocate for the other Side of the Question. And his *Disputation concerning the NECESSITY and CONTINGENCY of Events in the World, in Respect of God’s eternal Decrees*, is sufficient to cut the Sinews of *Calvinism* asunder.

You say, Page 51. "The University observed to Archbishop *Whitgift*, that *Barret* had advanced *Untruths*, against the Religion of our Church, *publickly received*, and *always held* in her Majesty's Reign, and maintained in all *Sermons, Disputations* and *Lectures*." I should suppose that this "*Academical Act*" cannot be very "*peculiarly grating*" to Dr *Nowell*, because it is an *Academical Untruth*. For 1st, What *Barret* advanced, was not *against* the Religion of our Church, (however *publickly at that time received*) as *always held* in her Majesty's Reign. For however the chief Rulers of the Church might then have *degenerated* into *rank Calvinism*, certain it is from the *Book of Common Prayer*, that the Church had once held *Melanchtonianism*. 2. It appears from Parson *Talbot's* Petition, in behalf of himself and his Brethren, that at most no other than *Semicalvinism* was maintained in some *Sermons* and *Disputations*; for which these *Semicalvinists* were called many *reproachful* and *opprobrious* Names, by the *persecuting Bigots* that were *thorough-paced Calvinists*.

You proceed to give an Account of the *Lambeth Articles*; after reciting which, you say, Page 53. "Your grand, fundamental Objection, Sir, to these Articles, is your *Hatred* of the Doctrines they contain." I shall make no Scruple to tell you, Sir, if that is not Dr *Nowell's* grand fundamental Objection to them, it is *mine*. And I *justly* hate them, because they are *false, unscriptural* and *blasphemous*. And therefore, confident as you are, that they *ought* to be a Part of our Faith, I am as confident, that *nothing* ought to be a Part of our Faith which *contradicts* the *express Word* of God, and represents the God of *Justice, Wisdom* and *Mercy*, as a *cruel, unwise, unjust* and *arbitrary Tyrant*, as these Articles do. But the Testimony of these Articles, you tell us from *Fuller*, "is an infallible Evidence, what was the *general* and *received* Doctrine of *England* in that Age, about the fore named Controversies." If you and twenty *Fullers* were to tell me, that Articles devised by about *half a Score* Men, and these

these Articles *rejected* by public Authority, and ordered to be *suppressed*, were an infallible Evidence, what was the *general* and *received* Doctrine of England in that Age, I should not believe you; no: These *rejected Articles* were an Evidence that the *general* and *received* Doctrine of England was the very *Reverse* of what these Articles contained.

Page 57. "Bishop Andrews agrees with the Archbishop, *as to the Main*, in his Determination concerning these Articles." This Account you give us from Dr Edwards. But it is a very *false* one. Bishop Andrews's Judgment concerning the *Lambeth Articles*, I have now lying before me. He differs from the Archbishop in several of the *most material* Points of the Controversy: For he says, "I dare not condemn the Fathers, who *almost all* assert, that we are *elected* and *predestinated according to Faith foreseen*: That the *Necessity of Damnation* is *hypothetical*, not *absolute*; Men being damned *for their Sins*, therefore *because they have sinned*; and not (merely) upon that Account, *because they are not Predstinated*" (to Salvation.) "Whether the Holy Spirit may not for a time be *withdrawn*, or *extinguished*, he owns, he doubts. Thou *standest by Faith*; be not *high-minded*, but *fear*: *Otherwise you also shall be cut off*. How should not this be an *irrisory Precept*, says he, if a Man *cannot fall away*?" With much more to the same Purpose. "That God is ready and at hand to *bestow* and *communicate* his Grace; and this, says he, I think, is *given to all*. It is the Fault of Men themselves, that what is offered is not (actually) conferred. For Grace is not wanting *to us*, but we are wanting *to that*." And this he confirms by this Passage from St Austin: "All Men may turn themselves from the Love of visible and temporal Things to keep God's Commands, *if they will*; because that Light (Christ) is the *Light of all Mankind*." The Cause why *all* are not drawn, or are not *so drawn*, that they come to the Son, is the *dissolute Will* of Men themselves, and not the *absolute Will* of God. It is plain from all this, that

that Bishop *Andrews* was as much a *Semipelagian*, as Parson *Talbot*, or any of those *Arminian Heretics*; so far was he from agreeing in the main to the *Lambeth Articles*, as Dr *Edwards* and you would have us believe.

Your pompous account of the “*ever-memorable Synod of Dort*,” as you call it, will never induce any impartial Man, that is acquainted with the Proceedings of that *infamous Cabal*, to think favourably of it. “*Scarce ever*, you say, I believe, did the Christian World, before or since, see such a Number of *Evangelical Divines*, so *learned*, so *pious*, so *discreet*, so *can-* “*did*” (why did you not add, so *heavenly* and so *angelical*?) “*assembled together under one Roof*,” Page 61. Is it possible you could ever think to impose upon an intelligent Reader, by saying this? I should imagine not. But you had this to be considered on your side; you were likely to meet with many Readers who *knew no better*; and many others, who would be glad to have any *Falshood asserted*, so it did but favour the *good old Cause*. That many of the Members of the Synod were *learned Men*, is true: But that they were, to a Man, *evangelical*, admits of some Dispute. You acknowledge, Page 47. that our Protestant Bishops and Clergy were in Queen *Elizabeth*’s days *more highly Calvinistic* than perhaps the Scriptures will warrant. *Maccovius* was as *highly Calvinistic* as any of them, and yet his *Blasphemy* was pronounced by the Synod to be *quite pure and orthodox*. And I can hardly allow such Men to be very *evangelical*, who, by your own Confession were *more highly Calvinistic*, than (without your *Perhaps*) the Scripture will warrant. *Pious Men*, I believe, the few *English Divines* were that were at the Synod. But as for the *chief Managers* and *Principal Doers* at that *Cabal*, I have too great Reason to fear they were but *so-so*. *Discreet* enough they were too, it must be owned; if by *Discretion* you mean *Subtily* and *Cunning*: For they took care to have none among them, as near as they could, but such as they thought *for their turn*; as appears from their Message to the Prince of *Anhalt*. And as for their *Candour* we have this Account from
one

one that was present at the Synod, "That things were
 " carried at *Dort*, somewhat worse than at *Trent* itself,
 " rather by *Violence*, than *Reason*. Their *Arguments*
 " were all *Iron*; their *Syllogisms*, *Stocks* and *Fetters*;
 " the *Prætor* made the *Major Proposition*, the *Lictor*,
 " the *Minor*, and the *Prison* was the *Conclusion*." And
 yet you would bear us in hand, that " never were De-
 " bates of such *Intricacy* and *Importance*, carried on
 " with more *Decency*, *Solemnity*, and *Unanimity*, than
 " in this Synod!" Page 62. For your better Informa-
 tion concerning this, and some other more interesting
 Matters, I would recommend to your serious Perusal
Episcopius's Account of the Synod of *Dort*, and the
Christian's Rescue from the Grand Error of the Heathen,
 (touching the fatal *Necessity* of all Events) and the dis-
 mal Consequences thereof, which have slyly crept into
 the Church. By *Thomas Pierce*, Rector of *Brington* in
Northamptonshire: And if it does not make you wiser
 than ever the reading of *Jerome Zanchius* did, I will
 turn *Mahometan*. But in the mean time, I must adver-
 tise you of this, that if you do not learn of Mr *Pierce*
 to become a *sounder Christian* than you are, you will
 be in danger of learning from old Father *Barlee*, his
 Antagonist, to rail and call Names in a manner even be-
 yond what your own natural Genius could carry you to.

Page 62. "I cannot, without doing Violence to
 " Truth, acquit the *Arminian Writers*, in general, of Ar-
 " tifice and wilful Misrepresentation, hardly compatible
 " with *Heathen Honesty*, and still less with *Christian Inte-*
 " grity, when they treat of Doctrines and Transactions
 " relative to *Calvinism*." I readily believe you; though
 you certainly might if you would. And yet would you
 have us acquit you of these Crimes, when you tell Dr
Nowell, that he apparently borrowed the Phrase, *Hor-*
rible Decrees, from Mr *John Wesley*. For is it not as
 apparent that Mr *John Wesley* himself borrowed it this
 Phrase from Mr *John Calvin*; and is it not equally ap-
 parent, that Dr *Nowell* might borrow it from *Calvin*, as
 well as Mr *Wesley*? Certainly you cannot be ignorant
 that your own Doctor, in his *Institutes*, calls the Doctrine
 of

of *unconditional Reprobation* a *Horrible Decree*. When therefore you would insinuate that Mr *Wesley* was the *Author* of this Phrase, and that Dr *Nowell* borrowed it from him, if you had not been a *Calvinist*, I should have *wondered* at you. But however my Wonder ceases, upon this Condition, I cannot acquit you of that *Artifice* and *wilful Misrepresentation*, wherewith you charge the *Arminian Writers*. Nor can I acquit (to use your own genteel Expression to Mr *Wesley*) the *Bell-wether* of your Party, of such *Artifice* and *wilful Misrepresentation*, in his *Review of Arguments against the Doctrine of General Redemption considered*, published in the *Gospel Magazine*, as it is called. He has this Quotation (if that may be so called, which was never written before.) Is it not a horrid Shame, to hear honest People so seduced into Love-killing *Factions*, *siding with* their Teachers? Whereas the words in that Pamphlet are these: Love-killing, *factious Sidings*, by their Teachers. The Passage is attributed to the Author, which is not his, but a Quotation from *Baxter*, as the Pamphlet declares. And if *W. M——n* could not see it, he should have made use of his *Peeping Glass*, which he uses upon other Occasions to find Faults, which might perhaps have prevented him from making any. But the *good old Cause* did not require it; and therefore he *wilfully misrepresented* the Matter. Yet *W. M——n* is a *most excellent Man*, and a *sweet Christian*.

Page 63. You tell us from Dr *Edwards*, “ That if
“ Mr *Hales* bid *John Calvin*, *Good-Night*, when *Epis-*
“ *copius* urged *John* iii. 16. it is likely he was reconciled
“ to him *next Morning*.” To prove this, certain
Passages are quoted from Mr *Hales*’s Sermons; among
which there is this: “ It is a noble Resolution, so to
“ humble ourselves under the hand of Almighty God,
“ as that we can *with Patience* hear, yea think it an
“ honour, that so base Creatures as ourselves, should
“ become the Instruments of the Glory of so great a
“ Majesty, whether it be *by eternal Life*, or *by eternal*
“ *Death*; though for *no other reason* but for God’s *Good-*
“ *will and Pleasure’s* sake.” In reading this and some
other

other *extravagant* Passages in your Writings, I have been almost at a Loss to know, whether you are really a *filly Calvinist*, or only an *artful* and *sly Personater* of one, who by exposing to the World the *Extravagancies, Weaknesses, and Crimes* of the Calvinists, endeavours to bring them into Contempt. However, let me ask you, Do you really think it an *Honour* to be *damned*, for *no other reason*, but, for God's *Good-will and Pleasure's* sake? If not, let me tell you, whatever you may pretend, you are as much an *Arminian* as the *John Goodwin* of the present Age; and (as one of your Party told me awhile ago) your carnal Mind rises up against the *Sovereignty* of God, as much as his. If you do think so, you and Mr *Hales*, and all such *Calvinists*, are welcome to that Honour *alone*. I will answer for it, no *Arminian* will envy you the *Honour of being damned*, though you entirely share it among you.

Page 67. "When *Arguments* fall short, it is too common with *Controversial Writers*, to call Names and sling Dirt." I must say to you, as you to Dr *Nowell*, "I could wish, Sir, that you had not stooped to this *illiberal Recourse*." For how sadly is your own Observation verified in your Letters to Dr *Nowell* and Mr *Wesley*? In the former, the *Arminians* in general are branded with the Character of *Prevaricating Subscribers, False Declarers of Assent, Mushroom Schismatics, Friends and Cousin-germans to the Papists*; Men, as Writers, guilty of such *Artifice* and *wilful Misrepresentation*, as is hardly compatible with *Heathen Honesty*, or *Christian Integrity*; not to mention the pretty Names you have bestowed upon *Individuals*. In the latter you call Mr *Wesley* a *restless Arminian*, the *Bellwether of deluded Thousands*, acting with all the *Sophistry* of a *Jesuit*, and the *dictatorial Authority* of a *Pope*, and the ignoble Part of a *lurking, sly Assassin*; a *Knave*, a *lying Sophister*, a *Divine* sunk beneath the Level of an *Oyster-Woman*, a *Theological Coward*, a *Religious Gambler*, a *Proteus*, possessed of more than *Serpentine Elability*, a *Windmill*, a *Scribler*, an old *Plagiary*, a *literary Picker and Stealer*, &c. &c. &c. Though you say

say to Mr *Wesley*, “*Blush* if you can;” as if you doubted, whether he could or not: I was in hopes you would have done so, upon a Review of what you had written; considering that you had no *Precedent*, from what Dr *Nowell*, or Mr *Wesley* had written, to write in *such* a Manner, and so no *Plea*. But I find myself mistaken. You only blame yourself in a subsequent Publication, for not having written in a *worse* Manner. The Comedian makes a *Blush* on a young Man’s Cheek, a hopeful Sign of Virtue still remaining: *Erubuit; salva res est*, says he. But if you can face out this, what shall we say? *Non erubuit; perdita res est*. Where there is not so much as a *Flushing* on the Cheek, the Case is *bad* indeed. However, if I may advise you, for the future *leave off* calling Names yourself, or no more blame others for doing it; lest otherwise some that are Men of as much Metal as yourself, should say to you, *Thou Hypocrite, first cast out the Beam out of thine own Eye; and then thou shalt see clearly to cast out the Mote out of thy Brother’s Eye.*

Page 68. In order to bring *John Goodwin’s Redemption redeemed*, into disesteem, you tell us, that the same *John Goodwin*, “that *virulent Anticalvinist*, “wrote an elaborate Treatise in professed Vindication of King *Charles’s* Murder.” Be that as it will, *Goodwin’s* Sentiments, as a *Politician*, cannot at all invalidate his Arguments in Defence of *General Redemption*. These will stand impregnable against all the Artillery of *all the Calvinists* in the World. But by the Way, Sir, let me ask you, was *Goodwin* a Rebel, for writing, as you say, *A Defence of the Sentence passed on King Charles, by the High Court of Justice*? I would beg Leave to ask, How much better are you for writing this: “Whenever a Prince *oversteps the Law*, Loyalty itself obliges a loyal People to say to “such a Prince, as the Almighty to the Sea, *Hitherto shalt thou come, and no further*,” Page 49. i. e. Loyalty itself obliges a loyal People in such Case to *rebel*: not to *remonstrate* and *modestly shew* the Prince his Error, and *request a Redress of Grievances*; but *daringly*
fly

fly in the Prince's Face at once; stretch out the *irresistible Arm* of Power, and give the dread Command, as God does to the Sea, and so *force* him to *Obedience*, or *dethrone* and *murder* him. I have not strained your Words at all. What can they mean else? Let me then ask you seriously again: Is this the Language of one that professes himself a Minister of Jesus Christ? An Ambassador of the *Prince of Peace*? And at *such a Time* as this? If you are not sorry for yourself, upon Reflection, I am the more sorry for you.

But *J. Goodwin*, you say, was a "*virulent Anticalvinist*." In which of his *anticalvinistical* Writings does this appear? In none that I have seen. I think there is hardly a controversial Writer to be found, that has more strictly observed the Rules of *Decency* and *Modesty* than he, notwithstanding the Usage he met with from the *calvinistic Party*. But for such a one as you to complain of his *Virulence*, considering your own *Venom* against the *Arminians* in general, and against *Dr Nowell* and *Mr Wesley* in particular, I must needs say, is no more a Token of your own *Modesty*, than it is of your *Candour* or *Truth*.

Page 71. Upon *Dr Nowell's* remarking on Article 23d, that the Compilers of our Articles—prudently avoided determining the Question, whether *Episcopal Ordination* is *necessary*; your Wisdom replies: "So, rather than not expunge *Predestination* from our Articles, you would expunge with it the *Necessity* of *Episcopal Ordination*." You might as well have said, that because the Compilers of our *Church Catechism* have only laid down the Sacraments, as *generally necessary* to Salvation, therefore they have altogether expunged the *Necessity* of them. But will you maintain that *Episcopal Ordination* is any more *absolutely necessary* in *England*, than it is in *Scotland*, in order to the profitable Discharge of the Ministry? I suppose not, unless you will shew yourself to be an *intolerable Bigot* indeed, and a Match for the stiffest Devotee under his *Holiness's* Jurisdiction. And if not, *unwarrantable* as
you

you suppose this Concession is in favour of the *Geneva Discipline*, you must make it, as well as Dr *Nowell*. Nor need you fear its being “told in *Glasgow*, or published in the Streets of *Edinburgh*,” since it will not give “the *Presbyterians*,” any manner of Occasion “to rejoice”, nor the *Daughters of the Kirk* to triumph,” if we can maintain our own to be the *primitive Mode* of Ecclesiastical Government.

Page 76. Because Dr *Nowell* acknowledges, there is such an Article as the 17th, concerning *Election*, you triumph again, crying, “*O vis Veritatis invitis etiam pectoribus erumpentes.*” — You have granted as much as any *calvinistic Writer* could have granted, “or a *calvinistic Reader* can desire.” Very far from it. Ask Dr *Nowell* his Meaning, and you will desire somewhat more, or be as *ill satisfied*, as you are with Mr *Wesley*’s Extract from your Translation of *Zanchius*. But you add, “You are got into the very *Midst* of *Geneva*, before you are aware.” No, nor so much as *halfway thither*. To understand that Article in a scriptural Sense, which it is certain ought be the *true Sense* of it, is to stand at a very great Distance from *Geneva* and you. But I see you are for imitating the *French*: You will sing *Te Deum*, even though you have lost the *Battle*.

