

VIRGINIA



GAZETTE.

With the freshest Advices,

Foreign and Domestic.

To the PRINTER.

SIR,
THE enclosed Letter, in Answer to Mr. Robertson's Criticism was sent me a few Days ago, by Mr. Dabney: And as he also has thought fit to address it to me, I hope you will give it a Place in your Paper, as, in my Opinion it deserves. I am, Sir,
Hannover,
Feb. 14, 1753. Your humble Servant,
Pat. Henry.

Reverend SIR,
I AGREE with you, that the Rev. Mr. Robertson's Letter is "written with a good deal of Judgment and Temper, and much in the Manner that Criticisms and Controversies ought to be managed by Men of Learning, especially Clergymen:" And I am glad you have given me an Opportunity of shewing, that I can reason calmly with an Opponent of calm Reason. I assure you, Sir, his writing and your publishing the Letter is so far from irritating me, that I am not without Hopes that I shall improve a Debate into an Occasion of more familiar Intercourse between us for the future, and an unrestrained and amicable Correspondence upon Subjects of superior Importance; which, you know, is not the frequent Effect of Controversy. A Letter or two may perhaps be spent, without Excess, upon the Subject now under Examination; but our Time, Sir, is sacred to more important Matters; and an over-careful Attention to such Minutiae, or Trifles of Criticism, both produces and discovers a Littleness of Mind; and therefore it will be, to our Honour and Advantage to give this Subject an handsome Dismissal as soon as possible.

As Mr. R's Letter was addressed to you, I join with him in electing you, Sir, to be the Moderator of our Debate: And I leave it entirely to your Judgment, whether to send this to the Press, and to Mr. Hunter's whether to publish it.

In my Answer to that ranting Wit, Mr. Democke, I declare, that these Lines, "I will overcome, or be overcome, &c." were not intended to intimate the Uncertainty of Christ's Victory over the Devil; but to assert in the strongest Terms the Impossibility of his failing in the Enterprize. I dare say, that none who are acquainted with Dr. Watts's Writings and Character, will injure him with the Suspicion of a worse Meaning. And as for myself, I do declare, that in the Translation I meant Nothing else than I have just now expressed; and Mr. R wisely declines debating my Interpretation, as not coming under his Cognizance. All my Hopes presuppose the supreme Divinity of Christ; and this, as Mr. R observes, includes his Omnipotence, and the Impossibility of his being overcome by the mightiest of his Creatures. So that Mr. R and I are exactly of one Mind about the absolute, infallible Certainty of his Victory over all the infernal Powers. This Certainty is what I intended to express; and the Question between Mr. R and me is, Whether I have expressed this in strong Terms, as I have alledged? Or, whether I have unluckily expressed the quite contrary, as he alleges? Whether instead of representing the absolute Certainty of Christ's Victory, I have represented it as contingent? and whether, instead of asserting the absolute Impossibility of the Devil's overcoming him, I have asserted it possible, or dubious?

The Method I have taken, after Dr. Watts, to express the Certainty of Christ's Victory over the infernal Powers, is, asserting a known Impossibility would come to pass, in Case he did not gain the Victory over them. "If Christ does not overcome the Devil, the Devil will overcome him." The Consequent is the most absolute Impossibility; and I presumed so far upon the Understanding of my Readers, as to take it for granted they would see it to be impossible, without my expressly telling them so.

Now, Sir, if I can shew that it is a customary, proper and significant Method of expressing an infallible Certainty, to suppose, that if such a Thing is not, then a known Impossibility exists, or that if such an Event does not come to pass, then something impossible will come to pass: If I can shew, that in such a Case it is not necessary nor proper expressly to call that an Impossibility, which is opposed to the Certainty; but that it is sufficient, yea, and more significant to describe the Thing that is impossible, and leave it to the Reader or Hearer to judge that it is impossible, without being expressly told it is so: If I can shew that this Mode of expressing a Certainty is used in common Conversation, in good Authors, especially Poets, who are allowed a peculiar License and Boldness of Expression, and even in the sacred Writers; then Sir, you will own that I have strongly expressed what I intended; and that Mr. R's Construction of my Words is forced and unnatural. This Task I undertake, with no small Expectation that I shall be able to go through with it.

