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Truth and modern-deism at variance;

Which is shewn,

From a careful examination of Mr. Thomas Chubb's four dissertations,

V I Z.

His I. On Melchizedek's paying tithes to Abraham.
II. On Esau's being a better man than Jacob.
III. On Balaam's excellent character.
IV. On the people of Israel's serving the Lord, intending, their butchering of their fellow-creatures.

These heads of argument, Mr. Chubb has decorated with several curious excursions.

To the Examination, are annexed

Select remarks upon the Rev. Dr. Isaac Watts's treatise, entitled, the glory of Christ, as God-man. In a Letter to a Friend.

By Caleb Fleming.

London:
Printed for the Author; and sold by M. Cooper, at the Globe in Pater-noster-Row. MDCCXLVI.
[Price, One Shilling and Six-pence.]
To the Public.

I have proposed to shew, that truth and modern-deism are at variance. By Truth, I mean, Things considered and treated by us as they are in their own nature, and as they are represented in that sacred book, the Bible. As to the term, Deism, or Theism, it properly stands opposed to Polytheism, and Demonifm; as a noble Writer has observed. And is of so much importance, that a man cannot be a settled Christian, who is not a good Deist. Christianity does certainly depend upon the belief of one supreme Being. Hence I understand our Blessed Lord, when he says, no man can come unto me, except the Father, who hath sent me, draw him. And this is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent. —But I have used the term, modern-deism, in the vulgar, tho' improper sense of the word; even as it is understood to import a disbelief of the written revelation. If therefore the true deism, or the belief of one God, is a proper qualification for men's embracing the Christian doctrine, or, their coming to Christ, and working the work of God, then it will follow, that modern-deism, as it imports a disbelief of the Christian revelation, must be at variance with truth.

In Mr. Chubb’s dissertations there does appear a want of honest, careful attention; as well as a want of decency. He has made the most venerable characters the subject of ridicule. He has burlesqued visions, and angelical conferences with holy men. And his treatment of God’s having a Son, is enormously base and offensive!

He should have known, that this world has no relation at all to the great universe, before he had burlesqued the ministration of Angels. —And also that God, the infinite Spirit, has no other way of communicating his will to men, but such as he pleaseth to allot him; before he had struck so boldly at the foundation of the written-revelation. He should have known that Wisdom, Folly, Pride, Rebellion have a constitution that implies Sex, because
men are called their Sons; before he had so insolently treated the notion of God's having a Son. And at the same time, it was incumbent on him to have proved, that all men have spoken, and written absurdly but himself. In a word, he should have demonstrated, that [what we call] the sacred Writings have no claim to truth; before he had attempted to take away their authority.

I undertake to shew, that he has greatly misrepresented these writings; and that the conclusions which he draws, are quite opposite to their most obvious sense and meaning.

What pleasure either he or any man can have, in prejudicing the world against a Book, which has been the greatest means of reforming mankind, of any other in the known world, I cannot conceive. For nothing is more certain, than that all the evils, I mean, the moral evils and mischiefs that have had a place among men, are condemned and provided against in this book!—it patronizeth no falsehood, no vice, no cruelty. But, when its rules and maxims have been uniformly practised upon, it has everywhere made men eminently just, charitable and pious.

Whereas, even the public worship of the one God, now preferred to life, by our brethren, the protestants in France, would be lost in the world, if modern-deism prevail'd!

The Letter annexed, contains select remarks, which chiefly have to do with the supposed union between the Father and the Son, as constituting one common principle of action, &c. or one God, which I call, personal union.—A subject, which has very considerable concern with the credibility of the Christian doctrine: and therefore cannot be thought foreign to the professed design of this Treat.

I hope the whole of the examination will be found plain and conclusive: as I have carefully avoided criticism; and conducted the argument upon the obvious view of the history. But with what propriety, the public must judge.
TRUTH AND MODERN-DEISM
At variance.

An Examination of Dissertation I.

In Mr. Chubb's first dissertation, he would make it appear, that Abraham did not give tithes to Melchizedek, but Melchizedek to Abraham. The History referred to, is in the xivth Chapter of Genesis. He will have it, "that Melchizedek having prayed to God for a blessing upon Abraham, and given thanks to God for giving him the victory, he then proceeded to bless or pay his thank-offering to Abraham himself, by presenting him with a tenth part of the good things, he had brought from Salem, (for he gave him tithes of all) and then, the other nine parts, no doubt, he distributed among the
On "the rest of the people to refresh and comfort Melchizadoek toward it."—p. 8, 9. This is Mr. C's account of the matter.

It will be proper to enquire what foundation there is for this sense, in the history. And there we are told, that "Abram [for his name was not now Abraham] when he had heard that his brother Lot was taken captive, he armed, and led forth his trained, or disciplined servants, three hundred and eighteen, and pursued the victorious Kings unto Dan; where he divided his forces by night, or placed them in the most advantageous form for engagement: then he smote them, and pursued them to Hobab, on the left side Damascus. And he [Abram] brought back all the goods the Conquerors had taken, and also his brother Lot, and his goods, and the women also, and the people. And the King of Sodom went out to meet him, whose city had been plundered, [by Cheredorlaomer King of Elam, and his Confederates] of all the goods and victuals that were in it. And Melchizedek, King of Salem, brought forth bread and wine, and he was the Priest of the most high God. And he blessed him and said, blessed be Abram of the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth: and blessed be the most high God, which hath delivered thine enemies into thine hand. And he gave him tithes of all. And
And the King of Sodom said unto Abram, "give me the persons, or souls, and take the Melchizedek's goods thyself."

And he gave him tithes of all. Melchizedek first blesteth Abram, in the name of the most high God, and then he blesteth the most high God; who had delivered Abram's enemies into his hand: It immediately follows, and he gave him tithes of all. Now whether the personal pronoun, he, be applied to Abram or to Melchizedek, the relative, him, to whom the tithes were given, could properly be neither the one nor the other; but the most high God, to whom the success was owing. Melchizedek's appearing in the character of priest of the most high God, does plainly determine Melchizedek to have performed the office of Priest in this affair; and Abram must have been the he who gave the tithes of all, as an acknowledgment of the success being from the most high God.—The he, can admit of no other reference, than either to Abram's giving the tithes of all to the most high God, or to Melchizedek's doing so: the him being relative to the most high God most evidently.—So that the all, of which tithes were given, must have been of the spoil which Abram had taken; otherwise it would have had no affinity with the acknowledgment made of the success. It must be a tenth of the spoil obtained by victory.

Melchizedek, as priest of the most high God, blessing Abram in his name, and attributing the success
On success to the most high God, made the oblation Melchize- proper, as expressing the external piety of those zedek times. — And that Abram had a right of such disposal of a tenth, is unquestionable: and must have been quite satisfactory to all those, who had so lately been under the oppressive, destructive hands of these plunderers; and who were likewise witnesses of the acknowledgment made of the success, as owing to God. And that Abram did do so, is most probable from the history. So that Mr. C's sense seems quite awkward and strained, viz. "that Melchizedek, the priest of the most high God, should "carry provisions out of Salem for the refresh-"ment of Abram and his company, and ap-"propriate one tenth to Abram." It is no less than an absurdity to suppose this, when Abram himself was not perhaps the five hundredth part of those who wanted the refreshment! And it must have been unworthy the brave and generous captain of this little army, to have suffered any such decimation appropriate to himself. It could surely be no other than Abram, who gave tithes of all. And this done, in consequence of a religious, solemn acknowledgment made to the most high God, as having given him the victory.

The very design of offering a tenth, as an acknowledgment of God's goodness in the interposal, will much better suit Abram than it can Melchizedek; for Abram gave the tenth, and Melchizedek, as priest, only presented the offering to the most high God. — With great
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On great impropriety would Melchizedek have offered Abraham the tenths, in acknowledgment of the success he had had, when he had just before attributed that success to the most high God.

And as the tenths, thus offered, was an act of homage to the Deity, we find Abram, in his answer to the King of Sodom, declaring, that he had lift up his hand, or made his acknowledgment, by the tenths, unto the Lord, the most high God, the possessor of heaven and earth.

We no where learn, in the Mosaic history, that tithes were ever given properly to men, but under the character of priests of the most high God;—and tho' the head of every family in the patriarchal world, may be allowed to have been priests; yet, in the present case, Abram does not appear in that character: nor, has he only part of his own family with him, but also other families, together with the heads of them. And besides, Melchizedek, the priest of the most high God, is introduced, as offering up public prayers and thanksgivings on the behalf of Abram. It was therefore quite in character for Abram to give, by the hands of this priest, tithes of all; as an open confession that he owed his victory to God, and had the most grateful sense of the obligation.

It was no unusual thing, for men in the patriarchal age to give the tenth, or appropriate a tenth, to the purpose of a religious offering. So Jacob says, Gen. xxviii. 22. And of all that thou shalt give me, I will surely give a TENTH unto thee.
On thee. It seems to have been a religious custom, or stated method of acknowledging their dependence on divine providence.

What then, because Abram was, in a sense, a priest in his own family, but had now put on the character of a warrior, together with all the males of his family fit for arms, had succeeded in his expedition, and was met by a priest of that most high God, who had given him the victory; must this priest offer and give tithes of all to Abram? Of all what? why, says Mr. C. "of all the bread and wine, that he had brought to refresh Abram and his Company." This cannot surely be the case; for there would have been great impropriety in Abram's having a tenth; as he was but one in five, six, or more hundreds that wanted refreshment.——And, in truth, this decimation of Mr. C's is an absurd thing, in his own explanation; because, "the other nine parts were distributed, no doubt, says he, among the rest of the people to nourish and refresh them." So that, what was eat and drank by Abram's servants, was properly given to Abram: and therefore, it is very absurd to suppose, that when the history says, that he gave him tithes of all, that this could mean, Melchizedek’s giving Abram the tenth of the bread and wine, which he brought to refresh him and his company withal; since, the whole, or the greatest part of this provision would be used by Abram and that part of his family, his armed servants, three hundred and eighteen!——
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It must then be referred to Abram, and on to his offering of a tenth to God, by Melchize-Melchizedek, in thankful acknowledgment of the victory zedek, he had given him. Indeed it must be owned, that Mr. C. is not singular in the sense he has put upon the history: for Mr. Pool, in his Synopsis Criticorum, takes notice, "some will have it that Melchizedek gave the tenths to Abram. Quidam volunt Melch. dedisse decimus Abrahamo." And he adds, "So some of the Jews. Ita Hebræi nonnulli." But there appears no foundation for the opinion in the history. It could be no other than Abram, who gave the most high God the tenths of all. And we are not by any necessity obliged to confine the all to what had been taken by the five Kings from Abram's Friends and Allies, tho' I have supposed this; for, if we only allow, that the five Kings had other substance with them, besides such spoil they had taken from Abram's Allies, we may apply the all to that plunder: tho' I think it no way improper to take in both. Which ever of these ways we understand it, nothing seems more plain, than that the tenths must be of the spoil which the victory had entitled Abram unto, and that constituted the eucharistical-offering: which acknowledgment Abram, and not Melchizedek, made to the most high God.

Thus, from every light, it can be placed in, the sense is obvious; and so understood, Mr. C. would have had no occasion for his observation.
On the author to the Hebrews; ch. vii.

Melchizedek, who says, [referring to this blessing of Abraham] that without all contradiction, the less is blessed of the better, or greater.

No, says Mr. C. "a beggar may bless, that is, he may put up his petition to God for a blessing upon a King; but then, it does not follow, that the beggar is better, or greater in any respect, than the King he blessed and prayed for; and therefore the aforesaid Author's reasoning must needs be inconclusive.

But why so positive? Is not Mr. C. self-condemned? "Is he not disposed to extend his knowledge or belief beyond the means of information, and so has recourse in conjecture? and as his judgment has no proper guide, so, consequently, he determines according to the arbitrary and wandering imagination of his own mind." p. 11.

This will, I am persuaded, be the case with his attempt on the character of the author of the epistle to the Hebrews; for it is wholly without foundation: the history of Melchizedek giving him, and not Abram, the character of the priest of the most high God, and the King of Salem. Mr. C. should have proved that there was no weight, no emphatical meaning in the character of, the priest of the most high God: that such priests were many; and that Abram was equally qualified, and commissioned
missioned by God to bless himself, as Melchizedek was to bless him, in the name of the Lord. Melchizedek, that Abram was blessed with effect by Melchizedek, may be rationally supposed from the character and office of Melchizedek; and from his being the only person in that idolatrous age, who was such a King, and such a Priest. There was none before him of like character and office, and none after him, till the Messiah, the prince. Even Abraham had no such distinguished character, as a priest, tho' greatly honoured of God for his piety and virtue, and called the friend of God.

Hence it was that the writer to the Hebrews affirms of him, from the history, that the less is blessed of the better, or greater; as Melchizedek sustained a superior character to Abram, being King of Salem, and also priest of the most high God; commissioned by him, in his name to bless Abram. Abram was convinced of this, and therefore very justly and piously gave tithes of all.

Upon this historical foundation it is, that the Psalmist, prophetically speaking of Jesus Christ, calls him, a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek. And in which the Writer to the Hebrews observes, that Melchizedek's priesthood was distinguished from the Aaronical priesthood; which distinction lay in the latter having tithes appointed for them, because they were to have no inheritance among the children of Israel, Numb. xviii. 20, 24. But Melchizedek was a King, as well as a Priest.

—And
On — And besides; the aaronical priesthood, Melchizedek had a succession in the tribe of Levi: but, Melchizedek had no predecessor nor successor, as a priest of the most high God, in his family. Mr. C. is therefore mistaken, when he says, "he apprehends, that it is agreed " upon by all, that the order of priesthood, " in Melchizedek, was the head, or principal " person of every family or tribe, who was " King, and priest in his own house." p. 12. And if he will take his notions from the history, he will find, that idolatry had taken an universal spread, at the time of this intercourse between Melchizedek and Abram.

Mr. C. will not allow Christ to be a priest, after the order of Melchizedek.—why? — because truly, "Christ did not perform " priestly acts, nor exercise any priestly office, in, " and among his own family or tribe." p. 17.

Since Mr. C. seems to have mistook the order of Melchizedek's priesthood, which is of itself sufficient to make him object to Christ's being a priest after his order. But then, it does not follow, that because Christ was sacrificed by the wicked Jews and Romans, that therefore he did not willingly submit to be thus sacrificed. We, who believe his divine character, do discern, that he freely gave his flesh for the life of the world. And are assured, that had he not consented to undergo the death he underwent, it would not have been so rewardable
ble, as that in consequence of such obedience, he should have a name given him above every Melchizedek.

He shewed, by his cheerful obedience unto the death, that the doing of God's will is preferable to life; and that the utmost degree of pain should be undergone with composure, in the doing or suffering according to that will. An example of obedience, which, if followed, will entitle to the favour of God, and qualify for life everlasting. In which the moral redemption of men can only consist; and on which account he is the Redeemer of men, as he thus becomes the author and the finisher of their faith in God.

The very idea of his ever living to make intercession for us, is such a view of his priesthood as implies a personal dominion assigned him, by virtue of that obedience unto death.

And thus we regard him, as the foundation of our hope and expectation of life, even from his being appointed of God the resurrection and the life. So that his exercising a priestly office now in heaven, if it be understood to mean his being made head over all things to his church, in virtue of his ministrations here on earth, Mr. C. may call it "the towering of our imaginations above the clouds." p. 17. if he pleaseth; I see nothing in it unworthy the hope and expectation of the most rational Christian, viz. that he shall find him dignified with such dominion, as is implied in raising the dead, judging
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On judging the world, and determining the everlasting Melchi-ing fates of men.