Page 78. “I challenge any one *Arminian*, to point out any one *spiritual Qualification*, represented in the Bible as *previously requisite* to everlasting Life; which Qualification is not in the same Bible declared to be the *Gift of God* and the *Work of his own Grace* in every one that shall be saved.” And I, on the other Hand, challenge any one *Calvinist* to point out any one *Arminian*, that will affirm such Qualification is *not* the Gift of God, and the Work of his own Grace. If you can find out any Man that affirms this, that Man observe, is *not an Arminian*.

Ibid. You say, “That the *Sentences* of Scripture, with which the Morning and Evening Prayer are appointed to begin, declare neither more nor less than this, that Persons possessed of such and such Graces, have

68 *The Church of England vindicated from*

“ have an *evidential* Right to such and such Privileges,
 “ by Virtue of God’s free Promises.” Not so. Several
 of them mention nothing about the *possessing of Graces*,
 nor *Right to Privileges*; but are merely *Prayers* for Par-
 don, *Confession of Sin*, or *Exhortations to Repentance*;
 which very Exhortations imply as much *Freewill* in
 Man, as any *Arminian* contends for.

Ibid. In your Remarks on the *Absolution*, you ask,
 “ Are all Sinners Partakers of this *true Repentance* and
 “ *unfeigned Faith*?” That is not the Question. The
 Point we contend about is, Whether *all* Sinners to
 whom the Gospel is preached, *may not be* Partakers of
 these Graces? And whether God hath *absolutely* de-
 creed, they *should not*? And Bishop *Andrews*, as I
 have shewn before, hath determined the Matter *against*
 you.—“ The *Faith* and *Repentance*, which the *Absolu-*
 “ *tion* mentions, were, in the Intention of the Com-
 “ pilers, considered as the Effects of God’s *Free Grace*,
 “ and not of *Man’s Free-will*.” Yes, of *Man’s Free-*
will also, *assisted* by Grace; as is plain from the 10th
 Article, (unless you would make the Article contradict
 the *Absolution*;) For therein the Grace of God is ex-
 pressly declared, as “ *preventing* us, that we may have
 “ a good Will, and *working with us* (not *without us*)
 “ when we have a good Will.” *Arminian Freewillers*,
 as you call them, therefore, “ acting consistently with
 “ their *darling Tenet*,” would be so far from “ *not* praying
 “ for Faith and Repentance *at all*,” that they would
 pray for these Blessings *continually*; and that with some-
 what more *encouragement*, than one could pray for them,
 who believes they are *unconditionally* designed *only* for
 a few, and so withheld from *all the rest* of Man-
 kind.

Page 79. Dr *Nowell* infers, from that Petition in the
Lord’s Prayer, *Lead us not into Temptation*; that the
 Church of *England* denies (absolute) *final Perseverance*.
 You reply, “ A most formidable Argument indeed! re-
 “ duced to some little Sort of Form it stands thus:
 “ The Church of *England* hath adopted the *Lord’s*
 “ *Prayer* into her public Service: But in that Prayer
 “ we

“ we request to be *preserved from Temptation* : Ergo, “ the Church believes, that the *truly Regenerate* may “ *totally and finally fall from Grace.*” A little Sort of Form the Argument is reduced to indeed ! So little that it may well make him that reduced it to such a Form, ashamed of it. Your *Major* is not what it ought to be. No more is your *Minor*, which is absolutely a *false Position*. The *Conclusion* is true, though it follows not from your *Premisses*. In the *Lord's Prayer* we do not pray, as you express it in your *Minor*, that we may be *preserved from Temptation* ; or, as you afterwards explain yourself, that we may “ *not be tempted to Evil,*” but that we may not be *led into Temptation* ; by which Phrase, I suppose, every sensible Man will allow, is meant, that we may not be *suffered to be overcome by Temptation*. Which Thing, if it were not possible, our Lord would never have taught us to pray against. But you will not deny, that a *truly regenerate* Man may be *overcome by Temptation*, yea, *fall into deadly Sin*. And it is possible that such a one may never rise again, Heb. vi. 4, 5, 6. — x. 38. Well then, to reduce the Doctor's Argument into a larger and somewhat better Sort of Form. than you have done, let it stand thus : Whatever Evil the Church of *England* prays against in that Prayer, which our Lord himself taught, she believes *may possibly* come to pass. But the Church of *England* in that Prayer, prays against *falling into Temptation*, which may be a *total and final falling from Grace* : Ergo, The Church believes that *some may totally and finally fall from Grace*. And such as *so* fall, according to you, must be *truly regenerate*, because no others *have Grace*. Nor indeed is it possible for any Man to fall from Grace, that *has it not*. Wherefore, though “ *Temptation* and “ *final Apostacy,*” are not “ *Terms synonymous ; fall-* “ *ing totally and finally into Temptation and final Apost-* “ *acy* are so.” if then these Terms are *synonymous*, the Doctor's Inference drawn from the Use of the *Lord's Prayer* does not “ *fall to the Ground,*” nor “ *vanish into Air.*”

Page 80. I shall not concern myself with the Doctor's Argument for *unlimited Redemption*, drawn from the *Te Deum*, as it is reduced to *some little Sort* of Form by you; but I shall animadvert a little on that which you set down as your own against it. "Our Church, you say, in the *Te Deum*, asserts, that Christ, by his Incarnation and Death, opened the Kingdom of Heaven to *all Believers*: But the *Whole of Mankind* are not *Believers*: Ergo, Our Church, in the *Te Deum*, does not assert, that Christ opened the Kingdom of Heaven to *the Whole of Mankind*." I deny the *Major*. Our Church does *not* there assert, that Christ *by his Incarnation* opened the Kingdom of Heaven to all Believers. This she asserts he did only, *when he had overcome the Sharpness of Death*. Whereas *by his Incarnation* he took upon him to deliver Man. By which Man, she evidently means *Mankind*; that *great sick Man*, which St *Austin* says, "lies extended all over the World, from the East unto the West, and for the healing of which *great sick Man*, the Almighty Physician came down." Now if after this great sick Man has been *healed* and *delivered*, he again *makes himself sick*, or *wounds himself to death* in any of his Members, and *will not* be healed again, when he might; *such Members* of this sick Man are to blame, and *not* the *Physician*. Our Church then, in this Hymn, asserts *unlimited Redemption*, though not *unlimited eternal Salvation*, which is a quite different Thing. The one is entirely *independent* of any Thing *done*, or *to be done* by Men; the other *depends* on Man's believing the Gospel, when proposed to him.

Allowing all that you say in your Note on the Petition in the Collect in the *Funeral Office*, Page 82. "That there is a Body of *elect Persons*; that they are chosen of *God himself*; and that they are a *certain, determinate Number*, which shall be so accomplished, that *not one* of the Number shall be missing; I cannot allow that this Number might not have been *more or less*. Nor will I believe, without better

" Proof

“ Proof than you, or any *Calvinist* upon Earth is
 “ able to bring, that these, as you say afterwards, are
 “ *simply and singly* the Objects of God's *gracious*
 “ *Choice*, *abstractedly* considered as such, without any
 “ respect had to *ought in them*, or *done by them*, whe-
 “ ther *actual* or *foreseen*.” When you can prove, that
 God is an *unjust, cruel, arbitrary self-willed Tyrant*, I
 may then perhaps have as *unworthy Thoughts* of him
 as you have, and allow of your *shocking Position*.

Your Term, *the World of the Elect*, I reject as *unscriptural* and *unknown to Antiquity*, and only coined by some
 leading Men of your Party, to serve a *wretched Hypo-*
thesis, by thus evading the Force of such Texts, as assert
General Redemption, which they could not otherwise
 withstand.—The Word *Εκλεκτός*, allowing it to signi-
 fy, as well as *Εκλελεγμένος*, *selected, picked out, and*
chosen from among others, is no Proof, that the Per-
 sons so favoured, were so favoured of God without
 any *Respect* had to *ought in them*, or *done by them*, whe-
 ther *actual* or *foreseen*; nor that he did not *regulate* his
 Election according to the *foreseen Faith and Works* of
 those he elected. To say that he did not, is, as Bishop
Andrews observes, to condemn almost *all the Fathers*.
 Whatever then Dr *Nowell's* Definition of the *Elect*
 may be, Mr *Toplady's* (if Bishop *Andrews* is to be heard)
 is at least so far a *newfangled* one, that it was hardly
 mentioned in the first Ages.

That *Watchfulness* and *Prayer* are the Means appoint-
 ed of God, whereby a Believer may *secure* his *Perseve-*
rance, is most certain. But that every one, who has
once truly believed, shall so use these Means, as that he
 shall *infallibly persevere*, I no where find that God hath
 decreed, as you tell us, Page 84. Your Text, 1 *Thess.*
 v. 23, 24. is far from Proof of this. Seeing what the
 Apostle had exhorted the *Thessalonians* to before, was, in
 order to their being *preserved blameless unto the coming of*
Christ. But to assure such Men, whom we have seriously
 exhorted to be careful to do such and such Things, that so
 they may be *blameless unto the coming of Christ*, that they
 shall certainly, and without any Possibility of miscarry-
 ing,

ing, be preserved by God hereunto, is nothing else, being truly interpreted, but to *tempt them to neglect* all our Exhortations to that Purpose. But I perceive, whatever Dr *Nowell* has, you Sir, according to your own Remark, have gotten such a Habit of *wresting the Scripture*, by coming to it *provided with your own Sense*, that you have acquired a *Dexterity of extracting* what Doctrines you please out of it.

Page 86. If Dr *Nowell* has asserted, “ That all
 “ whom God the Son hath redeemed, God the Holy
 “ Ghost sanctifies,” I must declare my Dissent both from him and you; if by *Sanctification* you mean, the *being fully renewed in the Spirit of our Mind*, and so made meet for Glory; which I suppose the Doctor does not mean, though you may. For *Redemption* and such *Sanctification*, are not “ *equilateral and commensurate* with each
 “ other. You may as fairly prove from our Catechism,
 “ that *Creation* is *equilateral and commensurate* with them
 “ both. With regard to the *rational Part* of the *Creation*, I maintain, from the *Catechism*, if that has any
 “ weight with you, that *Redemption* is *commensurate*
 “ with it. For, as God the Father is there said to
 “ have *made all Mankind*, as being Part of all the World;
 “ so is God the Son said to have *redeemed all Mankind*.
 “ But not so God the Holy Ghost to *sanctify all Man-*
 “ *kind*; but only *all the Elect People of God*. In what
 “ Sense the Church uses the Term *Elect* there, I shall
 “ not stand to enquire. But, this I say, it is certain
 “ that she, as well as the Scripture, uses it sometimes
 “ in a large Sense for *all Baptized Persons*; and at other
 “ times in a more *limited* Sense, for those only that shall
 “ be *infallible Heirs of Salvation*; that is, *persevering*
obedient Believers.

Page 88. “ *Calvinism*, it seems, is downright *Popery*,
 “ and *Popery* is *orthodox Calvinism*. But by what Act of
 “ *Transubstantiation* is this proved?” By your Leave I will
 “ tell you, by the same Act whereby you prove *Arminians* *Pa-*
pists. The *Arminians* say, that Man through the Aid of
 “ Divine Grace has *Freewill to do Good*: So say some *Pa-*
pists. The *Calvinists* maintain an *unconditional Election* of
particular

particular Persons to eternal Life. So do *some Papists*, and therefore, according to your Method of Proof, the *Calvinists* are *Papists*. Give up your Argument and we are content to let each Party be called nothing more than just what they are: The *Arminians*, merely as *such*, *Arminians* and no more; the *Calvinists*, merely as *such*, *Calvinists* and no more; neither one, nor the other barely on account of their distinguishing Tenets, being any more *Papists*, than they are *Italians* or *Frenchmen*.

Page 91. "I believe—I am convinced, that the Souls
" of all departed Infants whatever, whether baptized
" or unbaptized, are with God in Glory. And I
" think my Belief warranted by an Authority which
" cannot err. I believe—that in the Decree of Predesti-
" nation to Life, God hath included all, whom he
" hath decreed to take away in Infancy; and that the
" Decree of Reprobation has nothing to do with them."
I am exceedingly pleased with your Charity, but quite astonished at your Faith. O tell it not in Scotland, publish it not in the Streets of Geneva, lest the Daughters of the Kirk, as your Expression is, be grieved, and the Sons of Calvin lament and mourn; yea tell it not in London-Row, lest the Publishers of the Gospel Magazine, as it is called, who have given you so high a Character for a Defender of the Doctrines of (limited) Grace, should groan out, Oh! What a Fall was there! The Evangelic Mr Toplady, who took so much Pains to prove the Church of England calvinistic; who translated Zanchius, in order to shew, that God from all Eternity made the Devil a free Gift of far the greatest Part of Mankind; that he decreed their Sin and their Damnation for it when he had done; who so soundly chastised Dr Nowell, for maintaining, that the Church of England was Arminian; and who so heartily mauled Mr Wesley for exposing his orthodox Tenets; this very Mr Toplady, O Grief of Grievs, not content to maintain the heterodox Opinion of general Redemption, plainly declares his Belief of the universal Salvation of Mankind; and so in a few Lines retracts

all that he had written in Defence of Synodical Orthodoxy both before and after.

Do you start, Sir, and ask, where? In the Passage above quoted, in which you say, your Belief is warranted by *Matt. xviii. 14. Even so it is not the Will of your heavenly Father, that one of these little ones should perish.* Observe, our Lord does not say, one of these *little ones* that shall die in their Infancy; but *little ones* in general, whether they live long or die soon; for he declares, *Chap. xix. 14. of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.* It is plain therefore that *all Infants* have a *Right* to the Kingdom of Heaven; and if, according to your Doctrine, they who have *any Right at all* thereto have an *indefeasible Right*; if you ground your Belief of the *certain Salvation* of *Children dying in their Infancy* upon this Text, you must of Consequence believe the *certain Salvation* of *all others that arrive to Manhood.* If you deny this Consequence, you must come over to the *Arminians*, and own the *Amisibility of Grace.*

In Answer to your Comment upon the 17th Article, and what you have elsewhere advanced concerning *Predestination*, I shall here only say in general, that the Article only supposes that we are to have a *godly Consideration* of *Predestination* and *Election* in Christ, and not such an *ungodly* and *blasphemous* one as you hold forth; that though we acknowledge there are *some Sort* of Persons *elected* to eternal Life, and others *rejected*, yet we dare not, like you, entertain such Notions about these Matters, as represent God as a Being void of *Wisdom, Justice, Mercy, Holiness* and *Truth*; and when you drag in *1 Peter ii. 8, 9.* to confirm your Notion of *Predestination*, you seem to know no more the Meaning of that Passage, than you do the Meaning of the *incantatory Word, Abracadabra*, that was once used to charm away Agues.

Page 94. "The Article closes with two wise and
 "useful Cautions. 1. *We must receive God's Promises in*
 "such wise, as they be generally set forth to us in holy
 "Scripture. 2. *In our Doings, that Will of God is*
 "to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto
 "us in the Word of God." Admitting your Notion of
 Pre-

Predestination, there is no great *Wisdom* in these *Cau-tions* ; nor have they any *Use*, unless it be to contradict that *Notion*. For where is either the *Wisdom* or *Use* of giving *Cautions* to believe and do what, according to your *Account*, some *never can*, and others *cannot but* believe and do, by virtue of an *influencing* and *over-ruling* Decree? “ The *latter* of those *Propositions*, “ you say, by the bye, is evidently formed on the “ *Calvinistic Distinction* of the *Divine Will* into *secret* “ and *revealed* ” You very justly call it a *Calvinistic Distinction* ; for a *scriptural* one, as you hold it, it is not. But by the bye again, if the *latter* *Proposition* is formed on that *Distinction*, is not the *former* as well ; seeing the *Promises* are no less the *revealed* *Will* of God, than the *Precepts*? One would suppose it is.