Should I tell you Sir, I will answer Mr. R's Letter, or I will fly to the Moon; without adding expressly that the latter is impossible; would you suppose that I left the Event contingent and uncertain? Would you need expressly Information, that it is impossible for me to fly to the Moon; and therefore that it is certain I shall answer the Letter? Would you not at first Sight perceive it to be a strong, and emphatical Mode of expressing my fixed Purpose to answer it? I am confident you would. But the Impossibility in this Case, is not more evident and glaring, than that Christ should be overcome by the Devil: What Need then of expressly In-

* Aquila non capit Muscat.

formation in the one Case rather than in the other? Such a causeless Information would be an Insult upon the Understandings of my Readers.

Have you never used nor heard such enthymematical Arguments as these? There is a God, or this well-contrived Universe was made by blind Chance.--- Christ was really a Messenger from Heaven, or he was the greatest Impostor that ever appeared upon Earth.--- There will be a future Judgment, or divine Providence does not govern the World.--- &c. I dare say, Sir, you have often seen and understood such imperfect Arguments; and were far from censuring them as intimating any Uncertainty about a Providence, a future Judgment, or God's being the Creator of the World, because they were not finished with all the stiff Formalities of Logic, or because the Consequent was not expressly said to be absurd or impossible.--- I need not direct you how to apply this.

I have, not long since Sir, been enriching myself with that Treasury of pious and majestic Sentiments, *The Night-Thoughts*: And as I can now recollect sundry Examples of the Mode of Expression under Consideration, I shall produce them to you; and I am confident you will not condemn them.

- "Who reads his Bosom, reads immortal Life;
- "Or Nature, there, imposing on her Sons,
- "Has written Fables; Man was made a Lie. (mihl p. 131.)
- "Or Man survives the Grave; Or own, Lorenzo,
- "Thy Boast supreme †, a wild Absurdity. (p. 136.)
- "Or Man surmounts the Grave; Or Gain is Loss,
- "And forth exalted tumbles up the more. (p. 137.)
- "Or own the Soul immortal; Or blaspheme:
- "Or own the Soul immortal; Or invert
- "All Order. (p. 138.)
- "All is Delusion; Nature is wrapt up,
- "In tenfold Night, from Reason's keenest Eye;
- "There's no Consistence, Meaning, Plan, or End,
- "In all beneath the Sun, in all above,
- "(As far as Man can penetrate) Or Heaven
- "Is an immense, incalculable Prize.
- "Or All is Nothing, Or that Prize is All. (p. 161.)
- "Could we conceive Him, God He could not be;
- "Or He not God, Or we could not be Men." (p. 234.)

You see Sir, that Dr. Young, in all these Instances, has taken the same Method to express a certain Truth, which Dr. Watts and I have taken: The Argument is what Logicians call *Reductio ad Absurdum*, or *Reductio ad Impossibile*; than which nothing is more common. In all these Instances the Argument is elliptical, or a disjunctive Enthymema. The absurd or impossible Consequent is inferred from the Denial of the Truth to be demonstrated; but it is left to the Reader to see that the Consequent is absurd or impossible, without the Author's expressly Information.--- If Mr. R from this Line of mine, "I will overcome, or be overcome," can infer, that I leave the Event of Christ's Conflict with the Devil contingent; then, by the same Rules of Criticism, he must infer from the above Lines in *The Night-Thoughts*, that Dr. Young represents it as uncertain, whether the human Soul be immortal; or whether a Lie be wrought in our Constitution by the God of Nature, and the innate Presages of Immortality be false--- uncertain, whether Man survives the Grave, or whether an heroic Spirit be a wild Absurdity, Gain Loss, and superior Worth a lower Degradation--- that he gives his Deistic Friend Lorenzo, Liberty to own the Soul immortal; or to blaspheme, and invert all Order, just as he pleases--- that he leaves it doubtful, whether Heaven be an incalculable Prize, &c. or whether All be Delusion, &c.--- But if Mr. R, for the sake of Self-confidence, should put this horrid Sense on these Passages, which force another Sense upon such Readers as are free from that Temptation; I dare say, he will have the Honour of being singular in his Opinion.