This Writer seems greatly disturbed with what he calls, "the enthusiastic rapture St. Stephen was in, when he saw the heavens opened, and the glory of God, or God sitting on a glorious throne, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God;—and says, "that nothing concerning Christ's priesthood can be inferred from hence." p. 18.

In the idea of priesthood, which Mr. C. would seem to burlesque, perhaps there may be something ridiculous; but as having the interests and concerns of men constantly in view, I am of opinion, such a notion of priesthood may be rationally inferred. And we know, that the high-priest among the Jews, had the names of the twelve tribes, which he wore upon his breast-plate, as intimating, that he was the representative of that people.

With some analogy, therefore, the Jew-Converts might be directed, by this Christian-writer, to contemplate Jesus, as an high-priest, tho' he was of an higher order than that of Aaron; ever living to retain a concern for his people.

From hence, that is, from Stephen's vision, Mr. C. takes a tour to AbaB, and the lying-prophet, 1 K. xxii. "And by the Lord or Jehovah, "vah,
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"vah, he says, we must not understand the "supreme deity." p. 19.

If men seek to quarrel with the Writings of the Old or the New Testament, they may find a bad and perverse sense much more easily than a good one. I have looked over this history, and can find nothing to give me offence; much less, to lead me to arraign the character of Jehovah. The Jews had Prophets among them, or an order of men called so, who were trained up in the knowledge of the Scriptures; they were to speak and interpret God's words. And we read of the sons of the prophets, 2 Kings ii. 5. And of peoples enquiring of them, 2 Kings iv. 22. Ezek. xiv. 1.—And that one of their offices, was, to pray for the people, Jer. xiv. ii. xv. i. xxvii. 18. And they are supposed to have had schools or academies. But it is no where said, that all, who had the name of prophets, were good men. We read of false, as well as of true prophets, who pretended to speak in the name of the Lord. And in this xxiiiid of the 1st Book of Kings, of four hundred of them, whom Ahab had collected, false prophets, ver. 6. What sort of men they must be, one may learn from Ahab's character, given chap. xxi. 25, 26. who is said, to have sold himself to work wickedness in the sight of the Lord, and who did very abominably in following idols, as the Amorites had done, whom the Lord cast out before the children of Israel.——And it is as plain, that Jehoshaphat
On that had no good opinion of them,—as well Melchi—as that Ahab hated Micaiah the true prophet. Zedek. Micaiah is mentioned as contradicting what the battalion of Court-flattering-prophets had prophesied; and even declaring, that he had had a vision, in which, it was represented to him, that the Kings who refused his message would be prevailed upon, by a false prophet, to take the most destructive measures:—for the 19, 20, 21, 22. are evidently the language of a vision. Nor is there any difficulty in the 23d ver. where Micaiah says, Now, therefore behold, the Lord Jehovah hath put a lying spirit into the mouth of all these thy prophets, and the Lord hath spoken evil concerning thee.

It appears, to me, to be a strong irony. It seems as if the ridicule had been very apparent to Zedekiah, the principal of the false prophets; for he was so much enraged, that he smote Micaiah in open-court, ver. 24. probably, he understood that Micaiah intended him, by the spirit, in the vision, that stood before the Lord, who said, he would persuade Ahab: for Zedekiah says, which way went the spirit of the Lord from me, to speak unto thee? Micaiah's answer to Zedekiah, and his declaration to King Ahab, after he had ordered him into prison, are all in evidence, that what he had said about the lying spirit, in the mouth of the prophets, being put in by the Lord Jehovah, was the most severe and pointed ridicule imaginable! and intended to expose their message to the utmost contempt: for it is, by no means,
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capable of being understood in, the style of the grave, or the serious address; that is, as representing the truth of facts: but only a supposed tyrical representation of hypocritical appearances, put on by these men, who pretended to be the true prophets of Jehovah.

If Mr. C. should not be satisfied with this way of accounting for the Lord's, or Jehovah's putting a lying spirit into the mouth of the prophets, he needeth but to consider it as expressive of the permission of Jehovah: for in scripture language, Jehovah is often said to do that, of which he is no efficient cause at all; but only as he does not interpose to hinder, or obstruct the operations of wicked men.

In the case of Pharaoh, he is said to have hardened his heart; when it is evident, from the whole history, that Jehovah did nothing, that could naturally have such a tendency. All he did, was the not cutting him off, by any of his repeated judgments; and so allowed him time to harden his own heart. God raised him up, and made him to stand; he did not destroy him under his provocation, that he might shew his power, and declare his name thro' the earth.

And who that reads the aphorism, Prov. xvi. 4. The Lord hath made all things for himself; yea, even the wicked for the day of evil;—would understand it, as if God made men wicked. The writer cannot be so understood; for in the very next verse it is said, that every
On one proud in heart, is an abomination to the Melchi-Lord.—Men make themselves wicked, not zedek. God; he is no way capable of tempting men to wickedness: but when they are wicked, they agree to the day of evil, or, are fitted for it. He is then said to make them for the day of evil, as he appoints a day of evil, or of punishment for them.

Again, when God in his providence overrules the wicked designs of men to purposes worthy of himself, the good he brings about, is sometimes represented as if the evil belonged to his scheme; so Gen. xlv. 5. *Joseph passeth over* the wicked conduct and intention of his brethren, by a generous compassion to them, whilst they were under the intolerable weight of a wounded conscience; and bids them not be so grieved or angry with themselves, but to consider, that tho' they sold him thither, yet God did send him before them, to preserve life. Nevertheless, the wickedness was their own, tho' the beneficial event was God's; and should be marvelous in their eyes! Jehovah is therefore righteous, and acquitted of all concern in the case of the lying prophets, tho' he permitted them to deceive Ahab: for he, by his prophet Micaiah, forewarns Ahab of the evil.

Yet, says Mr. C. "the vision of the prophet "Micaiah, and of St. Stephen, of the Lord's "sitting upon a throne, and of Jesus standing "at the right hand of God, suppose the God "of Israel to be in part material, and thereby "visible;
"visible; tho' generally invisible to us: and as this raiseth a low, carnal, unsuitable and Melchizedek image of the Deity, so must be deemed idolatrous." This is the reasoning of part of 21, 22, 23 pages.

The conceit happens to be a very lame one; for in neither of these historical Facts, does the prophet, or St. Stephen appear to have understood what they saw to be the immensity of God, which can have no throne: but a glory that indicated such a presence of God there, as by no means excluded his presence any where else: yet, in both cases, it indicated a more radiant and striking display of the presence! Micaiah, as a true prophet, well knew, that in the appearances made to Moses, the displays of the divine glory, were always accommodated to the capacity and condition of Moses: and the history informs us, that they were far from impressing his mind with low and carnal ideas of God, or as leading him to suppose partly a material being: see Deut. iv. 12, 15, and onward. And the history intimates nothing like it, from the impression it had on the mind of Micaiah. The conceit is therefore without any the least foundation: for the Jewish writings, tho' they often mention the throne of God, yet they speak of the spirituality and immensity of God, with language suitable to exalt the Deity, and represent him as most adorable to the conceptions of all men, who can read the prophetic Scripture D without
On without prejudice. Let Mr. C. look thro' Isaiah's Melchizedek- prophecy; and attend to the representations of zedek. God in it, and then say, whether his mentioning of a throne, conveys a carnal and false image of the deity. Whatever may be the unhappy turn of Mr. C's imagination, I am confident, it had no such effect on Isaiah: for tho' he says, chap. vi. beg. that he saw the Lord sitting on his throne; yet he constantly speaketh of him in the most pure, grand, majestic language and style; even as the high and lofty one who inhabiteth eternity, whose name is holy! and who meteth out the heavens with a span! before whom all nations are as nothing, and are counted to him less than nothing, and vanity. Yea, from chap. xl. to the end of that book, the ideas conveyed of God, or the expressions used about him, are very far from being low, carnal, or unsuitable; tho' he saw the Lord on his throne. From such vision, he never did once dream of God's being in part material, and therefore visible; tho' Mr. C's disordered imagination has took this coarse painting. And in the case of St. Stephen, there is no more danger of any debased sentiment arising in the mind, from his seeing the heavens opened, the glory of the Lord, and Jesus standing at the right hand of God. — Every one, who is well acquainted with the language of Scripture, knows, that by right hand, when applied to God is a figurative way of expressing his active power and strength, as his name does his essential power: and he must be a weak person
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person indeed, who, because of this figure, On does conclude, that God has a right hand, and Melchi-
a left hand too, like himself. With the same zedek.
reason might we charge the Scripture with rai-
ing a debased, carnal, and false image of God, because it speaks of him as seeing and hearing,— must we therefore conclude that he has eyes and ears? And yet, what representation more awful and affecting, or fuller of Majesty, than these, viz. Prov. xv. 3. the eyes of the Lord are in every place, beholding the evil and the good!
Hab. i. 13. of purer eyes than to behold evil, and canst not look on iniquity!

And when we understand, that by right hand, applied to God, is a figure to express power and strength in a very emphatical sense, there is no more danger of any unsuitable or false image being produced, than by using the figure of eyes to express his understanding.
The phrase, right hand, is used by our Lord, Matt. xxvi. 64.

As to the heaven opening; an honest, careful mind will have no offence from the representation. It is very easy to suppose the faculties of perception in Stephen made fit, or well disposed for the vision; and this would be the very same thing in its effect, as if a medium or veil was removed; or it would be like to the drawing aside of a curtain. For, tho' God is said to be in heaven, he is said also to be every where, essentially present in all space: So that the difference of the display of his being, is, I humbly conceive, to be accounted for, from
On the different capacities and powers, both natural and moral, of his creation; added to the divine condescensions. Yet, there are high and low in a relative comparison of created existences, in the several parts of space; or high and low according to the conception of finite intelligences.

St. Stephen might then have the vision of a glory, upward, to his view; and see Jesus standing at the right hand of God; that is, invested with active power: having the symbols and marks of majesty in his whole appearance! and all this without any, the least, tendency to introduce idolatrous or base sentiments: And if so, Mr. C's remarks upon it, however sarcastical, will have no place. Let Mr. C. refer us to any other writings that are so well adapted to exalt the ideas of God, as those of the old and new Testament, if he is able.— Neither will the use of figure, admit of any objection. All writings abound with figure, and men are even incapable of discourse without it. Nay, the sublimity and excellency of all writings, has been estimated from the easy, natural, striking adjustment and application of figure.—The objectors to Revelation, can no more do without the use of figure, than the friends and advocates of it can: so that in the present case, if we but admit the propriety of the figurative expression applied to the visions related, we shall find the character of both the Jewish and the Christian historians secure from any injury design'd by this writer. The insinuation of romance, the attempt to defame and scandalize,
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scandalize, will have no place or weight, but with such who are under the dominion of Melchizedek.

The inference our Commentator would draw, from this play of his own imagination, is, p. 23. "that if the author of the epistle to the Hebrews was liable to err, and did err, as in the instances above; then, that may have been the case of other scripture-writers; I say, that may have been the case, for any thing we know, or for any grounds we have, from which we may fairly and justly conclude the contrary."

Whatever may have been the case with the author to the Hebrews, or other scripture-writers, the inference I draw from what has been offered, is, that the author to the Hebrews has not erred in the instances referred to: but this scripture-writer, Mr. C. seems to have greatly erred in his comment on him; and if he has greatly erred both in this, and in other of his writings, it will hold out to us this instructive lesson, viz. that what he says about the revelation, is by no means to be depended upon; but it must be very unsafe for any man to rely on his representation.

Thus have I done with Mr. Chubb's first Enquiry.

An
An Examination of Dissertation II.

Mr. Chubb's second Dissertation is, upon the conduct of Esau and Jacob, the two sons of the patriarch Isaac; whereby, he says, it appears that Esau was much the better man.

On "W HY the younger brother should be preferred in the posterity of Isaac, and " or whether there was any thing in reason or nature to be the ground of that preference, Mr. C. says, is the subject of our present enquiry, p. 26. He owns, " that there does not appear to be any other memoir or record but the Pentateuch only, from, and by which the character and conduct of the Hebrew patriarchs are discovered and made known to us; so it must be that record only which can furnish us with materials for the general enquiry." p. 25.

But having cited the history of Esau's conduct, in selling his birthright, he says, this perhaps is justly condemnable: p. 27. Yet in p. 29. he tells us, " that Esau acted properly in preferring a greater good to a less, when without it, he must have been deprived of both; he acted right in giving up his birth-right to save his life. So that, at the worst, Esau's misconduct was the effect of weakness, but not of wickedness; the produce of a"
"a mistaken judgment, but not of a vicious mind." And here, he again falls heavily upon the Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and chargeth him with giving a very partial account of Esau's case. p. 29.

How Mr. C. can reconcile his allowing, that perhaps the conduct of Esau, was in this point justly condemnable, with a direct justification of it, as proper and right, I am not logistician enough to find out. Or how was the effect of weakness, and the produce of a mistaken judgment, a sufficient ground of saying, perhaps he was justly condemnable?—Mr. C. will not allow this to be a good conclusion in any other case: he won't say what he here says, viz. that a man is justly condemnable for preferring a greater to a lesser good. He knows the contrary; and would pronounce absolutely, that he was justly commendable. He is therefore guilty of abuse of language, of absurdity in diction, as well as confusion in his ideas: for, at the worst, he only allows, it might have been the effect of weakness, and the produce of a mistaken judgment; but in a better light, it was proper and right for him to do it.

The historian faith, that Esau despised his birthright; by which Mr. C. thinks, "no-thing more can be meant, than that he had not set so high a value upon it as he ought, or as the case required that he should." p. 28. This again militates with the assertion
On the question of his acting properly and right. For

*Truth and modern-deism at variance.*

How can this be affirmed of him, who had not

and

set so high a value upon it, as he ought, or as

the case required that he should?

But even Mr. C's concession here, will help to justify the Author to the Hebrews, in calling

*Esau* a prophane person: for if Mr. C. will but recollect what he says in his note p. 12. of his first dissertation, viz. "that the principal person of every family, or tribe, was "King and priest in his own house;" perhaps it may follow, that *Esau* discovered his prophaneness in throwing contempt on the religious or priestly character he was to sustain *; and in wantonly resigning his claim only to gratify his appetite, that lusted strongly after *Jacob*’s mess of pottage. For it is very improbable, that *Esau*, when he return’d from hunting, should find nothing at all in his father’s dwellings to satisfy his hunger; or that there was no food there, except *Jacob*’s pottage; which Mr. C’s reasoning would insinuate. The supposition would be wild, and quite absurd; as well as the conclusion, viz. that unless he had had *Jacob*’s pottage, he must have died for want of food. His earnest manner of requesting that mess, which *Jacob* had prepared for himself, only intimates, his longing, or lusting for that particular food with great vehemence! and the barter which he makes of his birthright, with the contempt he expressed about it, after he

* N. B. I mention this upon Mr. C’s hypothesis; but don’t put it as the sense of the birthright.
had eaten, makes it probable, that there was something very irreligious in the thing.——

Neither does it appear, by the history, that Esau knew of this contract; for he wanted to have given Esau the patriarchal-blessing.

Indeed, it must be owned that Jacob used great artifice and deceit in order to obtain it; but it was his right, assigned, made over to him by his brother: thus much may be said in the favour of Jacob.

It is not to be wonder’d at, when we enter fully into the character of Esau, that we find him complaining of his brother Jacob, and calling him a supplanter. But if the Pentateuch is the only memoir to guide us in judging of the affair, Esau plainly had sold the birthright, tho’ he wanted his father to have given him the blessing of the elder son, or of Esau. "It would be a false insinuation, that Isaac did not "bless Esau;" as will appear, even where Esau plains, Gen. xxvii. 38. hast thou but one blessing, my father? bless me, me also, O my father. Upon which Isaac, we are told, blessed him, and says, behold thy dwelling shall be the fatness of the earth, and of the dew of heaven from above. And by thy sword shalt thou live,
and shall serve thy brother: and it shall come to pass when thou shalt have the dominion, that thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck.