But let me tell you, if your *Calvinistical Distinction* be well grounded, then ought no Man to receive God’s *Promises* as set forth, nor follow his *Commands*, as expressly declared in *Scripture*, until he is sure that these *Promises* and *Commands* are agreeable to his *secret*, which the *Synod of Dort* maintains is his *proper Will*. Yea, you yourself tell us elsewhere, “ that God’s *hidden* “ *Will* is *peremptory* and *absolute* ; and therefore cannot “ be hindered from taking effect.” Now certain it is, that whatever is *revealed*, is not God’s *hidden Will*. And if his *hidden Will* be alone his *proper Will*, and *pe-remptory* and *absolute* ; his *revealed Will*, so called, should rather be called Somebody’s *Whim* than God’s *Will*. For I cannot conceive how any *Thing* can in anywise be said to be God’s *Will*, or (whatever else it may be called) that is not *properly* his, and is not *pe-remptory*, nor *absolute* in some *Respect*. Upon your *Supposition*, the *Promises* and *Commands* in the *Bible*, I say again, are Somebody’s *Whim*, not God’s *Will* : for God’s *Will* is *secret* ; these *Things* are *revealed*. Thus, Sir, with your *calvinistic Distinction* you *destroy the Credibility* and *abrogate the Authority* of the *Bible*, and give up the *Cause* to the *Deists*. I had a strong *Suspicion* before, for more *Reasons* than one, that you are something *other* than a *Calvinist*. What you will

turn out by and by, Time only can discover. In reply to your Comment upon several Texts of Scripture in some following Pages, I shall only refer you to a Pamphlet lately published, intitled, *Arguments against the Doctrine of General Redemption considered.*

Page 98. Your Remarks on the 16th Article are very extraordinary indeed, and this Article, you say, 1. “ Treats of Sins committed, not after *spiritual* and “ *internal Regeneration*, but simply after *Baptism.*” Yet you tell us immediately before, (how truly you must look to) that *Baptism* and *receiving the Holy Ghost* mean the same Thing. Now it is certain, he that *receives the Holy Ghost* is posselt of *spiritual* and *internal Regeneration.* I do not say *Renovation*, for that is a different Thing. If therefore this Article treats of *Baptism*, which you say is the same Thing as *receiving the Holy Ghost*, it treats of *spiritual* and *internal Regeneration.* But let me observe to you, that our Church by *Baptism*, no more means, *receiving the Holy Ghost*, than it means thereby *spiritual* and *internal Regeneration.* However, it supposes, that *in* and *by* *Baptism*, the Holy Ghost is given to, and *spiritual* and *internal Regeneration* is conferred upon the Recipients. This is plain from the Prayer immediately preceding the *Dipping* or *pouring Water* upon the baptized Person: “ Grant that this “ Child may——ever remain in the Number of thy “ faithful and elect Children :” in which Number it is supposed *to be*, when baptized, otherwise it would be absurd to pray that it might *remain* therein. In the Address after *Baptism*, she asserts, that the Child *is by Baptism regenerate.* In the Prayer immediately following, she thanks God, that he hath “ regenerated the “ Infant with his holy Spirit.” In the 27th Article she maintains, that “ *Baptism* is a Sign of Regeneration or New-birth, whereby—the Promises of Forgiveness of Sins, and of our Adoption to be the “ Sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed “ and sealed.” But it would be a gross Absurdity to suppose Things *signed* and *sealed*, which were *not signified* and had *no Existence.* When therefore you say,
that

that the 16th Article treats *only* of *Baptism* and *not* of *spiritual* and *internal Regeneration*. you say what I cannot allow, unless you can prove, that *to be regenerated with God's Holy Spirit*, is something different from *spiritual* and *internal Regeneration*. No more is that true, which you advance ; 2. " That the *Influences of the Spirit* vouchsafed in *Baptism*, do not, for any Thing that the Article says, amount to *real Regeneration*." For certainly those that *receive the Holy Ghost*, and are *regenerated* by it, are *really* and *truly* regenerate. And hence appears the *Falsity* of your third Remark, " That the *Departure from Grace* given, of which the Article makes mention, is only simply stiled a *Departure*, without declaring that *Departure* to be either *total* or *final*." For the *Departure* mentioned is not simply stiled a *Departure* ; but *compositely*, a *Departure from Grace* given, which *Grace* is the *Holy Ghost*, or its *Influences*, said to be *received in Baptism*. However, therefore, the Article does not declare, " that *Departure* to be either *total* or *final*," no more does it declare, that it shall *not be such*. And though it declares, that *by the Grace of God we may rise again*, it does not declare, that *those that fall, every one of them certainly shall do so*. And now, " pray Sir," do you " let the Article speak for itself," and you will find it very much " affects the present Argument." It plainly implies, as Dr *Nowell* observes, that we may *so fall* from *Grace*, that we may *not rise again*.

But you remark, 4. " The *Whole* apparently relates " not to *Matters of spiritual Grace*, but to *ecclesiastical Censures*, and the *Exercise of Church Discipline*." Does it so? Suppose the present *Governors* of our Church were as *flaming Calvinists* as you are, and were to excommunicate, as, I suppose, you would wish them to do, every *godly* and *gracious Arminian* in the Nation, and you had the *Happiness* to make one of of the Number ; would you therefore venture to affirm, that they and you were fallen from the *Grace of God*, because ye were fallen under the *ecclesiastical Censures* of some *fiery Bigots*? You may as well affirm, that the

whole Church of *England* is fallen from Grace, because it is fallen under the *ecclesiastical Censures* of the Pope. Is it possible for any Man of *common Sense*, much less for such a mighty Pretender to *Reason* as you are, to confound the *Grace of the Holy Spirit*, received in Baptism, with *ecclesiastical Censures*? This shews you were *put to your Trumps* indeed. I may justly retort upon you your own Words to Dr Norwell: “ Surely the Cause must be very weak, which is so
“ able an Hand as yours, is so *feebly* and so *unfairly*
“ supported.”

Page 99. “ In the 17th Article,—the Elect are expressly said to be *justified, called* (Have regard to order, Sir; much depends upon it) to be *called*, and
“ *obey the Calling*, to be *justified, conformed to the Image*
“ *of Christ, walk religiously in good Works*, and at
“ *length to attain to everlasting Felicity.*” True; but what Elect? It is evident that by the *Elect* there, our Church means such Persons as *persevere in the Faith*; and so are chosen as *infallible Heirs* of Heaven. But this is not her Meaning wherever she uses the Term *Elect*, in her *Liturgy* and *Homilies*. It is therein often used in a *looser Sense*, for those that are only *presumptive Heirs* of Heaven, as it is frequently used in the Scripture. Those that *now believe* being stiled *Elect*, whether they *continue* in the Faith or not, as St *Austin* observes. Now I suppose there is no Man so void of Sense, as to suppose, that all or any of these, that shall be *infallible Heirs* of Heaven, will ever “ perish
“ by the Way.” But this hinders not, but that many of those who are now, thro’ believing, *presumptive Heirs* of Heaven, “ may perish by the Way:” for which reason there is need to *fear lest a Promise being left of entering into God’s Rest, any should seem* (*δοξῆν*) *should be seen,* or *found to come short of it*, Heb. iv. 1. Though by the way let it be observed, this will never happen to any one in consequence of God’s *absolute and irrelative Predestination*; but by his *just Appointment* on account of Mens own *wilful Sins* and *final Impenitence*. The different Notions of the Term *Elect*, given above, you
must

must allow of, otherwise all that you have cited from the Standard Writings of the Church to maintain the Doctrine of *Final Perseverance*, is only so much cited to *contradict* the Homily on the *Danger of Falling from God*.

I shall take the Liberty in my turn to give my Opinion of your Performance, as freely as you have given yours of Dr *Nowell's*, which is, (to return you your own Words) that your *Design* is not very *happily executed*, nor your *Objections* (to what you call *Arminianism*) very *solidly founded*, Page 105. And I really think, upon a Review of the whole, that you have no great Reason to sing *Te Deum* for your *imaginary Triumph* over the Doctrines of *Melanchton*, which our Church embraces, and maintains. But “ it is Matter of *Lamentation*, you “ say to the Doctor, that you should even have attempt- “ ed to subvert (the Doctrines of *Calvinism*;) and that “ the Church should receive any blow, how slight soever, “ from so respectable a Hand.” It may be so, Sir; and yet you cannot but allow, that a *slight Blow* given, though it were by a *respectable Hand*, may not be attended with so bad Consequences, as the *severe Scratchings* and *Clawings* with the *venemous Nails* of a *malapert Boy*.

In Answer to all the Pains you have taken to prove that our Church has *no fixt Principles*, and that her Homilies directly contradict her Liturgy (for what all that you have said from the Homilies, if we must understand it as you would have us, proves besides, I see not) I must tell you, that your Quotations are *mere Chicanery*. You make a great Bustle with them only to raise Dust to put out Mens Eyes. But notwithstanding this, some perhaps may see a little clearer, than you would wish. Some of your Quotations in Favour of your Doctrines are *nothing to the Purpose*, and others make *directly against* you. To consider some of the Passages quoted.

First, Concerning *Predestination*, as it respects Mankind: “ When God had chosen to himself a *Peculiar* “ and *Special People*, from amongst all other Nations, “ that knew not God,—he gave unto them certain “ Ordinances.” What then? Is this an assertion that

he *irrespectively* chose all this People to be *infallible Heirs* of Heaven? No, nor a Syllable to the Purpose. — “The *true Church* is an universal Congregation or Fellowship of God’s faithful and *Elect People*.” This likewise is no more Proof that our Church maintains *Ca’vin’s Doctrine*, than it is that she embraces *Mahomet’s Doctrine*. — “Let us only trust to be saved by his Death and Passion, — that he may receive us into his heavenly Kingdom, and place us in the Number of his *elect* and *chosen People*.” Nothing can more directly oppose the Doctrine of *irrespective* and *unconditional Election* than this Passage; seeing that it absolutely makes our being placed in the Number of Christ’s *Elect* and *chosen People*, to depend upon our *trusting to be saved by his Death and Passion*. That which hath the greatest *seeming* to favour your Opinion, is what occurs in the next Quotation; wherein it is declared, that “God, of his Mercy and *special Favour* to some, hath appointed them to everlasting Salvation.” But even this is no more than *seeming*. For not an Air or the least Breath is here concerning the *irresistible working* of Grace, or the *Absoluteness* and *Irrespectiveness* of Election. Nothing at all is advanced here, that opposes the *rational* and *scriptural* Opinion, that God has *regulated* his Election, by the *foreseen Faith* and *Works* of Men.

As little to your Purpose are the Passages you quote, to impose your Notion of God’s Decree of *Reprobation* upon our Church. — “Every Word in God’s Book, is unto the *Reprobate*, the *Savour of Death unto Death*.” And what then? This is no Proof that our Church holds, that God from all Eternity made the Devil a *free Grant* of far the greatest Part of Mankind, *irrespectively* of their Sins; much less that he decreed they should *necessarily sin*, and then be *infallibly damned* for their *necessitated Sin*, as you *blasphemously* teach. — “God may do what liketh him, and none can resist him.” We grant. Yet Nothing *likes* him, but what is *just*. So that neither here does the Church confirm your Notion of *absolute* and *irrespective Reprobation*. — “He worketh

“worketh all Things in his secret Judgment, to his own Pleasure; yea, even the Wicked to Damnation,” saith Solomon.” I call upon you, with all your Learning, to shew me where Solomon says this. Not in the Text referred to in the Homily; and I do not remember that he says it any where else. I shall admit of no Authority but what is drawn from the *Fountain Head*; and not from any *corrupt Stream* whatever, however it be too rashly suffered to make its Way, and settle in the Homily.

I cannot but take notice here, with what seeming Satisfaction, and a kind of pleasing Gust, most Predestinarian Writers and Talkers mention the horrible Decree of absolute and unconditional Damnation. They tell us we are God’s Creatures, and he hath a Right to do what he will with his own: To take some to Heaven, and send a thousand times more, it may be, to Hell; and that merely for his Good-pleasure’s Sake, (as Mr Hales’s Expression is) yea, and think it an Honour that he will send us to Hell. As if Hell was Nothing more than a Back-Kitchen, and a good warm Corner there was too good for us. While they are afraid of it themselves indeed, they think of it with Horror, as a Place of *inexpressible Torments*, (as it certainly is, according to the Scriptures.) But as soon as they fancy themselves *elect*, and so they are sure of Heaven, they will talk of Reprobates going to Hell, with as much Composure and Unconcernedness, yea, with as much Pleasure, as if going to Hell were Nothing worse then going into a Bagnio, or into the Hot Springs at Bath or Buxton. That Predestinarian Oracle, *Elisha Coles*, very coolly tells us, that “Non-election (which observe, is only Hell in Embryo, and has Damnation at the End of it, is not a Punishment; it is but the withholding a free Favour, which God may justly deny to one Sinner, while he gives it to another; i. e. it is only consigning a Sinner over to everlasting Burnings, without any Possibility of, or Provision made for his escaping. And with what Indifference, or rather Delight, some Predestinarians view this Non-election, or consigning over of necessitated Sinners to unavoidable endless Torments, it is a-
B 5 mazing

mazing to think. It is not long since, that one, who ought to have known better, speaking of some abandoned Sinners, declared openly, that he "*loved to see the Swine wallow in the Mire*, because it was all the Heaven they had to expect." And when one asked, Would not you pray for such poor Sinners, Sir, that God would *grant them Repentance unto Life?*" He roundly answered, *No*. Would not this give any one a Surfeit of such Principles?

Your Doctrine of *absolute Providence*, which you say, Page 109, is intimately connected with, and *solely founded upon Predestination*, is no more the Doctrine of our Church, than your Doctrine of *absolute and unconditional Predestination*. For however we acknowledge the Decision thereof to be right, that "*Epicures they be, that imagine, that God — hath no respect of inferior Things; and that he has no Stroke in them;*" yet we affirm that *Fools they be, that imagine, God hath made an absolute Decree, that a Man shall not walk up to his Knees in Mud, when he hath Eyes to see, and a clean Path before, them unless such a Man were an Idiot, and his Case called for such an Exertion of Providence, and God saw meet to employ it.*

2. "With regard to the *Extent of Redemption*.——
 "Christ is the high and everlasting Priest, who hath
 "offered himself once for ALL upon the Altar of the
 "Cross" Could you possibly offer these Words of
 our Church in proof that she maintains *particular and limited* Redemption? You might just as well have produced the Apostle's Words, *God hath made of one Blood all Nations of Men*; to prove that God hath made only *some Nations* of that one Blood. Your Cause is not holpen in the least from these Words: "Our Debt
 "was a great deal too great for us to have paid.—It
 "pleased Him (Christ) therefore to be the Payer there-
 "of, and to *discharge us quite.*" For however God *was in Christ reconciling the World unto himself*, it does not follow, that the *World* is, *on their Part, reconciled unto God*. If so, it would have been a senseless Thing indeed in the Apostle, to *pray Sinners in Christ's Stead to be reconciled*

reconciled unto him. Yet hence you ask, *Page 110.* "How can it come to pass, that *some* of these very Persons shall be *thrown into Prison*, and there *tortured*, whose Debts have really been paid *to the utmost Farthing?*" It may be, because they *contract fresh ones*, and such as Mercy itself pronounces shall *not be forgiven*. But is it possible, that you could borrow any of your Terms from our Lord's awful Parable, *Matt. xviii. 23—35.* and not as well find an Answer to your own Question therein? A Question which betrays, either great *Inattention* to the Scriptures, or great *Perverseness*, in the Proposer.

You affirm, *Page 110.* "Upon these two *correlative Suppositions*, 1. That the Death of Christ was a *vicarious Punishment*; and 2. That it was a *proper, real, adequate Atonement* for Sin, — either *universal Salvation*, or a *limited Redemption*, must necessarily follow." And what Matter is it to you whether, seeing you maintain *both*? But with your Leave, Sir, neither of these *Consequences* follows from these two *correlative Suppositions*. The Death of Christ *was a vicarious Punishment*, yet it follows not, that *all Mankind* shall be (eternally) saved, but *only such* of those, to whom the Gospel is proposed, as *repent and believe* it. And Christ's Death *was a proper, real, and adequate Atonement* for Sin; and consequently Redemption was not *limited*, but as *universal* as Sin, with respect to Mankind. *Redemption and eternal Salvation*, remember, are not *convertible Terms*. For though *none* shall be eternally saved that *has not been redeemed*; yet *many* that *have been redeemed*, by wilfully refusing to accept the Benefits of their Redemption, *may not be eternally saved*. When you tell us the Church "*believes Redemption to be only co-extensive with Election.*" If by *Election* you mean such a Kind thereof as concerns only those that shall be *infallible Heirs* of Heaven, You maintain her Creed to be as *abominable* in this Respect, as that of the Church of *Geneva*, or the *Musselmens* at *Constantinople*. You must excuse me therefore, if I cannot suppose her so *corrupt* in her Principles;

Principles; till you can prove that her Principles are contrary both to *Scripture* and *Reason*.

There is but one way, you say, to elude the Force of this Argument, and that is, fairly and aboveboard to take Refuge in *Socinianism* (as the great *Grotius*—unhappily did) by denying that Christ died as our *Substitute*. Did *Grotius* turn *Socinian*? It was to the *eternal Shame* of your *evangelical Synod of Dort*, and all that subscribe to their Decrees. Considering the Usage that he met with from that *persecuting Rabble*, it were no Wonder, if not only *he*, but all those truly godly Men besides, that were his fellow-Sufferers under the *Calvinists*, had turned *Libertines*. For the *Punishments* inflicted by these *horrible Tyrants* upon many of the *best* of Men living at that Time, which Punishments came but little short of these inflicted by a *Roman Inquisition*, were enough to make Christianity abhorred by all Mankind, if we may suppose the Authors of them to have been Christians. But will you, Sir, blame a Man for turning *Socinian*? For is it not notorious, that every *Calvinist* upon Earth, is no other than a *Socinian* at the Bottom? Christ, you maintain, never did die for *Reprobates*. His Blood, you say, was not shed *in vain*. But if it was shed for the *Elect*, it was shed *in vain*; if these, as you affirm were such *eternal Favourites* of Heaven that nothing could hinder their eternal Happiness. Neither therefore was his Blood shed for the *Elect*. If then, according to your Principles, Christ did not shed his Blood, did not die, either for the *Reprobates*, or for the *Elect*; you that hold such Principles are *downright Socinians*, denying that Christ died as the *Substitute* for any Man, and in any Man's room and stead.

Your Argument for *particular Redemption* drawn from God's *Foreknowledge*, Page 111, concludes as strongly for *universal Salvation*, as for *particular Redemption*. For, to argue after your Manner, "Would God create Millions and Millions of Men in his own Image, who, as himself knew at the Time he did it, would certainly deface that Image?" If he did not foreknow this, what becomes

the Charge of absolute Predestination.

becomes of his *Deity*? If he *did* foreknow it, and yet created such *Persons*, it was, in effect, creating them unto *Condemnation*; and then *Creation* (so far as these *Persons* are concerned) can hardly be considered as an Act of *Mercy* or *Goodness*. Hence any one might subjoin in your Words altered a little; “ For my own
“ Part, these, and similar Considerations, strike me so
“ strongly, that I find myself obliged, by Dint both
“ of *rational* and *scripture* Evidence, to believe, that
“ God *actually* and *infallibly* secured the Salvation
“ of every *Individual* that he created.” This Argument is as good for *universal Salvation*, as yours of the same Kind, for *particular Redemption*; though neither really concludes for the one Point or the other.

