

*Sir Richard Bulkeley's  
Remarks on the Caveat against  
New Prophets Consider'd*

*by*

*Edmund Calamy*



Layout © Quinta Press 2021

Sir *Richard Bulkeley's*  
 R E M A R K S  
 ON THE  
*Caveat against New Prophets*  
 CONSIDER'D,  
 In a LETTER to a Friend.

SIR,

**W**HEN I Preach'd against the *New Prophets*, and Publish'd my *Caveat*, I expected that some would reckon I was their Enemy, because I told them the Truth: But were they ever so angry, this would be my satisfaction, that I have sincerely endeavour'd to do service to our Common Christianity; and therefore I can easily bear all their Reflections. Had I run into any Mistakes in Fact, I should upon better Information have been very ready to have rectify'd them; of could they prove upon me any Misrepresentation of the Sacred Scriptures, I should be as ready to retract, as they to desire it: But till then, the more they reproach me, the more I pity them; and the more they threaten, the more am I confirm'd.

I'm sorry so Learned a Gentleman as Sir *Richard Bulkeley*, should think it worth his while to take so

A

much

much pains, in Defence of a cause that so little deserves it: But am thankful for his Endeavours to make me sensible of my Faults, which I think I so far know myself, as to be safely able to say, I am desirous to mend: And since it is your desire I should give you an Account how far I am improv'd under his Discipline, I readily comply; and leave it to you, either to Conceal or Communicate it, as you see Cause.

He is much concern'd, *Pag. 25.* at my *losing my Time and Labour.* 'Tis very Compassionate to have so much regard to one to whom he is so much a Stranger. I'm sorry he should have so much reason in this respect, to be concern'd on my Account: For I must own that I have often *lost my Time and Labour:* And that I am so unhappy as to do it still whensoever I search the Scriptures for any *Certain Intimation, that GOD would give forth Inspiration, for the general use of the Church, after the Death of the Apostles.* Nay, I have *lost my Time and Labour* in turning over those Sheets which he has given me a promise should *put me in mind of several Passages of Scripture that would fairly bear that Sense.* I profess I cannot find them. And whether it be thro' my *Neglect either in Reading them, or Observation on them,* I cannot well tell; but if it be chargeable upon either I am equally unhappy, because my End is not answer'd, after he had rais'd my Expectation.

Had I us'd mere *Diligence in reading History,* and allow'd more time for it, I am sensible it might have been the better for me: But I think if my Memory does not extreamly fail me, I have read of some such stories as he so kindly puts me in mind of, concerning *Papias, Quadratus, Iranæus,* and the *Legio Fulminea, or Fulminatrix,* (upon  
which

which you know our Matter *Witsius* has a Learned Dissertation) and several other particular Instances of Inspiration, or Miracles, in the three first Centuries; but I am not sensible that they were foretold in Scripture, or that they were for the General Use of the Church. And some Stories of that kind that are reported, I take to be of dubious Credit, as appears from the Objections of the Criticks against them. But suppose it be own'd that there were some few Remains of Inspiration after the Death of the Apostles, which I no more deny'd than I did that there may be a little Light remaining in our Hemisphere, after the setting of the Sun, yet am I so weak-sighted that I cannot discern the Force of an Argument drawn from thence, for *the Revival of Inspiration for the General Use of the Church*, which is the only thing I spake against.

In the next Page, I fall under his Displeasure, for explaining *all Flesh* in the Prophecy of *Joel*, of *some of all Sorts and every Condition*, which I must confess I take to be very justifiable. Dr. *Lightfoot* gives this as the Reason for that Explication. He says 'twas an Axiome in the Jewish Schools, That *the Divine Majesty dwelt not on any*, out of the Land of Israel. Now it was declar'd by the Prophet, that the Spirit should be pour'd forth *upon all Flesh*, to intimate that there should be no Confinement of that nature. Other Reasons may be seen in Dr. *Pocock* on *Joel*, by such as will take the pains to consult him. However, I'm far from thinking that *Forty Jews and Forty Heathens Convert ed, may, stand for a completion of the Prophecy*, which is to be extended to all the Glorious Fruits of the *Pentecost* Effusion, in the numerous Converts that were gain'd to Christianity, by the Ministry of the

A 2 Apostles.