The classic Poets, Sir, do also make Use of the like Mode of Speaking; and express a Certainty in strong Terms, by opposing an Impossibility to it. They describe the Thing that is impossible, without expressly calling it so; presuming upon the common Sense of the Reader, to render that Formality needless, as I have done.--- It may be sufficient to give you two Instances.

Ovid represents Paris expressing the Constancy of his Passion for Oenone, or the Impossibility of his ceasing to love her, thus;

"Cum Paris Oenone poterit spirare relicta,
"Ad Fontem Xanthis versa recurvat Aqua."

Ov. Ep. 5.

Which may be thus translated;

When Paris shall unfaithful prove,
And from his Fair withdraw his Love;
Then Xanthis shall invert its Course,
And roll its Waters upwards to their Source.

In the same striking Form does Virgil express the Constancy of his grateful Remembrance of Octavianus.

"Ante levis ergo pascentur in Aethere Cervi,
"Et freta destituent nudos in Littora Pisces:
"Ante, pererratis amborum Finibus, Exul
"Aut Ararim Parthus bibat, aut Germania Tigrim,
"Quam nostro illius labatur Pectore Vultus."

Ecl. 1.

† Viz. an heroic Spirit.

Thid

Thus translated by Dr. Trapp :

"Therefore swift Stags shall sooner feed in Air,
And Tides leave naked Fishes on the beach ;
Sooner shall Parthia and Germania change
Their Climate, this drink Tigris, Arar that ;
Than from my Soul his Image be effac'd."

One acquainted with the ordinary Course of Nature, had no Need to be told that Rivers cannot invert their Course, that Stags cannot feed in the Air, &c. and therefore he cannot suspect that these Poets intended to intimate the Possibility or Uncertainty of these Things ; but must perceive at first Sight, that they only intend to express in strong Terms, that what they declare, is certain ; as certain as the Non-futurity of an Impossibility. But the Impossibility in these Cases, is not so great in itself, nor so glaring to the Reader, as that Christ should be overcome by the Devil ; and therefore, if there be no Need express'd to point out the Impossibility in the former, sure it cannot be necessary in the latter.

Finally ; We find this Mode of expressing a Certainty exemplified in the sacred Scripture. One Instance is sufficient. Thus saith the Lord, If you can break my Covenant of the Day, and my Covenant of the Night ; and that there should not be Day and Night in their season ; THIS may also my Covenant be broken with David my Servant. — This hypothetical Proposition may be reduced, without altering the Sense, into a disjunctive Form, exactly correspondent to the debated Lines in my Poems. — "I will keep my Covenant with David my Servant ; Or my Covenant of the Day and Night, may be broken" — It was needless expressly to add, "which is impossible ;" — for Common Sense could not but see the Impossibility.

Or, if you please, we may easily reduce the Lines under Examination into an hypothetical Form, without altering the Sense ; and then you will see their exact Correspondence to this striking Declaration of the Prophet. — "If I can be overcome by my own Creature, and my royal Scepter be wrested from me, &c. then may I fail in the Undertaking of Man's Redemption, and be overcome by the infernal Powers," &c. — It was needless here to complete the Argument according to the strictest Formalities of Logic by adding, — "But that I should be overcome by my own Creature, &c. is impossible : Ergo, That I should fail in the Undertaking of Man's Redemption, &c. is impossible." — For the same Kind of Argument is left unfinished by God himself in the Passage mentioned.

In the same Manner the Apostle reasons † in Proof of the Resurrection. 'Tis true, his Arguments are in the hypothetical Form ; but that you may at one Glance perceive the Agreement between them and the Mode of Expression in my Poems, I shall reduce them into Disjunctives, in the right Hand Column.

Hypothetic.

If there be no Resurrection of the Dead, then Christ is not risen.

If Christ be not risen, then is our Preaching vain, and your Faith is also vain, and we are found false Witnesses for God, &c.

If Christ be not risen, then they which are fallen asleep in Christ, are perished.

Disjunctive.

There is a Resurrection of the Dead ; or Christ is not risen.

Christ is risen ; or our Preaching is vain, and your Faith is also vain, and we are found false Witnesses for God, &c.

Christ is risen ; or they that are fallen asleep in Christ, are perished.

