



Bodleian Libraries

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

This book is part of the collection held by the Bodleian Libraries and scanned by Google, Inc. for the Google Books Library Project.

For more information see:

<http://www.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/dbooks>



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 2.0 UK: England & Wales (CC BY-NC-SA 2.0) licence.

ANIMADVERSIONS

ON THE

Rev. Mr. E. HARWOOD'S

AFFECTIONATE and CANDID

LETTER,

TO THE

Rev. Mr. CALEB EVANS.

By a BY-STANDER. ~

Μητε γελῶτα ἀποπειρῆ σπρηγῆ, μητε λογον μετα θρασυας αποδεχεσθαι,
το μεν γαρ ἀνοητον, το δε μαυικον.

Isocrat.

B R I S T O L :

Printed and sold by S. FARLEY, in *Castle-Green*; sold also
by T. CADELL, and PALMER and BECKET, in *Wine-
street*;---and by G. KEITH, in *Gracechurch-street*; and
J. JOHNSON, in *Pater-noster-Road*, London. 1767.

[Price SIX-PENCE.]



ANIMADVERSIONS, &c.

A TRULY charitable and benevolent temper is admired and applauded by most men; and he who is possessed of it, seldom fails to engage the esteem and affection of the pious and good of all denominations. But there are some who talk much about candor and charity, meekness and benevolence, and yet, when they are put to the trial, frequently discover a censorious, bigotted, proud and malevolent temper. This is too frequently the case with writers who presume to reprove others for the *want* of candor. And yet what can be more ridiculous, than to see a man exceed the bounds of moderation and decency, and discover a spirit of levity, ran-

cor and malice, while he is declaiming *against* this temper, and pleading for a spirit of moderation and love? To such a man may it not be said in language similar to that in which St. Paul reproveth some sort of teachers---- Dost thou teach us that a man should be candid, and art thou censorious? Dost thou teach that a man should be moderate, and art thou a bigot? Dost thou teach that a man should be humble, and art thou proud? Dost thou teach that a man should be benevolent, and art thou malevolent? Dost thou teach that a man has a *right* of private judgment, and dost thou *censure* a man for declaring his private judgment?

MR. E---s being desired by the society in Broad-mead to deliver, previous to his ordination, a confession of his faith, complied with their request, and freely declared his private judgment; to which Mr. H-----d says every man has a right; and yet he very uncharitably censures Mr. E---s for maintaining this right; inveighing *most vehemently*
against

againſt Mr. E---s's faith, as *heretical* and *diabolical*; and declaring, upon this account, he will have no more to ſay *to him*, or *any* who are of *his* ſentiments.——This, I believe, is the firſt time of late years, in Briſtol at leaſt, of a miniſter's being reproached for making a confeſſion of his faith, when deſired to do it by the people to whom he was called to miniſter.

I SHALL not pretend to enter into a detail of arguments to defend thoſe ſentiments which Mr. H-----d has pronounced diabolical; for who will not believe that they are ſo, now Mr. H-----d has aſſerted it? Nor ſhall I pretend to ſay a word againſt the decency and propriety of his introducing the famous *knight of la Mancha*---and the delicate *Dulcinea* his miſtreſs; for thoſe who have read that very inſtructive hiſtory of the knight-errant muſt be ſtruck with the beautiful compariſon. Mr. E---s is the *knight of la Mancha*, his principles are *Dulcinea*, and in conſcientiouſly adhering to them,
he

he acts as extravagant and ridiculous a part as the *knight-errant of la Mancha*.----O, who can be compared to our author, for illustrations and comparisons! And I hope to make it appear before I have done with him, that he is equally as famous for his candor and consistencies.----So great is his good temper and candor, that he must step a little out of his path to pay a compliment to Mr. E---s's father, for an expression, the propriety of which none can dispute, though it is not quite elegant enough for the fine taste of our letter-writer.