Apostles. But certainly there must be a difference between the two Sayings, I will pour out my Spirit upon all Flesh, and All Flesh is Grass. The one cannot intend, so unlimited an Universality as the other. I won't indeed say. That *there is any one Person of all Flesh that is not Grass*, and yet think there have been many that have been Members of the Church since the Descent of the Holy Ghost, who never had the Spirit pour'd forth upon them, tho' they come within the compass of *all Flesh* in his Sense. I doubt such a Piece of Criticism as this upon *all Flesh* would have been reckon'd trifling had it come from a Preacher: But I shan't presume to give it a name, when it drops from the Pen of a Gentleman.

Pag. 27.

*When Men are ty'd to an Hypothesis, to what poor shifts are they put to support it?* Sir Richard cannot but know whose Words they are. By way of Comment upon that Text., I'm charg'd with *wresting matters of Fact, diminishing great Occurrences, and magnifying small ones, and confounding even Chronology.* He might with as much ease have said that Dr. *Lightfoot*, and all our most Celebrated Commentators, are in this respect guilty, and he would have had equal Reason. For all the Ground is this; that as he says, *I make the Effusion of the Spirit on the Day of Pentecost, A. C. 34. to be the full accomplishment of Joel's Prophecy; and yet take in the Destruction of Jerusalem, which was Thirty six Years after, Viz. A. C. 70.* I must confess the *Pentecost Effusion* is with me no *small Occurrence*; I think we have good reason to *magnifie* it, since St. *Peter* has therein gone before us. We may very safely say, that that began the Accomplishment of the Prophecy of *Joel*, since that Apostle directly asserts it: But drat it was the *full Accomplishment* of it, I neither

ther said nor thought. The Effusion of the Spirit on the Day of *Pentecost*, was not *that great and notable Day of the Lord*; that was the time of the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, which was no *small Occurrence* neither; which I in so many Words declare (p. 15.) *fell out within Forty Years of our Saviour's Resurrection and Ascension*: which certainly was no Confounding Chronology. I do indeed say, *Pag. 14.* that *St. Peter* declares, That *this Prophecy and Promise was to be fully accomplish'd in those days in which he liv'd*, but I expresly take in *Jerusalem's* Definition as the full Accomplishment of that Prophecy, which began to be accomplish'd, on the day of *Pentecost*. And how this will bear so heavy a Charge, may deserve *Sir Richard's* farther explication in his next Part. For tho' I agree with him. That should GOD threaten to shower a Pestilential Disease upon a whole Kingdom, if some few Families in a Town *should be carry'd off by some fore-running Drops of it, this could not be said to be a fulfilling his Threatning*: Yet might the *fore-running Drops* be said to begin the accomplishment of that Threatning which would be entirely *fulfill'd*, when the *whole Kingdom* was destroy'd. And after the same manner was the *Pentecost* Effusion the beginning of the Accomplishment of that Prophecy of *Joel*, which in the Destruction of *Jerusalem* was completed.

I'm very, free to *Consult the Grammar*, Of any other Book that is within my reach, that may help to give this Gentleman satisfaction. I readily agree that the Word *This* in *St. Peter's* explication of *Joel's* Prophecy, refers to *the thing spoken of*, rather than to *the time spoken of*: Nor am I aware that I had the least hint to the Contrary. But i have not any one *Grammar* in my Study, that gives me any Rule that should lead me

Pag. 27.

to conclude, that tho' the *Pentecost Effusion* was the *thing spoken of*, yet the time when that Effusion happen'd, with what thereupon follow'd, was not the *time spoken of*. It must be some *New Grammar* that I have not yet been so happy as to hear of, that must help me to understand, how that could be the *thing*, if this was not the *time* that the Prophecy intended. Till such a *Grammar* be produc'd, and the Grounds it goes upon are consider'd, I think I must conclude, that he may as well seek for *another thing* to accomplish *Joel's Prophecy*, as for *another time*, in which it was to be accomplish'd.

Pag. 59.

I'm also bid to *Go and Learn the Original Languages of the Scripture a little better*, which I'm free to do; and will thank him for his help. 'Tis my desire to be improving in that Piece of most useful learning to the Last. However, *I have heard it said (I need not quote my Author)* that upon supposition this Caveat Writer had been so unhappy as not to *understand the Critick* or rather the Criticism of the Bible (which I must confess I should be glad to be more compleat in) the *Dissenters* in general might have been spar'd, with whom this Author seems not to have any great Acquaintance. At least they might well enough have been past by in this Case, when so Learned a Church-man as Mr. *Whitby* was referr'd to in the Margin, that I might save my self the Labour of Transcribing him upon *Acts 3. 21*. But whosoever is guilty, it seems *Crispine* must pay for it. However that you may see I am far from being singular, in moving to have that Text rendred, *the times of the Consummation of all things*, rather than *the times of the Restitution of all things*, I'll give you that Learned Doctor's Words.