It is pity, it is matter of some concern, that Mr. C. has not determined the nature of the birthright, or shewn us in what it did really consist. He waves this, and says, "he shall
On "not enquire whether in those times parents
Esau " had it in their power, and it was left to their
and " option to determine the state and condition
Jacob. " of their posterity, either for prosperity or
" adversity, for many generations to come."
P. 34.

Mr. C. will not expressly say there was nothing in it, because this would prove too much for him, viz. that Esau received above a valuable consideration.

But what if the blessing of the Birthright had a reference to that promise made to Abraham, that in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed? And that altho' they had no perfectly clear idea of the intention of it; yet they might understand by it, that some great person should descend from them; and that the line of descent would be declared by the head of the family: as it had been the case with respect to Isaac himself, who was to be called the seed of Abraham. So, very probably, it was expected that the person thus distinguished should name his descendant, in the direct line of the promise. Isaac seems inclined to have pronounced Esau his successor, in this line. But nevertheless, when he had pronounced it on Jacob, he found that he could not revoke it. He knew that it must be his lot, and not the lot of Esau.

Mr. C. would insinuate, "as if Esau had had great injury done him by Jacob." p. 31, 33. One would have thought, from his account, that he
he had been disinherited of the patrimony. But there is nothing like it. The Blessing is, "a prayer to God for him: and a conferring of the title of "superiority—be Lord over thy brethren." And this prayer to God, Mr. C. makes little of. —Add to this, the history says no less than that Esau drove Jacob away from all his father's inheritance; and would not have suffered him to share any part of the patrimony. So that if this patrimony belong'd to the blessing, Jacob, in Esau's intention, shall not have it. And it does not appear from the history, that tho' Jacob did see his Father Isaac before his death, that he had such share of his Father's possessions, as could give the least offence to Esau: nay, that he had any share at all. Compare Gen. xxxv. 37, 38, 39. with chap. xxxvi. 6, 7. In the former place we have an account of Jacob's visit to his father, and his father's death. In the latter, that Esau took his wives, and his sons, and his daughters, and all the souls of his house, and his cattle, and all his beasts, and all his substance which he had got in the land of Canaan, and went into the country from the face of his brother Jacob, for their riches were more than that they might dwell together: and the land wherein they were strangers could not bear them, because of their cattle.

This account does not look as if Esau had been supplantd by Jacob of the patrimonial estate. He should seem to have greatly increased in his possessions by the death of Isaac. Besides, before this, when Esau and Jacob
On had their reconciling interview, chap. xxxiii. Esau they both say, that they had enough.—So that and whatever was the distribution of Isaac's pos-

sessions, it does not appear that Esau thought himself aggrieved; but he consents to separate from Jacob, because of his own abundance.

Nor could his quitting, and leaving Jacob on the place in the least intimate, that Jacob, and not he, had the patrimonial estate. For the text says, that it was the land wherein they were strangers.—But the reason why Esau removed, and not Jacob, should rather seem to have been the greater affluence of his moveable possessions, viz. flocks, and herds, and the great increase of his family. And as to Lord-

ship, dominion or sovereignty over the per-

son of Esau, if this was intended by the Birth-

right, Jacob does not appear to have enjoy'd the title and dominion conferred by the blessing, or to have claim'd it.

On the contrary, when they meet to-

gether, Jacob treats Esau as his elder bro-

ther, or superior, and calls him his Lord, Gen. xxxiii. 14. As this sense of the blessing is prophetical, so it must refer to Jacob's po-

sterity, since he did never personally enjoy it.

The history no where mentions Jacob's exercising one single act of dominion over Esau. If therefore neither riches, nor title, nor power were the things in which Jacob supplanted Esau: but the birthright and blessing intended the conveyance of a promise, that re-

spected a very distant event; [as I think it evi-

dently
dently did] this allowed, Mr. C. I imagine, will not be so fond of laying any stress upon it. I dare say, he does, in his heart, make Isaac welcome to it; and thinks Esau a fool for crying about it.

But how will Mr. C's account of Jacob's villany stand, when we take this view of the birthright and blessing? how was he so consummate a rogue, as he would make him? If property was conferred by the birthright or blessing, alienable property, Esau and not Jacob was the accomplished villain! as he occasioned his brother to be banished, by threatening his life: and would not have suffered him to share those possessions assigned him by his father, but would have seized them all for himself.

It is true, Jacob did use dissimulation, great dissimulation and hypocrisy; and his mother assisted him in it: but then, it should be considered, that he had been the comfort of her life, and Esau the bitterness of it.—Upon the whole, there seems to be nothing so difficult to be accounted for in the history, as Isaac's blind affection and fondness for his undutiful son Esau.—And yet, in this, he was not singular. Other good and worthy men, as well as Isaac, have discovered an amazing affection for even their most profligate and abandoned offspring!—

Again, should it still be objected, that there was a difference between the birthright and the blessing? I can understand it in no other light, from
On the history, than the prophetical confirmation of the rights of the primogeniture, which Esau had sold to his brother Jacob. Esau: and which Isaac would have conferred on Esau, but, by a deception, pronounced on Jacob, and could not reverse it. For had the Blessing intended a bequest of his worldly fortune, it does not appear, but that Isaac would have had both power and a right to have altered his will, as soon as he found the deception.

Upon a review, we find, that Esau had a blessing; yet not that blessing, which would have belonged to him, had he kept his birthright, and behaved well. And moreover, that altho' there is no defending hypocrisy, yes, or deceitful stratagems in any; yet in respect of Jacob such circumstances do occur, as make his case less criminal by far, than Mr. C. would have it: circumstances which bear very hard upon Esau's character! for it seems to me, by the history, that Esau sought to have obtained the very blessing, that he had long before actually sold to his brother Jacob, and under oath too!

To proceed: Esau threatens to be the death of Jacob, in the days of mourning for his father. But says Mr. C. "tho' this part of Esau's conduct may be justly blameable, yet it had every alleviating circumstance attending it." Mr. C's Hero, it seems, must be almost blameless, tho' he be in his heart a murderer, a fratricide, a son of Cain, a child of the Devil,
Devil, in the very intention of his soul! he will vindicate this, because it is Esau. For it seems, "that tho' Esau had this in his heart, "yet because he did not hastily put it in prac-
tice, but only intended to do it at some di-
stance of time; hence there is, every alle-
viating circumstance attends this part of Esau's "conduct." p. 35.

Mr. C. who expresseth such an abhorrence of murder in other cases, has vouchsafed to say thus much, and in so bad a manner, in favour of a determined assassin.—He afterward proceeds to arraign Rebecca, "as conscious of the "ill usage that had been done to her son "Esau, who, hereupon, to prevent bad con-
sequences, prevails upon Isaac to send Jacob "away to his uncle Laban." p. 35.

The history says, one reason was, because she was afraid that Esau would slay him, therefore she took this method, that by a long ab-
fence, his anger might be pacified. Is this an alleviating circumstance in favour of Esau? but there is more than this in it; she was afraid that Jacob would have intermarried with ido-
laters, as Esau appears to have done: for she says to Isaac, I am weary of my life because of the daughters of Heth; if Jacob take a wife of the daughters of Heth, such as these [Esau's wives] which are the daughters of the Land, what good shall my life do me? Gen. xxvii. 46. and comp. xxvi. 34, 35. And Esau was
On was forty years old, when he took to wife Judith Esau the daughter of Beeri the Hittite, and Bashe-
and math the daughter of Elon the Hittite, which were a grief, [the Hebrew, as by margin,] a bit-
terness of spirit unto Isaac and to Rebeccah. Mr. C. has cited this passage, p. 31. But then, with his usual complaisance to Esau, he says, "whether he was any way blameable in " the choice of these women, the historian has " not informed us, but only, that they were " a grief to his parents; and therefore nothing " can be concluded from it, either to his " praise or dispraise."

I know not what he would expect more, from the history, to form a conclusion upon. For he speaks well of Isaac, however he may have formed disadvantageous ideas of Rebecca; he calls him Esau's tender, loving father, p. 33. But there is not any thing more ex-
press than that Esau's inter-marriage with these women, was a bitterness of soul both to Isaac and Rebeccah; and as it should seem, from the history, it was a piece of conduct not much to the praise of Esau. Yet Mr. C. won't conclude any thing about it!—He won't,—tho' it so evidently appears, that they made the life of Rebecca so unhappy to her, that she assigns it as one chief reason why she would rather send Jacob away from her, and deprive herself of the singular pleasure and comfort she had in him!—There is great room then to suppose Esau had been very un-
dutiful in this piece of conduct. That he had not
not consulted, at all, his parents comfort or pleasure in his marriages. Neither is it in the least probable, that these complaints would have been made, if he had. In the other patriarchal characters, the historian gives a particular relation concerning the parental approbation and choice; as in the case both of Isaac and of Jacob: who were married under the direction of their parents.——But Esau's marriage seems to have been an undutiful and impious piece of conduct. Besides this, whatever might have been the disposition of his wives to idolatry, or any other wrong measures which they took, had Esau retained a just and filial piety, he would not have suffered them, nor have become himself, in consequence of such inter-marriages, the occasion of bitterness of soul to his parents, in their old age.

Mr. C. seems to be a very unfair, a very partial reader and commentator. He says, "the historian has not informed us whether "Esau was blameable in his choice of those "women: but only that they were a grief to "his parents." Surely, he is a stranger to the parental grief, or he would not have treated it with so faulty an indifference. And besides, I am obliged to say it, he does injustice to the historian: for the crime was of so heinous a nature, that Esau himself is expressly said to have seen that the daughters of Canaan pleased not, were evil in the eyes of his father Isaac: and accordingly he went and took another wife, viz. Mahalath the daughter of Ishmael, Abra-

On Esau and Jacob.
On ham's son, Gen. xxviii. 8. Esau seems by this to acknowledge his wickedness, in inter-
and marrying with the idolatrous Canaanites. He is much affected with the thought of Isaac's having blessed Jacob, and sent him to Padan-
aram out of the reach of his fury; and that he might not, as he had done, take a wife of the daughters of Canaan; and he feels a pain-
ful consciousness from the thought of Jacob's obeying his father and mother, and being gone, as it reproached his own undutifulness.—These thoughts moreover, afford him the rea-
son of his not having the blessing, as he had married idolaters; and therefore his line of de-
scent would have been unworthy of the pro-
mise.—On these accounts he is now a peni-
tent, filled with remorse; but too late. Tho' in order to please his father, he will not throw off all apparent regard to religion any longer, but will go and take a wife of Ishmael's family. Notwithstanding all this said by the historian, Mr. C. can draw no conclusion!—

This may serve to abate the force of Mr. C's resentment against Jacob, played off till p. 44. At that page he begins his burlesque of "the "hieroglyphick dream of Jacob's, Gen. xxviii, "and the slow progression of the angels up and "down the ladder."

I fancy, if an heathen had formed such a re-
presentation, in order to denote the ministra-
tion of angels; [tho' Mr. C. is not fond of the doctrine
doctrines of a providence, either conducted immediately by God, or mediatel) and the thing had not been found in revelation; had it but been under the title of a philosophic dream, he would have greatly admired it!

He is offended, because he thinks Jacob has just been engaged in very wicked practices; which by no means appear to be any thing like what he has stated them: for, this enquirer has been too partial—he has not considered Jacob as fleeing for his life, from the vengeance of a brother, who would have murdered him; viz. because he, by dissimulation, had secured the birth-right, which Esau had long ago made over to him, and would have got from him the confirmation of it. Neither does he consider, that Jacob, and not Esau, had been the comfort and joy of his parents, the aged Isaac and Rebecca; and that he is now making his journey at the command of his parents, whose faces he probably must never see more.

Had Mr. C. done justice to Jacob's character, or treated it with half the complaisance he has done Esau's, he would have found salvo's enough for Jacob; he would have done this, had he made him his favourite character. He must have seen some striking marks of piety in Jacob's vow, which he mentions, p.45 and not have said, "that Jacob took care to stipulate good terms for himself, whether he trafficked with God or with men."
On

To vow a tenth of what God should give him, as a constant perpetual acknowledgment of his dependance and obligation, don't deserve to be called a mercenary stipulation; but from the pen of a man of Mr. C's age and understanding, should have been treated as a pious resolution.

Worse yet, Mr. C. says, "it does not appear that this part of the bargain was made good."—The history nowhere tells him, that it was not. "He is again disposed, contrary to the rule he proposes, to extend his knowledge or belief beyond the means of information, and therefore determines according to the arbitrary and wandering imagination of his own mind." p. 11.

He ought to have shewn, that Jacob did not perform his religious vow, which is too indecently called, a part of the bargain. Poor Jacob is very unfairly treated; but the comfort is, the attack is very futile and weak. "Jacob's vow, says he, seems to have been like that of the sailor's in the storm." p. 46.

How and where has it this appearance? why in Mr. C's imagination! but nowhere else.

He farther says, "whether Jacob's multiplying of wives and concubines, is consonant to that rule of action which the species of mankind is to be governed by, is a question I shall not enter into." p. 46.

Why
Why will he not enter into it? Is he not comparing the characters of Jacob and Esau? if he be, it was proper he should have enter'd into it. But because he should have no advantage from it in his argument, Esau's having had many wives, and some of them greatly to the prejudice of his character, shewing his want of filial piety; therefore it is, I presume, he would not enter into the enquiry.

He next follows Jacob in his journey to Laban, and considers his contract with him, as to the reward of his labour, or his yearly wages: which, he says, "had the appearance of a most fair and equitable proposal, and seemed to bespeak the proposer, Jacob, to be a man of strict honour, honesty, and integrity; but, in truth, it was an artful contrivance in Jacob to get the best of Laban's cattle to himself," &c. p. 47.

This he calls Jacob's craft and subtilty; tho' he does not tell us how he came by it.—Whether any other but Jacob, or even Jacob himself, except in these circumstances, could have produced the same effects by the same means. —But without any regard to truth or mercy Jacob is charged "with covetousness and craft, that were inexhaustible, p. 48. in draining the blood out of the veins of his uncle Laban."
He calls this, *Jacob's skill in natural philosophy*. Be it so; it then deserved *reward*. As all *philosophers* have thought, in proportion to the beneficial use they have been able to make of their knowledge. But has he proved that it was owing to this *source*? Not at all. For this being once done, and the methods of operation obvious; *others* might have made the *same* experiment, and with *like* success. But who has done it? Did *Jacob* ever do it afterward?—so that if it cannot be proved to have been owing to this *source*; it is then no more than a *romance*, to say, it was his skill in *natural philosophy*.

We will examine the *authentic memoir*, the history upon it.

*Jacob* serves the first seven years for Laban's daughter *Rachel*. Laban deceives him, and gives him *Leah*. He then serveth seven years more for *Rachel*. A flagrant proof of *Jacob's* inexhaustible covetousness!—He desires of *Laban* to let him go to his own country, with his *wives* and *children*, Gen. xxx. 25, and appeals to *Laban*, that he *knew the service he had done him*. Laban intreats him to stay, and says, *I have learned by experience, that the Lord hath blessed me for thy sake*. Had this been *Jacob's way of sucking the blood out of Laban's veins*? No, Mr. C. will say, "it " was his getting all *Laban's strong cattle.*"—*Jacob* did practise upon his strong cattle, in consequence of the liberty he had of doing so, by
by virtue of the contract. And what if Laban complains? Jacob had all along before this, served him with all his power; and Laban had deceived him, and changed his wages ten times, ver. 6, 7. He served him fourteen years for his two daughters, six years for his cattle. He had done it with fidelity and diligence. What beasts had torn, he bore the loss of, Laban demanded it of him. And he was so constant to his charge, that in the day, the drought eat, or consumed, or as the Septuagint, burnt him with heat, and the frost by night, was upon him; and his sleep departed from his eyes, ver. 39, 40. And Jacob declares, that except the Lord had been with him, surely Laban would have sent him away empty, ver. 42. It should therefore seem that Laban was the ill man, and not Jacob, and that the success of his practising on the cattle was owing to the more immediate blessing of divine providence.