BUT let us attend to a few of his *consistencies*, or rather *inconsistencies*. With a contemptuous sneer at the society in Broad-mead and at all the ministers who were present at Mr. E---s's ordination, and assisted in the solemnities of the day, he says to him, p. 5. *I hope, Sir, your mind was in the same situation, as I know mine was immediately before ordination.* Well, this is very charitable; for it is to be supposed

supposed that Mr. H-----d's mind was in a very good situation, *when he considered the solemn transactions of a minister at his ordination, and anticipated in his mind that awful and approaching day*: but it seems that Mr. E---s's mind was in a very *bad* situation; *for he could not be contented with making an open confession of his faith, without throwing contempt on others, and spitting out on them the aconite of a spiteful spirit, and mixing with what he apprehended the pure and unadulterated doctrines of Christianity, the leaven of spite, malice and uncharitableness against other churches that differ from him;* which Mr. H-----d hopes is *new and unprecedented*.----And yet, at the same time, he hopes that Mr. E---s's mind was in the *same situation* as *his* was before ordination. If this was the situation of Mr. H-----d's mind before his ordination, why does he then blame Mr. E---s for discovering the same? What! a man find fault with the picture of himself? strange indeed! And yet it appears that Mr. H-----d in all the bitter things he says of Mr. E---s, speaks against himself: so that the reader will remember,

remember, while Mr. H-----d is buffetting Mr. E---s, he is cuffing about his own delectable image.

BUT, says Mr. H-----d, p. 7. "I would no more quarrel with a man for the *complexion* of his *mind* than for the *complexion* of his *person*." And to be sure it must be a very foolish and ridiculous thing for one man to quarrel with another for the complexion of his person. Now he does not say that he will not quarrel with a man *either* for the complexion of his mind *or* the complexion of his person. Had he said so, I might then have only replied, Sir, you *do* quarrel with Mr. E---s for the complexion of *his* mind. And consequently Mr. H-----d will quarrel with a man both for the *complexion* of his *person* and for the *complexion* of his *mind*.

"You will allow me, Sir, (says he p. 12.) to make a few remarks upon a confession of faith, which appears to me and many others so distinguishingly singular"---And in these
 remarks

remarks he says to Mr. E---s “ *I shall be as free with you, Sir, as you have been with me, to which you ever were, I assure you, extremely welcome.* But by the manner of Mr. H-----d’s writing his sincerity in this declaration is suspicious; for he writes against Mr. E---s like one who is evidently animated with rage, and prompted by a spirit of revenge. This I think appears throughout the whole of his letter; and had Mr. E---s been extremely welcome to the freedom he has ever taken with Mr. H-----d, I can by no means think that he would have wrote to him in such a spirit as that by which this letter was evidently dictated.

Mr. E---s says, “ that the right of private judgment is the undoubted and unalienable privilege of every rational, intelligent creature.” Now Mr. H-----d would, if possible, find fault with this, tho’ it is quite agreeable to his own sentiments; and, because he cannot object to what is asserted, he calls it the true *Namby Pamby*, and quotes it intelligent *creter*.

B

But

But he is diverted from this *Namby Pamby* by an inconsistency discovered in what follows. *There are various doctrines which tho' decried, &c.* But wherein is this inconsistent with what Mr. E---s says about the right of private judgment? Is it not true that there are various doctrines decried by many professing Christianity? Does Mr. E---s say that many who profess Christianity have *no right* to decry these various doctrines? No; but only that the society in Broad-mead look upon these doctrines to be the very *essentials* of the gospel. And pray have not this society a right to private judgment in this affair? Yes, they have according to Mr. H-----d's own confession. And if Mr. E---s thinks that it becomes this society to be well satisfied that the person they chuse to minister to them be well acquainted with these doctrines, and established in the belief of them; has he not a right to this private judgment? Would not Mr. H-----d himself chuse to be satisfied of the *aversion* of a minister's mind to those diabolical tenets which Mr. E---s maintains, before he would chuse
him

him to be *his* minister? But if so, according to his own way of reasoning, he would oppose the right of private judgment, and do that which he condemns in Mr. E---s. *Who then art thou, O Harwood! that condemnest another for the very same thing that thou allowest in thyself?*

UPON reading his declamation on the articles of Mr. E---s's faith, recapitulated, p. 14, and particularly the representation he gives of the doctrine of election, which one would think Mr. E---s had declared to be the sovereign choice of a very *insignificant* number to eternal life, and a fastidious culling *five* or *six*, out of *five* or *six* million, &c. I could not help making this observation; That when men set themselves to oppose the truth, the only arguments they generally make use of are illiberal abuse, false representations, and shameful scurrillity.