“That these Words (says he upon that Text)  
“can



“cannot be meant of a *Restitution* of all things to  
“their former State is certain: For sure 'tis very  
“improper to say, there will be a *Restitution* of all  
“things to their former State, *which God hath spoken*  
“*by the Mouth of all his Prophets*; for since these things  
“relate to the fore-runner of our Lord, CHRIST's  
“coming in the Flesh, his Life, Death, Resurrecti-  
“on and Ascension, the Preaching of the Gospel to  
“the *Gentiles*, and the Reign of Antichrist, the calling  
“of the *Jews*, and the coming in of the fulness  
“of the *Gentiles*, these things may very well be  
“said to be Exhibited, Perform'd, Accomplish'd,  
“and Consummated; but I see not with what  
“Propriety or Truth they can be said to be re-  
“stor'd to their former State, or be renew'd. And  
“therefore ἄχρι χρόνων ἀποκατάστασεως πάντων, is by the  
“*Syriack* rendred *until the fulness of the time of all*  
“*things*; by the *Arabick* till, *the time in which all*  
“*things shall be perfected or finished*; by Tertullian,  
“*adusque tempora exhibitionis omnium*; by Irenæus,  
“*usque ad tempora dispositionis omnium*; that is, till  
“the time of exhibition or disposal of all things:  
“By *Oecumenius*, till the time that all things do  
“εἰς πέρας ἐλθεῖν, come to an End. And (says he)  
“for the Confirmation of this Import of the  
“Word, we have the suffrage of *Hesychius* and  
“*Phavorinus*, that ἀποκατάστασις is τελείωσις, the Cori-  
“summation of a thing. Hence then (says he)  
“I argue thus against the Doctrine of the *Mille-*  
“*naries*; since CHRIST is to continue in  
“Heaven till the Completion or Consummati-  
“on of all things spoken by the Holy Prophets,  
“if the *Millennium* were any of them, CHRIST  
“must continue in Heaven, till the Consummati-  
“on of that also; and therefore is not to come  
“down from Heaven to Reign on Earth till the

“*Millennium* be ended; Nor can that be contemporary with our LORD’s Second Coming, which is from Heaven.

Sr. *Richard* best knows why he took no notice of this Doctor’s Comment, when I referr’d my Reader thither for Authority. I hope he wont offer to question his skill in Criticism. I’ll give him another that has had a Considerable Reputation for that sort of Learning; and that is Dr. *Lightfoot*. ★ His Words are these.

“The Word ἀποκατάσσις indeed signifieth a restitution to a former State, a repairing or amending, as might be frequently shewed in Greek Writers; but in Scripture doth not so properly signifie this, as what the Rabbins would express by a fulfilling, or accomplishing. And the Preposition ἀπό doth not so much Hand in the Force of *Re* or *again*, but it Hands in opposition to ἀ privative in ἀκατάσσις, which signifieth unsettled or unconfirm’d; And so ἀποκατάσσις πόλεως is oppos’d to κίνημα, *Polyb. Hist. Lib. 4. Settlement of a City*, to Tumult. And to take up these two places where this Word is us’d in the New Testament, *Mat. 17. 11.* and here: *Elias* indeed shall first come, καὶ ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα *And shall restore all things*: What? To their former State? Nay, that the *Baptist* did not, for he brought them into a clean different Estate from their former. Or *he shall amend all things*: That is true indeed, so the *Baptist* did, but how will this place in hand bear that Sense, which speaketh not of the mending of all things, but of their ending? And how improper would either of these Senses run in this Verse, *’Till the restoring of all things to their former Estate, which God hath spoken by the Mouths of his Prophets? Or till the amending of*  
“all

★ See his Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles in his Works, Vol. 1. Pag. 758.