You see Sir, St. Paul proves the Resurrection, by pointing out the Consequences that unavoidably follow from the Denial of it : Consequences so evidently absurd or impossible, that I dare say not one of his Readers to this Day has mistook them for Possibilities or Uncertainties, because he did not expressly call them Absurdities or Impossibilities ; and yet I think they are every whit as liable to Misconstruction, as the Lines from whence Mr. R — n has drawn such horrendous Inferences ; for the Absurdities or Impossibilities resulting from the Denial of the Resurrection of Christ are not more evident than those resulting from the Supposition of the Omnipotent Jehovah being conquered by his Creatures.

Must every Argument, Sir, be cast into Mood and Figure, in Order to render it intelligible ? Must all the Parts of an hypothetical or disjunctive Syllogism, the Antecedent and Consequent, the Major, Minor and Conclusion, be expressed in full, in Order to free it from Misconstruction ? e. g. Must the Apostle thus formally draw out his Argument ?

If the Dead rise not, then is not Christ risen :

But, That Christ should not be risen, is impossible :

Ergo, That there should be no Resurrection of the Dead is impossible — Or, It is certain there shall be a Resurrection of the Dead.

If it be unreasonable to require a Reasoner to hamper himself with such logical Fitters ; how much more unreasonable is it to confine the Muse with them ? She must not indeed fear into Bombast, jumble Contradictions, and rush into impious Extravagancies † ; but if she be not indulged the Privilege of making Excursions beyond the Bounds of strict Logic, she is miserably enflaved, and must degenerate into cool Reasoning ; and a logical Poet is as great an Absurdity as a fanciful, chimerical Reasoner. — However, since Mr. R — n (whose Genius discovers more of the calm Reasoner than imaginary Poetaster) will have a poetical Flight tried at the rigid Tribunal of Logic ; I may safely submit to the Trial in this Instance. The criminal Lines then will make their Appearance at the Bar in such a Form as this :

"I will overcome the Devil, or the Devil shall overcome me."

But, That the Devil should overcome me, is impossible.

Ergo, It is certain that I shall overcome the Devil.

Or I may cloathe them in all the pompous Parade of Mood and Figure in the following Syllogisms ; and then to be sure they will be acquitted.

BAR- That a Creature should overcome Christ, is absolutely impossible :

BA- But, The Devil is a Creature :

RA- Ergo, That the Devil should overcome Christ, is absolutely impossible.

BAR-

* Jer. xxxiii. 20.

† 1 Cor. xv. 13, &c.

1. ————— Pictoribus atq; Poëtis
Quilibet audendi semper fuit æqua Potestas : ———
Sed non ut placidis coeant immunia, non ut
Serpentes Avibus generantur, Tigribus Agni.

Hor. De Art. Poet.

BAR- That Event, the Non accomplishment of which would infer an absolute Impossibility, is infallibly certain :

BA- But, Christ's Victory over the Devil is an Event, the Non-accomplishment of which would infer an absolute Impossibility :

RA- Ergo, Christ's Victory over the Devil is an Event that is infallibly certain.

And now Sir, I presume I am logical enough ; and you see that the formal Syllogism and the poetical Proposition differ only in this, that the Impossibility is expressed in the one, but left to the Reader to discover with his own Eyes in the other.

You see by this Time Sir, that Mr. R — n had no Reason to ask, "Is there nothing more implied in this Proposition, I will overcome the Devil, or the Devil shall overcome me, than this, I will overcome the Devil ? Was there ever a disjunctive Proposition, such as this is, without two opposite Parts ? &c." I will show him the two opposite Parts of the Disjunction ; and after all, both will only express this in strong Terms, That Christ shall certainly overcome the Devil ; or, that it is impossible he should not overcome him. — "I will overcome the Devil ; or that shall come to pass which is impossible." — This, I presume, is a complete disjunctive Proposition ; and yet it is exactly the same with that which has unlappily incurred Mr. R — n's Censure, with this small Exception, that in the one, the impossible Thing is described without being expressly said to be impossible ; in the other, the Word impossible is used, without describing the Thing that is so.