BUT what follows upon this vehement outcry against Mr. E---s's sentiments is truly
mar-

marvellous. *I assure you, Sir, I shall never FOR THE FUTURE be moved by any thing you shall say or write of me.* Very well; but why not moved for *the future?* for it seems by this that he *has* been moved by what Mr. E---s has said and written of him in time past. But he will not be moved for the future, because Mr. E---s now appears to be a Calvinist. And yet, strange inconsistency indeed! he tells Mr. E---s, p. 6, that at the very time he was so much moved by what he said and wrote of him, *That your principles were calvinistical in the true sublime I perfectly knew*; and then it seems he *was* moved by what Mr. E---s wrote of him, but now he says he will *not* be moved for *the future?* Why? because he now knows what he perfectly knew before. *Risum teneatis amici?*

· WHEN Mr. E---s said *that there are various doctrines decried by many professing Christians, and that many of the doctrines, in which he declared his faith, are opposite to the fashionable tenets of the present day*; Mr. H-----d supposes,
 P. 19,

p. 19, that he meant the societies of *Lewin's-mead, Tucker-street, Castle-green, Callow-hill, &c.* and says *that they are, and ever will be, he believes, decried by these societies.—that they will ever value themselves upon despising such gloomy notions, and that the ministers and people in these societies will never commend any man for the strength of his faith, but the wisdom of it.* Now, tho' I am persuaded Mr. E---s had no particular reference to these societies, yet they are heartily welcome to the fine compliment Mr. H----d pays to their superior understanding: but I believe some of them will not thank him for it. Let us however look into the scriptures, and see if any man is there commended for the *strength* of his faith. Yes verily, and we read there of *strong* faith, and *great* faith; but I don't remember meeting with the term *wise* faith or the *wisdom* of faith. Of Abraham it is said by St. Paul, Rom. iv. 20. *He was strong in faith* (ενεδυναμωθη τη πιστει) *giving glory to God.* And to the Syrophænician woman our Lord said, Mat. xv. 28. *O woman, great is thy faith* (μηγαλη σου η πισις). Now were
not

not these persons commended for the *strength* of their faith? Yes: and by whom? By those who were as judicious, as the ministers and societies which Mr. H-----d says will commend no *man*, nor any *body* of men, for the *strength* of their faith.

WE are further told that what Mr. E---s believes to be the essentials of the gospel, *have long been the reproach of the Dissenters; and that the clergy never failed in the last century to stigmatize the Presbyterians with the rigid and melancholy doctrines of reprobation and fatalism.* But it seems the Presbyterians are now grown wiser, and the reproach of Calvinism, p. 20, is wiped from their churches. Very well; wondrous light shines upon them, and glorious is the liberty they enjoy. But, methinks it is a little strange that the clergy should stigmatize the Presbyterians with the doctrines of reprobation and fatalism, since the *Presbyterians* never *acknowledg'd* these doctrines, and if they are the *consequences* of *Calvinism*, as Mr. H-----d insinuates, tho' the Calvinists

Calvinists do not allow it,---then they belonged as much to the clergy as they ever did to the Presbyterians ; for the clergy in the last century all subscribed to the doctrines of Calvinism as they all do likewise now, previous to their ordination.—See the articles of the church of England, particularly art. 17, concerning the doctrine of election. If it should be replied, but they did not believe these doctrines when they subscribed ; then I should say they were bad men, and persons of no conscience, from whom reproaches are no more to be regarded than applauses. But for my part, I have a better opinion of the clergy of the last century, and am ready to think those of our establish'd church who have any veneration for the memory and writings of such exemplary prelates as *Leighton, Beveridge, &c.* &c. not to mention any of the inferior clergy, will not thank Mr. H----d for his compliment. Have the Presbyterians however, since the reproach of Calvinism has been wiped from their societies, been more famous for their piety and the increase of their churches than they

were before? If so, they might then glory in their new light; but it is evident that they are not more numerous, that they are not more pious, and that they are not more exemplary in their lives than they were before. What is the advantage they have gained then? Why the applause of those clergymen (if such there are) who subscribe to articles which they do not believe, and who promised to defend what they oppose---great honor indeed! of which Mr. H-----d is heartily welcome to boast.