Nor does Jacob appear to have been over-paid for his labour. Neither did he do the least injury to Laban. And the cattle, thus taken away, he had an undoubted right unto. So that if Laban suffered in his estate, does it not appear that it was the just punishment of his oppression and unrighteousness towards Jacob? No other reason can be assigned from the history.

Moreover, the cattle taken away by Jacob, were for the support of Laban's daughters and their children, as well as for Jacob: and for that number of persons who went along with
On with him, who had been part of Laban's Esau family: all which, the covetous, cruel Laban and would have sent away starving! Such is the Jacob, excellent character of Laban, which Mr. C. so much pities, nay, so much admires.

Mr. C. might have spared his severity on Jacob, p. 51. where he says, "that it was both impious and false, for him to make it the act of God, viz. the taking away Laban's cattle, and giving them to him,—and that he covered his evil deeds with the cloak of divine providence."

From the history, nothing seems more evident, than that it was an interpos'd of providence.—For in chap. xxx. 39. we are told, that the effect of the measure which Jacob took with Laban's plain, or simple colour'd cattle, [for Laban had removed, tho' Mr. C. has took no notice of it, all the ring-straked, spotted, and speckled of his cattle, three days journey from those cattle he allowed Jacob to practise upon,] the effect was, that they brought forth cattle ring-straked, speckled, and spotted.—But from the same history, Jacob chargeth Laban, with changing his wages ten times, chap. xxxi. 7, 8. So that when Jacob had practised upon the cattle, Laban would tell him, at one time, that none but the speckled should be his wages; upon which providence so ordered it, that the cattle bore none but speckled. When Laban saw this, then he would again change his wages, and allow him no.
Truth and modern-deism at variance.

On

no other property but in the ring-straked; hereupon the cattle bore nothing else,—and so on.

Mr. C. should not have cited this appeal of Jacob's, and then have charged him with impiety and falsehood, in fathering these productions on providence; unless he could have shewn, from the history, that this was the effect of Jacob's artifice, or cunning.

There is something in Jacob's accusation of Laban, that supposes his uncle very arbitrary and unjust in his treatment of him. And from his changing his wages, such was the appearance of providence in Jacob's favour, that his appeal lies unanswered in the history.—And that Laban changed his wages, as to the cattle, after Jacob had made use of his devices with them, is a far more probable conjecture, than that he did it before such practice upon them; because, if there had been any natural tendency, from the manner of peeling his sticks, to make some speckled, some spotted, and others ring-straked, there would have been no room of complaint: for the preparing of the rods all one way, would have been as easy a task for Jacob, as it had been to peel them diverse ways, at first. The reason of the complaint, must therefore lie, in the arbitrary alteration of the terms, after the same method had been taken by Jacob, as at the first; and in the pain which it gave Jacob, to find, that Laban would not be convinced [notwithstanding such evidence given] that it was the hand of
On of God, or the immediate interposition of providence, which secured him the reward of his service.

Jacob. And indeed Laban seems to be at last convinced of it, when he swears by the God of Abraham, and the God of Nahor, ver. 53. And prays, that Jehovah, the supreme God, would watch between him and Jacob, when they were absent from one another. And bids Jacob see, God is witness between me and thee. May we not reasonably conclude, that this method of providence in favour of Jacob, had, by this time, cured Laban of his idolatrous dispositions; and reconciled him to the loss of his Gods, or images? ver. 12, 13. I wonder Mr. C. has not more display'd the great iniquity of Rachel, in stealing her father's Gods!—he has however paid her the compliment, "of having learned the art of lying and "disimulation as well as her husband," p. 52. tho' he has not offer'd the least thing in proof of it: nor can he tell from the history, that her excuse was a lie. Neither does her husband ever appear chargeable with falsehood, but in that single instance, of personating his brother, which was done by him with reluctance, and at the strong instigation of his Mother; of whom he appears to have had an high veneration. — Where then does the charge of impiety and falsehood centre? Surely not on Jacob.—For, there is nothing in the whole history to ground it upon.

Mr.
Mr. C. is also pleased to treat Jacob's dream with great freedom, and calls it "one of his arts of dissimulation, made use of to justify himself, at the expense of his uncle's reputation." p. 49.—But what is it that prejudice will not enable a man to say? The history stuns him full in the face, and the truth of its whole thread, reflects guilt strongly upon him. When he comes to Laban's dream, he is in some sort of confusion, and says, "who, or what this god was that interposed in favour of Jacob, when his character and conduct are taken into the account, is hard to find." p. 52.

Perhaps it may, when given by Mr. C.—But by the character and conduct of Jacob, as it lies in the history, the difficulty will not be found. And one may venture to tell Mr. C. that it was the true God, the supreme God, the God of Abraham, and the fear of Isaac. Or in the language of Laban himself; it was the God of Abraham, and the God of Nahor. See Gen. xxxi. 53.

It is certainly no less than to do injury to Jacob's character, to leave him and Laban at variance, with such high charge of blame on the former: when the history would have furnished this writer with Laban's "conviction of his own crime, being the aggressor, the guilty person; and likewise his reconcilement with G 2 " Jacob,
Truth and modern-deism at variance.

On "Jacob, by a solemn Covenant;—their
 descendant, by the blood of the Covenant
 and " eating and tarrying all night together in the
 mount; Laban's killing his sons and his
 daughters, and blessing them upon his de-
 parture." Gen. xxxi. 54, 55.

And Mr. C. must own that this is a capital
 omission.—It looks too much like a writer who
 is resolved to disparage, and disgrace a char-
 acter without any foundation.

I would advise Mr. C. as a next trial of his
 skill, to attempt a proof of Cain's character
 being better than that of Abel's. It will give
 him perhaps as desirable an opportunity of at-
 tacking the writer to the Hebrews: And if he
 can but make Pharaoh's character, a much
 more excellent one than Moses's, he will ef-
 fectually and at once destroy all credit in the
 authority of the Mosaic Writings.

Mr. C. has omitted two things very much
 in favour of Jacob.—The first of these which
 I refer to, is, that the whole scheme of the decep-
 tion was laid by his Mother, Rebecca; and all
 the means were provided by her for the execution
 of it. She was able to come at Esau's goodly
 raiment; she put it upon Jacob. Moreover,
 she prepared the meat for the taste of Isaac.—
 Jacob strongly objected to the scheme; he
 says, he should appear to his father, as a de-
 ceiver; and bring a curse upon himself, rather
 than a blessing. Gen. xxvii. Yet, his mother
 insists upon it that he obey her voice; and affi-
 rites
Truth and modern-deism at variance.

fures him, that she will take the curse upon herself.—

Jacob appears from the history, incapable of having undertook, or of accomplishing the scheme, had it not been for his Mother. She makes it a point of filial duty; and removes from him the difficulties which lay before him. She engages to answer for it to Isaac, and reconcile him to the deception: which appears by the history to have been the case, tho' Isaac at first trembled with a great trembling; ver. 33.

The other thing, he has omitted of great moment, is, that in whatever respect Esau might think himself injured by him, Jacob must be allow'd to have made him restitution, by giving him his blessing.—Take my blessing, I pray thee. chap. xxiii. 11. His present, which Esau accepted, consisted of 200 she-goats, 20 he-goats: 200 ewes, 20 rams: 30 milch-camels with their colts: 40 kine, and 10 bulls: 20 she-asses, and 10 foals.—In all, about 580 head of cattle.

The manner in which he receives his brother Esau's pacific turn of mind and reconcilement to him, is very moving. He tells him, that it had given him a sort of divine pleasure, he had seen his face, as tho' he had seen the face of God.—And it argues the piety of Jacob, to express so much delight in his brother's conversion. He left him a murderer, and now meets him a penitent. Esau runs to meet Jacob, embraces
Embraces him, falls on his neck, kisses him; and they both weep; ver. 4.

These are very important parts of the history; and will by no means quadrate with Mr. C's design of blackening Jacob's character. But, on the contrary, they speak much in the favour of this renowned Patriarch. He seems to have had as great a veneration for truth, as Mr. C. tho' he once acted the part of a deceiver, in obedience to the command of his Mother. And Esau discovers a great esteem and veneration for him, when he comes to himself; and is far from thinking him that base scoundrel, Mr. C. would make him. Even Esau in the height of his power, and fulness pays him the utmost respect and deference: as a man that God had dealt graciously with! on which account he accepted of his blessing. See ver. 11.

Men, should therefore, as that calm and judicious writer, the reverend Mr. Joseph Morris observes, in his Sermon upon Elifha's calling down fire from heaven vindicated, "all men should do justice to the memory of the deceased, as well as to the character of the living; and put the most favourable construction upon their actions from the same principle of humanity, which would lead them to judge charitably of their contemporaries. It is a mean and wicked thing to misrepresent and calumniate the dead, who cannot speak for themselves; which crime will be the greater, if they deservedly bore
Truth and modern deism at variance.

"bore a good character, and are allowed to have acted well in the general course of their lives: We should not rashly suspect evil of such men, but impartially weigh all the words of an historian, and view all the circumstances of their action, before we judge of their conduct in any particular case. And if there is room for a favourable opinion, charity and justice oblige us to think the best of them."

Mr. C. is in haste, to shew his dislike of Jacob's wrestling with an angel, p. 54. "The angels were a species of beings, that very much resembled mankind, eat and drank with them: but it is not quite so clear, whether they were male and female, or do increase and multiply like men; tho' some passages seem in favour of the affirmative side of the question. Such as Job i. 6. "the sons of God were angels, from Satan's associating with them."

But what if the sons of God, should more probably intend, religious men; such who worshipped the one God in opposition to, or distinction from idolaters? It seems much more probable; so I understand it. And I presume my opinion has full as much ground as his, nay more.

In the language of the new testament, the phrase, sons of God, manifestly intends, persons of great virtue; those who bear a moral resemblance
Truth and modern-deism at variance.

On semblance of him, whether they be male or female. So John i. 12. As many as received and him, i. e. his doctrine, [women as well as men] to them gave be power to become the Sons of God. Rom. viii. 14. Those who are led by the spirit of God, are the Sons of God. comp. v. 18. Phil. ii. 15. I John iii. 1, 2.

It, at the same time, is expressive of the important privilege those persons enjoy, who duly venerate the revelation which God has made of his will by his son: even as it indicates a moral resemblance of God, which is not at all confined to sex. Men or women, who become virtuous and holy, under the means God vouchsafes them, are honoured with the character of the sons of God.

Mr. C. says, p. 55, 56.—"if there is nothing in the constitution of each individual, which denominates it either a male or female; then it is plain, that the term son, as well as daughter, is altogether irrelevant to that species; because there is nothing to ground the distinction, and therefore not the appellations, upon.—So that if God has a son, then there must be, at least, a capacity in nature for his having a daughter."—

I chuse to cite no more of this, as it is so much to the disreputation of this writer. He must own, he has ever owned, that God may properly be called, a father. I know of none but an Atheist that has ever denied this. A Theist
Truth and modern-deism at variance.

Theist cannot, however greatly he contemns the Revelation. But if God may be looked upon as a father, without applying the idea of sex to him, then he may have creatures, that deserve the appellation of sons, from their moral resemblance of him, tho' they should be of a species that has no distinction of sex; or tho' they should be creatures of different sexes in the same species. For as the term or appellation, father, applied to God, has nothing to do with a constitution that is bodily or material; so the relation subsisting between him and virtuous beings, is of a spiritual and moral nature, and will justly admit of the appellation, without any regard had to bodily constitution. In p. 112. this same writer speaks of God as the common father of mankind—and as not being the God and father of one nation more than another.—And does Mr. C. think of him as a material being, or as having a body, when he has so much ridiculed the notion, in his first dissertation?

The very text he cites, p. 57. from Gen. xxxiv, concerning Dinah's going out to see the daughters of the land, might have led him to discern the distinction intended by the sons of God, in the place before cited, Job i. 6. comp. as intending such, who were the worshippers of the true God, in distinction from idolaters.

* Mr. C. has attended but very little to the use of words: or else he would have known, that nothing was more common in the Hebrew language, [as appears from the translation we have] than to apply the appellation, son, to a disciple of Wisdom; or, the son of pride, to express a proud man, &c.
Truth and modern-deism at variance.

On But he wants to shew his resentment to Esau wards Simeon and Levi, &c. " who no doubt, and " says he, were appointed for that purpose by Jacob. " the rest; who, like thirsty bloodhounds, came " upon the city." p. 58, 59.

Far be it from me to justify an action condemned by Jacob: and that had great cruelty in it. I am as little fond of any thing that looks like cruelty, as Mr. C. can be. But I hate defamation; it is wrong in any writer. To stab men's characters is as little defensible, as to murder, or take away their lives: And I would yet have that opinion of Mr. C. as to hope, that where he fees it to be the case, he will own that it is so.

I am not assured, from the history, that any one of the sons of Jacob were concerned in this massacre, but Simeon and Levi. See Gen. xxxiv. 25, 26, 27.—And it came to pass that two of the sons of Jacob, Simeon and Levi, Dinah's brethren, took each man his sword, and came upon the city boldly, and slew all the males. And they slew Hamor and Shechem with the edge of the sword, and took Dinah out of Shechem's house, and went out. The sons of Jacob came upon the slain, and spoiled the city.

Here is no mention made of the other sons of Jacob. And it may as properly, perhaps, only properly be understood, of Simeon and Levi, those sons of Jacob, who had slain the men of the city; then entered the house of the prince, slew him and his son, brought their sister away; and after this, came upon or among the slain,
Truth and modern-deism at variance.

flain, and took away the spoil. This seems to be the plain sense of the history: for,

At v. 30. Jacob is said to reprove no one of his sons but Simeon and Levi. Whereas if the others had been concerned, they surely would have been mentioned:—but not one word of any other in the whole history. And when we read him pronouncing his last thoughts about his children, called his blessing; we find that he reproaches no one for the crime but Simeon and Levi: And yet, tho' there is not any foundation of charge in the history, Mr. C. adds to the text, "who no doubt were ap-
pointed for that purpose by the rest."—And, "probably the other sons, having the signal given "them."

Upon the whole, it is therefore evident, that whatsoever might be the resentment of the rest of Jacob's sons, to the indignity offered their sister Dinah, it does no where appear from the history, that any one of them had either laid the scheme, or consented to the execution of it, save only Simeon and Levi. None but these are charged with the crime: whereas in the comment of Mr. C. they were equally guilty, as confederates. But had this been the case, Jacob would, no doubt, have laid no such partial charge of crime, by putting it wholly on Simeon and Levi; nor from a total silence acquit all the rest. Mr. C. makes the other brethren, not only conspirators against the lives of Shechem, and Hamor his father,
On but confederates in the slaughter: whereas had Esau he attended carefully, and without prejudice, and he might have seen, that it is not at all neces-

fary to suppose them parties at all in the slaugh-
ter, but the contrary: for the history expressly says, that the sons of Jacob, who perpetrated the slaughter were Simeon and Levi; and confines it to them, by saying, two of the sons of Jacob, v. 25. " who slew all the males in " the city, then Hamor and Shechem, and " brought out Dinah their sister: after this, " they spoiled the city." Now, if these two armed men may be supposed capable of the greater exploit, without any assistance from their brethren, they were surely capable of the less, viz. that of spoiling the city, when all the men were slain.