But whether your Arguments are sound or not, I suppose, we need not stand to inquire. Every Thing that *looks like* an Argument, yea the bare *ipse dixit* of such a Man as you, doubtless ought to be received as *canonical*. For you are looked upon by some as a Man inspired. I do not say

——*With Ale, or wiler Liquors*

That inspir'd WITHERS, PRYNNE and VICARS.

But I may too justly say with a *worse Spirit*, as is most evident from your Letters to Dr *Nowell* and Mr *Wesley*. And with such an *Unction*, who can doubt whether you are *guided into all Truth*?

Page 111. You quote these Words from the Homily on the Sacrament: “ The Death of Christ is *available* for the Redemption of *all the World*.” And then give us this extraordinary Note upon the Word, *available*: “ That is, of *sufficient Value*; which it most certainly “ is. But *Availableness*, or *intrinsic Sufficiency*, is one “ thing; *intentional* and *actual Efficacy*, is another.” Hold, Sir! By your leave, they are not *another only*, but two more Things. *Intentional* and *actual Efficacy* are not *synonymous Terms*. God himself may *intend* that to be *effectual*, which may not *actually* be so, as appears from many Instances. *Ab Intentu ad Actum*, therefore concludes no more than

a Po-

a Potentiâ ad Actum. Your Quotation then from the the Homily, notwithstanding your Note to *pervert* its Meaning, is sufficient to shew, that in the Opinion of our Church, Christ died *intentionally* to redeem the *whole World*.

What you produce from the Homilies, to maintain “ Man’s *exceeding Depravation* by Nature and *total Inability* (if you mean, as the Homilies speak, of “ *ourselves* and *by ourselves*) as to spiritual Good,” we no more oppugn than you do; yet we cannot suppose our Church in any of the Passages cited *contradicts*, much less *intended so to do*, what she advances in her 10th Article concerning Man’s *Co-agency* with God, under the Aids of his Grace, which is implied in the Expression of *God’s working together with us*, when thro’ his preventing Grace we have a Will to good; for that would be to suppose her, (as there is too much Reason to think you would have us do) to have *no fixt Principles*. *Hoc Ithacus velit*: But he must give *solider Proof*. We desire not a Whit more to be granted concerning *Man’s Freewill* and the *Powers of Nature*, than is contained in the Passages you have cited, and in the 10th Article.

Page 114. You say, “ The Church is careful to assert the *absolute Energy, Independence* and *Efficiency* of “ *Divine Grace*.” Where? Not in one single Passage that you have quoted from the Homilies, nor any where else. To print what you would have thought Expressions pertinent to your Purpose in *Capitals*, does not at all enlarge their Sense. If you had had them printed in the largest Characters that ever *strutted in rubrick* in a *Play-bill*, it would only have made your *Lines look big*, and have left your *Arguments as beggarly*, as if they had been printed in *Nonpareil*. Nothing of *Absoluteness* is here *asserted*, nor so much as *boasted at*, except with regard to *preventing Grace*. This we allow, with the Homilies, and 10th Article, to be *absolute* and *independent*; but yet we cannot suppose *co-operating Grace* to be so, without contradicting both; and

and proclaiming ourselves such, as have need of a plentiful Dose of *Hellebore*.

With regard to this Point of the *absolute Energy*, or *Irresistibility* of divine Grace, you say in the Sermon before-mentioned, "The Gospel of Grace may be rejected; but the *Grace of the Gospel* cannot:" Which is as much as to say, a Man may have the Grace of the Gospel, that will not believe the Gospel of Grace when it is propounded unto him. I am somewhat incredulous in this Matter; and think that here, at least, you have said a Word which you *ought* to *unsay*; though perhaps you *will* not. It is my humble Opinion, the Man that rejects the *Gospel* of Grace, at the same Time rejects therewith the *Grace* of the Gospel, as much as he that rejects a Purse of Gold unopened, rejects the *Gold* as well as the *Purse* that contains it. It is true, a Man may take out the Gold and throw away the Purse; but he cannot *take Grace* and *throw away the Gospel*. When you tell us, immediately after, "It" is recorded, *All the Day long have I stretched forth my Hands to a disobedient and gainsaying People*;" I should imagine the People that thus *disobeyed* and *gainsaid*, rejected, not only the *Gospel*, but the *Grace* of it too. And I am greatly confirmed in this Opinion, by that Word of St *Luke*; who tells us, that the *Pharisees and Lawyers rejected the Counsel of God*, *ἡ ἐκείνου*, towards themselves; which, I suppose, was a Counsel of *Grace*, even the *Grace* that is ordinarily conveyed by the *Channel* of the *Gospel*. For to reject God's Counsel of *Wrath*, in the Manner there meant, they could not; nor if they could, would any Harm therefore have happened unto them. And I am farther confirmed in my Opinion from that Word of St *Stephen* to the *Jews*, *Ye do always resist the Holy Ghost*; and that in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, which mentions some that *have done Despite to the Spirit of Grace*: Which Phrases, I conceive, cannot but mean the rejecting the *Grace* of the *Gospel*, as well as the *Gospel* of *Grace*. So that to distinguish between the *Gospel* of *Grace* and the *Grace* of the *Gospel*, can no more establish the Doctrin

trine of the *Irresistibility, Unconditionality, absolute Energy*, or whatever else you call it, of *Divine Grace* (in the Salvation of the Soul) than to distinguish between a *Well of Water* and the *Water of a Well*, establishes the Doctrine of the *absolute Energy* and *irresistible* and *independent* Effects of Water to quench a Man's Thirst.

The Doctrine maintained by our Church concerning the *Influence* and *Indwelling* of the Holy Spirit, and *Assurance* of the Favour of God, we heartily assent to. And it is much to be wished, that it were more insisted on by some, than it is. But here in your Note on the Passage quoted from the 2d Homily on *Faith*, you say, "the Saints, even under the *Jewish Dispensation*, " had, according to this Homily, not only a *special* " *Confidence* and *Trust*, that God was *then their God*; " but likewise that he *would be so* still, and be their " *Maintainer* in the Grace he had given them. But " how, you ask, is this consistent with the *new Arminian* " *Doctrine of finally falling from Grace*?" I will tell you, Sir. Only suppose that God hath promised to *maintain* his Grace in those that duly use the *Means* to that End, and that those Saints had this *special Trust* and *Confidence* to have their Grace maintained in *no other Way*, and there will appear no Inconsistency at all between their *special Trust* and *Confidence*, and the Doctrine of *finally falling from Grace*.

But why do you call this a *new*, or an *Arminian* Doctrine? It is as old, at least, as the *Book of Homilies*, and is plainly contained therein. What you advance from thence in favour of *absolute* and *unconditional Perseverance*, is nothing to your Purpose. All your Words and Phrases that you have *suborned* on your Side and set in *Buskins*, are not *capital Proofs* of your Point, but *capital Presumptions*. Whoever has read the Homilies knows that there is one intitled, Of the Danger of falling from God; in which are these Words: Page 65. " If they who are the *chosen Vine-* " *yard* of God, bring not forth good Grapes, that is, " good Works, they shall be *put from* the Grace and " Benefits

“ Benefits that they *had*, and ever might have enjoyed through Christ. They shall be *deprived* of the heavenly Light and Life, which they had in Christ, while they abode in him. They shall be (as they were once) as Men *without God in the World*, or rather in worse taking. And to be short, they shall be given into the Power of the Devil, who beareth Rule in all them that are *cast away from God*. Now what deadly Grief may a Man suppose it is, to be under the Wrath of God, to be *forsaken* of him, to have his Holy Spirit, the Author of all Good, to be *taken from him*, to be brought into so vile a Condition, that he shall be meet for no better Purpose, than to be for ever condemned in Hell.”

Can any Man that reads these Words of our Church, pretend to say, that she maintains the Doctrine of absolute unconditional *final Perseverance*? He that does, must have a Heart as full of *Perverseness*, as his Head is of *Perseverance*. Nor is there one Passage among all that you have cited in favour of that Doctrine, that *undeniably* makes for it. Yet you reckon this among “ the *Doctrines* that she *holds* ;” among “ the *Truths* to which *all* her Clergy have *subscribed*.” Hold, Sir, I and thousands beside never considered this Point, and some others objected against, as *Doctrines*, much less as *Truths held* by the Church, nor did we ever *subscribe* them. But you say, “ Truths these, which have no more to do with *Methodism*, properly so called, than they have with *Mahometanism*.” I allow you this, and assert moreover, that they have just as much to do with *Mahometism*, as they have with *Christianity*.

Will you hear the Judgment of Dr *Featley*, a tolerable calvinistic Divine, in the Days of King *James I.* delivered in a Sermon, preached before the Archbishop of *Canterbury*, and the rest of his Majesty’s Commissioners in *Causes Ecclesiastical*, 1617, at *Lambeth*? which, no doubt, was agreeable to the Doctrine maintained in the Church *then*, and is the Doctrine of our Church *now*. “ Christ will not quench the smoking Flax, if there be any Spark of divine Fire in it.” Yet

“ Yet if this *Spark* be not *blown*, and the *Wick* en-
 “ lightned again, it *will die*. In like Manner, if we
 “ do not, according to the Apostle’s Precept *ἀναζωπυρεῖν*,
 “ *stir up* the Grace of God in us, and use the utmost
 “ of our religious Endeavours to *kindle* again the *Lamp*
 “ of Faith in our Souls, that *Spark* of *divine Faith* and
 “ *saving Grace*, which we conceive that we have, will
 “ *die*. As it is not *Presumption*, but *Faith*, to be con-
 “ fident in God’s Promises, when we walk in his Ordi-
 “ nances ; so it is not *Faith*, but *Presumption*, to *assure*
 “ ourselves of the End, when we *neglect* the Means of
 “ our Salvation. We may *no otherwise apprehend* or
 “ *apply* unto ourselves the gracious Promises made to
 “ all true Believers in the Gospel, than they are pro-
 “ pounded unto us ; which is not *absolutely*, but *upon*
 “ *Conditions* by us to be performed through the Help
 “ of divine Grace ; namely, To wash ourselves, to
 “ make us clean, to put away the Evil of our Doings
 “ from before God’s Eyes. To cease to do evil, to
 “ learn to do well, to seek Judgment, to relieve the
 “ Oppressed, to judge the Fatherless, and to plead for
 “ the Widow ; to break off our Sins by Righteousness,
 “ and our Iniquity, by shewing Mercy to the Poor ;
 “ to abhor ourselves, and repent in Dust and Ashes ;
 “ to remember from whence we are fallen, and do the
 “ first Works ; to be zealous and amend, *and* to bring
 “ forth Fruits meet for Repentance.”

“ To argue from a *strong Persuasion* of our *Election*,
 “ and from thence to infer immediately *Assurance* of
 “ *Salvation*, is, as *Tertullian* speaketh in another Case,
 “ *Ædificare in ruinam*. The safe Way to *build up* our-
 “ selves in our most holy Faith, and surely fasten the An-
 “ chor of our Hope, is, to conclude from *Amendment of Life*,
 “ *Repentance unto Life* : From our *Hatred of Sin*, God’s
 “ *Love unto us* : From *Hunger and Thirst* after Righte-
 “ ousness, *some Measure* of Grace : From *godly Sorrow*
 “ and *Son-like Fear*, and *Imitation* of our Heavenly Fa-
 “ ther, the *Adoption of Sons* : From continual *Growth in*
 “ *Grace*, *Perseverance* unto the End : From the *Fruits* of
 “ *Charity*, the *Life* of our Faith : And from all, a *Modest*
 “ *Assurance*

Assurance of our Election unto eternal Life. Not curiously to dispute the *Scholastic* Question concerning the *absolute impossibility* of the *Apostacy* of any Saint, and of the *Amisibility* of *justifying Faith*; which many learned Doctors of the Reformed Churches hold fitter to be *extermind* than *determined*; or at least to be *confined* to the *Schools*, than *defined* in the *Pulpit*. That wherein all Parties agree, is sufficient to *comfort* the *fainting Spirits*, and *strengthen* the *feeble knees* of any *relapsed Christian*; that God would never be wanting to raise him, if he be not wanting to himself. But if, when he is returned with the *Sow* to his *swallowing in the Mire*, he taketh *Delight* therein, and never *striveth* to pluck his Feet out of it, nor rise up out of the *Dirt*; if he never cry for *Help*, nor so much as put forth the *Hand* of his *Faith*, that *Christ* may take hold of it, and by *effectual Grace* draw him out of the *Mud*, he will certainly *putrify in his Sins*. So does this *Magazine of Wit and Eloquence* bear *Testimony* to the *Truth* here; though, to please a *Party*, like most other *Calvinists*, he soon after tacks about, and rears his *seven Pillars of Perseverance*: *Pillars of Touchwood* indeed; by far too weak to bear the *Weight* that is laid upon them; all resolvable into this *weak and comfortless* Proposition, *Whoever does not fall finally, will endure to the end, and be saved*. I presume a *Man* need neither be a *Conjurer* nor a *Calvinist* to know this.

Let me add a *Word* more. You are the *Vicar of Broad Hembury*, and as such, I suppose, you sometimes administer the *Sacraments of Baptism*, and the *Lord's Supper*. Now when you *baptize* a *Child*, you declare that it is *regenerate*, not only with *Water*, but with the *Holy Ghost*. When you administer the *Lord's Supper*, you declare that the *Body* of our *Lord Jesus Christ* was given, and his *Blood* shed, for *every Person* to whom you deliver the *sacred Elements*. I would ask you then, *Sir*, do you really believe that every *Child* you baptize is *regenerate* with the *Holy Ghost*, and taken into the *Number of God's faithful and Elect People* (as you profess to believe, when you *Pray* that such *Child* may
remain

remain in that Number) and so can *never fall finally* away; and do you really believe that Christ hath died for *every one* that receives the Communion at your Hands, and so, that it is impossible *any one* of them should perish? If you do, your Faith stretches even beyond an *Arminian's*. If you do not, according to your narrow Notion of Election, you profess with your *Lips* to believe that to be *true*, which in your *Heart* you believe to be *utterly false*. Consider this Point a little, Sir, and then, however a *Lay Calvinist* may be an honest Man, tell me whether you think it possible, that a *Calvinistic Clergyman* can be honest, who administers the Sacraments with Words which he does not *always believe to be true*?

However you affirm, page 130. that these are “the *Principles of the Reformation*.” Some of them *are*, and some *are not*; unless you call the *Decrees* of the Synod of *Dort* the *Reformation*, which I cannot allow to be so, otherwise than from *better to worse*. And “to our *Departure* from these Principles, you say, it “is chiefly owing, that the *Church* and *Churchmen* “are the *Scorn of Infidels*.” So then you suppose *Infidels* would esteem both as *Christian*, if they were but *Calvinistic*. I am in some doubt of that. — “That so “great a Part of the common People of this Land are “funk into such *deplorable Ignorance* of Divine Things.” Not so. I know many that have *deep Experience* of Divine Things, that never were *Calvinists*: And on the contrary, many *rigid Calvinists*, that *know nothing* of Divine Things *experimentally*. — “That Multi- “tudes, who are Churchmen *upon Principle*, are “forced to go to *Meeting*, in order to hear the Doc- “trines of their own Church preached.” Allowing this to be the Case with some, it is notorious that many more have been *spirited away* from the Church to Dissenters *Meeting-houses* by such as you, who persuade them, that whatever Truths they hear, they do not hear the *Gospel*, unless they hear *Predestination* preached. — “That to this we may impute, in great “Measure, the vast and still increasing *Spread of In-* “*fidelity*”

“fidelity amongst us.” I cannot believe you. If ever I turn *Deist*, it will be when I am convinced that no Man can be a *Christian* except he be a *Calvinist*; as I once heard a sensible Person flatly affirm. And from *such a Persuasion* I have known several Persons, and some of no mean Name, renounce the Christian Faith. It is the *preaching up Calvinism*, Sir, that makes *Deism* spread, and not the *preaching it down*; and that, I apprehend, you know *too well*.—“That to the same Source may be traced the *rapid, and alarming Progress of Popery* in this Kingdom.” I am somewhat slow of Credit here too. *Arminianism* and *Popery* are not so near akin by far, as *Predestination* and *Popery*; the learned Dr *Potter*, once a *rigid Predestinarian*, being Judge. He tells his warm *Calvinistic Friend*, Mr *Vicars*, “If you look again into their Books, and consider well, you will confess that the Church of Rome makes more *against the Arminians*, than for them. The prime Controversy, on which all the rest are but Appendances, is that touching the *absolute, irrelative Decree*; in which Point, if you collect and number the Suffrages, *ten for one* against the *Arminians*.” He adds, “The Truth is, our Reformers did herein say over again those Lessons, which they had learned in the *Roman Schools*.” What reason have you then to assert, that “it gives a true *Papist* less Pain to hear of *Pope Joan*, than of *Predestination*?” However, I must own I could as soon submit to *Pope Joan’s Bulls*, as to *yours*; and as soon be a *Devotee to Mahomet*, as a *Worshipper of Moloch*.

Page 134. “I heartily wish good Works abounded more among us, than they do: But I am certain they never will, until they are enforced on *Christian Principles*, even the *Doctrines of Grace*.” Here you are quite right in *Matter*; but I suppose not in *Meaning*. What do you mean by the *Doctrines of Grace*? *Predestination* and its *Correlates*? Pray by what Figure is the Doctrine of *inevitable, unconditional Damnation*, called the *Doctrine of Grace*? I cannot conceive, unless

less there be such a Figure in *Rhetoric*, as is called *Contradiction*. You may just as well call the Doctrine of *Original Sin*, the Doctrine of *Original Holiness*, as call the Doctrine of *absolute Predestination*, the Doctrine of *Grace*.