BUT Mr. E---s, it seems, is a *Papist*, or at least but a *very little* from *popery*; for he has said *that it is by no means sufficient, that a minister declares his belief of the Bible in general*; for which Mr. H-----d says *the vicar of Christ would thank you, Sir, — his Holiness thinks as you do — an ample harvest is rising up for the Jesuits*. What a *foolish* or *wicked* man must this E---s be, to say it is by no means sufficient that a minister declare his belief of the Bible in general! But let us look into Mr. H-----d's confession of faith, and see if *his*
mind

mind was in the same situation with Mr. E---s's as to this point, when he was ordained. — Yes it was; for he has said a great deal more than barely *I believe the Bible in general*. And if it would have been sufficient to have said *I believe the Bible*, why so long a confession of faith, Mr. H-----d? It is truly marvellous that a man who has so severely treated another for saying that a confession of faith in the Bible in general is not sufficient, should nevertheless add something more to *his own* confession of faith. But I forget, Mr. H-----d's mind was in the same situation as Mr. E---s's a little *before* ordination; but *now* it must be altered: yet remember, Mr. H-----d, *a printed confession of a man's principles at his ordination*, you tell us p. 45, *is an everlasting monument*. Yea, and it seems there is *no altering or revoking it*. So that if a man should think better, and see reason to *change* his sentiments, there is no such thing as *revoking* the confession he has published. But suppose Mr. E---s should renounce his diabolical tenets, could he not *publish his recantation*? And if he

C

should

should publish it, would this said confession of which Mr. H-----d complains, be then any longer *a monument of the turpitude of Mr. E---s's mind?*

ANOTHER capital charge is, that Mr. E---s's faith must be brought to *certain discriminating tests and terms of ordination, which are esteemed sacred, and infinitely important—ininitely more so than the Bible.* p. 24. But what a flagrant misrepresentation is this of what Mr. E—s has said? Had these *tests and terms*, of which Mr. H——d complains, been derived from *any other* book than the Bible, or handed down by *tradition* and received as such, an objection might be made to them; yet then Mr. H——d could not prove that they are esteemed *infinitely more important than the Bible*, by that *illustrious protestant society* he speaks of. But it unfortunately happens, unfortunate I mean for Mr. H——d in this controversy, that this said Protestant society believe these doctrines which Mr. H——d, not Mr. E—s, calls *tests and terms*, to be contained

tained *in the Bible*, and *to that* they appeal for the truth of them; and can join *Chillingworth* as well as Mr. H——d, in saying *The Bible, the Bible is the religion of Protestants!* And to this Book has Mr. E—s appealed for the rectitude of his faith, resting it *solely* on the authority of the Bible. Those then who adhere to the system of faith delivered by Mr. E—s, are in no great danger of being led by the Jesuits to Rome; for they are as far from Popery as Mr. H——d is, and those who are led by him.

BUT if we will believe Mr. H——d, “it is very strange language from a Dissenter, which yet Mr. E—s uses, to say not only *that churches have a right to require from their ministers satisfaction in what they apprehend to be the soundness of their faith*; but that those ministers also who join in their ordination have a right to the like satisfaction. This is very strange language it seems. Nevertheless I can hardly think that Mr. H——d himself, notwithstanding his extensive charity, and tho’ he says *he has*

a heart too ample for any system, I can hardly think that he would join in the ordination of a minister, if he was not satisfied that his faith was more sound than he apprehends Mr. E—s's to be. For according to Mr. H——d's account, Mr. E—s's sentiments are *diabolical*, and those who hold and propagate the same are cultivating the soil for a plentiful harvest to be reaped by the Jesuits. Surely then it cannot be supposed that Mr. H——d would join in the ordination of *such ministers*. O H——d, H——d! how *inconsistently* dost thou talk! whilst writing against Mr. E—s thou art writing against thyself, and exposing the weakness of thy head, if not the badness of thy heart.