Hence you may also see the Impertinency of Mr. R — n's Illustration from the Case of Hamilton and Mackay. If it had been as impossible in the Nature of Things, that Mackay should overcome Hamilton ; if the Impossibility had been as evident to every Man ; as it is that the Devil should overcome Christ ; then indeed the Parallel would be just. But is this the Case ? Can Mr. R — n suppose, that the rawest Novice in Christianity can look upon God and his Creature as equal Matches as two Scotch Noblemen ? I really thought, Sir, none of my Readers would need my particular Information in this Case ; but how hugely am I disappointed, when a Gentleman of Mr. R — n's Abilities seems to need it !

Thus much may suffice, Sir, for the Vindication of the debated Lines : And here I would willingly conclude ; for were it not a Debt justly claimable by you and Mr. R — n, and that my Silence would look like Neglect, I should have thrown by my Pen some Hours ago ; and you will observe, no Doubt, that I write with that Languor and Carelessness natural to one that has not his Cause at Heart. — However, to do Justice to you, I shall make a few Remarks on some other Parts of Mr. R — n's Letter, which seem material.

If I rightly understand Mr. R — n, he is substantially of my Mind with Regard to the Nature of an Oath, as used by the Deity, though he piously scruples the Use of the Word Imprecation ; and about this we shall not contend. Mr. R — n observes, that "when God condescends to make Use of an Oath ; such as, As I live, saith the Lord, — the true and full Meaning is this, — that he vouchsafes, by a solemn Attestation, to give the utmost Assurance that his Promises and Threatenings will as surely be fulfilled, as he lives, and is the God of Truth." And does not this imply, that if they be not fulfilled, then he will cease to live, and be no more the God of Truth ? If Mr. R — n will reply, that this is impossible ; I heartily grant it ; and here indeed lies the Force of the Assurance ; q. d. "If I do not fulfil my Threatenings and Promises, then let that come to pass which is impossible ;" and thus it is an Exemplification of the Mode of Expression in my Poems.

Mr. R — n says, that "if the Oath, As I live saith the Lord, means only, Let me not live, i. e. Let me die, then he can see no Reason why it may not better become Mortals to swear by it, than the immortal God." But pray Sir, would it be any Confirmation of his Declaration for One to say, "If I do not perform such a Thing, then let that come to pass, which will certainly come to pass, whether I perform it, or not ?" This would be the Sense of such an Oath in the Mouth of Mortals ; for all such must die, whether they perform their Oaths, or not. But for One to say, "If I do not perform such a Thing, then that shall come to pass which is impossible ;" this would render the Performance of the Thing as certain as the Non-futurity of an Impossibility, than which Nothing can be more certain : And this is the Sense of the above Oath, when used by Him who only hath Immortality.

Tho' Mr. R — n insists upon it, that no Imprecation is implied in the elliptical Passages of Scripture I mention ; yet I think he grants that they must be filled up with that Idea generally expressed by the Term Imprecation ; for he apprehends, that when Dr. Whitby supplies the Defect in such Places, he only intends to represent God as saying, "Let me not be esteemed or accounted God ; or, Let me not be accounted true" — Or as other learned Men supply this elliptical Hebraism, Patiar haberi mendax, i. e. "I will suffer myself to be accounted a Liar." And if the Supplement be taken in this Sense, Mr. R — n seems to approve of it. But does not the Supplement in this Sense convey the Idea of an Imprecation, as well as in mine ? For, can the Deity continue God, and yet authorize his Creatures not to esteem and account Him God ? Must he not cease to be God, when it ceases to be the Duty of his Creatures to account Him true ? Must He not suffer Himself to be undified, when He suffers Himself to be accounted a Liar ? In short, it is no more impossible for Him to cease to exist, than to command or even tolerate his Creatures to esteem and treat Him as a Liar ; which would be to alter the unchangeable Nature of Things, and stamp the sanction of his own Authority upon the grossest Irreligion.

Mr. R — n thinks I have egregiously failed in vindicating the Passage we have been examining, from Scripture-Authority, because I have not produced the express Words of Scripture. But are the Authority of Scripture and the express Words of Scripture the same ? Can Nothing be demonstrated from Scripture, unless it be expressed there totidem Verbis ? Are not natural, direct Deductions from Scripture-Principles, as certain as the Principles themselves ? I dare say Mr. R — n himself makes Use of Scripture-Consequences as of Divine Authority in other Cases, without Scruple ; otherwise his Faith is very scanty, and poorly attested.