You tell Dr Norwell, page 135. "I have endeavoured to rub off the *extraneous Varnish* (from the Church) with which you, Sir, have *disguised* her." And you might justly have added, I have *daubed* her with a *fouler Fucus* of my own. "The Doctrines, which she avows," I am of Opinion, as well as you, "appear *amiable* in the Eyes of all her *genuine* Sons;" but these are not the Doctrines of *Calvinism*. Even Calvin himself confesses that the *supposed* Decree, upon which all your distinguishing Tenets depend, is a *horrible Decree*. I suppose therefore, "the *justly famous* Dr South," must have become a *Twichild* before he fell in love with it, as you insinuate he did. Upon a near View, *Calvinism* was found by the *justly famous* Archbishop *Usher*, Dr *Goad*, Dr *Potter*, and others, to be such an "*horrid, bideous Thing*," that, as the learned and judicious Dr *Pierce* expresses it, it "*frightened them into their Wits*." You however, have taken great Pains to dress up the Church in these *Ravens Plumes*: And who can wonder that any one, viewing her under this *Disguise*, should cry out, "How *black* she looks!" But you tell us, "I have no *Interest*, abstracted from Hers, to *promote*; no *Resentment* to *gratify*; no *Party* to *serve*." After your *wile abuse* of Mr *Wesley*, and the *virulent Manner* in which you treat *Arminians* in general, there is no Man will believe you, even though you should *swear*, as well as *say* this. Your "*undissembled Respect*" for them all in the *Lump* too evidently appears, to leave room for a Doubt, whether *Resentment* and a *strong Attachment* to some *Party*, had not too great an Influence over you in your Undertaking.

I had intended to make a full and particular Reply to your Pamphlet, intituled, *The Doctrine of absolute Predestination stated and asserted*; but (besides that
there

there having been *two Manuscripts* shewn to me, which I suppose will be sent to the Press soon, and which will save me that Labour) I trust that the two Pamphlets published not long since (the one intitled, *Arguments against the Doctrine of General Redemption considered*; the other, *A Defence of God's Sovereignty, against the horrible and impious Aspersions cast upon it by Elisha Coles, in his Treatise on that Subject*;) will sufficiently confute what you have advanced in favour of your Opinion in that Pamphlet. However, I cannot help making some Strictures upon a few Things that are advanced therein.

You tell us in your Preface, that “ *St Austin*, and “ many other great and excellent Men, have not “ scrupled to admit, both the *Word* (Predestination) and “ the *Thing*, properly understood.” What then? This is no Reason why we should admit either, *improperly understood*. And so, I maintain, you understand them. And your kind of Predestination has no Foundation either in *Scripture* or *Reason*. Every *Argument* you advance for it is *false*, and *fallacious*; and every Text you produce, *perverted*. This, I hope, will appear evident to every unprejudiced Reader of the two Pamphlets just now mentioned. But you add, “ I “ have no Objection to being called a *Stoic*, so you but “ prefix the *Word Christian* to it.” I suppose a Man may as soon form an Idea of a *Christian Turnstile*, as of a *Christian Stoic*. But supposing such a Being could exist, what right can *such* a Man as you have to the Appellation? A *Stoic*, to answer his Character, must bear every Thing, however disagreeable to Nature, with the *Patience* of an *Indian Bramin*; almost with the Unfeelingness, and with no more *Resentment* than a *Stock* or *Stone*: Like *Epicletus*, let his Leg be broken without winceing at it: And the *Christian*, to answer his Character, must have that *Love*, which, *sees*, *covereth* all Things, *believeth* all Things, *hopeth* all Things, *endureth* all Things. But upon every Slight put upon your *Wisdom*, upon every little supposed *Affront* given to your *august Reverence*, you break out into

into violent Wrath, lay about you for Vengeance, and *acheronta movens*, scatter Firebrands, Arrows, and Death.

Yea, and after you had treated one of your Opponents in such a Manner, considering the Provocation given, as would make any one, besides yourself, blush to read over again, you deliberately add, in a subsequent Publication, "I blame myself, on a Review, for handling Mr *W.* too gently. I only gave him the *Whip*, when he deserved a *Scorpion*." So entirely regardless are you of these apostolical Precepts: *Be an Example of the Believers, in Word, in Conversation, in Charity, in Spirit, in Faith, in Purity. Reprove, rebuke, exhort with all Long-suffering.*

Upon this Consideration, however, you profess to have no Objection to being called a *Christian Stoic*; I fear you will not find many that will think you worthy the Character of a *Stoic*, much less of a *Christian*, except it be some of your own Party: I say some; for even among them there are others that have as unfavourable an Opinion of you, as if they had been *Arminians*.

You tell us, page 2. "Whatever He (God) fore-knows to be future, shall necessarily and undoubtedly come to pass." That it shall undoubtedly come to pass, I grant; but that every Thing foreknown of God to be future shall necessarily come to pass, I deny. God foreknows many Things to be undoubtedly future, which yet are mere Contingencies. If he did not, he should not be infinite in Knowledge. But it is no Wonder that you thus take upon you to limit the Knowledge of God, when it is considered that by and by you dare even to make a Devil of him. Your Distinction, borrowed from *Luther*, between a Necessity of Infallibility, and a Necessity of Coaction, page 3. does not at all free the Divine Being from the Imputation which you cast upon him, of being finite in Knowledge. For this necessary Coaction, which is to secure the Infallibility of Events, must have an impellent Cause; which impellent Cause, you tell us, is

the

the Will of God; which is “ nothing else than *God himself willing.*” And according to your Doctrine, *without this impellent, or, as you speak, efficacious Will of God,* God himself *could not know* what would *infallibly* come to pass. This indeed you advance as an Argument of God’s *infinite Knowledge*; but most unhappily, since it is only an Argument of *finite and limited Knowledge.*

You tell us farther, “ that the *Divine Foreknowledge* “ has an *Influence* on the *certain Futurition* of the Things “ *foreknown.*” And page 15. “ that the Will of God “ is the *Governess* of our : And that a’l Things turn “ out according to the *Divine Predelination*; not only “ the *Works* we do *outwardly*, but even the *Thoughts* “ we think *inwardly.*” Yet you say, page 13. “ My “ Meaning is, that the *Prescience* of God does not lay “ any *coercive Necessity* on the Wills of Beings *naturally free.*” So that your Meaning is, the Foreknowledge of God is *influential* in the Wills and *Actions* of Men, and it is *not*: It *constrains* them, and it *does not*. That the Will of Man is *free*, and it is *not*. That Man is *not free* you maintain, because he is *constrained* and *compelled*; and yet he is *free*, because he is *sensible of no Compulsion*; that is, he is as *free* as a *Weathercock*, that is not *rudded to a Point*, but is *driven about* just as the Wind changes Quarter: A *free Agent* acting by *fatal Compulsion*. I really think, Sir, your Doctrine is as *unreasonable*, as it is *unintelligible*; supposing Man to be a *rational Being*.

Page 4. “ The Divine Will, you say, is very properly “ distinguished into *secret* and *revealed* ;” and that the one is in some Instances *opposite* to the other. “ Thus it was his *revealed Will*, that *Pharaoh should* “ let the *Israelites* go; that *Abraham should* sacrifice “ his Son; and that *Peter should not* deny Christ: But, “ as was proved by the Event, it was his *secret Will*, “ that *Pharaoh should not* let *Israel* go; that *Abraham should not* sacrifice *Isaac*; and that *Peter should* deny “ his Lord.” What a Character is here given of the *infinitely, holy, wise, just* and *good* God! You have painted him out such a Being, as cannot but be the

Abhorrence and Detestation of every Man that has any Sense of Honesty and Sincerity.

Confident as you are, that to the *Deviation from yours*, (which you call, *our established Doctrines*) “ we
 “ may impute, in great Measure, the vast and still
 “ increasing Spread of *Infidelity* among us:” I, as
 confidently assert, that the Increase of this Spread is,
 in great Measure, owing to the *preaching up* such
 Doctrines. A well known Writer, who is no more
 a Friend to my Principles, than he is to yours, after
 viewing God, in the Light that he is represented in
 by *Predestinarians*, too justly makes this Reflection:
 “ If it be possible to *revere, love, or confide* in such
 “ a Being as this, I must own I know nothing of the
 “ *human Heart*, or its *Affections*. Sure I am, that a
 “ Man of this Character, and who should act in this
 “ Manner, would be the Object of *Dread* and *Abhor-*
 “ *rence* to all, who should be so unhappy as to be de-
 “ pendent upon him. What Advantage favourable to Vir-
 “ tue, can be made of the *Imitation* of such a Being as this?”

But we know that God is a God of Truth, and without Iniquity, just and right is he. Deut. xxxii. 4. When therefore you lay down such a Position, you wickedly blaspheme his Honour; and what you advance is absolutely false.

God's secret Will, simply considered, as well as his revealed Will was that Pharaoh should let Israel go; and it never was his Will that he should not, only in Case he would not. It never was his Will that Abraham should sacrifice Isaac, if thereby you mean slaying him; for the Scriptures sufficiently declare, that Abraham did in that Matter whatever God required of him. The Word *הָרַג*, used in the Command of God to Abraham, no more properly signifies to kill, or burn, than it does, to grind to Powder; however, it was commonly used for offering up as a Burnt-Offering. Its proper Meaning is only to ascend. And all that God required of Abraham was, that he should make Isaac ascend up as an Offering unto him; without signifying whether it should be from the Altar in Flame and Smoke, as the common Opinion was; or whether only upon the Altar. According to your own Rule, the Event shewed

shewed that the *latter* only was the Will of God. *Abraham* did his Will; both his *secret* and *revealed* Will. Nor was the one *contrary* to the other at all. Nor was it God's *secret* Will, simply considered, any more than his *revealed* Will, that *Peter* should deny his Lord. God *determined* no such Thing, only in case *Peter* should wilfully and self-confidently run into the Way of Temptation. However, if you will still maintain these *two opposite* Wills in the Divine Being, you shall then be able to free him from the Charge of *mocking his Creatures*, when you can free a Man from the Charge of *Lying*, while he speaks a *known, wilful Falshood*: Nor shall you till then prove his Creatures "*inexcusable* for neglecting to observe his Will of Command." You may assert, page 6. "*Pharaoh* was *faulty*, and therefore *justly punishable* for not obeying God's *revealed* Will, though God's *secret* Will rendered that Obedience *impossible*;" but I deny it. I will ask you one Question, Sir. Suppose there were such a Law, that you among others should go on foot to pay your Attendance on the King at his Court upon a Day appointed, on *Pain of Death*; and before that Day comes, the King should *secretly* order your *Legs to be cut off*, or you to be *chained* close to to some Pillar at twenty Miles distance; would you pronounce yourself *faulty* and *justly punishable* for not obeying the *revealed* Will of your Sovereign, when his *secret* Will had rendered that Obedience *impossible*? I trow not. Much less, unless in one of your *raving Fits*, would you pronounce yourself *justly punishable* with an *eternal Hell*, for not doing what the Will of God rendered *impossible to be done*.

Not content with such *horrid Blasphemy* in thus charging God with *Prevarication*, *Fraudulence*, and *Double-dealing*, you make him, page 23. the *Principal* in all the Wickedness that is in the World; and tell us expressly from *Luther*, when he was in his *predestinarian Phrenzy*, that "*God worketh all Things in all Men; even Wickedness in the Wicked.*" page 25. I must needs tell you, Sir, both *Luther* and you are very *wicked* for asserting this; and that your charging

your *Wickedness* upon God will by no Means discharge you from the *Guilt* of it. But this *Blasphemy*, shocking as it is, is little to what follows, page 23. where you endeavour to maintain, that God is *Satan*, or the *Devil*. "It was the Lord, you say, that moved David himself to number the People. Compare 1 *Chron.* "xxi. 1. with 2 *Sam* xxiv. 1." Upon comparing these Scriptures, I find in *Chronicles*, that it was *Satan* that moved *David* to sin against God. In *Samuel*, I find only that *He* moved him. The *Antecedent* to which *Relative*, *He*, you say, is *the Lord*. So that according to your Account, *the Lord* and *Satan* is *one* and the *same* Person. I cannot, I dare not believe you, that God and the Devil are *one*. Had you looked into the Margin of your Bible, you could not surely, unless *willingly* and *wickedly*, have run into such a dreadful Mistake. The Translators themselves, in *Samuel*, have noted *Satan* as the *Mover* of *David* to his Sin; and that without doing Violence to the Text. For in the *Hebrew*, as well as other Languages, the *third Persons* of *Verbs* are often used *impersonally*. Accordingly the Verb *לָמַד*, in *Samuel* might have been better rendered, *There was one* (viz. *Satan*, as in the Margin, and *Chronicles*) *that moved*. What shall I condemn here? Your *Oscitancy*, your *Ignorance*, or your *Wickedness*? The first I hardly can. The second perhaps I may; but whether it be not the last, your own Conscience can best determine.

Having expressly asserted, that "God worketh—even *Wickedness* in the Wicked;" you afterwards endeavour to clear him from Blame on this Account, by saying, "We can easily conceive of an *Action*, "purely as such, without adverting to the *Quality* of "it: So that the Distinction between an *Action* it-
 "self, and its *Denomination* of good or evil, is very
 "obvious and natural." Now I presume *Wickedness* implies the bad *Quality* of *some Action*, either of the Body or Mind. But can you, Sir, conceive an *Action* wherein there is *Wickedness* of any kind, without adverting to the *Quality* of it, whether it be a *wicked Thing* or not? I am inclined to think *such Conception*
 can

can hardly be the Product of your *Wisdom*. Admitting there is a Distinction between an *Action itself* and its *Denomination* of good or evil, is it possible to separate *that* from it, which denominates it good or evil? Surely not. There is a *Quality* in the Action, which is *inseparable* from it, however we may distinguish between it and its *Denomination*. Thus *Adultery* is a *Quality*; and the *lying with another Man's Wife*, an *Action*: Nor is it possible to separate the *lying with another Man's Wife* (which is the *Action*) from *Adultery* (which is the *Quality*, without which the *Action* can have no Being.) If therefore God, as you affirm, works this Wickedness in the Wicked, it is impossible that he should, as you pretend, work it "*physically, simply, and sensu diviso, abstractedly from all Consideration of the goodness or badness of it*;" but he must needs be the *Author* of it "*in a moral and compound Sense, as it is sinful*." So that still, I say, your *blasphemous Doctrine*, like *Hobbes's*, makes God the *Author of all the Sin in the World*.

But *Tilenus* shall answer you farther: "*There are Sins of Commission (as well as Omission) not capable of that Distinction; as in Blasphemy, Murder, Adultery; wherein the Act is not to be distinguished from the Exorbitancy: (So distinguished, as to conceive a Possibility of Separation between the Act and its Quality.) And were such a Distinction allowable before God (and if it be not, sure it is not to be alledged on his Behalf) every Transgressor might shew a fair Acquittance, and justly plead Not guilty. The Adulterer might say, He went in to his Adulteress, as a Woman; not as she was married to another Man; and that he humbled her for Procreation, or for a Remedy of his Concupiscence; not for Injury to her Husband. The Blasphemer might say, what he spoke was, to make use of the Faculty of Speech, and to keep his Tongue in Use; not to dishonour the Almighty. And so might every Offender have leave, by Virtue of this Distinction, to separate his sinful Act from the Enormity of it; and every Sin would become a Miracle, that is, it would be an Accident without a Subject.*" If your God stands

in need of this *Logic himself*, there is all the Reason in the World, that when he sits in Judgment, he should *allow* the Benefit thereof to others. You see, Sir, your Distinction, *subtil* as it is, has not *Wisdom* enough in it to free your *predestinating* God from the Charge of being the “*true Author of all the Sins and Wickedness of this World, past, present, and to come.*” Nor indeed need you be much concerned whether it has or no, if the *Devil* be God, as you teach us just before.

But you *stalk on*, page 27. “*Every Action, as such, is undoubtedly good.*” According to your Account then, *Murder*, as an Action, is *undoubtedly good*. *Whoring* is good. *Thieving* is good. Truly, Sir, if I believe God’s Word, I cannot believe you. — “*God may be the Author of all Actions, as he undoubtedly is, and yet not be the Author of Evil.*” Let us see how you will make this appear — “*Suppose a Boy, who knows not how to write, has his Hand guided by his Master, and nevertheless makes false Letters, quite unlike the Copy set him; though his Preceptor, who guides his Hand, is the Cause of his writing at all, yet his own Ignorance and Unskilfulness are the Cause of his writing so badly. Just so God is the supreme Author of our Action, abstractedly taken, but our own Vitiosity is the Cause of our acting amiss.*” But suppose the *Hand* of this *poor dull Boy*, like that of a *Puppet*, has *no Motion* at all, but what is given it by the *Impulse* of the *Hand that guides it*, as you strenuously maintain, then the *Action* of this *Boy*, his *making false Letters, Potbooks and Hangers*, as the Phrase is in Schools, is chargeable altogether upon the *Master*, and not at all upon the *Boy*. His *Hand*, according to your Account, is as *merely passive*, as the *Pen* that is in it. The *Master* having *sufficient skill*, and an *irresistible Power*, should have taken care that the *Boy’s Hand* might have made *truer Letters*. Still, Sir, if there be such a Thing as *Evil* in the World, according to your *silly Simile*, God is the *Author* of it. In order then to clear God and Man at once, you had better leave out the Qualification, *as such*, and roundly affirm, *every Action is undoubtedly good*; and that there

is no such Thing as *Sin* in the World. And why should you not here, as well as in your Preface, where you admit, that "*whatever is, is right.*" This Objection you have started, that such must be the Consequence of your Doctrine of *Predestination*. To which you gravely answer, "Consequences *cannot* be *helped.*" I reply, Yes verily but they *may*. Reject the Premises, which ought to be rejected, and no such Consequence can possibly follow. We may then upon Principles of *Scripture* and *sound Reason* affirm, that *some Things* are *not right*: *Some Actions* are *not good*; and that God is *not the Author of Evil*.