Now for a very marvellous passage in Mr. E—s's confession, *I am sensible it is now become quite fashionable jealousy and indiscriminately to decry all creeds, &c.—but they have all some creed or system of their own.*—This it seems is truly marvellous. But pray has Mr. H——d no system of his own? Yes; witness his confession;

fession; marvellous! Then why all this outcry against creeds and systems, good Sir? Because they are contrary to mine? Aye, this is the very reason; and this, as Mr. E—s says, is the grand rock of offence. But Mr. E—s has celebrated the *faith*, Mr. H—d says the *infallibility*, of the Reformers, and calls their system the glory and bulwark of the Reformation. Shocking indeed for a Dissenter thus to talk, “and a man who, one would think, must have read of the good old Puritans, and their sufferings. ——— And for what did these good old Puritans suffer? Why, Mr. H—d would make us believe, and he may make those believe who will take his word for it, that they suffered for not believing the doctrines of Calvinism, and that they were of Mr. H—d’s sentiments. But it is well known to those who have read the history of these Puritans, that they were Calvinists in principle, notwithstanding they suffer’d for their non-conformity to the discipline and ceremonies of the church of England.

NEVER-

NEVERTHELESS our author says, p. 31, *The Reformers were great and glorious characters. But then as for your predestination and your personal election, and your original sin, and your imputed righteousness, and your Athanasian consubstantiality, and your other curiosities, this your particular system they sealed and sanctified as the bulwark and glory of the Reformation.* And this they did for a very good reason, which is this: They saw that these doctrines were evidently contained in the Bible. And on the other hand, they rejected the *Pope's supremacy and infallibility, transubstantiation and auricular confession, penance and purgatory, &c.* because they were things no where to be found in the Bible. And could Mr. H——d prove that the particular system which the Reformers sealed and sanctified as the *bulwark and glory of the Reformation*, has no more foundation in the scriptures than the *Pope's supremacy, &c.* then down with this bulwark, which according to our author, is built with diabolical materials.

BUT

BUT “ all *Protestants* and *Protestant Dissenters* it seems p. 33, *have some Creed and System of their own — and that is the BIBLE.*” I would now fain know what Mr. E—s is. The Bible it seems is the creed of ALL *Protestants*. The antient Reformers were *Protestants*, the Bible then was their Creed. The members of the church of England are *Protestants*, the Bible then is their Creed. The Dissenters are *Protestants*, the Bible then is their Creed. Mr. E—s is a *Protestant Dissenter*, the Bible then is his Creed. Yet, it seems by what was said a little while ago, the Bible is *not* his Creed, but the system of the Reformers. What then is the conclusion? Why you are not a *Protestant*, Mr. E—s, for the Bible is the Creed of all *Protestants*—But hold, Mr. H—d, I think, says to Mr. E—s, *This your particular system the REFORMERS sealed and sanctified as the bulwark and glory of the Reformation*; if so, then it is most evident that Mr. E—s is a *Protestant*, and the Bible also is his creed. Consequently he is a *Protestant*, and he is *not* a *Protestant*. But leaving
 this

point to be settled by the learned, I beg leave to propose the following query. Whether if Mr. H----d had been present when St. Paul exhorted Timothy to *bold fast* * (ὑπόσπουσιν υἱαινοντων λογων) *the form of sound words*; and said, † *if any man consent not to wholesome words* (υγιαινουσι λογους) *he is proud* (τελευφωλαι) *knowing nothing*, he would not have called this *creed-making, uncharitable, bigotry, &c.* and have said to St. Paul, as he does to Mr. E—s, now, Sir, I take my *final farewell* of you?

BUT what a strange man Mr. E—s is! he publicly extols that particular system of faith, which is the bulwark and glory of the Reformation: and he is so weak, if not wicked, as to think that the author of the Confessional, and Mr. H——d's learned friend Dr. Dawson, even with the assistance of Mr. H——d himself, would not change this old system for a better, nor introduce a more pure and perfect form of religion. And he has moreover said *that it is become quite FASHIONABLE zealously and indis-*

* 2 Tim. i. 13. † 1 Tim. vi. 3.

indiscriminately to decry all creeds and systematic confessions of faith: And yet 'tis the COURT, says Mr. H-----d p. 35, *always leads and establishes the fashion in all nations*; and I could never learn that these fashionable people decried creeds, &c. What a blunder then has Mr. E---s made in his use of the word *fashionable*? 'Tis a pity to spoil the wit that is displayed upon this occasion. But yet, methinks the laugh Mr. H-----d has rais'd, *must* turn a little upon himself, as well as upon Mr. E---s. For after all his flourishes about the *fashionableness* of creeds and systems, because the *court* leads the fashion; he himself calls these same *fashionable* things *old antiquated embellishments*. And in his late proposals for a liberal translation of the New Testament, he represents the enemies of these old creeds and systems, as having *gloriously* stem'd the torrent of corruption, and as being distinguish'd from the *great vulgar* as well as from the small.