Further ; the Passages I mentioned § are evidently elliptical. — Elliptical Passages must be supplied, in Order to make Sense of them. — These elliptical

§ To those I may now add, Deut. i. 35. 1 Sam. iii. 14. Ps. xcvi. 12, & lxxxix. 35. & cxxxii. 2, 3, according to the Hebrew and the LXX.

elliptical Passages will admit of no other Supplement than Dr. Whitby has inserted. — Dr. Whitby's Supplement was what I intended, and Mr. R—— approves in his Sense, which is substantially the same with mine. — A necessary Supplement of an elliptical Passage is of the same Authority with that Passage. — Therefore Whitby's Supplement is of Divine Authority. — Therefore in vindicating my Poems from that Supplement, I vindicate them from Divine Authority. Q. E. D.

Mr. R——n "desires me or any One else to produce in all the old or "new Testament any one Passage, where God or Christ expressly use an "Imprecation." — And without the least Insult or Ill-Nature I desire Mr. R——n or any One else to shew where I undertook to do it; & *est mibi magnus Appellus*. I have indeed used the Word *sometimes*, ["sometimes the Imprecation is understood, &c."] but my Design was not to intimate that I was certain the Imprecation is at *other Times* expressed; but only that I was not certain that it is not expressed in any Passage of Scripture; and this Uncertainty I must labour under, 'til I contract for telling a Turn of Mind, as to read all the Old and New Testament to make to insignificant a Discovery. That it is *sometimes understood*, I have asserted; and that I presume, has been made good: But more I have not asserted; and therefore I am no more concerned to prove more than Mr. R——n himself. — This is no Violation of my own Words; for I think I can demonstrate that the Word *sometimes* is not seldom used in this cautious indefinite Sense, without any Anathema to *other Times*.

I own Sir, there is a great Deal of Beauty and Justice in Mr. R——n's Remark, "That the holy Penmen did not fill up the elliptical Passages, probably out of Reverence to the Attributes of God; — and that "this may determine us to be very cautious how we supply them." And it is really with Horror and Reluctance that I have supplied them; lest some broken Sentence, or the Inference of a known Absurdity should suggest to weak Minds some blasphemous Idea concerning that venerable Being, who is Witness to all our little Debates about him, and before whom I would prostrate myself and adore. — But as it is lawful, and sometimes necessary, in reasoning with an Atheist or a Deist, to suppose, (without granting) that there is no God, or that Christ was an Impostor, in order to shew the Absurdities and Impossibilities that would flow from these Suppositions; and as Mr. R——n seems to approve of Dr. Whitby's filling up these Blanks in order to convince the Scrupulous of the Lawfulness of judicial Oaths; I think my Conduct, in a like Case, equally lawful and necessary in itself, and doubt not but it will appear so to Mr. R——n, especially since he has taken the same Liberty himself in his Letter.

If you should not judge this Letter worthy of a public View, (as perhaps it is not) you will at least communicate it to Mr. R——n with my friendly Salutations; and assure him, I shall never take it ill, that a Gentleman of his Judgment and Moderation should freely make his Remarks upon my Writings or Conduct; especially when he attacks me in open Day, in his proper Name.

I am,

Reverend SIR,

Your sincere Friend,

and humble Servant,

SAMUEL DAVIES.

Hanover,
Jan. 30, 1753.

To the PRINTER.

SIR,

HAVING Reason to fear Deism has some Adherents in Virginia, I desire you to publish, in your Paper, some Reasons I have transcribed from an eminent Author, to shew that the Scriptures are the Word of God. Tho' they may not convince Infidels, yet they may be of some Use to Believers; and your making 'em known will oblige, Sir,

Your affectionate Friend, and humble Servant,

ANONYMUS.

First, THE true Godliness and Holiness wherewith the Writers of the Scriptures shined as Lamps in their Times, and far surpassed all Men of other Religions, which sheweth the Work of God's Spirit in them, and how unlikely it is that such Men should obtrude into the Church their own Inventions instead of God's Word.