“all things which God hath spoken by his Prophets?  
“But clear and facil is that Sense that is given,  
“till the accomplishment of all things that God hath  
“spoken by the Mouth of his Prophets. The things  
“which GOD had spoken by the Mouth of  
“his Prophets from the beginning of the World  
“were, CHRIST’s Victory over Satan in  
“the Salvation of all his People; his Conquest  
“of the last Enemy Death, the Calling of the  
“Jews, the Fulness of the Gentiles, &c. And how  
“can these things be laid to be rector’d or amended?  
“They may most fitly be said to be accomplish’d,  
“perfected, or performed: And fo muft the fame  
“Words be rendered of the Baptist, *Elias truly*  
“*cometh and accomplisheth all things that are Writ-*  
“*ten of him; and so must the Son of Man do all*  
“*things that are Written of him, as Mark follows*  
“the Sense, *Mark 9. 12.*

I leave Sir *Richard* to answer his own learned Difficulties upon these Foundations. But for fear he should say, that these are Clergy Men, for whom he upon several Occasions discovers no very profound Respect, I’ll add, that Sir *Norton Knatchbull*, who wrote himself Knight and Baronet, was of the same Mind, as appears by his Annotations. Nor is this Sense peculiar to Englishmen, as may be seen by such as will consult *Casaubon* and *Grotius*, whom I never yet heard Charg’d with being defective in Criticism. All which put together, whatever it may do as to this Gentleman, would to some in his Circumstances prove a Temptation to wish, either that they had dropt this Text, or insulted less upon Occasion of the mentioning it.

I am next charg’d with a worse than Mahometan Error, in asserting the Paradiacal State, the  
New

New Heavens and the New Earthy *to be after the Final Judgment*. But here a double Question offers. The first is, Whether or no it be an Error? and the second, What sort of Error? Whether worse than the sensual *Millenarian*, or *Mahumetan*, or any other Gross Errors? To prove it a Truth, I pleaded 2 *Pet.* 3. 13. And if it be there asserted, or if it may be justly thence inferred, I conceive 'tis no Error. Now the Apostle in that Chapter very positively asserts that before the New Heavens and the New Earth were to appear, *A Day of the LORD was to come, in which the Heavens should pass away with a great Noise, and the Elements melt with fervent Heat, the Earth also and the Works that are therein being burnt up*, Ver. 10. And *all these things were to be dissolved*, Ver. 11. And that, by a Conflagration, Ver. 12. which it is intimated should be as Universal as the Deluge in the Days of *Noah*, Ver. 5, 6. Now I must confess I cannot see how the Apostle could well have given a more lively Description of the attending Terrors of the Great Day of the Final Judgment. But here this Gentleman comes with his Difficulties, which will never prove this an Error, tho' I could not solve them, if it be but here asserted. He says then there must be a *New Creation*; which is not necessary. A *Dissolution* there will be; for St. *Peter* plainly asserts it: But he does not say it will, be an annihilating Dissolution. Nay, his comparing it to *Noah's* Deluge intimates that the *Dissolution* spoken of would not annihilate the Substance of Heaven and Earth, any more than that Deluge did. *The World that then was, being overflowed with Water, perish'd. ver. 6.* The Form Perish'd, and the Structure was Dissolv'd, but the Substance Remain'd. There needed not a *New Creation* then;

no

no more will there alter the othe Dissolution foretold, because the Substance will remain as before. He adds, this *New Creation, must be Eternal, altho' Material, and as Material, to be measur'd by Time, Eternal Time: A fine Parcel of Absurdities together.* I answer, since GOD has not told us how long these New Heavens and New Earth shall last, and whether or no they shall be subject to any farther Revolutions, 'tis best and safest for us to supend our Judgments, doing which we avoid such Absurdities as those mention'd, or any other that can be added. But let this *Hypothesis* be once prov'd an Error, that is, let it be fairly made appear that 'tis not here laid down by St. Peter, and I'll readily quit it: And till then. Sir Richard may debate with whom he pleases about the Errour, whether it be worse than *Mahumetan*, or worse than the *Millenarian*. For 'tis to no purpose to compare that with Errors of any sort, which for what yet appears may be a great and a solid Truth.

Poor *Crispine* comes in again, p. 70. for finding fault with that saying of *Marion*, That *the Gospel is so spoil'd, as that, we must have it quite new.* He says, *it is plain, a thing may be renew'd, and yet continue the same, the Rust or Filth, or whatever defiles it, being taken off from it.* Now for my part I should be sorry to plead either for *Rust* or *Filth*, and yet I think my self bound to stand up for the Old Gospel, and cannot be for one *quite new*. As for them that *have had a hand in corrupting the Good Old Gospel, by handling it deceitfully*, (and it is no difficult matter to guess who he means,) Let them say I, that are Guilty, answer for themselves; They shall no more have me for an Advocate, than those Persons shall have me for a Companion, who under pretence of *restoring it to its Purity by the Power*  
of

of the Holy Spirit, whiffle it away till it comes to nothing.