However, in their wrath, tho' it was cruel, and in their anger, tho' it was cursed, they spared the little ones, the children, and the women; as these were supposed not to have approved the rape which Shechem committed upon Dinah, v. 29.

The history seems to have thus acquitted the other sons of Jacob, who must have been chargeable, if the thing had been as Mr. C. has represented it. Or if we could suppose them, even to have assisted in spoiling the city, they must have been looked upon as accssories to the massacre; and deserved reproof and censure from Jacob: and I see no reason of doubt, but they would have had it; and that we should have known it.

In
In p. 62. we have Jacob's character summed up. "Upon the whole, it seems to be this, viz. he was a covetous, crafty, designing man; who sacrificed truth, honour, and honesty to his avaricious views: and tho' he made a profession of great piety, and he is said to have had frequent personal conferences with God, with Angels, &c. yet his conduct, upon the whole, seems justly condemnable, and what even a wise and good man would greatly disapprove."

Whereas, "Esau appears to have been a plain, honest, undesigning, good-natured man."

I do cheerfully refer the Dissertation of Mr. C's upon these two Characters, to a comparison with what I have offered. Being persuaded that the supreme God may yet, with great propriety, be considered, as having been the God, the patron, and defender of Jacob, notwithstanding the attempt of this writer, to make it improbable, or impossible.
An examination of diff. III.

Mr. Chubb's third dissertation, is, upon the conduct of Balaam. In which he says, that prophet's character is cleared of those reproaches and imputations wherewith it has been stained.

On Balaam

IN p. 72. it is said, "that as Balaam would give no answer to Balak's messengers, until he had received instructions from God, and then he would answer agreeable there- to: this cautious conduct in Balaam seems to merit praise, in that he would not hastily take upon him to bless, or to curse, until he had consulted his principal, and was invested with proper authority for either."

We may already form a judgment of Mr. C's opinion as to prophets, and revelations, and visions, from what has been observed of him in the two former dissertations. He seems to laugh at them, as mere chimeras. Nevertheless, we shall find him mighty gravely defending the character of the prophet Balaam, as he thinks it will give him an opportunity of demolishing the authority of a New Testament writer or two. Indeed he has not quite covered the grimace of this grave defence; for he here mentions Jehovah, under the appellation of Balaam's principal! "who, or what that God was that appeared to Jacob and to Laban."
"Laban, we are before told, he thinks it hard to find: whether a being of a species like to man, that increased and multiplied, is not so clear a point; but he thinks there are some passages in Holy Writ, which seems to favour the affirmative side."—p. 54. We cannot therefore suppose him in earnest in this dissertation, but as having a favourite view and purpose to serve, viz. that above-mentioned.

However, Balaam, he tells us, 'disregarded the importunity of Balak, and all his bribes, and would not curse Israel,—he held fast his integrity. And when he saw that it pleased the Lord to bless Israel, he went not forth to receive instructions, as at other times, but the spirit of the Lord came upon him, and he propheced of, and pronounced a blessing upon Israel, p. 74, 75. Thus it appears from the Historian, that he resolved, and made good his resolution, not to deviate from his duty, either by excess or defect, that he would do neither more, nor less, than as God should direct; that the word which God should put in his mouth, that and that only, he would speak. And, therefore, whatever opprobrious names he may have been stigmatized by, whether that of conjuror, enchanter, or otherwise; yet his behaviour and conduct appear to be amiable, and which has not been excelled by many of those whose names have been enter’d upon record, either in sacred or profane history. And
And he introduces the prophet Micah as relating something that will greatly heighten his character; that by what authority he knows not. p. 76. Micah vi. 5, 6, 7, 8.' From which passage Mr. C. concludes, that "never had any man more just and proper notions of the supreme Deity, and of the true grounds of men's acceptance with him, than Balaam had." p. 77.

Here Mr. C. has borne his testimony to the passage in Micah, as giving "the most just and proper notions of the supreme Deity, and of the true grounds of Man's acceptance with him." There is something then very good in the book, which we call a divine revelation. Something, that no theist can possibly exceed.

But yet, as Mr. C. does not know by what authority Micah relates this, he seems too bold in making that use of it which he does in Balaam's character.

And truly, it appears very plain to me, that the prophet does not mention these things, as the words of Balaam, but as his own. He indeed "bids them, the Jews, reflect on what Balak consulted, and what Balaam answered." But the things he infers from those transactions are intended to shew the inefficacy of all their consultations, contrivances or schemes. — That they cannot be fairly understood as the words of Balaam, seems evident, because that prophet once and again bid Balak build altars, and
and offer sacrifices. See Numb. xxii. 39, 40. On
xxiii. 15,—29, 30. And fought after enchant—Balaam
ments, chap. xxiv. 1.

The History informs us, that Balaam did
not, could not curse Israel. But as soon as the
history of Balaam's intercourse with Balak
finishes, chap. xxiv. 25. the account takes
place, of the people of Israel committing whore-
dom with the daughters of Moab. It does
not say here expressly that Balaam advised to
this stratagem; but inasmuch as the very same
historian in another Book intimates, that Ba-
laam would have cursed Israel, but God would
not hearken to him, Deut. xxiii. 5. and that
nothing else could be the plain and manifest
design of his directing Balak to build altars,
and offer sacrifice; compare Josb. xxiv. 10.
we may fairly conclude, that Balaam would
have cursed Israel, or intimated such desire in
the several directions he gave Balak: and
was capable of giving such advice. So that
the words of Micah, will not bear to be un-
derstood as the words of Balaam.

But to this Mr. C. says, "that Balaam's
" desire to curse Israel, is not supported, but is
" rather contradicted by the more general hi-
" story of Balaam; so it carries with it its own
" answer." p. 84.

By way of reply, I ask, why did Balaam make
so much of the messengers, and use so many
stratagems to gratify Balak, and seek to please
him,
On him, by directing him again and again to sacrifice, if he had not been influenced some way, by a desire to curse Israel? The run of his history does not contradict, what the same historian has said of God’s not hearkening to Balaam, who wanted to have cursed Israel.—How is it that God did not hearken to Balaam, if Balaam had not had such desire? That he had, seems evident, and is a sufficient ground of St. Peter’s remark, viz. that Balaam loved the wages of unrighteousness? 2 Pet. ii. 15. and of Jude’s, that he ran greedily after reward.—

The Revelation made to St. John, expressly mentions him as teaching Balak to cast a stumbling block before Israel.—And the history has nothing in it that contradicts this. It is therefore infinitely more safe, to rely on the declarations of these New Testament writings, than on the imagination of any man.

Mr. C. indeed builds upon the words of Micah, as if they were Balaam’s words; but if there is no reason to conclude they were his words, but Micah’s reflections upon the vain, and fruitless attempts of Balaam and Balak, as they most probably, and I think undoubtedly are, then Mr. C’s reasoning has lost all its force, and what he builds upon it must every bit of it fall to the ground.

In order to remove all imaginary ground of objection, I will endeavour to account for the intercourse between Jehovah and Balaam, tho’ a bad man; and then put the narrative into
one connected view; by which the wide throat of credulity may be seen to belong to Mr. C. Balaam on p. 86.

That Jehovah should make such use of Balaam, as the History informs us he did, tho' a dealer in enchantments, or a famous conjurer, of whom Balak had an high opinion, may, I imagine, be thus well accounted for: viz. As it was a method of convincing the Moabites of his being the God of Israël, thro' a medium of their own chusing.—And from this condescension of Jehovah to a converse with Balaam, tho' Balaam found himself under an inability to do the thing which he was desired by Balak to do; yet, he might presume, upon the conferences he had, that in consequence of some farther use of sacrifices and enchantments, that spirit of divination which he wanted, would come upon him.

Balaam seems not to speak at any time about Israël as one who declared himself freely, but under impulsive constraint.—I have formed these ideas of him from a careful view of the history: See Numb. xxii. 13. God had told Balaam, that he should neither go with the elders, nor curse the people: upon which Balaam bids them go back; for the Lord had refused him leave to go with them. I will give an abstract of the following history, as it appears to me.

"After this, Balak sends more honourable princes. Balaam tells them, that he cannot go beyond..."
On "beyond the word of the Lord, if Balak would give him his house full of silver; ver. 18. but he would have them tarry all night: and he would try what might be done. He has leave to go. Yet, God's anger is said to be kindled against him, because he went."—The difficulty here may be removed. "The condition of leave, was, that he should be govern'd by God's direction, the word which should be said to him." And it seems highly probable, that he had been making fine promises to the princes, of his cursing Israel. "On which account, we have the appearance of the angel, and the speaking of the a.s; which were proper to convince the princes, as well as reprove the prophet for his presumption.—That this was the case, seems probable from ver. 35. where the angel suffers him to go forward with the men, only he was to take care, not to speak any word about Israel, but what should be spoke to him." This seems to me to be a rebuke for what he had said, and to give us the key. And when he comes to Balak, he tells him, that he had no power at all to say any thing of himself. Lo, says he, I am come to thee! have I now any power at all to say any thing? the word that God puts in my mouth, that shall I speak. That is, thou art never the better for sending for me, I am no free-agent in the affair: and thy princes can witness to the reproof I had by the angel, in the way,
"and also to the express order I had from him.—

"However, Balaam, on the morrow, orders Balak on a high hill, according to the custom of idolaters, to build him seven altars, and prepare him seven oxen, and seven rams. And Balaam and Balak offer'd a bullock and a ram upon each altar. These are some of the enchantments. This magician useth this mystical number of altars, and sacrifices, seven; an equal number of heaves and of rams: and says, peradventure God would meet him there. He is met, but so far from any success from his enchantments, that he blesseth Israel, and curseth the enemies of Israel, and he does it in Balak's hearing, chap. xxiii. 1,—11. And tells him he could not help it, ver. 12. Balak carries him to the top of another high hill. They do the same things over again. Balaam seems now to be more confident about meeting the Lord.—The Lord meets him, and the parable he obliges Balaam to utter, signifies his unchangeableness; and that no enchantment would lie against Jacob, or divination against Israel.—Balak now bids Balaam neither curse at all, nor bless at all. But Balaam tells him, all that the Lord speaketh, that I must do. Nevertheless they will make another attempt; at which Balaam saw that it pleased the Lord to bless Israel, so that he fought no more after his enchantments; but is again obliged to speak " of
of Israel as wonderfully victorious and amazingly prosperous! And tho' Balak's anger is kindled against him, yet Balaam is forced to deliver a flinging prophecy about the destruction of the Canaanites.

In all this account I cannot see the least intimation of any virtuous character belonging to Balaam. For even what he said of desiring to die the death of the righteous, and of having his latter end like his, was no more spoken freely by him, than any other part of the parable, from a compulsive impression made upon him. He appears to have been an idolater; and to have used his enchantments, in order to have obtained leave, and a power of cursing Israel in the name of the God of Israel, but could not.

Thus have I examined the facts from which the character of Balaam is to be drawn; and find nothing good in it. The inference which Micah makes from Balak's consultations, and Balaam's answers from Shittim to Gilgal, will teach one the righteousness of the Lord, but not of Balaam. His whole conduct which Mr. C. applauds, was involuntary. Nor is there one single passage in the whole History, that intimates either his piety or virtue. Mr. C's charging the New-Testament writers with calumny, p. 87. is quite groundless.

I have not, in these few observations, offer'd the least violence, that I know of, to the true and apparent
apparent state of the case. And tho' I no more On
delight in exaggerating a wicked character, than Balaam
in detracting from a good one; yet it appears —
plainly to me, that Balaam's was not a good
one; and that the remarks of the New-Testa-
ment writers may be justified, from that very
historian's account, who wrote the transactions
of Balaam and of Balak.
An examination of diff. IV.

Mr. C's fourth dissertation, is, upon that assertion of the Lord Bishop of Salisbury's, in a late sermon from Judges ii. 7. viz. thus far all is well. His design is to prove, that Joshua's sense of the Israelites serving the Lord, intended, their butchering of their fellow-creatures.

On Shall not undertake to defend a Writer of great abilities, as are those of the Bishop of Salisbury. He needs not my help; for if he thinks Mr. C's remarks worth his notice, he will, I am persuaded, convince the world of the inconclusiveness of the reflections made upon his assertion. Nevertheless, I will take some particular notice of the chief design of this dissertation, which, according to the late method taken by Mr. C. is to depreciate the authority of the sacred writings.

He, p. 89, 90. will consider the premises, from which the conclusion is drawn: and he says, "that by serving the Lord, sometimes signifies worshipping him, or shewing outward marks of respect, suitable to the external piety of the times, and which in Joshua's time consisted in building altars, offering sacrifices, &c. but then, this could not be intended by the historian, because in these services,
serving the Lord.

This passage, I am of opinion, is expressed somewhat improperly, as will be seen in the following respects: As,

1. When he says, that serving the Lord, is to be understood, the shewing outward marks of respect to him, suitable to the external piety of the times: I understand the outward marks of respect, viz. building altars, offering sacrifices, &c. being in themselves what would express the external piety of the times, and not any thing distinct from it; or, as what may be called, suitable to the external piety. Had he said, that these things were suitable to the internal piety of the times, he had spoke, in my opinion, more properly; but then it would not have suited so well with his design: which is to insinuate, that they had been almost totally deficient in serving the Lord, from the time of their passing over Jordan, [at which time they were circumcised, and kept the passover] till the time of the second attack upon Ai.

To suppose them influenced by a faith in the one God, and a fear and reverence of him, tho' they had not manifested that external piety, which consists in building altars, and offering sacrifices, &c. would not serve Mr. C's purpose, because the internal piety might be said to be, a serving of the Lord.
2. I can less relish that expression, of being 

serving almost totally deficient; for if it was but almost, 

there had been some one instance or more of 

Lord. 

such respect paid to the Lord, notwithstanding 

the history should not give the least hint of their 

performing any act of publick worship, until 

the end of Joshua's campaign.——But if there 

had not been any, and Mr. C's opinion be con-

clusive, viz. that from the silence of the his-
tory, there could have been none, then, his 
almost totally deficient is very absurdly expressed. 

On the other hand, to suppose that there 
might have been one public act of homage per-
formed by them, will admit, upon the same 

ratio, that there had been more or many; which 

will absolutely destroy the whole of his reason-
ing.——But, what must one think of the law 
of the weekly sabbath, or how it would ope-
rate upon them? Was it not expressive of pub-
lic homage, as they rested upon it from their 

labour, by virtue of its being a divine com-
mand; tho' they did not build altars, or offer 
sacrifices?

Secondly, serving the Lord, he says, "some-
times implies worshipping the Lord, and him 
only, in distinction from, and in opposition 
to the worshipping of idols, and the gods of 
other nations; but this, the Historian has 
informed us, was not their case; and there-
fore could not be intended by him."

P. 90.
Why so? why because "Joshua, a little before his death, called the people together, and having reminded them of the victories they had obtained, which he considered as the works of the Lord, and which the historian called the mighty works of the Lord, that he did for Israel, he exhorted them as followeth, Josh. xxiv. 14. to fear the Lord, and serve him in sincerity, and in truth, and to put away the strange gods, &c. Hence, he says, it is plain, that the Israelites, in his time, even whilst they were making war upon the Canaanites, retained and venerated the gods or idols their fathers had worshipped." p. 91.