Secondly, The Simplicity, Integrity, and Sincerity of these Writers in Matters that concern themselves and those that belong unto them, doing nothing by Partiality, 1 Tim. v. 21. neither spurring their Friends nor themselves; so Moses, for Example, in his Writings, spared not to report the Reproach of his own Tribe, Gen. xxxiv. 30. and xlix. 5, 7. nor the Incest of his Parents of which he himself was conceived, Exod. vi. 20. nor the Idolatry of his Brother Aaron, Exod. xxxii. nor the Murmuring of his Sister Miriam, Numb. xii. nor his own declining of his Vocation by God to deliver the Children of Israel out of Egypt, Exod. iv. 13, 14. nor his own Murmuring against God in his Impatience, Numb. xi. 11, 12, 13, 14. nor his Want of Faith after so many wonderful Confirmations, Numb. xx. 12. and xxvii. 14. Deut. xxxii. 51. And tho' he were in highest Authority, and having a Promise of the People to believe whatsoever he said, Exod. xix. 8. & xx. 19. & xxiv. 3. he assigneth no Place for his own Sons to aspire, either to the Kingdom or to the high Priesthood; but leaveth them in the mean Degree of common Levites: All which Things declare most manifestly, that he was void of all earthly and carnal Affections in his Writings, as was meet for the Pen-man and Scribe of God; hereunto also may be added, that he writeth of himself, Numb. xii. 3. that he was the meekest of all the Men that were upon the Face of the whole Earth, which no wise Man would in such Sort report of himself, if he were left to his own Discretion.

Thirdly, The Quality and Condition of the Pen-men of these holy Writings, some of whom were never trained in the School of Man, and yet in their Writings shew that Depth of Wisdom that the most learned Philosophers could not attain unto. Some also were before professed Euphemists to the Truth, whereof afterwards they were Writers: Amos was no Prophet but an Herds-man, and a Gatherer of wild Figs, Amos vii. 14. Matthew a Publican, employed only in the gathering of Toll, Matt. ix. 9. Peter, James, and John, Fisher-men, whose Liberty of Speech when the Chief Priests and the Elders of Jerusalem beheld, and understood that they were unlettered and ignorant Men, it is recorded, Acts iv. 13. that they were marvelled, and took Knowledge of them that they had been with Jesus: Paul, from a bloody Persecutor converted to be a Preacher and a Writer of the Gospel, shewed by that sudden Alteration, that he was moved by a Command from Heaven to defend that Doctrine which before he so earnestly impugned.

Fourthly, The Matter of the holy Scripture being altogether of heavenly Doctrine, and favouring nothing of earthly or worldly Affections, but every where renouncing and condemning the same, declareth the God of Heaven to be the only Inspirer of it.

Fifthly, The Doctrine of the Scripture is such as could never breed in the Brains of Man; three Persons in one God; God to become Man; the Resurrection, and such like, Man's Wit could never hatch, or if it had conceived them, could never hope that any Man could believe them.

Sixthly, The sweet Concord between these Writings, and the perfect Coherence of all Things contained in them, notwithstanding the Diversity of Persons by whom, Places where, Times when, and Matter whereof they were written; for there is a most holy and heavenly Consent and Agreement of all Parts thereof together, tho' written in to sundry Ages, by so sundry Men, in so distant Places, one of them doth not gainstay another, as Mens Writings do; as our Saviour Christ confirmeth them all, Luke xxiv. 44.

Seventhly, A Continuance of wonderful Prophecies, foretelling Things to come to long before, marked with their Circumstances; not doubtful like the Oracles of the Heathen, or Merlin's Prophecies, but such as expressed the Things and Persons by their Names, which had all in their Times their own Performance; and therefore unto what may we attribute them but to the Inspiration of God? Vide Calvin. Institut. Lib. 1. Cap. 8. Thus was the Messiah promised to Adam 4000 Years before he was born, Gen. iii. 15. and to Abraham 1917 Years before the Accomplishment, Gen. xii. 3. The Deliverance of the Israelites from Egypt to the same Abraham 400 Years before, Gen. xv. 13, 14. The Prophecies of Jacob, Gen. xlix. concerning the twelve Tribes, which were not fulfilled 'til after the Death of Moses; and that of the Continuance of the Tribes and Kingdoms of Judah, held until the coming of Christ: In the first Book of Kings, the 13th Ch. 2, 3. there is delivered a Prophecy concerning Josias by Name, 334 Years, Eza. xlv. 1. concerning Cyrus 100 Years before he was born; Daniel's Prophecies, and that especially of the 70 Weeks, Dan. ix. 24. are wonderful; so likewise are those of the Rejection of the Jews, the Calling of the Gentiles, the Kingdom of Antichrist, &c. some of which now we see fulfilled.