THE next passage I meet with, p. 37, I know not how to reconcile with truth, or with the 9th

D

corr.

commandment. *God knows*, says Mr. H----d, *I have no design to misrepresent any man's creed or character, &c.* But does he not represent the doctrine of election as the sovereign choice of a very *insignificant* number? And does he not talk of *five* or *six* fastidiously culled out of *five* or *six* million; and *thousands* and *myriads* of immortal souls *reprobated* to everlasting damnation by an *irreversible* decree? Does he not represent Mr. E---s's notion of the *test* or *standard* of faith, as the *same* with the sentiments of the *Romish* church? Has he not represented Mr. E---s as believing that certain *tests* and *terms* of communion are *infinitely* more important than the Bible? And has he not moreover *insinuated*, that he believes *innocent* babes are damn'd *for old Adam's sin*? And I would further ask, has Mr. E---s said one word of any of these things? No, he has not. And yet Mr. H----d has the effrontery to call GOD to witness *that he had no design to misrepresent any man's creed or character.* As to infants, notwithstanding all the flourishes of this rebuker about them, Mr. E---s, I am persuaded

suaded thinks as charitably of them as himself. But it is evident that the sentence of death, passed on our first parents, in consequence of their disobedience, is executed on many of their descendents in a state of infancy. Nor are they, while in this state, exempted from numerous calamities which sin has produced in the world. Let not Mr. H-----d then charge those with holding a most horrible doctrine who believe in original sin, 'till he can prove that afflictions and death, to which we are exposed in our infantile state, are not the consequences of sin. And moreover, that there is not early discovered in children a propensity to that which is evil. For in making a frightful figure of this doctrine, dressed up by himself as a bugbear to alarm the fears and terrify the mind of the fond parent, he acts most disingenuously; and exhibits, to those who are disposed to pay a greater regard to the evidence of scripture than to the false representations of an *invidious* declaimer, not the most *lovely* picture either of his understanding or heart.

I AM

I AM now come to the specimen which Mr. H-----d gives us of Mr. E---s's most marvellous and uncharitable confession of faith, and his occasional remarks on the curiosities, of which he makes a detail. He begins with what he calls

1. THE Athanasian Trinity; which, to render it odious and frightful, is styled, p. 38, a *popish doctrine*. Now the question is not whether it is a doctrine believed by the church of Rome, for so are many of the doctrines which Mr. H-----d himself believes; but whether it is in the Bible? And till Mr. H-----d can prove that it is *not* in the Bible; which he has not done as yet, and I believe never will: I shall venture for my part to embrace this doctrine, notwithstanding Mr. H-----d's endeavours to *frighten* me from it, by calling it a *popish doctrine*; and drawing absurd consequences from it, which do by no means belong to it.

2. THE next article which comes to hand is what he calls the *horrible and truly infernal doctrine*

doctrine of *personal election* and *predestination*. Which he represents as the election of a *thousand* in a *city*, a *hundred* in a *town*, or *five* or *six* in a *village* to everlasting happiness, and by an irrevocable decree, which took place from all eternity, consigning all the rest, but these *few chosen ones* to everlasting burnings. And yet Mr. E---s says, p. 26, of his confession, he believes *that no man shall be called to an account for the abuse of privileges he never enjoy'd; but shall have a most fair and equitable trial, and be condemned, not by any ARBITRARY decree, but for the wilful violation of known duty, and so his condemnation be entirely of himself*. Now such a *false* representation as this of the matter, and pronouncing it an *infernal* doctrine, is the *mighty* argument Mr. H-----d advances against it; which to be sure must *entirely* overthrow it. For if *Mr. H-----d* says it is infernal, it *must* be so; and his ipse dixit must be *solid* argument: for to be sure a man *so* learned as Mr. H-----d is, must know what is from Hell, and what comes from Heaven.