I am therefore the more concern'd to keep the Old Gospel, because being satisfy'd that Inspiration for the General Use of the Church, ceas'd with the Apostles, I see not any Ground to hope for a New One by Inspiration: And I have no Prospect that an un-inspir'd Gospel would do us any service. I think *the Anathema at the End of the Book of Revelation* ought to discourage any Pretence or Attempt to revive Inspiration. And I cannot see but that the Argument I urg'd is firm and strong, which is this: That *if it be dangerous to add to that particular Prophecy, it must be much more so to add to that Canon which our Lord has declar'd to be finish'd.* Here Sir Richard asks me, *Whether our Lord has declar'd it out of Inspiration?* I answer; I take the Book of the Revelation to be the finishing the Canon of Scripture, and that by inspiration. I'm very sensible that it was some time before that Book was generally own'd to be a Part of the Canon, and yet conceive if it was Divinely Inspir'd it was design'd to be a Part of the Canon, nay really was a part of it from the first. And if at the End of it, it is intimated that the Canon is finish'd, then is it dangerous to make an Addition. And if the *Bead-roll* which it is threaten'd will be *collected out of my Elaborate Work*, be but of *such Assertions*, I don't think I shall labour under any very formidable Apprehensions.

Pag. 71.

Ibid.

*Its a shrew'd Observation he makes indeed in the very same Page, That God was true to his Word in the Days of Noah.* Without all doubt, he will be so in every Age: But the Question is, Whether they that would willingly pass for Prophets in our times, have a like Mission with *Noah*, and that be truly *the Word of God* which they bring. Let that be

be once prov'd, and I shan't offer to Question whether or no GOD will be true to it: But till then, he may call those who refuse to Credit it *Scoffers*, if he pleases, but they are evidently on the safest side.

In the next Page, having turn'd what I had said about the Prophet *Joel* and *St. Peter*, at his pleasure, he exercises his Wit, in saying. That *Joels explaining St. Peter must be by an extraordinary Prescience without doubt, for he liv'd several Hundred Years before St. Peter spoke the Words referred to.* But the worst of it is there appears no occasion for this piece of Wit, if a Man considers but my Words. explain'd *Joel's Prophecy* from *St. Peter*, and not *St. Peter* from *Joel*. And yet if *St. Peter's* last Days, were the last Days of *Jerusalem* and the Jewish State, it must certainly be too hasty in these Gentlemen, as soon as ever they hear the last Days mention'd, to fancy their own times are particularly referr'd to. 'Tis true, the same Apostle does say, that *in the last days there should come scoffers*, 2 Pet. 3. 3: And there have been but too many such in every Age, since *the last Days* commenc'd. However, had this Gentleman turn'd to his Greek Testament, he'd have found a difference in the two Expressions. In Acts 2. 17, ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις: But in 2 Pet. 3. 3, 'tis ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν. In one 'tis properly *in the last Days*; and in the other, *in one of the last of the Days*. So that in one of the last of the last Days, even in the close of Time, *Scoffers* are to arise: And I doubt when this Pretended Dispensation, is prov'd a Mistake by the Event, it will hasten their Coming, and cause that Generation of Men strangely to increase and multiply.

He says *I am Inclined to a sort of Apocalyptical Millennium, one of my own Invention.* But I find they <sup>Ibid.</sup> that

that have had their Fancies working that way, have generally drawn such Odd Schemes, and been so wofully baffled, that of all the Subjects I know, that would be one of the last I should choose for the Employment of my Invention. I do indeed (and I have long been of that Mind) think it most probable from Scripture, that the Church of CHRIST will before the End of Time, be in a much more flourishing State than ever hitherto; That the Body of the remaining *Jews* will be signally Converted, and the Gospel universally Publish'd: But as for Time, and Method, and Means, and Manner, I leave them to GOD, without pretending to give scope to Invention; and I believe it will in the Issue appear that Others might as well have done so too. I want not to *get over the obvious Query* he mentions, *viz. How the Millennium must begin before that Generation passes away?* In this Case he offers me a little Help of the Critick, by telling me the Signification of the word Γενεᾶ. This is kind, I confess; at least it has that appearance: But he might have staid till I had been down, before he had been so officious to help me up. I am under no Difficulty as to the Passage of our Saviour in *Mat. 24.* as he apply'd it; But my Query is, Upon what Grounds do these *New Prophets*, apply the same Passage to our Times? I am not to seek what our Saviour meant when he said, *This Generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled;* but I want Evidence that the *Millennium*, especially such a *Millennium* as these Gentlemen have invented, is to commence before this Generation passes away? And it had been time enough to have talk'd of *untying the Gordian Knot*, when that had been produc'd. That would have been, doing  
Busi-