You charge Mr *Wesley* with *Inconsistency* on Account of a *Mistake* in his *Notes upon the New Testament*, which you are not sure was his own; and it should seem it was not, because it was *corrected* in a subsequent Edition. This, I suppose, you could not but know. To charge this upon him therefore afterwards, what is it, but to give us the clearest Proof of your own *Disingenuity* and *Baseness of Mind*? But suppose the worst, that Mr *Wesley* was really so inconsistent with himself as to maintain *both Sides* of a Contradiction, it is about an *innocent Point*; so that which ever Side his Reader takes, it can do no harm. But you, Sir, are *inconsistent* enough to maintain, that God *is*, and *is not* the Author of Sin. And *common* is the Case, and *dreadful* is the Consequence of taking the *former Part* of your Contradiction. The *Carpocratians* thought it their *Duty*, as well as *Interest*, to *fill up the Measure of their Sins*, by which God was to be glorified: And your Doctrine exactly coincides with theirs.

You have indeed *nibbled* at a Way to free God from being the *Author of Sin*, by distinguishing between the *Action* and the *Quality* of it. But your Master *Hobbes*, as able a *Calvinist*, in Appearance, as your *Zanchius*, will teach you, that this Distinction will not do. He declares, that after all his Meditation, he "*cannot find any Difference between an Action, and the Sin of that Action.*" As for Example; between "*the killing of Uriah, and the Sin of David in killing Uriah.*" Nor when one is the Cause both of the

" *Action* and the *Law*, how another can be the Cause
 " of the *Disagreement* between them; no more than
 " how one Man making a *longer* and a *shorter* Gar-
 " ment, another can make the *Inequality*, that is be-
 " tween them." *Hobbes!* in this thou reasonest well;
 and to the utter *Destruction* of Mr *Toplady's* colweb
 Argument.

Let us see what you have gained by mending, I
 should have said marring the Translation of these Words,
 ὢν ὁ σωτὴρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων, and rendering them, *The Pre-*
server of all Men, 1 Tim. iv. 10 If God be the *Pre-*
server and not the *Saviour* of all Men, he is not the *Sa-*
vour of them that believe. But if he is the *Saviour*
 of them that believe, he is then the *Saviour* of
 all Men. For these are spoken of in that Text, as the
 Objects of God's Salvation, as well as *Believers*.

I must needs say, that you, like some of the wise
Reviewers * of our Day, seem to have criticised here
 with your *Heels* instead of your *Head*. This is *small*
Dust indeed thrown into the Scale, to make it pre-
 ponderate in favour of *Calvinism*. But as much weightier
 Matter hath been found too light for that Purpose,
 such an *Atom* as this, must needs leave your Cause
 in the *Mounting Scale*.

But when you had taken upon you to alter the
 Translation here, why did you not alter and amend
 Rom. ix. 11. Where do you find the Word *Children*,
 in that Text? It is true, it is *foisted* into our Tran-
 slation, but it is not in the *Original*, nor has it any
 more Business there, than the Word *Lions* or *Dragons*.
 It is not in the Text alluded to. What is there said

is

* Some of those most accurate and judicious Gentlemen, in the
 very same Review wherein they find fault with the Negligence
 of my Language, in my *Argument's* against the *Doctrine* of *General*
Redemption considered, sneer at a certain medical Gentleman for
 using the Word, *forkened*, in his Writings, and tell us that this
 Word, " tripped up their *Critical Heels*." I would advise these
 Gentlemen, for the future, to criticise with their *Heads* instead of
 their *Heels* (unless their Brains have shifted Quarters) or else to de-
 sist from the arduous Task of *Reviewing*; for if they continue to
 be such *Bunglers* at the Business, there is no Man of Judgment
 would ever think them qualified for any higher Honour than to be
 made some of the principal Characters in the next DUNCIAD.

is this: *Two Nations are in thy Womb, and two manner of People shall be separated from thy Bowels, and the one People shall be stronger than the other People, and the elder shall serve the younger,* Gen. xxv. 23. I desire to know then what Authority you have from such a Text as this, to pronounce *Jacob personally elected* to Salvation, and *Esau personally reprobated* to Damnation? And where does the Apostle from the Example of these *two Twins*, “infer the *eternal Election* of “some Men, and the *eternal Rejection* of the Rest?” Not in *Rom. ix.* He is no more speaking there of Mens *eternal States*, than he is speaking of their *Houses* and *Lands*. He is speaking of Nothing more than the *choosing* of the *believing Gentiles* to, and *rejecting* the *unbelieving Jews* from, the Privilege of the Gospel, as is plain to every one that reads that Chapter *with due Attention*, and *without Prejudice*. If the Apostle knew that the *Jews* were doomed to *everlasting Damnation* by the *eternal Decree* of God, what *Wickedness* had it been in him to rise up *against God's Sovereignty*, as you call it, and to express himself on this wise: *I could wish that myself were accursed, separated from Christ, for my Brethren, my Kinsmen according to the Flesh?* ver. 3. But I perceive you had rather an *Apostle* should lose his *Credit*, than the *Predestinarians* lose their *Cause*.

Page 74. “The *Condemnation* of the *Ungodly*—“is not *unjust*, seeing it is *for Sin*, and *only for Sin*.” How can that be, if there is *no such Thing as Sin?* If every *Action* is good; and *whatever is, is right?* But supposing they are condemned *for Sin*, it is, you say, *for necessitated Sin*; “they were *predestinated* to *continue in final Impenitency, Sin and Unbelief*.” *Page 72.* In answer to your Question then, “Where is the *supposed Unmercifulness, Tyranny or Injustice* of the *Divine Procedure?*” I reply, Supposing your *horrid Doctrine* true, in first *predestinating* and *necessitating* Men to *sin*, and then *damning* them for *sinning*. If this be the Case, if you should ever come to *lift up your Eyes in Torment*, (which God forbid) you will then see as *much Unmercifulness, Tyranny and Injustice* in such a

Procedure, as I do now. Your Arguments, used to vindicate the Divine Justice in *such Procedure*, are all mere *Fallacies*. You would tell a quite different Story in Hell.

You vindicate the Mercy of God no better than his Justice. “Who ever accused a Chief Magistrate, say you, of Cruelty, for not sparing a Company of atrocious Malefactors, and for letting the Sentence of the Law take place upon them by their Execution?” No Man could justly accuse the Magistrate, supposing he had no hand in causing these Malefactors to do amiss. But if he, as you say of God, worked their Wickedness in them, and then caused them to be put to Death for it, all the World would accuse such a Magistrate of the greatest Cruelty, Tyranny and Injustice. How much more might these Things be charged upon God, supposing it true, as you teach, that he first predestinates and necessitates Men to sin, and then not only takes away their Lives, but destroys both Soul and Body in Hell, for their necessitated Sins? You are not content to charge God foolishly and unthinkingly with doing wrong, but wickedly, and in a deliberate Manner.

Page 90. “That Predestination ought to be preached, you say, I thus prove: The Gospel is to be preached, and that not partially and by piecemeal, but the whole of it.” But by the bye, Predestination, as you have stated and asserted it, is not the Gospel; nor any Part of it. It is not ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ, but ΚΑΚΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ. Not good News, but bad News. Not glad Tidings of great Joy to all People; but dreadful Tidings of great Sorrow to far the greatest Part of Mankind; made so, not by any Fault in Man, but by the inevitable Decree of God. That it is not a Scripture Doctrine, I hope, I have made appear sufficiently in a Tract, intitled, *Arguments against the Doctrine of General Redemption considered*; and more clearly still in another Tract, intitled, *A Defence of God’s Sovereignty, &c.* to which I refer the Reader.

But you say, page 103. “The Doctrine of Predestination (I presume you mean, as you have stated and asserted it) is not only useful, but absolutely necessary to be taught and known. For, 1. Without it we cannot

" cannot form *just and becoming Ideas* of God." Without it, I grant you, we cannot form an Idea, that God is the Devil, as you teach, page 23. yea, that he is worse than the Devil, as you all along maintain; (not only as tempting Men to sin, as the Devil does; but necessitating them to it, which the Devil cannot do.) But this is not to form a *just and becoming Idea* of God. To form a just Idea of God, we must suppose him, at least, to be *loving to every Man, and his tender Mercy to be over all his Works*; that he is not willing that any should perish, but that rather they should turn from their Sins and be saved. And such an Idea of God, I presume, we may form without your Doctrine.

Page 105. " 2. Predestination is to be preached, because the Grace of God, which stands opposed to all human Worthiness, cannot be maintained without it." This Sprunge hath catched many an unwary Woodcock, Just as if God could not freely bestow his Grace upon some, unless he should deny it to an hundred, or perhaps a thousand or more, for one on whom he bestows it. God may and does offer his Grace to all, as is evident from Titus ii. 11. *The Grace of God that bringeth Salvation to all Men* (so the Margin is) *hath appeared.* And he hath given a Power, at least offers a Power to all Men, to accept of his Grace when offered; otherwise to offer his Grace, would be mere Mockery. And if some accept what others refuse, their Salvation is altogether of Grace, as much as if God had never offered his Grace, nor Power to accept it, unto the Rest. This you will not allow. But who cares for that? If you are disposed to talk wildly, with your "*excellent Austin*" and "*Zanchius*," you shall give us leave to think soberly, as we ought to think.

Page 107. " 3. By the preaching of Predestination, Man is duly humbled, and God alone is exalted." These Ends may be better answered without preaching Predestination, as stated and asserted by you. Man may be sufficiently humbled by insisting upon that Word of Christ, *Without me ye can do Nothing*: And God alone exalted by maintaining, that it is He that gives Energy to our *Willing and Doing*, of his Goodwill (*εὐδοκία*). The Arminians, you say, maintain, " that Conversion

" and

“ and *Salvation* are wrought and effected by ourselves
 “ and *God together*.” And does not the Church of
England maintain the same in her 16th Article, where-
 in she teaches us, “ that the *Grace of God prevents*
 “ us, that we may have a good Will; and *works with*
 “ us when we have a good Will?” And does not
St Paul teach the same, saying, *Work out your own Sal-*
vation with Fear and Trembling: For it is God that
worketh in you both to wil and to do; gives Energy to
your willing and doing, of his good Will? And does not
 your excellent *St Austin*, upon 1 *John* iii. 3. teach
 the same also? “ Behold, says he, after what manner he
 hath not taken away *Freewill*, that the Apostle should
 say, *keepeth himself pure*. Who *keepeth us pure* except
 God? But God *keepeth thee not so, against thy Will*.
 Therefore, inasmuch as thou *joinest thy Will to God*,
 thou *keepest thyself pure*. Thou *keepest thyself pure*,
 not of thyself, but by him, who comes to dwell in thee.
 Yet because in this thou *doest Something* of thine own
 Will, therefore is *Something* also attributed to thee. Yet
 so is it ascribed to thee, that still thou mayst say with
 the Psalmist, *Lord be thou my Helper*. If thou sayst,
Be thou my Helper, thou *doest Something*; for if thou *doest*
Nothing, how doth he *help*?” You see then, however
 your *whiffing Oracle*, *St Austin*, is one while for hav-
 ing *Predestination* preached, in order to *maintain Grace*;
 otherwhiles he *plays the Arminian*, and shews that the
 Business may be done *without such preaching*; and conse-
 quently that Man may be *humbled*, and God *exalted*
without it. And indeed to talk of God’s working Con-
 version in Man, without Man, is to talk such palpable
Nonsense, as were almost enough to make an *Idiot* laugh
 at it.

Page 109. “ 4. *Predestination* should be publickly
 “ taught and insisted upon, in order to confirm and
 “ strengthen true Believers in the Certainty and Confi-
 “ dence of their Salvation.” It is an avowed Princi-
 ple of your Party, “ that *Perseverance to Salvation*
 “ must demonstrate the Truth of Faith; and wherefo-
 “ ever this follows not, there Faith was but pretended.”
 If therefore no Man can know that he is a true Believer

till he has *persevered to Salvation*, the preaching of Predestination can never *confirm* and *strengthen* any one in the *Certainty* and *Confidence* of his Salvation. As this End therefore cannot be answered by *such* Kind of Preaching, it is downright *Folly* to preach it for such an End.

Page 111. “ 5. Without the Doctrine of *Predestination*, we cannot enjoy a *lively Sight* and *Experience* of God’s *special Love* and *Mercy* towards us in *Christ Jesus*.” I suppose we *can*. For if *Christ* took not hold of *Angels*, but of the *Seed* of *Abraham* he took hold; and was made *Partaker* of *Flesh* and *Blood*. This Matter duly laid to Heart, is sufficient to give us a *lively Sight* and *Experience* of God’s *special Love* and *Mercy* towards us in *Christ Jesus*, *without* hearing the Doctrine of *Predestination* preached. But it seems you cannot look upon God’s *Love* and *Mercy* to you with *Wonder* and *Gratitude*,” unless you are sure, that if he *saves* you, he will *damn*, it may be an *hundred* or a *thousand* on the other Hand.” It is well for us that the Scripture hath taught us not to measure *God’s Mercy* by a *Predestinarian’s Charity*. But however, neither can the End here proposed be answered by the Doctrine of *Predestination*; seeing that, according to your Principles, no Man *can be sure* of God’s *special Love* and *Mercy*, till he hath *persevered to Salvation*. In vain then shall you preach *Predestination*, “ that the *special Grace* of God may *shine*,” while the very preaching of that Doctrine *eclipses its Beams*.

Page 113. “ 6. Another Reason—for the *unreserved Publication* of this Doctrine is, that from a *Sense* of God’s *peculiar, eternal* and *unalterable Love* to his People, their Hearts may be *enflamed* to love him in return.” This Reason must likewise *vanish*, when it is considered, that however *peculiar, eternal* and *unalterable* God’s Love to his People is, upon *Predestinarian Principles*, no Man can be *sure* that he is one of God’s People, in a *saving Sense*. Even your own Doctor, *Calvin* himself, asserts, “ That the Heart of Man hath so many *Starting holes*, and *secret Cor-ners* of *Lying* and *Vanity*, and is *cloathed* with so
many

“ many Colours of *guileful Hypocrisy*, that it often *deceiveth itself*. And besides, Experience sheweth, the *Reprobate* are sometimes moved with the *same Feelings* that the *Elect* are, so that in their own Judgment, they *nothing differ* from the *Elect*.” So that the preaching of *Predestination* will do but little towards *enflaming* the Hearts of God’s People to love him. For though they may have *such Feelings* as the *Elect* have, according to *Calvin*, it may be all *guileful Hypocrisy*; and unless they are *sure it is not*, which according to him, they *never can be*, they can have no *sufficient Ground of Love to God*. They may “ *fall down* (as you advise) before his *electing Mercy* ;” but must *rise up again uncertain* whether they have any Interest in it.

Page 114. “ A 7th Argument for the *preaching of Predestination*, is, that by it we may be excited to “ the *Practice of universal Godliness*.” Nay, this can never be, if what you assert, p. 24, be true. There you say, “ God *occasionally*, in the *Course of his Providence*, puts both *elect* and *reprobate* Persons into *Circumstances of Temptation* ;—even *such* as shall *cause* “ the Persons *so tempted*, *actually to turn aside* from the “ Path of Duty, to *commit Sin*, and *involve themselves* “ and *others in Evil*.” And to confirm your Opinion, you give us that *blundering, blasphemous Translation of Isaiah lxiii. 17.* which Text, rightly interpreted, no more proves your Assertion, than it proves that *Adam* planted the Garden of *Eden*. However, if the Case be as you assert, how can the *preaching of Predestination* excite to *universal Godliness*, when the *Effect of Predestination* itself is, as you say, the *producing of all the Wickedness there is in the World*? You expressly teach, that whatever Men do, be it good or bad, they do it by *Virtue*, and in *Consequence of the eternal Decree of God*: And when Men are once persuaded of this, they will have but *little Concern* about the *Practice of universal Godliness*. They will naturally conclude, that *such a Measure* thereof as the Decree hath *apportioned* to them, which is just as much as they practice,

be it *more* or *leſs*, will be altogether ſufficient for their Turn. The *preaching* of *Pred.ſtination*, then, I preſume, will be ſo far from *exciting* to the *Practice* of *universal Godlineſs*, that it has a direct Tendency to *deſtroy* it.

Page 115. “ 8. Unless *Pred.ſtination* be *preach-*
“ *ed*, we ſhall want one great Inducement to the Ex-
“ *erciſe* of *brotherly Kindneſs* and *Charity*.” So far
from this, that Nothing ſo much tends to *difſolve the*
Bonds of *brotherly Kindneſs* and *Charity*. Of this I
have had ſufficient Experience. I know a Gentlewo-
man, not twenty Miles from *Salisbury Plain*, (I make
no Doubt, you know whom I mean) take her barely
as a *Woman*, ſhe is one of the *ſweeteſt*, and *moſt amiable*
Temper upon the Face of the Earth: take her as a *Cal-*
viniſt, and when the *ſour Leaven* of *Pred.ſtination*
operates upon her Mind, and what a *Change* is there?
She is no more *herſelf*. I have heard her declare, that
ſhe could love no one as a *Chriſtian* that did not *hold*
Pred.ſtination; and that ſhe could not *pray* for the Sal-
vation of any Relation ſhe had, unleſs ſhe had Reason
to *believe they were Eleſt*; for in ſo doing ſhe ſhould
think ſhe was *oppoſing* the ſovereign Will of God. Such
Narrowneſs of Spirit is not peculiar to her; it is the
natural Conſequence of *Calviniſm*. Mr *Toplady* him-
ſelf too well knows this to be true. If he will not
own it, his Writings too evidently *make it appear*. If
any *Calviniſt* be of a *better Spirit*, and has a *universal*
Love for all Mankind, it is entirely owing to his *Chriſ-*
tian Principles, which have gotten the better of his
pred.ſtinarian Notions.