3. You

3. "You next, says he, confess your belief of the vicarious atoning sacrifice of CHRIST for the sins of his chosen people;" and then draws this conclusion, *it seems Christ died only for the elect*. Very well, Sir; and are not the redeemed of the LORD called *a chosen generation*? (υμεις δε γενεα εκλεκτου).* But, says he, "I thought that the scriptures said, that CHRIST by the grace of God tasted death for *every man* ---that he died for the sins of *the world*" ---And he might here have added that it was said of CHRIST, *behold the WORLD is gone after him*, tho' the Pharisees did not go after him, nor the majority of the Jewish nation. But who denies what Mr. H----d says, or rather what the scripture says on this subject? Yet will any man say that CHRIST died *to save* any more of the world than what *are* saved? He died for *all* who believe and repent, and *all* and *none* but such are saved by him. If Mr. H----d therefore believes CHRIST will save him; but if he does not believe he shall not be saved. In which case it would be no consolation to him to be told that CHRIST died for him. Under
this

* 1 Pet. ii. 9.

this head he subjoins a few more of Mr. E---s's phrases, which to him appear very *curious* and *ridiculous*, as that *the Lord Jesus Christ is the alone meritorious and procuring cause of the whole salvation*. And indeed I thought so too before Mr. H----d insinuated the contrary; and to be plain I think so now, notwithstanding Mr. H----d thinks differently.—Another curiosity is *the absolute necessity of regeneration, the renewal of the heart, and the sanctification of our corrupt natures effected by the operations of the good spirit of God*. And our LORD himself says, *except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God*. And I am disposed to pay a greater regard to what our LORD says, than what Mr. H----d says on this subject. St. Paul moreover speaks of being chosen to salvation through *sanctification of the spirit*. And I also prefer St. Paul's opinion to the judgment of Mr. H----d on this point. And I moreover think what the same apostle says of the perseverance of the saints, Phil. i. 6. is of more than equal authority to what Mr. H----d can say against it. So much then for a defence

defence of Mr. E---s's principles; and I think my arguments *for* them are at least full as good as our author's reasons *against* them.

MR. E---s having exhibited to the world such a ridiculous picture of his understanding and laid open the badness of his heart at the same time.--- *Now, Sir, says our author p. 44, I shall take a final leave of you, I will never have any controversy with a man who exhibits to the world such a picture.*—But why then did he begin *this* controversy? If Mr. E---s is beneath his notice, why did he take the pains of writing to him, and of writing so long a letter as what is before me? A letter price One Penny, might have been long enough to have expressed his *contempt* of Mr. E---s, and of all those who are of the same way of thinking with him. But some apology may be made for the length of this letter, because Mr. H-----d says it is the *last* he will ever write on religious controversy “with an avowed Calvinist and Predestinarian Baptist.” And yet all gloomy and melancholy principles he *will*

evr

ever make it his ambition to exterminate; and *such* creeds, *such* essentials, *such* gibberish, &c. &c. &c. he *will* honestly *protest* against, p. 50. So that he *will* write again on religious controversy, and he *will not* write again on religious controversy.

BUT, says he, p. 46. *The christian and benevolent Baptist* (for *such* it seems the *Calvinistic Baptist* is not) *I love and honor. He is an illustrious example of integrity and conscientious adherence to the scriptures. He will be acknowledged and honored at the great day by his Lord and Master with marks of peculiar distinction.* Now if Mr. H-----d is *sincere* in what he here says of the christian and benevolent Baptist, he himself acts against the dictates of his own conscience, whilst he continues a Presbyterian. He is convinced that the christian and benevolent Baptist *adheres* to the scriptures, which Mr. H-----d says are *his creed*; and he believes that the christian and benevolent Baptist will be honored by his LORD with marks of *peculiar distinction*: and yet he himself is no:

E

a Ba:

a *Baptist*, but a *Presbyterian*. So that according to his own confession, he cannot expect to be honored with marks of *peculiar distinction* at the coming of our LORD. But he says he is *in christian communion* with the Baptists. By christian communion with the Baptists is generally understood partaking with them of the LORD'S Supper. I would fain know then with what congregation of Baptists Mr. H----d is in communion. I never heard of his being in communion with any baptist church in this city. But Mr. H----d will possibly say that I put a wrong construction on his sense of christian communion, and that he meant no more than *conversing* with the Baptists, or taking a *friendly meal* with them sometimes, and *corresponding* with them in a free and affectionate manner. Then let this be the sense of christian communion, for to be sure such a sense it will bear. But, Mr H----d, if ever you expect to be honored with marks of *peculiar distinction* at the coming of your LORD and Master, you must be a *Christian* and *benevolent* Baptist.