Business, and might have prevented his *fear of nauseating the Reader with his Reflections on this Author of the Caveat.*

At last I'm charg'd with a Crime, which he says, *others may put a Name to.* I'll fairly State the Case, and then let any Man judge between Plaintiff and Defendant, on which; side *the Crime* lies, and what name to give it. I in my *Caveat* gave the Words of a Paper that was deliver'd by one that would willingly pass for a Prophet, to a near Relation; which Paper was declar'd to be drawn up by immediate *Inspiration*, Importing a Threatning of Judgment upon persisting in rejecting his Message; but giving still ten Days to determine on one side or the other, after which GOD was to visit with Mercy or Judgment, as the Person should chuse. I added these Words: *'Tho this is above 5 Months age, there is no judgment yet appears. The Persons concern'd are Living, and Signal Monuments of the Goodness of God. There is no remarkable Display of the Divine Power, unless in a way of Consolation.* Now says the Gentleman, *supposing that this was the State of this Person, when this Sermon was Preach'd, yet if before the Printing of it the Case was greatly alter'd, and such a Visitation or Display of the Divine Power appear'd, as that the Person's own Mouth did own to be a Judgment of GOD, and which still continues, and. rather encreases than asswages; and that of this infliction this Author was not ignorant; Can those Words of his, be the Words of Truth or Soberness, or becoming the Messenger of Truth to affirm; upon Pretence that there was nothing of it befallen when the Sermon was Preach'd, tho' there was long before it came out in Print? This says he, is matter of Fact, tho' I have spar'd Names out of Respect.* To which I shall only say this, that tho' between the Preaching and Printing my Sermon the Party concern'd had a Fall, yet I neither did nor do conceive *the Case thereby greatly alter'd.* That there was a Fall it's true I knew, being sent to, for my Prayers on that Occasion, and at the same time desir'd to Bless GOD that it was no worse but I neither could see any reason to suppose that Fall to be a Judgment, nor did I know that *the Persons own Mouth own'd it to be a Judgment,* nor could I hear, tho' I inquir'd, that he who deliver'd the Paper, did represent it to the Party concern'd as the judgment that was threaten'd. On the contrary I understood that the Party concern'd was as little satisfi'd with these *Prophets* as ever, and had still *Remarkable Consolation,* and it was upon that Account I mention'd it. But Sir *Richard's* great Assurance about this matter, has led me to make yet a farther Enquiry; and now I can Certify all whom it may Concern, that the Party never did *own the Fall to be a Judgment*

ment of GOD, and that it does not still *continue or increase*; that there is a great deal of Comfort and Satisfaction, No likelihood of falling in with the Dispensation pretended, nor fear of the Judgments threaten'd. This I deliver for *matter of Fact*, upon sufficient Authority: And am afraid that this Gentleman's different representation of the matter, will with some People weaken the Credit of his other Relations, which he seems to lay such a stress upon.

Pag.74.

After all, he tells me. That I cannot say it is not Possible for *this Dispensation to be of GOD*. Whereas, I conceive I have prov'd it impossible for GOD to have my Hand in it, without contradicting himself, and slurring his own Perfections. *If there be one undeniable Mark of the Finger of GOD in it, he tells me that I am gone, tho' there be an hundred dubious ones.* On the Contrary I have shew'd in my *Caveat*, p. 32, 33. That one solid Objection against the Inspiration of any Persons, ought to outweigh ever so many plausible Pleas in favour of it: And whether I have not offer'd more than One such Objection, let the Reader Judge.

Pag.75.

He Promises *A Continuation of his Examen of my Position and Arguments very Speedily*: Which I shall be ready to Receive and Consider. And the less of Heat there is in it, and the more of Argument, it will be not only the more becoming a Gentleman, but the more likely to Convince. I am,

Sir Yours,

Westminster,  
April 5. 1708.

E. C.

---

LONDON:

Printed by T. Ilive, for Thomas Parkhurst, Jonathan Robinson and John Lawrence, and Sold by Ben. Bragg, in Paternoster-Row. 1708.

Price Two Pence.