Surely this is unfair reasoning: for, from the time of their having built an altar to the Lord, at the attack upon Ai, till the time that Joshua gives this exhortation, was about twenty-four years. At which time having been flushed with success, and beginning to enjoy a peaceful possession, the worst that can be supposed, is, that the bulk of the people might possibly become vain and foolish. But there is not the least reason to conclude, that this had been the real condition and character of this people, during the whole time of their being engaged in war; but the contrary. For they never had one single promise of success against their enemies, whilst in a state of idolatry; but must have been defeated and cut off whenever they [being idolatrous] engaged
On serving God commissiooned them to dispossess the Canaanites, was their idolatry and enormous wickedness! Let any one read the xviii chapter of Leviticus, and then say, if he can, that any people could have been more abominably wicked! Besides, Israel is threatened, that if they went into the same abominations, the land should spue them out also, ver. 28, 29. And their possession of it, depended upon their preserving themselves free from idolatry and vice, upon their cleaving to the Lord, and serving him, in this latter sense of the word, viz. worshipping the Lord, and him only: or else there is no truth, either in what Moses, or what Joshua declared. I would refer my reader to the constant declarations of both. So that if the history is to be our guide in this matter, and not the groundless opinion of Mr. C. the Israelites could not have had success in one single battle; nor have been able to have made one single conquest, had they been idolaters during the engagement. And altho', they, some of them might possibly have become wanton, and ungrateful at the time of this exhortation given them by Joshua; yet, when he declares his own choice, Josh. xxiv. 15. they appear not to have been so far rivetted in their follies, but express repentance; i.e. supposing this the state of the case.

But, I am of opinion, [tho' for argument's sake, I have supposed the worst of them,] that they, at this time, were not at all gone into
Truth and modern-deism at variance.

into idolatry. The reasoning of the former, On chapter, and of this, would lead one to think serving them no idolaters. — Joshua is only apprehensive, that this might hereafter become the case with them, upon their complete establishment, when in a state of fulness, of uninterrupted peace, and tranquility. And the very answer of the people will naturally lead one to conclude, that they had not now become idolaters; for they say, God forbid that we should forsake the Lord, to serve other gods! — Does this look like the answer of a people conscious, at the same time, of their being idolaters? Or, does it not rather express the utmost abhorrence expressed by them of idolatry?

To this Mr. C. will reply, "that Joshua says, " ver. 23. Now therefore put away the strange " gods that are among you, and incline your heart " unto the Lord God of Israel. And that hence " it is plain, that the Israelites retained and ve- " nerated the idols their fathers had served." p. 92.

I think that this is not plain: it seems more plain, that many of the idols of the Canaanites might yet remain in the land undestroyed; but since they had had experience, ocular demonstration, that they were vain and idle things, which had foiled the Canaanites in no stead; but they had every where fallen before the arms of Israel; hence it is reasonable to conclude,
Truth and modern-deism at variance.

On conclude, that they must have the utmost serving the Lord. Nevertheless, Joshua, well knowing how vain men may become, especially in easy, full, and prosperous circumstances; he thus exhorts them, with great earnestness, to put them away, and destroy them, even all those idols, and to consider them, as of the same nature and kind, with those of Terah the father of Nachor and of Abraham, who served other Gods,—and not the true God. Josh. xxiv. 2.

It is farther evident, that this exhortation, has reference to their after-conduct, and not to the character of their present disposition, from Joshua's writing their promises and vows in a book, and erecting a memorial-pillar, Josh. xxiv. 27. which was to be a witness unto them: by their recollecting on what occasion it was erected, lest at any time they should deny their God. They were immediately to destroy the idols of the Canaanites that were in the land. And see to it, that in after-times, they did not become idolaters.

It is so far from being probable, that the Israelites had at this time gone into idolatry, or retained and venerated the idols of their fathers, whilst they made war with the Canaanites, that it was morally impossible. The historian has never said it was their case: so that for any thing Mr. C. has said or can say, from the history, the second sense he has mentioned of serving the Lord, was justly applicable to Israel during the whole time of Joshua's
Joshua's campaign, and even at the time of his thus exhorting the people.

His third sense of serving the Lord we have p. 92. "Sometimes, says he, it implies, the executing vengeance, on those whom God has appointed to destruction, or, at least, on those who were declared to be thus destined, by the men who assumed the character of being God's voice to the people. And in this way of serving the Lord, it may, perhaps, be truly said of the people of Israel, that they served, or intended to serve the Lord all the days of Joshua, &c. And indeed this way of serving the Lord is represented in holy writ as highly valuable, and disobedience to commands of this sort, is represented to be most detestable." Hereupon he introduces Samuel's order to Saul utterly to destroy Amalek.

Here is evident design of burlesquing the commission said to be given to the Israelites. But with what reason? Has Mr. C. ever attempted to set before his reader the real character of the Canaanites: or once attempted to prove, that the true God had no right of thus shewing his abhorrence of their provoking idolatry and vice? or, how it is inconsistent with the perfections of Deity, that he should thus singularly punish a nation, that was singularly abandoned to all that is reproachful to human nature? And make use of a people
On people to extirpate that vile, abominable, provoking nation, in order to establish the better the first principles of his moral government among men: And in this great and awful example hold forth to the world his abhorrence of idolatry and vice!

He has done nothing like it.—Yet, I know it is said by way of objection, "that it "would have been more consistent with the "perfections of God, to have extirpated these "nations, by some other instruments of his "vengeance, rather than by the hands of men, "whom he has so expressly forbid to murder "one another."

But let the objector take a review of those wonderful, those miraculous methods of divine providence, that were made use of towards Israel, in order to convince them, [who were very backward to the task] that it was the voice of God; and that they would no more be chargeable with the crime of murder, than men are, who put to death the most obnoxious members of human society.—

Let him consider the extirpation of these inhabitants, as the historians have placed it; and it may lead him to awful and adorable sentiments of God's holiness, of his truth, and righteousness; but will, by no means, lead him to form any conceptions of God most high, but what are consistent with his character, of the Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, slow to anger, abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity,
transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty, visiting the iniquities of the serving fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them who hate him.—

Let him farther consider, that the appointment of the Hebrew nation to be the executioners of divine vengeance on the Canaanites, on account of their idolatry and vice, was an apt means of impressing them more strongly with an aversion to what was the reason of the judgment. They would see, that as they were to spare neither man, woman, nor child, who were delivered up to the sword; so it must be the case of themselves, of their own nation, if they became imitators of this wicked people.

And moreover, as all this depopulation and destruction was gradually accomplished, according to the express declaration of prophecy, all nations around had thereby a fuller evidence given them of the God of the Jews being the supreme God; and that they were separated by him, as a people whom he owned, and had taken under his protection.

The King of Moab and his princes, and the elders of Midian had had the information of God's design towards the Canaanites by Balaam, whom God made use of, as a prophet among them. And they might all have known that the God of Israel, was the true, the supreme God, during the forty years preservation of that people in the wilderness.
Let the objector further consider, that this serving very people of Israel, when they suffered a defeat before the Canaanites, at any time, it was owing either to some neglect and disobedience to the orders given them, or it was on account of their disbelief and distrust of the commission being from God, that they should utterly destroy the Canaanites. And that in their success, they always had the manifest appearances of the supreme God.—When the sum of the evidence is laid together, it will amount to an ocular, as well as moral demonstration, that God had commissioned Israel to be the executioners of his vengeance: and could be no manner of breach of that Law, thou shalt do no murder.

Mr. C. indeed says, "that supposing the Canaanites were idolaters, yet they were not singularly so; there having been multitudes of others both then, and before, and since that time, who have been equally culpable, which yet have been treated with much greater lenity. And that God should single out the idolatrous Canaanites, and treat them with so severe a resentment: whilst he winked at idolatry in all other places and times, is a supposition that greatly derogates from his honour, and therefore is not to be admitted." p. 115, 116.

This again is saying without book. It nowhere appears from the history, that there were multitudes of other idolaters, at that time, equally
equally culpable. And therefore for any thing that Mr. C. can shew, they were singular in serving their enormous vice, and abominable idolatries! His conclusions or reasonings have no manner of foundation; because, from the History, they are represented as criminal above all other people. They were appointed to destruction, by reason of their crying iniquities; they had the notice of it, by one of their own Diviners; and had forty years stay of the execution.

He says, "the Israelites cherished that ido- "latry, they were appointed to extinguish."

The history every where assures us, that they suffered and were punished accordingly, or in proportion to their idolatry, when charge-able. So that this has no weight, as an ob- jection to the divinity of the commission given to destroy the Canaanites.—With as much ease might every thing else be set aside, that this writer has offer'd, which is not particularly noticed.—He pretends to be guided by the memoir or record, and says, he can only be furnished with materials of his enquiry from thence. But he makes much more history, than he finds in that record.—

One might in the present case, ask this Writer, why he does not accuse the great God of injustice for drowning the world, by an universal deluge; sparing only one family? He that could justly do the greater, might surely,
Truth and modern-deism at variance.

On surely, with as much justice, do the less. —

Mr. C. professeth to write in honour and justice to the supreme God. I accuse him not of hypocrisy, but with the want of due attention; and would no more than he affirm, that God could, consistently commission men to do things, in his name, that are unworthy of his perfections. It is impossible he should. But in the case in question, tho' it has been made a disputable case, by Mr. C. and others; yet, I can, in my own thoughts, reconcile it as much with the perfections of God, as I can his destroying the world by a flood: and think I see in it, not only great, but wise and kind design, when I view the extensiveness of it: viz. to establish the doctrine of the one God, and spread the reverence of his name among men! —

It could not possibly be the result of imposture. The circumstances in which the whole affair was conducted, prove the divinity of the commission, both to the Israelites and to others. —

To the Canaanites, the commission had indeed the aspect of judgment, and the Israelites were to be the executioners of God's vengeance. But what then? was there not a reason? And shall Mr. C. or any man call the Governor of the world to account for it, or arraign him, at his own bar! God's judgments are often a great deep; but this, he has been pleased to explain the reason of: and it appears to be such as will forever justify him.
On

Notwithstanding this, Mr. C. is displeased serving at "Moses, and Joshua, and Samuel assuming "the Character of being God's voice to the "people."

If he will but admit the history to speak for itself, there are sufficient and convincing evidences, of their being his voice. And it was impossible that the people could be deceived in it. What they deliver, in the name of the Lord, is made good: and no instance, do I know of, that makes it suspicious. As to Samuel, the text cited, is, Sam. i. 15. I suppose he intends, 1 Sam. xv. 2. which relates the reason of the destruction of Amalek, viz. What he had done to Israel. This Amalekite

ation was the first that drew the sword against Israel, and they seem to have done it offensively; see the history, Exod. xvii. 8. probably, they attempted to have put all Israel to the sword.—It is very evident, that the Amalekites discover'd the most savage, cruel, bloody disposition, as may be learnt from Deut. xxv. 17, 18, 19. Remember what Amalek did unto thee by the way, when ye came forth out of Egypt. How he met thee by the way, and smote the hindmost of thee, even all that were feeble behind thee, when thou wast faint and weary; and he feared not God. Therefore it shall be, when the Lord thy God has given thee rest from all thine enemies round about, in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee for an inheritance to
On to possess it, that thou shalt blot out the remem-
serving brance of Amalek from under heaven; thou
the shalt not forget it.

Lord. Does not this afford us a very full reason of
the direction which Samuel gave Saul? and
was it not worthy a prophet of the Lord to
examine their publick records, and give direc-
tion about the execution of those things which
God had given in charge to Israel?—It is
certain, moreover, that there was a base, da-
flardly, as well as cruel, savage disposition in
the Amalekites; as is evident from their falling
upon the rear of Israel; the feeble and wearied!
and very probably, all the young children, and
women, that were among them. And this
they did, at a time when Israel had given them
no offence. Besides, the Amalekites appear to
have been very senseless, hardened idolaters; for,
they feared not God.—Ainsworth has observed,
that the Chaldee has it, he feared not the glory
of the Lord.—i. e. He threw contempt on the
visible symbol of the divine presence that was
with Israel.

But perhaps Mr. C. may not pay so much
regard to these pasages, as he will to what his
most excellent prophet Balaam speaks con-
cerning it. And what does he say? turn to
Numb. xxiv. 20. And when he looked on Ama-
lek, he took up this parable, and said, Amalek
was the first of the nations, but his latter
end shall be, that he perish for ever,——
i. e. utterly be destroyed! Amalek's being
the first of the nations that warred against
Israel,
Truth and modern-deism at variance.

Israel, is ascribed, as a reason of that total destruction, by this man of superior understanding! which Mr. C. allows Balaam to have been, p. 84.

The perambulation this Writer has made around the walls of Jericho, shews him to be a man of great credulity, a mere Enthusiast, one of a wild imagination; since he supposes, that the walls were delved under, or so undermined, by the Israelites, that upon their making a great shout they fell down! This deserves no sober consideration.

I leave it to observe how he runs away with the notion, "of the spies taking up their quarters with an harlot, who shelter'd and concealed them, as adding treachery to her lewdness." p. 95. If Mr. C. had been an ingenious and earnest enquirer after truth, he might have been informed, from almost any of those skilled in the Hebrew language, that the word signifies an hosstress, as well as an harlot. She kept an house of lodgings, or of entertainment for strangers. But, who would have insinuated from the History, that the spies had a criminal correspondence with her? Their business and their danger, as well as Rahab's, were enough to have excused them from such censure. And it would have been much more becoming a modest man, especially one of Mr. C's years, to have put a better sense upon the narrative. She might be an honest woman, tho' an hosstress, for aught Mr. C. knows. But because
On cause the Holofernes were so generally persons of ill-fame, our translators were led to use the word Harlot; whichsurely was not quite so proper.

However, if this woman cannot be charged with lewdness, Mr. C. will charge her with treachery: and yet, from the history, she did no otherwise than what became a wise and virtuous woman to do. Her full conviction appears, *Josb. ii. 9, 10, 11.* I know, says Rahab to the men, I know that the Lord has given you the land, and that your terror is fallen upon us, and that all the inhabitants of the land faint, or melt because of you. For we have heard how the Lord dried up the water of the Red-Sea for you, when you came out of Egypt; and what you did unto the two Kings of the Amorites that were on the other side Jordan, Sihon and Og, whom ye utterly destroyed, and as soon as we heard, our hearts did melt, neither did there remain any more courage in any man, because of you: for the Lord your God, be is God in heaven above, and in earth beneath. This looks much like a pious confession.—

Allowing Rahab to have seen things in this light, what charge of treachery can lie against her? To have done otherwise, must have argued the utmost stupidity and folly, as well as impiety! and had she not been persuaded of the truth of it, she would scarce have risked her own life, and that of all her family, as she did, by hiding the spies. For the hazard she had run of their lives, is one ground and reason of
of her plea, that their lives might be spared together with her own.

"The destruction of Jericho is the subject of a declamation, p. 97. as if upon the foot of a massacre."

Yet before such liberties had been taken, it should have been proved, that the Jews, under the conduct of Joshua, had not had sufficient proof, of its being the judicial appointment of God—and that it was some way inconsistent with his moral character.

That the innocent, or less nocent, should fall with the guilty, was quite consistent with other instances of God's judicial proceedings with cities, states, and kingdoms.—But the permission or appointment is not chargeable with any injustice; because, this is not the last state of existence into which men shall come. A retribution will open and explain the whole plan of providence; and reconcile the most knotty and difficult appearances of it. Even such, which have no apparent reason assigned of them, but was not the case of the Canaanites destruction.

However, nothing can escape the lash of Mr. C. "he rallying the folly of sending men to spy the land, when God had engaged, by promise, for their success." p. 95.

Mr. C. as an anti-revelationist, is become a very loose writer; and therefore sometimes dif-
On difficult to be understood: yet, if I understand serving him here, he has his eye to Moses's sending the one man of every tribe, to spy out the land, Lord. Numb. xiii. For he says afterwards, that these spies went to Jericho; that is, those who had been foolishly sent out to spy the land.