Eighthly, The great Majesty, full of heavenly Wisdom and Authority, such as is meet to proceed from the Glory of God, shining in all the whole Scripture; yea, oftentimes under great Simplicity of Words, and Plainness and Easiness of Style, which nevertheless more affected the Hearts of the Hearers, than all the painted Eloquence and lofty Style of Rhetoricians and Orators; and argueth the Holy Ghost to be the Author of them, 1 Cor. i. 17, 21, 24. & ii. 15.

Ninthly, In speaking of the Matters of the highest Nature, they go not about to persuade Men by Reasons, as Philosophers and Orators, but absolutely require Credit to be given to them, because the Lord hath spoken it: They promise eternal Life to the Obedient, and threaten eternal Woe to the Disobedient; they prescribe Laws for the Thoughts, to which no Man can pierce; they require Sacrifice, but they prefer Obedience; they enjoin Fasting, but it is also from Sin; they command Circumcision, but it is of the Heart; they forbid lusting, coveting, &c. which is not to be found in any Laws but in his that searcheth the Heart.

Tenthly, The End and Scope of the Scriptures is for the Advancement of God's Glory, and the Salvation of Man's Soul; for they treat either of the noble Acts of God and of Christ, or the Obedience of Man: And therefore by comparing this with the former Reason, we may frame this Argument; If the Author of the Scripture were not God, but some Creature; if he were a Creature, he were either good or bad; if a bad Creature, why forbiddeth he Evil so rigorously, and commands Good so expressly, and makes his Mark to aim at nothing but God's Glory, and our Good? If he were a good Creature, why doth he challenge to himself that which is proper to God only, as to make Laws for the Heart, to punish and reward eternally? &c. If it were no Creature, good nor bad, it must needs be God.

Eleventhly, The admirable Power and Force that is in them, to convert and alter Mens Minds, and to incline their Hearts from Vice to Virtue, Psal. xix. 7, 8. Psal. cxix. 111. Heb. iv. 12. Acts xiii. 12. tho' they be quite contrary to Mens Affections.

Twelfthly, The Writers of the holy Scriptures are most ancient of all others: Moses is ancients than the Gods of the Heathen, that lived not long before the Wars of Troy, about the Time of the Judges; and the youngest Prophets of the Old Testament match the ancientest Philosophers and Historians of the Heathen.

Thirteenthly, The deadly Hatred that the Devil and all wicked Men carry against the Scriptures, to cast them away and destroy them; and the little Love that most Men do bear unto them, prove them to be of God: For if they were of Flesh and Blood, then Flesh and Blood would love them and practise them, and every Way regard them more than it doth; for the World loveth his own, as our Saviour Christ saith, John xv. 19. But we (being but carnal and earthly) favour not the Things that be of God, as the Apostle saith, 1 Cor. ii. 14. and until the Lord open our Hearts, and we be born again of God's Spirit, and become as new born Babies, we have no Desire unto them. 1 Pet. ii. 2.

Fourteenthly, The marvellous Preservation of the Scriptures, though none in Time so ancient, nor none so much oppugned, yet God hath still by his Providence preserved them, and every Part of them.

Fifteenthly, The Scriptures, as Experience sheweth, have the Power of God in them, to humble a Man, when they are preached, and to cast him down to Hell, and afterward to restore and raise him up again, Heb. iv. 12. 1 Cor. xiv. 25.

This is Life eternal, that they might know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ. S. John xvii. 3.

I count all Things but Loss, for the Excellency of the Knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord. Phil. iii. 8. which Knowledge the Scripture only can teach.

A CHRISTIAN.

L O N D O N,

December 7. By Letters from Edinburgh we have the following Account of Anderson, who was condemned at Worcester for Desertion: He is a Roman Catholic, born in Yorkshire, descended of a good Family, has had so liberal an Education, that he is well versed in all the modern Languages, and has travelled into most Parts of Europe: That, occasionally,