Page 117. “ 9. Laſtly, Without a *due Senſe* of
“ *Pred.ſtination*, we ſhall want the *ſureſt* and the *moſt*
“ *powerful* Inducement to *Patience*, *Reſignation* and
“ *Dependence* on God, under *every ſpiritual* and *tem-*
“ *poral Affliction*.” And will a *due Senſe* thereof *work*
theſe Virtues in us? I can then only ſay, if ſo, you
that preach it ſo ſtrenuouſly, have *not a due Senſe* there-
of. Where was your *Patience* when you wrote your
Letter to Dr *Nowell*? Where was it when you wrote

to Mr Wesley? Alas! Sir, we have in yourself such *undeniable Proof*, (supposing you that *bearty Predestinarian* you pretend to be) of the *Insignificancy of Predestination* to induce to *Patience, Resignation and Dependence* on God, under *Afflictions, Oppositions, and Disappointments*, that I cannot think it at all *needful or useful* on this Account to *preach Predestination*, any more than upon any of the former. Upon the Whole then, I affirm, contrary to you, that *Predestination*, as *stated and asserted* by you, is an *unscriptural* and an *unreasonable Doctrine*, and therefore *ought not to be preached*. However, I make you this Challenge: Bring me *one Infidel* that was ever *converted* to the Faith of Christ by the *preaching of Predestination*; *one carnal Professor*, that was ever *amended* by it; *one careless Sinner* that was ever *stirred up* by it; or *one distressed Soul* that was ever *comforted* by it; I will then stand convinced of my present Mistake, and turn *Predestinarian* too. These Effects are produced, *not by preaching Predestination*, but by *offering Salvation* through Christ to *all in general*; by *preaching the Gospel*, as you advise, to *every Creature*; and that without telling them of a *horrible Decree*, which hath *absolutely and inevitably* shut far the greatest Part of them out from having *any Benefit by, or Interest in* that Salvation, and made their *Damnation necessary*.

You close your Book with a long Quotation from *Melanckthon* in favour of *Predestination*; and tell us, "that he never, to the very last, retracted a Word of what he there delivers." Did he not? Read *Melanckthon* again. See if you cannot find this in him, as much *against Predestination*, as what you quote is for it: "Let us remove from St Paul such *Stoical Disputes*, as overthrow *Faith and Prayer*. For how could *Saul believe or pray*, when he *doubted* whether the *Promise* belonged to him, or when that *Decree of the Destinies* had prepossessed his Mind: It is already decreed, that thou shalt be a *Castaway*; thou art not written in the *Number of the Elect*, &c." Look in his Chapter concerning *Freewill*; see whether he does not say there, he had known many, who would argue

in this Manner: "If my *Freewill* doth avail *Nothing* in the mean Time, till I percieve that *Regeneration*, you speak of, wrought in me, I will indulge my *Unbelief* and other *vicious Affections*: and then adds; this *Manichean Imagination* is an *horrible Mistake*; and from that *Error* our Minds are to be fetched off, and taught that *Freewill* avails *Somewhat*." The Truth is, while *Melanckthon* was, as it were, *Luther's Scholar*, he was as *wild* and *wavering* as his *Teacher*; but when he began to think for himself, he became a *sober, rational Man*; *sound* in his *Judgment* and *settled* in his *Principles*: and it was him chiefly that *Arminius* and the Church of *England* followed in their *Doctrine* and *Interpretation* of the *Scriptures*.

Now, Sir, notwithstanding you have so violently lashed Mr *Wesley* for exposing your Book; I shall venture to tell you, that it is one of the most *contradictious, sophistical, unscriptural, and blasphemous* Books that I ever read. Nor can I tell what Judgment to form of you; whether you are really a *Calvinist*; or whether, like *Hobbes* of *Malmsbury*, you (as he is supposed to have done) only talk from the *Teeth outward*, playing the *Drole* with Religion, upon the Grounds given you by the *rigid Predestinarians*, in order to bring Christianity into *Disrepute*, and so to make way for the fashionable Notion of *Materialism*. You seem indeed to lament the *Spread of Infidelity* and *Deism* among us, and then teach *Infidels* and *Deists* how to *ridicule* the *Bible* and the *Church*. You seem to pay a great Regard to both, but it is easy for every *attentive* and *considerate* Reader to see, that, like *Joab*, you *stab* while you pretend to *kiss*. Whether you intended so to do or not, I leave to be determined by the Searcher of Hearts and your own Conscience. But till I see more Reason, than I do at present, to think more favourably of your Book, I cannot stile it, as you do Mr *Wesley's Abridgment of your Zanchius*, a *Penny Mouse*, but a *two Shilling LEVIATHAN*.

Your personal Quarrel with Mr *Wesley* I have Nothing to do with; and therefore shall say but a little more concerning

concerning your Letter to that Gentleman. I would however take the Liberty to ask you, what could be the Occasion of all that *vile Abuse* and *Scurrility*, which you have thrown out against him? Was there a sufficient Reason? No. Had he abused and ridiculed you, as the Publishers of those called Mr *Hervey's* Letters, did him, you might then with some Reason and Justice, have *retorted* his own Words upon him. But there was Nothing of this in the Case. However, you say, he abridged your *Translation* of *Zanchius*. Well, suppose he did, you might have abridged his *Sermons*, and so have been even with him. But it seems, he added a *Line* to your Words, by way of Remark. Well, suppose it be so; that Line was not added, as *your* Words, but was put in a *Parenthesis*, as his *own*. And you might so have added *twenty* Lines to any of his Writings; which would have been a better Way of shewing your Resentment, then calling him twenty *reproachful* Names. Yea, but besides all this, he prefixed and subscribed the *Initials* of your Name to his Abridgment. And what then? There are thousands that would never have had the least Guess at your Name from thence, if you had not unadvisedly exposed yourself. And where then was the mighty Crime of meddling with the *Initials* of your Name? I hope you have not the Vanity to imagine that the *Initials* of your Name are as sacred among Christians as the *Initials* N^{th} are among the *Jewish* Rabbins. But, what is worst of all, he closes his *puny Abridgment* thus: "The *Elect* shall be saved, do what they will: The *Reprobate* shall be damned, do what they can. Reader, *believe* this, or be damned." It is true, he does so. And (as the Author of a printed Letter addressed to you, rightly observes) "every Reader of your Book, who understands plain English, and is capable of drawing a Conclusion from the plainest Premises, must allow these Words to be the *Sense*, the obvious *Import* of Numbers of your Propositions, though they are not your *very Words* themselves." So that herein you are not injured at all. Upon the Whole, in
my

my Judgment, there was no need of your *Scorpion*, which you repent you had not used. Your *Whip* lashed abundantly too severely for the Offence given. But you had a mind to shew your *Wit*: to which, I suppose nobody would object, so it were done upon *proper Occasions*, and in a *proper Manner*. But these *Restrictions* you unhappily did not regard. This puts me in mind of some Lines written by the late celebrated Mr *Nash*, and hung up in most of the public Places about *Bath*.

*Envy and Malice must that Man perplex,
Who aims at Wit, not to reform, but vex;
Which is, if we may judge by Shakespear's Rules,
Always a Villain's Office, or a Fool's.*

I would not so far subscribe to Mr *Nash's* Sentiment, as to call you either the one or the other; but this, I believe, every candid Man will allow, that you suffered your *Passion* to outrun your *Reason*, and your *Wit* to overshoot your *Wisdom*, when you launched out into such *virulent Abuse*, and such *malicious Charges* against a Man for little more than an *imaginary Crime*.

You say, in your Letter to the Parishioners of St MATTHEW, *Bethnal-Green*, concerning the Reverend Mr *Haddon Smith*, Curate of that Parish, who it seems has offended you, and whom you suppose, it would render *too considerable* (astonishing *Haughtiness*!) were you to address him by Name, that you “*chastised Mr W. with a studious Disregard to Ceremony.*” Sir! that is not all. You are certainly conscious to yourself, and every one that reads your Letter to Mr *W.* cannot but see, that you did not barely study a *Disregard to Ceremony*, but moreover endeavoured to *defame, slander*, and *traduce* him as much as you could. And, whatever Mr *Smith* has done in his Performance, you, in yours, have suffered “*Heat and Scurrility*, to supply “*the total Vacuity of Argument.*” And however you could not prevail with yourself to render to Mr *S.* *Railing for Railing*, you prevailed with yourself to do worse

worse by Mr *W.* even to render Railing, where *none* had been given. You had not then perhaps preached your Sermon on 1 *Tim.* i. 10. at *Bethnal Green* and *Blackfriars*; however, certain it is, you did not act agreeable to the Advice therein given: "Let not your Zeal be of the *inflammatory* Kind: Let it be tempered with *unbounded Moderation, Gentleness* and *Benevolence*; and shine forth as the Sun with *healing in its Wings.*" Would any one ever imagine that the Man who gives this Advice in the very same Sermon, in a Note, thus bitterly exclaims against one, whom he calls "an *Arminian Schismatic*, grown gray in the Service of *Error*; and who, he says, still goes up and down, sowing his *Tares*, seeking whom he may devour, and compassing *Sea and Land* to make *Profelytes*?" Could any one believe that the very Man who gives such Instruction, not only sinned against that and the plain Command of God, but is so far from repenting of his Sin, that he declares, he repents he had not sinned worse! I must needs say there is no Occasion for that; for you have really shewn that you act so much upon the *Machiavellian* Principle, that in spite of all your *Rhetoric*, you have induced many People to question, whether you are possessed at all of the *Christian*.

Whether Mr *W.* be that very bad Man, which you represent him to be, (which *Charity* would induce me to hope he is not, and my own Knowledge of some Facts he is charged with, force me to declare he is not;) let me ask you, Sir, whether you yourself have not done in divers Particulars the very same Things, which you look upon as so criminal in him? And if they were Crimes, were they ever the less so, because you did them? I think not. Will you plead, what I did was for want of Consideration, and at that Time, through an Error in Judgment? Very well! If your Brother needs it, give him one End of your Mantle. If it will cloke your Fault, it is wide enough to cloke his too. However, I cannot but think, Sir! that Mr. *W.* is every way your Superior, in Years, in Learning, in Judgment, and in the Rank he stood

stood in, while he was a Member of the University of *Oxford*. And this considered, I should suppose that (I do not say "*Ceremony*," but) a little Decency at least, if not *Respect*, ought to have been observed in your Address to him. You, I find, think otherwise, because he has somewhat offended you by abridging your *Zanchius*, and especially in this, forsooth, because he is *not* a *Calvinist*.

After reading your Invectives against Mr *W.* must not every one be amazed at your following Harangue upon *Bigotry*. "Of all Vices, you say, *Bigotry* is one of the *meanest* and *most* *mischievous*. Its *shrivelled contracted* Breast, leaves no room for the *noble* *Virtues* to dilate and play. *Candour*, *Benevolence*, and *Forbearance*, become *smothered* and *extinguished*; partly from being *cramped* by *Littleness* of *Mind*, partly from being *overwhelmed* with *intellectual* *Dust*. *Bigotry* is a *determined* *Enemy* to *Truth*; inasmuch as it essentially interferes with *Freedom* of *Enquiry*, restrains the *grand* *indefeasible* *Right* of *private* *Judgment*, confines our *Regards* to a *Party*, and, by limiting the *Extent* of *Moderation* and *mutual* *Goodwill*, tears up *Charity* by the *very* *Roots*. In short, *Bigotry* is the *very* *Essence* of *Popery*." All this, behold, is asserted by the Man, that has shewn himself in his Writings the *greatest* *Bigot* that ever existed. Without one Grain of *Candour*, *Benevolence* or *Forbearance*, *Moderation*, *Goodwill* or *Charity*, he flies *open-mouthed* upon those he calls *Arminians*, upon all that are *not* *Calvinists*, as if, like the *Dragon* of *WANTLEY*, he would make but a *Mouthful* of them, and swallow them up at a *Gulp*; pursues them with the most *opprobrious* and *reproachful* *Names*, loads them with the *bitterest* *Invectives*, and, as far as in him lies, by the Tenor of his Doctrine, dooms them all to *Hell*, though they are ever so *worthy*, *pious*, *Christian* Men. While, on the other Hand, some of the *worst* of Men, as *Rebels*, *Hypocrites*, *Oppressors*, *Plunderers*, and what not, are cried up as *evangelical*, *eminent*, *learned*, *pious*, *discreet* and *excellent*, because they were *Predestinarians*. If this is not *Bigotry*, *Nothing* is. And if *Bigotry* be the very

Essence

Essence of Popery, Mr *Toplady* will find it impossible for him to free himself from the Charge of being a *Papist*. When I read this Passage, and divers such inconsistent Matters, notwithstanding the Ground given by some others in his Writings, to suspect him for Something worse, I could hardly help charitably hoping that he was only a *Madman*. He has, it may be, his *sober Intervals*; but having had a *Twirl in his Lantern*, he has his *raging Fits* too, when he is hurried into *Inconsistencies, wild Reveries, and extravagant Language*. If this be the Case, poor Man! he is to be *pitied*; if not, he is *inexcusable*; unless we admit his Doctrine of *Predestination*.

I would now only ask you a few serious Questions: Not, whether Mr *W.* ever preached *Calvinism*, but whether he ever preached the *Gospel*? Of which Calvinism, as to its *distinguishing Tenets*, is *no Part*. Has he not preached the Gospel of Christ for many Years; even, perhaps, before you were born? Does he not preach it now? Does he not preach now in the same Manner that he always did, ever since Mr *Whitefield* and he set out in a public Manner? I do not ask, whether he has gained many Followers by his preaching; for that any Enthusiast, a *Nicholas Storck*, and *Thomas Muncer*, a *John of Leyden* and *Knipperdoling*, might do: But whether he ever by his preaching *converted* any Sinners from the Error of their Ways? Whether God ever did, or does not now own his Ministry, by making it *effectual to the saving of Souls*? Whether there never was, nor are now, any that were brought to the Knowledge of themselves and of God, by his Means, and that still continue in the Doctrine that he preaches? You cannot, you dare not but answer these Questions in his Favour. Why then, if God hath owned him for his Minister, or any one else that you rail on as *Arminians*, by setting his Seal to their Doctrine, take them with all their Failings, (and there is great Reason that you and I should do so; seeing we are not without;) Take them, I say, with all their Failings, unless they are fallen into a Course of known, wilful Sins, and at the Peril of
your

your Soul be it to say one Word against ſuch Men, that may be a Means to hinder their *Uſefulneſs*, by bringing *Contempt* upon their Miniſtry, becauſe they are not *Calviniſts*, becauſe they *caſt out Devils*, (that is) becauſe they *turn Sinners from Darkneſs to Light*, and from the *Power of Satan unto God*, and do not follow you. I would add moreover, if God, by the Miniſtry of theſe *Arminians*, ſo called, converts Sinners to himſelf, it is an evident Proof that he ſends them to preach his Goſpel; but I preſume, you will find it difficult to prove, that he hath ſent you to teach them how.

I fear many amongſt you have much to answer for, on this Score of depreciating the Miniſtry of all that do not preach *Calvinism*. And what do you gain? You may gain Applauſe in the *Goſpel Magazine*, as it is falſly called, that *Montb'y Medley of Truth and Error*, ſound Words and *Blasphemy*, trumped up as a Vehicle to convey *Calvinism* and *Slander* round the Nation; but you will have no Praise on that Account of God. Yea, you *leſſen* yourſelves in the Eſteem of wiſe Men. I could tell you of divers of your own Perſuaſion, that have been ſo diſguſted at you, and an intimate Friend of yours, for *Railing*, inſtead of *preaching the Goſpel*, that they have determined to hear you no more. I would adviſe you therefore to let *Arminians*, as you call us, and eſpecially Mr *Wefley*, alone. Mr *Whitefield* is gone to Reſt, and is happily eſcaped out of the *Din* of your *vain Jangling*, which he was heartily tired of before he went hence. Mr *W.* is *old* and *ſtricken in years*, and conſequently it will not be long before he follows him. Let his *gray Hairs* go quietly down to the Grave. And whatever Failings he may have, as a *Man*, ſee that you, as a *Chriſtian*, bury them in the Bowels of *Charity*, before his Body is buried in the Bowels of the *Earth*. This I ſhould think a much better Way to convince the World that you are one of the *Elect*, than your uſing either your *Whip*, or your *Scorpion*.

I have long taken Notice, that one can hardly ever enter into religious Converſation with thoſe of your Party,
but

but they soon come to Dispute. I have hardly known any Calvinists that are not guilty of this. Let a Man be ever so much a Christian, he is never *right*, unless he be as *rigid* in his Notions, as they are. I could point out a Man that for many Years hath profest to be a *B. liever* in Jesus Christ, and his *circumspect Walking* and truly *Christian Disposition* bear sufficient Testimony to the Truth of his Profession. A Man more *devoted* to God, I do not know that I have ever met with: A Man more *diligent in Business*, more *servent in Spirit*, and that, with a *holy Fervency*, and more given to *serve the Lord*. And yet how has poor *John* (for that is his Name) been buffeted by divers *Calvinistical* Ministers, and condemned as a *Legalist*, and as one that holds *grievous Errors*, because he holds *General Redemption* and the *Possibility* of falling from Grace; and therefore, according to our Lord's Advice, *watches* and *prays*, that he may be *sure not* to fall. Now I would ask, what would you or he gain, if he, as you would wish him, were to embrace your Notions? It would make neither him nor you a Whit more *holy*, nor a Whit more *happy*. You would gain a *Profelyte*, and he would gain a *Change* of Opinion, and that would be all, unless, perhaps, he should grow more *careless* after his Change, (which, it is a thousand to one but he would) and then his greatest Gain would be a *grievous Loss*.