Moses did it, no doubt, to satisfy the people, by adding the testimony of a witness from every tribe, to avouch the truth of what he had been instructed to tell them concerning the land of Canaan. 'The spies all do agree in the fruitfulness of the country: yet the majority of them are intimidated, from the observations they had made of the inhabitants. Upon which the people murmur against Moses, and against Aaron; even the whole congregation. So that hereupon God declares to them by Moses, that they should wander in the wilderness forty years; even till the caskets of all the grown persons who had murmured, should have fallen in the wilderness; and not one of them should enter this promised land, but Joshua and Caleb.

And those very men who brought the evil report, actually and immediately died by the plague before the Lord.' Numb. xiii. and xiv. chap.

By what authority does Mr. C. charge with folly the sending of the spies? If we may rely on the history, the only authentic memoir, it was wisely done; and their murmuring gave occasion of such a testimony to the promise being
ing made by God, and to the divine mission of Moses, that was well suited to confirm their faith in them: and reconcile that people to conduct under Joshua, his successor, as became proper for them.

Mr. C. has overlooked this. He has not considered, that by reason of the Israelites murmuring at the talk, assigned them, by that Lord, who had divided the Red-Sea for them, after the miracles wrought in Egypt, that there is the space of forty years appointed for their wandering, or their different journeyings in a barren desert: all which time they were to be fed from the immediate hand of God by bread from heaven. That to convince Israel, that God had designed them to be the executioners of his vengeance upon the idolatrous Canaanite nations, ten of the twelve spies who brought the evil report about the land, immediately die by a plague.——That all the murmurers at the appointment are threatened with death; and shall have their carcases fall in the wilderness within the space of forty years; and so be deprived of any advantage from the promise of a good land for an inheritance. That the two spies only, who had brought a faithful and good report, and who were willing to have relied on the power of God, and to have put in execution the appointment, shall outlive the forty years, and have an actual possession in the good land. Mr. C. I say, has not observed how the accomplishment of these things gave full and undeniable evidence of its being a divine appointment.
On pointment: and proved, that Moses's commis-
sion was from the true God.—Had he duly
considered these things, he would not have so
boldly ventured, in the manner he afterward
does, [as I shall take notice] to have charged
that generation of Jews, which did put the
decree in execution, with murder, and inhu-
man barbarity: tho' it should happen to be
such a sense of serving the Lord, as is confined
to the execution of his vengeance.

And moreover, when it is added, that the
forty years miraculous preservation of this vast
number of people in the wilderness, proved to
be a slay of the execution of the sentence de-
nounced against the Canaanites, or an oppor-
tunity given them of learning and concluding,
that the God of Israel was the only true God,
the adventure of such an opprobrious charge
will be more perilous.—

Pray tell,—what folly does hence appear
in Moses's sending the spies?

Mr. C. seems in that 95th page to intend
the same men sent out by Moses; and after-
wards by Joshua: but I shall take no advan-
tage of this blunder, more than to observe,
that it is of a piece with his other obser-
vations.

Mr. C. will have it, that Joshua's manage-
ment of the siege of Ai, and his defeat in the
first attack, p. 98, 99. was a notable instance
of the fallacy of the pretence of being under
God's direction. For, says Mr. C. "this de-
Truth and modern-deism at variance.

"feat put Joshua into the utmost confusion at first, till he had recovered himself, and thro' his great penetration and sagacity he had found out an expedient to revive the courage of the Israelites, and to save his own reputation, as God's voice to the people. Achan had taken of the accursed thing, and that was to be considered as the ground of God's displeasure against Israel; and consequently of their being put to flight by the men of Ai. — This he calls an improper and unnatural dispensation of providence, that Achan's sin, the sin of an individual, should bring displeasure upon all Israel. For that Ezekiel has assured us, in the name of the Lord, that God is not a partial being—that the soul that sinneth shall die."

I have examined the history; and can see no manner of reason or ground of the burlesque. If that only authentic memoir be made the guide of enquiry, it will not appear from thence, that the evil was found out by Joshua's great penetration or sagacity; but by the Lord's declaring to him, that Israel had sinn'd; and then shewing him in what method he should discover the offender.— In the estimation of the Lord, Israel had sinn'd, tho' but one of all Israel was the criminal; and yet, this Lord is no partial being. When we consider the following things, this will be intelligible.

1. That a proclamation had been made thro' the camp of Israel by their General, that they should
On should in any wise keep themselves from the accursed, or devoted thing, lest they made them the selves accursed, and the camp of Israel a curse, Lord. and trouble it, Joth. iv. 18.—Hereupon they were to look upon the interests of the whole camp, as depending very much upon every man’s personal conduct, in the point of keeping themselves from the accursed, or devoted thing; which was certainly an argument of the utmost force to oblige men to their duty.

—And will not Mr. C. allow, that by the misbehaviour of one man, a whole battalion may suffer greatly, or be cut off? But will this affect the moral character of God, or even the skill of a General, tho’ the whole battalion are destroyed by reason of one man’s misbehaviour?

2. It happens, that the death which Ezekiel is speaking of, relates to the moral character and final state of men; when he says, that no man shall bear another’s guilt or iniquity, i. e. God, as judge, will not impute the crime of one man to another, as making any part of his character.—No more did he do it in the case before us; unless Mr. C. will say, and then prove, that because thirty-six men fell by the sword of the enemy, on account of Achan’s having taken the accursed thing, that therefore these thirty-six men had taken that same accursed thing which Achan took.—On the contrary, they were no more chargeable with it than the rest of the army, who did not fall in the engagement. Nevertheless, Achan’s taking the accursed thing, was the real occasion of
of this defeat; for the Lord had before declared to them, by Joshua, that he would serve consider such iniquity as what would bring a curse and a trouble upon the whole congregation. But surely, neither the Lord, nor Joshua, nor the congregation, nor any man who reads the history with care, has reckoned these men in the least privy to, or guilty of taking the accursed thing. So that the dispensation of providence appears neither improper nor unnatural; nor any way inconsistent with God's being an impartial sovereign. For, tho' innocent men may, and often do suffer greatly, even death itself, on account of the crimes of the most wicked; yet, as this belongs not to the retribution of the just and unjust, but is a part of this dispensation of trial;—so it will become Mr. C. before he ventures to arraign the dispensations of providence, to examine with much more care, to distinguish much better, and not support his favourite design, by authorities quite foreign to his purpose.—For notwithstanding all he is able to say to the contrary; Moses, and Joshua, and Ezekiel, do truly appear to have been God's voice to the people; Insomuch, that if God be truth, by the mouth of his servant Ezekiel, we may let Mr. C. and every other gainsayer be liars, much rather than either Moses or Joshua. To adopt the ungentleel language of, p. 99. where C. has appointed the odium for Moses and Joshua.

As
On As to Achan's family suffering with him, there was in this nothing extraordinary.

Something like it has been reckoned needful, in, perhaps all, however in most polite na-

tions, to preserve order, and give terror to others; or, the better to prevent the perpetration

of those crimes which would greatly affect the public welfare.——It is therefore justifiable,
as we distinguish between the moral character of the nocent and the innocent, and only look

on such severities as political or civil appointments designed for the service of the public.

Mr. C. says, it was accursed, "because in-

stead of the gold and silver being put in

God's storehouse, Achan put it in his own;

and that made it the accursed thing."
P. 99.

This Gentleman seems unwilling to do the

historian justice, when any thing lies in the

narrative unfavourable to his design. Else,

why did he not mention the vessels of brass

and iron, as well as the silver and gold, which

are said alike to be consecrated to the Lord?

Josh. vi. 19.—Truly this would have created

him some difficulty: and have broke the edge

of his drollery.——As it was proper that dis-
cipline should be preserved in an army. But
does not Mr. C. remember to have read, in our

public News-papers, what an alteration it made

in the face of affairs when the Queen of Hun-
gary's
gary's army, when engaged with the Prussians; viz. when their eagerness of plunder quite serving changed the scenery of the action. And if he would but consider the LORD, as General, and King of the Jewish army, he will see a very great propriety in this rule of discipline, that forbade plunder; and all lampoon would be spared about not putting the gold and silver in God's storehouse.

Besides, his historian tells him, that Achan pleaded guilty.—Indeed I have sinned against the Lord God of Israel, and thus and thus have I done, Josh. vii. 20. He owns great guilt, tho' Mr. C. treats what he had done, and the charge of crime ludicrously. Nay, he had hid in the earth, in the midst of his tent, the thing he coveted, because he knew it to be accursed, ver. 21. every token, every mark of guilt, and capital offence does appear!

Yet, with Mr. C. Achan is innocent, and his punishment unjust. At the same time, this Writer pretends to have all his enquiries about Achan wholly directed by the history. But surely, no man can be a more partial and unrighteous commentator than he.

The history of the tenth chapter of Joshua, likewise gives him offence, "because of the hailstones discomfitting the armies of the five Kings of the Amorites." p. 102.

But who can help it? it is not to be wonder'd at, that a man, who allows of no particular
On particular providence, should dislike any account serving of wonderful interposals. And he thinks, the that the stopping of the diurnal motion of Lord. the earth, was quite needless; since the same thing might have been effected by that other miracle, namely, the hailstones. I readily grant, that the same thing might have been effected in both cases, by the miracle of large hail. But pray why may there not be variety in the miraculous, as well as in the ordinary appearances of providence? Does not the Deity appear more adorable, when men are more influenced and impressed by such variety?—If miraculous interpositions had been always in one unvaried form; the epithet would not have belong'd to them. Nay, in the nature of things, it should seem that a train of miracles must be varied, and uncommon appearances.

Mr. C. that he may avoid the force of miracles, asks this question, "What assurance have we, that any miraculous power, was exercised by, or among the Israelites, to countenance this commission? If it should be said, that the credit of those miracles is sufficiently supported by the history, in which they are recorded: Answer, then I fear our arguments must end in a circular dance; the credit of the histories is supported by the miracles, and the credit of the miracles is supported by the histories." p. 119, 120.

He
He well saw, that if the miracles were credible, the testimony was full for the divinity of the commission: and therefore he would set these aside. But under favour, Mr. C. is obliged upon his own rule of argument, to admit as fully the truth of miracles, as the truth of the fact of destroying the Canaanites: i.e. if the History, that only authentic memoir, be his guide, as he says it shall be. And therefore his whole argument, is a vain, idle parade; that is to say, if he rejects the authentic testimony of the commission being from God, in order, that he may vilify and condemn a fact, unjustly, arbitrarily bereav’d of its legal defence.—Such treatment, in a court of judicature, Mr. C. would think no language poignant enough to reproach!——

He goes on inveighing against the destruction of the Canaanites as a most inhuman, shocking carnage! but he does not attend at all to the inhuman character and carnage of these idolaters, when they fell on the rear of Israel; and of whom the spies said, that they eat one another. See Numb. xiii. 32. a land that eateth up the inhabitants thereof.—Cannibals.—So, I chuse to understand the words. And if we look over their most hateful character, one can scarce suppose or imagine any thing too savage, too base, too vile for them to practife.

I do not understand this to be any part of the false report which the spies delivered; but reckon that consisted in representing the enormous
On mous size, and incredible strength, and fierceness serving the whole inhabitants!—Such sort of reports concerning the Highlanders, Mr. C. may remember, did greatly intimidate the minds of South-Britons: tho' it was no more than an artifice of men, of either dastardly, or of poison'd, infected spirits, who could meditate the banishment of Liberty from these Kingdoms! It was much owing to the artful spread, of their being quite an unequal match for Englishmen, that they made so undisturb'd a march into the heart of England. But the report of the Jew-spies concerning the Canaanites as being Canibals, I think very consistent with their real character, or, with the truth of the case: for this account, tho' deliver'd by the timid or evil-minded spies, is no where contradicted. Commentators indeed understand the phrase, a land that eateth up the inhabitants thereof; to intend, their destroying one another by civil wars. But this, I presume, is an improper sense, when put in the mouths of these spies: since what they said was to discourage and not to encourage: which this latter sense must greatly contradict. But the character of men-eaters would convey a most shocking, savage idea of the inhabitants.

There is no analogy, where Mr. C. says there is one, viz. "between the Israelites thus serving the Lord, by executing his vengeance upon an irreclaimable, abandoned people. And "John xvi. 2. The time cometh, that whoso-" ever
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"ever killeth you will think that he doth God service; tho' killing men is the subject of serving both." p. 108.

In the one case, they had the fullest testimony that could possibly be given, of its being the will of God, by an apparatus of miracles. —In the other, men have no testimony at all; but stand condemned by every law both of God, and of civil society that is humanized. In the one case, idolatry and enormous vice is the reason of the appointment; —in the other, religion, human liberty, a love of truth, and a firm attachment to it, is the reason of the killing. —In the one, the very executioners of divine vengeance, are threatened with equal destruction, and an utter extirpation, if they copy after the example and customs of these irreligious and wicked nations they destroy. —In the other case, they who kill, are threatened, in the revelation, with everlasting destruction for the doing so: forasmuch as the killing of another, merely because of religious sentiment, supposeth, no eternal life abiding in him who killeth.

The late rebellion, "supposed to have succeeded, is a very bad comparison, tho' called, by this writer, the rod of God's hand," p. 111.

The design of it was not to extirpate idolatry and enormous vice, but to establish them: so that we are well assured, that a popish pretender
On tender with his Scotch-highlanders, could not, by a secret divine influence, be stirred up, and the sent by God to chastise and punish us, upon a like foundation, with the Israelites.—The spirit of the whole design, its manifest aim and intention was such, all Britons might know, in making opposition to them, no man fought against God, or attempted to baffle and disappoint the gracious purposes of his kind providence towards us.—again,

Altho' the commission to destroy the Canaanites was unlimited; yet, from the Jewish constitution, they were obliged to treat with friendship, and admit among them every stranger, that would embrace the true religion, or own and worship the one supreme God.—And the very case of the Gibeonites is fully in evidence: for tho' they used deception to save their lives, yet the great plea they offer to prevail for a league with Israel, is, the reverence they had of the name of the Lord God of Israel, Josh. ix. 7. And this league they had made with Israel, was all the reason which the five Kings had to make war upon Gibeon.—Farther,—It is very probable that great numbers of the Canaanites, who were possessed of some humanity, fled to Egypt, and made up those colonies that settled there under the Pastor-Kings.

—Dr. Winder, in his history of knowledge, I think, has made it very probable, "that these invaders of Egypt, were Canaanites, who fled from before Joshua about the middle of his conquests. They had en- couragement
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On couragement from the weak state the Egyptians must yet be in, on account of their serving overthrow at the Red-Sea. And, probably, the Egyptians were struck with a panic, considering them as a part of the Hebrew-nation, who had sojourned among them as shepherds.—This made their settlement, "in the Lower-Egypt, easy.—And if his opinion be good, which I am pleased with, viz. "that the Egyptians were led to circumcise their children after the Exodus of the Hebrews—as they would think on the tremendous judgments of God upon their nation, and imagine, that this conformity to the Israelites would reconcile them to their God, as it had, they knew, distinguished his favourite people—which could not be a custom in Egypt before, because objected to the Hebrews as their reproach." The very rite of circumcision would then keep the event of that great destruction alive upon the minds of the Egyptians for ages. Their panic would therefore be at this time strongly revived. For tho' they probably behaved thus, in order to appease the God of the Hebrews; yet, they retained their idolatry, and worshipped many strange Gods: consequently, they would have no just ground of confidence arising from this compliment paid to the God of Israel.—

"The invasion made by the Pastor-Shepherd was about forty years after the egress. And Joshua's conquest of Canaan was accomplished in six years. The Doctor supposes
On "supposes these fugitives to have been less pro-
serving "flagrant and wicked, who chose not to defy or
the "oppose Isreal; which intitled them to the
Lord. "connivance of providence."