BUT

BUT my thoughts were so employed on the christian and benevolent Baptist, that I forgot to take notice of Mr. H-----d's concern for the *Deists*; for should any of them see Mr. E---s's confession of faith, he fears it will confirm them in their infidelity. Now to alleviate Mr. H-----d's distress on this occasion, I would inform him that the *Deists* see very plainly, without being told by Mr. E---s, that the doctrines, so obnoxious to Mr. H-----d, are *evidently* contained in the Bible. What then must be done to convert them to Christianity? Why we must say these doctrines *are not* in the Bible, and so deny great part of the scriptures that the *Deists* may believe them. This is to become *almost* *Deists* that the *Deists* may become *almost* Christians. A very fine way of making converts indeed, Mr. H-----d!

AND is there something so horrid in Mr. E---s's notions that Mr. H-----d, p. 46. *almost questions his sincerity who professes them?* Are then all the Calvinists a set of hypocrites? this is very charitable indeed, Mr. H-----d!

And

And did you think so when you joined yourself to a church in London which patronizes these principles? Now I would not think so uncharitably of you as to suppose it: but rather that, in your own opinion, you have a clearer head and a better heart than you had then; a heart to spurn the calvinistical doctrines, a head to laugh at them, and a pen to throw contempt on all who believe them.

YET, says Mr. H-----d, p. 48. “ The rights of *private* judgment I claim as the *privilege* of my *birth*, of my *country*, of my *religion*.” And to this he has an indisputable right. But why then does he blame Mr. E---s for declaring his private judgment? And suppose Mr. E---s’s private judgment should be, that Mr. H-----d is an arrogant and self-conceited man — that his principles are very erroneous — that he opposes the essentials of religion — that he ridicules the most sacred things — and that he was at the beginning of the controversies, which have been carried on for some years past in Bristol; may he not claim,
as

as well as Mr. H-----d, this right of *private* judgment, as the *privilege* of his *birth*, of his *country*, of his *religion*?

THE letter now before me, Mr. H^d. says is the *first* pamphlet of religious controversy he ever wrote. Had he said it was the first time he ever wrote on religious controversy, I should then have reminded him of his proposals for publishing a liberal translation of the New Testament, in which he abuses the good old translators, and almost every one who differs from himself—And I should also have referred him to his preface of the livery-man's pamphlet—Nor should I have omitted to mention his news-paper controversy, in which he exposed his folly to multitudes in Bristol. But as he will probably say these publications were not *pamphlets*, I shall say no more concerning them.

AND the rather as he *flatters himself that this will be the last pamphlet he shall write on religious controversy*. And it may be well for him
if

if it is; for those who have no head to dispute, and who want temper to manage a controversy, would do well to desist; and employ their talents in writing little treatises on practical religion. And I would advise him to write the next on *Christian charity*.

I SHALL take notice of but one thing more, and that is what he says of Mr. E---s's publication on the Trinity, which he styles an *unfortunate* publication.—In what respects *unfortunate*, Sir? Not as to the sale of the book, for it soon went thro' three editions. Not *unfortunate* as to the cause defended, for the book has not yet been refuted. How then? Why *unfortunate* for George Williams and his preface.

A WORD of advice to him and I will conclude. While he has a *mind to conceive*, an *heart to cherish*, a *religion to justify*, and a *country to patronize*, *freedom in enquiry* and *liberty in religion*; let him give that *same liberty* to others, and not despise and reproach them for using it. IF

IF he must dispute, let him advance *arguments* instead of *reproaches*, attend to the force of *reasoning* on subjects, instead of *ridiculing* them, and exercise christian *charity* towards those who differ from him, instead of *abusing* them. Remembering, as is suggested in my motto,—That to *laugh* at any man for his religious principles is FOLLY, and to endeavour to convince him of his errors by *vehement* declamation and *abusive* language, is MADNESS.

T H E E N D.