I am not alone in my Observation. I accidentally met with a Hymn-Book, lately published by the Rev. Mr *John Berridge*, Vicar of *Everton, Bedfordshire*; in the Preface to which, he tells us: " When the Lord
 " first opened my Eyes, I was much visited by Pre-
 " destinarians from far and near. I then took notice,
 " that instead of desiring to join in Prayer, discoursing
 " of the Love of God, or exhorting me to press forward,
 " and strive to enter in at the strait Gate, they made
 " an endless Clutter about Election and Reprobation;
 " speaking the same Things an hundred Times over:
 " So that after a Conference held with one, I knew
 " what every other Person had to say. Can this be
 " called lifting up the Hands which hang down? Was
 " it

“ it not more like the Coming of Foxes to spoil the
 “ tender Grapes? For my Part I seek no strange
 “ Lord; not Predestination, but JESUS be my GOD!
 “ Thus being weary of Disputes, I refused to con-
 “ verse any longer with them. So do ye, my Bre-
 “ thren, or no Rest will ye find to your Souls ”

“ It is no Wonder that Satan bestirs himself about
 “ Election; for Nothing serves his Purpose better.—
 “ Christ says, *Strive to enter in at the strait Gate,*
 “ Luke xiii. 24. but Satan, perceiving his Opportu-
 “ nity, says to the weary Predestinarian, “ Strive not
 “ at all; for if thou art appointed to be damned,
 “ why shouldst thou strive against the Stream? And
 “ if thou art ordained to Salvation, saved thou must
 “ be; whether thou striveest or not. Then, Soul,
 “ take thine Ease; it is good for thee to eat, drink,
 “ and be merry: For thou canst not cope with God,
 “ whose Decrees are unalterable, and his Power ir-
 “ resistable.”

“ I shall conclude this Head, my Brethren, with a
 “ few Questions to each of you.—Is it reasonable to
 “ think that God would send his Son to die a cruel
 “ and accursed Death for the human Race, if the Lot
 “ of each Individual was determined before the World
 “ was made? I take it for granted, that such is the
 “ Doctrine of Predestination; which, if true, Is not
 “ all Preaching and all Hearing vain? Is not every
 “ Soldier of Christ beating the Air? Could you be-
 “ lieve the far greater Part of Mankind to be pre-or-
 “ dained for Hell, and yet cry out with *Abraham* of
 “ old, *Shall not the Judge of all the Earth do Right*;
 “ or with *St John*, *God is Love*?”

I know your Plea: “ All that do not hold *parti-*
 “ *cular Redemption*, let them profess what they will,
 “ and appear ever so good, they have only *counterfeit*
 “ *Grace.*” *Counterfeit Grace is genuine Nonsense.*
 Grace is *real* Grace, or there is no Grace at all.—
 “ However they have no better than *common Grace.*”

Nor can they, or you have any *better*. It is true,
 one may have a *larger Measure* thereof than another;

but whatever their Measure be, their Grace is, for *Kind*, the same. It is, in all that have it, the *Grace of God*; unless you maintain there is such Grace as the *Grace of the Devil*. And if by this, which you condemn and despise under the Notion of *common Grace*, a Sinner is enabled to *break off* his Sins, to *rely* upon the Lord Jesus Christ for Salvation, to *love* God and all Mankind for his Sake, to *walk religiously* in good Works, and to *have the Mind that was in Christ*; (even though he should not believe your Doctrine of Predestination) which has been the Case of Thousands, let such a one only have this Prayer answered, Lord, evermore give me this Grace! I desire no *other*, I desire no *better*, only a *larger Measure* thereof: And, my Soul for his, such a one will not miss of Heaven.

I know some among your Party (whatever you may do) that maintain, "A Man may do all this, and have *no Grace* at all. He may be *enlightened*, *taste the heavenly Gift*, *be made Partaker of the holy Ghost*, *taste the good Word of God*, and the Powers of the *World to come*; and so far *Nature* may go. He may not for all this have one Spark of *true, saving Grace*." But this is plainly to contradict that Word of our Saviour, *Without me ye can do Nothing*; and that of his Apostle, *We are not sufficient of ourselves to think any Thing as of ourselves*. But can a Man indeed, by the Power of *Nature*, think one good Thought; *work himself up* (as they speak) to enjoy any of the Experiences above mentioned? Why then, if he can do it *once*, and in *any measure*, he may do it *when* and *as much* as he will. He has no need of Grace, if he can by *Nature* help himself in *Time of Need*. Such Calvinists, however, as speak in this Manner, should never quarrel with *Arminians*, *Pelagians*, *Papists*, and *Free-will Men*. For they are somewhat more than *Arminians* and *Papists* in this Respect: *Pelagians* and *Free-will Men* with a Witness. Against such Calvinists I must enter my Protest. If any Man experience the *least Measure* of those Things above mentioned;

mentioned; if he thinks so much as *one good Thought*, if he has *one good Desire*, it is not the Produce or Effect of *fallen Nature*. It is the *Grace of God*; *free, unmerited* Grace alone, that thus *works in him to will and to do*; *energizes* (if I may so say) his *volitive and active* Faculties of his *Goodwill*. The Meaning of which Expression of the Apostle, *Trismegistus* (if we take his Words $\theta\epsilon\omicron\pi\rho\epsilon\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, in a Sense worthy of God) has excellently well given us, when he styles God, $\epsilon\nu\epsilon\rho\gamma\epsilon\iota\alpha\ \pi\alpha\sigma\omega\acute{\nu},\ \tau\omega\acute{\nu}\ \delta\upsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\omega\nu,\ \kappa\eta\ \Delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\mu\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \pi\alpha\varsigma\omega\acute{\nu}\ \tau\omega\acute{\nu}\ \epsilon\nu\epsilon\rho\gamma\epsilon\iota\omega\nu$: “The Energy of all Powers, and the Power of all Energies, or vigorous Actings.”

You see I have followed you, Sir, “though at an *humble Distance*;” and can you be angry with me “for copying so *venerable* an Example?” Indeed I almost begin to fear you will challenge me, as you have done Mr *Wesley*, “to *measure Swords*, or *break a Pike* with me.” If so, I can only say, *Alas!* Sir, I am quite unskilled in the *Exercises* of the *Bear-Garden*. I know Nothing at all how to *fence* or *push*. I shall willingly submit to be *posted for a Coward*. You shall have all the *Honour of Valour*. I shall be quite content with *Honesty* and a *whole Skin*.

But why should we differ, when, according to your ninth Reason for *preaching Predesination*, there is so *sure* and *powerful* an Inducement to *Peace* and *Amity*. Possess your Mind, Sir, with a *due Sense of Predesination*, (which, it seems by your Letters to Dr *Nowell* and Mr *Wesley*, you have not done yet) and “this will be a most *sure* and *powerful* Inducement to *Patience*, *Resignation*, and *Dependance* on God, under every *spiritual* and *temporal Affliction*;” yea, under *all Crosses*, *Oppositions*, *Affronts* and *Injuries* whatever. Such a Sense of *Predesination* must entirely *reconcile* you to Dr *Nowell*, Mr *Wesley*, and *Me*; and to every other *Antagonist*, that shall set himself against you. You will then rest satisfied, that whatever any of us have *said*, whatever we have *done*, we have only done what was our “*Business below*”—“*filled up the Departments*, as you say, and discharged

“ the *several Offices* assigned us, in God’s Purpose, “ *from everlasting.*” You will then own, “ *What-ever is, is right.*” That Dr Nowell did *Nothing amiss* with regard to the *Oxford Expulsion*; wrote *Nothing amiss*, in his *Answer to the Author of PIETAS OXONIENSIS*. That Mr Wesley did *Nothing amiss* in all that you lay to his Charge; wrote *Nothing amiss* in his *Abridgment of your Zanchius*. And that I have *done Nothing amiss* in any Thing that I have said or written. Whatever some *foolish Men*, that *know Nothing of*, or *will not believe* the Doctrine of *Predestination*, whatever, I say, such Men may condemn as *wrong*, a *heartly Calvinist* will *cloke* with *Fate* and an *eternal Decree*; and thus maintain, as you do, “ *Every* “ *Action is undoubtedly good*; it being an *actual Exer-* “ *tion of those operative Powers*, given us by God, “ *for that very End.*” Be then, Sir, not only “ a “ *doctrinal*” *Predestinarian*, but a *practical One*; so shall you perhaps be able to tame that *wild Beast of Impatience* that now *rages in you*; subdue that *Lion-like Fury*; and put away from you all that *Bitterness, Wrath, Anger and Clamour, Evil-speaking and Malice*, with which you are now overwhelmed, as with a *Flood*. As you number yourself among the *Elect*, shew that you are such, not by *preaching and writing vehemently* against the *Generalists*, that you call *Arminians*, but by a strict and inviolable Observance of that apostolical Precept: *Put on therefore (as the Elect of God, holy and beloved) Bowels of Mercies, Kindness, Humbleness of Mind, Meekness, Long-suffering; forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, if any Man have a Quarrel against any: even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye, Col. iii. 12, 13.* And this done, we shall have no more Objection, than you have, to your being called a *CHRISTIAN STORIC*.

P O S T S C R I P T.

I Shall not consider fully, as I might have done, your famous Sermon preached at St Matthew's Bethnal Green, and at St Ann's Blackfriars, on 1 Tim. i. 10. because I think, as to the doctrinal Part, it is sufficiently answered in the foregoing Pamphlet, and in another, intitled, *A Defence of God's Sovereignty against the impious and horrible Aspersions cast upon it by Elisha Coles, in his Practical Treatise on that Subject*. This however I must say, I am surpris'd that you was not aware, that your *exalting* yourself in the Manner you have done in your Sermon, as well as in your other Writings, against those that oppose you, is the readiest Way you could have taken to *abuse* yourself in the Esteem of all Men. You boast in your Sermon, "I find myself at a Loss, not *what to say*, but *what to leave unsaid*." Again, "From the very Commencement of my unworthy Ministrations, I have not had a single Doctrine to retract, nor a single Word to unsay." In your Letter to Mr Wesley you say, "I have no Notion of encountering a Windmill; in lieu of a Giant." Again, "I would no more enter into a formal Controversy with such a Scrib-
bler, than I would contend for the Wall with a Chimney-Sweeper." In your Epiphonema to Dr Nowell, you form this Climax, "A Protestant! a Protestant Divine! a Protestant Divine of the Church of England!" and raise him up aloft, and then, as it were, set your Feet on his Head, and try to trample him into the Earth." In the Postscript to your Sermon, you say, concerning Mr Smith, the Curate of St Matthew Bethnal Green, "It would render that *unthinking*, but, I would hope, well-meaning Gentleman, much too considerable, were I to address him by Name." What *excessive superciliousness*

ciliousness and *haughtiness* of Spirit? What *Majesty* of *Pride* does such Language as this betray? What could the *greatest Peer* of the Realm say more with Regard to the *meanest Peasant*?

I know Nothing more of Mr *Smith*, than what you say of him in your Postscript. As to myself, I make no Scruple to tell you I am, what some call, an *Exotic*; one destitute of the Honour of *Academical Education*. The highest Degree I lay claim to is, that of a *poor Fellow* of *Jesus College* in the *University of Christianity*. You may be a *Man of Fortune*, and a *Man of Family* for aught I know; and doubtless you are so, if it be such an *unpardonable Crime*, as it seems it is, to meddle only with the *Initials* of your Name. However you have, to your *Self-abasement*, entered into Holy Orders; and so have put yourself upon a Level, with respect to *Order*, with Mr *Smith* and *me*. But setting us aside, as Men *nullius Nominis*, and leaving you the *Third* with Dr *Nowell* and Mr *Wesley*, I can hardly pronounce you as the *Chief* and *most Honourable among the Three*. Excuse my Plainness, Sir; yea, and if I tell you farther, you seem much to stand in need of learning that Lesson dictated by *Solon* of *Athens*, ἴσθι σεαυτὸν; *Know thyself*; and of praying heartily that Prayer prescribed by our Church, From all *Blindness of Heart*, from *Pride*, *Vainglory*, and *Hypocrisy*; from *Envy*, *Hatred* and *Malice*, and all *Uncharitableness*; Good Lord, deliver us!

I shall only observe farther in general, that I find *Sophistry*, *Fallacy*, *false Insinuations*, *Raillery*, *Perversion* of Scripture and our Church Articles, *Self-contradiction*, or *Self-sufficiency*, *Haughtiness*, *Pride* and *Vanity*, glaring in almost every Page; and that I cannot readily believe you, when you say,

1. "That what I am going to observe does not proceed from the least Degree of *Bitterness* against the Persons of any, from whom I differ." (For from what else did your rancorous Note concerning him that you call "an *Arminian Schismatic*" proceed? Not from *Meekness* and *Love*, I presume." And,

2. "That

2. " That I am infinitely remote even from the " *lightest* Wish of erecting myself into a *Dictator* to " others." (For what but an *earnest* Wish of that Kind could move you to be so positive in Points that have staggered divers of the most renowned Men for Learning and natural Abilities, that ever adorned the Christian Church ?)

" The Rights of Conscience, you say, are *inviolably sacred*; and Liberty of private Judgment is " every Man's *Birthingright*." If so, let every Man enjoy his *Rights* and *Liberty*; at least without abusing them, as you have done the *Arminians*, as you call them. If others can see but with one Eye and you see with both, pity their *weak Sight*, but do not bite their *Noses* off. Do not bring *Railing* for *Reason*, and *Scurrility* for *Syllogism*. Such *Salve* will never open *blind Eyes*. If you continue to use it, as you have done, I dare pronounce, as they will never be cured by your *Doctrine*, much less will they by your *Example*. However, let you and your Party adhere strictly to the Maxim laid down above, and it will at once put an End to all *fierce Contention* between *Predestinarians* and *Generalists*.

I must confess I am as sick of *Controversy*, as I am of your *Opinions*. And yet, without declaring my Sentiments, and my Reasons for embracing them, this once for all, there is no End of answering the daily Cavils of *Religionists* that labour to hinder the Success of my Ministry, and that of others who think with me, by means of your Writings, and those of some others of your Persuasion. If I were a *Predestinarian* indeed, I should only laugh at their Attempts. I would say, Ye Fools! if God hath *decreed* that my Ministry shall have a *good Effect* upon the Hearts of the People, ye cannot hinder it, do what you will. And if he has *decreed* that I shall *labour in vain*, he can steel the Hearts of the People against my Word, without your lending him a *helping Hand*. But as it is my *Misfortune* not to be able to see into the Reasonableness of such *absolute Decrees*, I think it right and reasonable.

sonable to defend my Principles against those that oppose them, and to *give a Reason of the Faith that is in me*; and I hope I have done it with as much *Meekness* as you yourself could have done it. I am hitherto *steady*, because I see no Reason as yet to stagger. Yet I am not *perverse*. I am open to Conviction. And if any Man can shew me from *plain Scripture* or *sound Reason* that I am in an Error, I will renounce it immediately. For I count that Man either a *Fool* or a *Knave*, that will retain an Error one Moment after he is clearly convinced it is an *Error*: A *Fool*, who suffers his *Pride* to force him to maintain an Error *always*, because he hath *once* done it: Or a *Knave*, that will still maintain an Error against *Conviction*, for the Sake of some *By-ends*.

I shall add but one Thing more. You perhaps know the Proverb,

Pastores odia exercent, Lupus intrat ovila.

While the *Shepherds* are quarrelling, the *Wolf* gets into the Sheepfold. A Truth how sadly verified in our Day. While you are thus berating the *Arminians*, *Rome* and the Devil *laugh in their Sleeves*, and make a *Prey* of both their Flocks and yours. You call yourself a *Presbyter* of the Church of England. Let me advise you: *Præsta nomen tuum. Consule Ecclesiæ.* Make good your Character. Consult for the Good of the Church: Which is not to be done by *reproaching* those that you suppose to be in Error; but by *instructing in Meekness* those that oppose themselves; by *preaching the Truth as it is in Jesus*, and transcribing the Truth you preach into *Practice*. And in your Preaching, observe the Hint given by *Origen*, Preach good Things *well*: that is, as he says, *sincerely* and *soundly*. And in doing this, use as many Flowers as you will: Only take Care that they be *Flowers of Paradise*, and not *Flowers of Adonis*, or Something worse; as too many are that you have hitherto used. If you believe the Doctrine of *Predestination* to be true,

true, preach it humbly, as your Opinion, and give the best Reasons you can for it. And if a *Generalist* believes the Doctrine of *General Redemption* to be true, let him as humbly preach it as his Opinion, and give his Reasons. But do not you doom him to Hell, because he believes Christ *tasted Death for every Man*, and will not preach what he does *not* believe. If you think a true Believer can never fall from Grace, preach so with Humility, as it is your Opinion, giving your Reasons. And if a *Generalist* believes that a justified Man may make *shipwreck of Faith and of a good Conscience*, let him preach so, giving his Reasons: But do not you consign him over to the Devil, because he will not *play the Hypocrite*, and preach contrary to his Conscience. In a Word, *Think and let think*, at pleasure, in all Points which do not enter into the *Essentials* of Religion. An *Arminian*, as well as you, believes, that *there is no other Name (or Thing) under Heaven given among Men, whereby they can be saved, but only the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ*, and that *there is Salvation in none other*. And believing in this Name, and through Faith *having the Heart sprinkled from an evil Conscience, and the Body washed with pure Water*, both the *Generalist* and the *Predestinarian* are equally sure of Heaven. Our great Business then, next to believing in Jesus Christ, is, to pray earnestly to God that he would give us a *sound Judgment, an upright Heart, a forbearing Spirit*, tempered with *prudent Zeal*, and *holy, humble Love*, and *Grace to serve Him acceptably with Reverence and godly Fear*; that so living to God here, we may live *with God* for ever hereafter. This is my earnest and hearty Prayer, for myself, for you, and for all that profess the Religion of Jesus Christ, our *common Lord* and *only Saviour*. *Amen.*

2 1 2 1 1