To return to the Gibeonites; when they af-
sign a reason of their conduct, in deceitfully
gaining a league, it is, say they, because it was
certainly told thy servants, how that the Lord
thy God commanded his servant Moses to give
you all the land, and to destroy all the inhab-
itants of the land from before you; therefore
we were sore afraid of our lives because of you,
and have done this thing, Josh. ix. 24. They
were deeply, thoroughly convinced of the
rightful and supreme sovereignty of the God of
Israel; and therefore form a stratagem, which
was permitted to succeed, for their own safety.
Nor do we find, from the history, that Israel's
Lord ever disapproved the league being kept
inviolable: but on the contrary, having put
themselves under the protection of the God of
Israel, they are most remarkably delivered from
the confederate arms of five Canaanitish Kings!
Mr. C. might here have seen a reason of that
astonishing phenomena of the hailstones, and of
the earth's stopping in her diurnal motion. The
miracle is philosophically intimated, according
to the truth of things, as the moon, the earth's
satellite, flood still, at the very same time, in
the valley of Ajalon. See Mr. Derham's Astro-
Theology, in his objections against Copernicus
answered, p. 19. for otherwise there would
have been no need of the moon's standing still
with
with the sun, she not being his satellite, but the earth's.

Hence one may conclude, from the case of the Gibeonites, and of the Colonies that settled in Egypt, under the Pastor-shepherds, and from the preservation of Rahab and her family, that tho' the commission to destroy the Canaanites was absolute, in the tenour of it, yet, there were conditions of mercy reserved for all such who should not oppose the authority of the true God: and that continued impenitency and obstinacy against the evidence of miracle, and after the Canaanites knew of the sentence, were the reason of the destruction, and gave it all its compass.

There is then an infinite disparity, and disagreement between the two cases of the destruction of the Canaanites, and the late Rebellion, under a popish, idolatrous pretender, who had not one single divine voucher of his commission, either to conquer or to destroy: but the contrary.

If what I have proposed to the public, in this Examination, should be entitled to the character of just and fair reasoning, then, I must be allowed to have proved the proposition, of which the Title consists, namely, "that Truth and modern-deism are at variance." For the topics are manag'd by Mr. C. in defence of the infidel-scheme. But if, on the other hand, I have failed in the attempt,
On attempt, I must ask pardon of the public, and serving of the Gentlemen, whose opinions I have in the jured.

Lord. I shall conclude this Examination, in the language of Mr. C's conclusion, with some variation. "The ground of what I have offered, is in honour and justice to the supreme Deity. "For I am God's creature, a believer in his son, Jesus; so, I think, I have a right to "take off those groundless imputations, where- "with Mr. C. has stained the characters of "good men, viz. patriarchs and apostles; the "beautiful and spotless character God most "high; and of the revelation he has made of "his purposes towards men."

ERRATA.
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A Letter to a Friend,

Containing select remarks upon the Rev. Dr. Isaac Watts's treatise, entitled, the glory of Christ, as God-man. Works V. 305

To Mr. ———

Dear Sir,

At your request, I have read over and remarked upon Dr. Watts's Glory of Christ, &c. and now present you and the public with my observations.

Pref. p. 6. He describes "our Saviour as a complex person, God and man united, so as to make up one complex agent, one intellectual compound being, God joined with man, so as to become one common principle of action and passion. John xiv. 10. the God, and the man are one."——

Could the Doctor defend this, his scheme might stand well enough. But it appears to be absolutely impossible from the nature of the pure, uncompound, immutable, infinite Spirit, that he should be so united: and the difference
difference between created, and increased, must eternally remain between the God, and the man. One intellectual being cannot become a compound of intellectuals: or God, and man can never so unite as to become one intellectual compound being. God is eternally impassible, as unchangeable; and cannot therefore undergo any union with another being, that would make him one common principle of action and passion.

Ibid. "The child Jesus, on this account, is called, the mighty God. Esay ix. 6. And God's own blood, is mention'd, Acts xx. 28. "And the intimate and present union allows him to say, John x. 38. and ver. 30. I am "in the father, and the father in me, &c."

The union cannot be personal, as is here supposed, but moral. It is of the same nature and kind with that which subsists between his disciples, and him, and his father. But if it implied one common principle of action and passion, the perfect nature of God must be changed. If not changed, then the Saviour could undergo no real suffering, nor be capable of any real reward. For says the Doctor, p. 92. "the Godhead is incapable of any rewards, "nor can a God be rewarded at all."—The God and the man could have no such union, because the will of the Saviour, was subject to the will of a superior. This will gives him law, on which account he calls him his holy and righteous Father. And the God rewarded the obedience
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obedience of the man.—The union then could not imply one common principle of action and passion.

Page 48. "The Godhead is generally allowed to be one and the same in all the three persons."

The Doctor does not allow it in his useful and important questions, &c. for, p. 162. he has said, "that we are not expressly, plainly, and particularly informed, whether the Spirit be a really distinct principle or power of God; or has a proper distinct personality of himself: so neither are we required to worship him, in any text of the Bible that I can find."

Here, the personality of the Spirit is not found at all. And yet the Godhead of the three Persons is now asserted!—But if the Godhead of the Spirit is one and the same with the Godhead of the Father, worship is due. Yet, it can be one and the same, in none but one and the same. i.e. If Godhead means absolute, infinite perfection. And this sense of Godhead can belong to none but the Father. See p. 48. "The Father always maintains the character of the invisible God."

But the Son never once claims this character; hence the Godhead, or what is implied in the character of the invisible God, cannot be one and the same, in the Father and in the Son.—The Godhead dwelling bodily in
in the Son, left them as different as an habitation and an inhabitant are. And because the Godhead is said to dwell bodily in the Son, but never is said so to dwell in the Spirit; the Godhead is not one and the same in all the three Persons. Nay, there are not three Personalties with which it can be so much as resident, in the above sense of the Doctor.

Page 62. "There is an infinite distance between the great God, and a mere creature, even the most excellent creature, and that when it is employed as an ambassador for God."

In p. 50. "the pre-existent soul of Christ was a proper human Spirit." If so, then in his pristine nature he was but a creature. And no union, nor any office can make him otherwise. But if it was any thing else, any thing besides an human Spirit, then it was not a proper human Spirit.

Page 67. "The most familiar idea of a complex person is that of man, who is made up of soul and body."

Grant this: will it prove that the body is one common principle with the soul? or will it not rather prove the one to be subordinate to the other? The one a principle suited to rule, the other to obey.——The soul is not so much as conscious how the body is animated. The simile will not answer; since God's residence in an angel, or in Christ, cannot intend any such impressions upon the one or the other, as will destroy
destroy the distinction of personal consciousness. The consciousness of the God, will not be the consciousness of the Angel, or of Christ; or, the residence will not imply an union that constitutes one common principle of action and passion. The Angel cannot be conscious, that that immediate exertion of power from the deity, was an immediate exertion of power from himself; as God himself would be conscious of the exertion. And the Angel’s moral, personal ministration, God could not be conscious of, as any other than the Angel’s moral, personal ministrations.——I am therefore at a loss to know what the Doctor means, p. 67. when he says, “much more is God immediately conscious of every motion, action, and occurrence that relates to the Angel.”——Besides, God’s name being in, or with the Angel of the Covenant, might as clearly be distinguished from the Angel, as the voice from the excellent glory was distinguishable from the man Christ Jesus; when it was said, this is my beloved Son, hear ye him. 2 Pet. i. 17. comp. Math. xvii. 5.

P. 80. “Jesus Christ is both God and a creature.”

The idea is so complex, that a man ought to have a capacity of reconciling contradictions, in order to receive it.——If God is not a creature, and Jesus Christ is a creature, it is impossible that Jesus Christ can be both: Nay, if Jesus Christ be a creature, and God another creature...
creature, it is impossible one creature can be both.

P. 81. "John x. I and my father are one. "The Father and the son are not two infinite "spirits, but one and the same God."

We are assured that the Father is one infinite spirit, exclusive of the son. If then the son has true and eternal Godhead, he is another infinite spirit. If he has not true and eternal Godhead, but as a son is a dependant, a derived being; he and the Father cannot be one and the same God.

P. 86. "There are other surprizing powers "and dignities which are derived to the man "Christ Jesus, partly by his exaltation to the "throne in heaven, and partly by virtue of his "union with the Godhead."

The union then cannot be personal: that is, such as to constitute one intellectual compound being *: because of the difference of the consciousness in that being, to whom surprizing powers and dignities are derived; and in that being's consciousness, who imparts such surprizing powers and dignities.

P. 88. "That the great and blessed God "condescended to assume any human soul and "body into a personal union with himself, was "a matter of free and sovereign favour."

That he never did, or could do it, is evident, from his own infinitude and immensity:

* Note, This is what I mean by personal union, and what the Doctor would contend for.
and from the express declaration of that very being, with whom he is said to be in personal union. I came not to do my own will, but the will of him who sent me. Not my will, but thine be done.

Ibid. "The influences and privileges derived from this union are limited by the will and pleasure of God."

It cannot then be a personal union, by reason of the limitation. If God and man make up one complex agent, one intellectual compound being, one common principle of action and passion, there can be no limitation of influence; unless God can be supposed, by virtue of his own will and pleasure, to be what he is not; or cease to be what he is. And it is as absurd to imagine any privileges derived to this complex being.

P. 89. "One of the sacred laws of this ineffable union seems to be, that the man Christ Jesus should have ideas and influences, knowledge and power, communicated to him by the indwelling Godhead in such measures, and at such successive seasons, as he stood in need of them for his several offices and operations in the divine economy."

The union then is not personal: because of the communication and dependance. But the infinite difference is preserved.

P. 91. "The divine nature is eternal and self-sufficient, full in itself of all real and
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"possible powers and dignities, nor can it re-
ceive any new powers, nor can it have any
real advancement."

But new powers and dignities are communi-
cated to Christ Jesus; therefore the divine na-
ture, which is eternal and self-sufficient, can-
not belong to him. Where then is the per-
sonal union? or how is the Father and the
Son one and the same God?

P. 93. "The humiliation of Christ the me-
\[...\]diator has a more peculiar respect to his hu-
man-nature, so it is the human-nature that
is more especially exalted by the Father,
but still considered in union with the divine,
and under the character of mediator."

How can the human nature considered in
union with the divine, admit of exaltation,
when it is supposed, p. 80, that by means of
this union, Jesus Christ is both God and a
creature?

P. 101. "The man Christ Jesus may say,
Father, I will that this or the other obdu-
rate sinner be reclaimed, softened, and sanc-
tified: Father, I will that his sins be for-
given him: and hereupon the blessed spirit
of God works this divine change upon the
sinner, and seals this forgiveness to the soul.
---Why may he not work wonders of
grace on the souls of men, in the same way
as he wrought miracles of healing on their
bodies?"
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The representation cannot be just; because it supposes the conversion and sanctification of a sinner to depend merely on the will of Christ; which if it did, all sinners would be converted and sanctified: for the same reason, which could excite him to will the conversion of one, would have the same strength in it for his willing the conversion of all, unless he be a respecter of persons.—But tho' he does will the conversion of all, as his Father would have all men be saved; yet neither his, nor his father's willing such universal salvation, has any such effect. And he himself has never placed the remaining obstinacy of any sinner upon his own want of willing their conversion, but upon their personal unwillingness.

And one may tell the Doctor why Christ cannot work such wonders of grace upon the souls of men, in the same way as he wrought miracles of healing on their bodies;—it was, because in the one case they were mere patients, but in the other case they must always be considered as agents. One is the work of irresistible power, the other the successful effect of moral suasion. The subject of one operation, inert matter, of the other, active spirit.—

P. 180. "Distinct personalities," are considered by him, "as having no distinct mind or will.—The three personalities are "but one conscious mind or spirit."

When I can conceive of a personality without a mind or will, I shall then be able to conceive
conceive of distinct personalities as having no distinct mind or will.—But how I shall ever be able to conceive of three personalities as one conscious mind or spirit, I have no idea.—

P. 195. "Sonship is no image of paternity: a derived property or subsistence is no image of an undervived one."

But we have no way of forming any distinct ideas of Christ, in his highest character, but under the appellation of a Son: and if Sonship is no image of paternity, any more than a derived property or subsistence is an image of an undervived one, then the difference between the person of the Son and the person of the Father remains infinite.

It is therefore a most absurd declaration, which we have p. 217. "The soul of Christ is not a mere creature, for by its near and intimate union to the divine nature, it becomes one with God: which honour is not given to any creature whatsoever, but to the man Christ Jesus."

The honour given by the union, whatever that union is, supposeth a difference between the person giving, and the person receiving that honour. And if the soul of Christ, is not the soul of God the Father, but something distinct, it must either be dependent on him for its being, or independent. If independent on him, it cannot be one with God, unless dependency and independency can become one. But if dependent, then the soul of Christ, must be
be another God for the sake of its independency.

You see, Sir, I have wrote without reserve upon the union.

These remarks are not intended, in the least, to reflect on the Doctor's religious character.—I venerate him as a pious Christian, as well as a Gentleman of learning, and of a fine imagination.—But I am of opinion, he mistakes the Scripture doctrine; and that his Book will furnish matter of objection to the Christian scheme. And hence I thought the giving of this Letter a place here, would not be impertinent.—Nevertheless, I imagine, you will be under apprehensions for me.—But be satisfied; I firmly believe in one God, and in all that is said in the New-Testament to the honour of Jesus Christ, whom I sincerely reverence as the Son of God, and the Saviour of men!

So that you see, Sir, by profession, I have as good a right as any man to the Christian character, and fellowship.—And yet, you know, it has been the constant artifice of men, who arrogate to themselves the name, Orthodox, to call out, Arian! and Socinian! as noxious persons,—just as a man would cry out, a mad dog.—Nevertheless, was I to resign the name of Christian, to be denominated a partisan of any human scheme, I freely own, that I should prefer that of an Arian, Socinian, or a Sabellian, far before that of a tri-
theist or a trinitarian, who holds a personal union:—being firmly persuaded, that the New-Testament can teach no doctrine contrary to, or inconsistent with the absolute unity: nor does it ever intend to convey any such contradictory Ideas, as those of one person being three persons! or of three persons being one person! This could never be a doctrine of divine revelation. And I am fully of opinion that Dr. Watts has said enough to expose the fallacy of it; tho' he would seem to maintain it. Does he not seem too much afraid of the snarl of bigotry? —Had the Doctor understood the union between the Father and Son, as no other than a moral union, that may subsist between God, and any intelligent moral created Being; and only have represented the presence of the Father with the Son, as the most adequate and adorable display that is made of the one God! I am persuaded, he would not have felt those complex difficulties, that he often seems so very sensible of.—The Scripture warrants such sense.—For to us, Christians, there is but one God and Father of all! and by the Gospel we are taught to believe, that this one God raised up Christ from the dead, and gave him glory, that our faith and hope might be in God. —The offence of the Cross, and the scandal given to the credibility of the Christian doctrine, by the trinitarian-scheme, I apprehend, cannot be enough lamented! And to what is called Orthodoxy, is the modern-Deism, the disbelief.
belief of Christianity greatly owing.—This appears from all the tracts wrote against revelation; which at the same time that it reflects so strongly on the orthodox scheme, greatly exposeth the want of ingenuity, and impartiality in the rejectors of the divine revelation.

I am, Sir,

Your obliged, humble servant,

C. Fleming.

Hoxton-Square,
August 30, 1746.